OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

---

3 EDWARD VII., 1903

VOL. LVIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWELFTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE FIFTH DAY OF MAY, INCLUSIVE



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

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER

P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., D.C.L. (*Oxon.*)

AT THE OPENING OF THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE NINTH PARLIAMENT

1903

CABINET FORMED JULY 13, 1896

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P. C., G. C. M. G., K.C., D.C.L. (*Oxon.*)
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Rt. Hon. Sir Richard J. Cartwright, G.C.M.G.
Secretary of State	Hon. R. W. Scott, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. Sir F. W. Borden, K.C.M.G., B.A., M.D.
Postmaster General	Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock, K.C.M.G., K.C., M.A., LL.D.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. Sydney Fisher, B.A.
Acting Minister of Railways and Canals Minister of Finance	Hon. W. S. Fielding.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. Clifford Sifton, B.A., K.C.
Minister of Customs	Hon. Wm. Paterson.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. James Sutherland.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. M. E. Bernier.
Minister of Justice	Hon. C. Fitzpatrick, B.A., K.C.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. Raymond Préfontaine, B.C.L.
Without Portfolio	Hon. W. Templeman.
Minister of Railways and Canals	(Vacant).
(Not in the Cabinet.)	
Solicitor General	Hon. Henry George Carroll, LL.B.

Clerk of the Privy Council ..... John J. McGee.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur	Speaker.
Peter Macdonald, M.P.	Deputy Speaker.
Mr. T. B. Flint	Clerk of the House.
Mr. J. B. R. Laplante	Assistant to the Clerk.
Lieut.-Col. Henry Robert Smith	Serjeant-at-Arms.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION, NINTH PARLIAMENT

1903

ALCORN, GEORGE OSCAR—Prince Edward.
ANGERS, CHARLES—Charlevoix.
ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH ELOI—Berthier.
AVERY, MELZAR—Addington.

BALL, GEORGES—Nicolet.
BARKER, SAMUEL—Hamilton.
BAZINET, CHARLES—Joliette.
BEITH, ROBERT—Durham, W.R.
BÉLAND, HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BELCOURT, NAPOLEON A.—Ottawa.
BELL, ADAM CARR—Pictou.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E.R.
BERNIER, HON. MICHEL E.—St. Hyacinthe.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BIRKETT, THOMAS—Ottawa.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BLAIR, HON. ANDREW GEORGE—St. John (City).
BORDEN, HON. SIR FREDERICK W., K.C.M.G.—King's, N.S.
BORDEN, ROBERT L.—Halifax.
BOURASSA, HENRI—Labelle.
BOURBONNAIS, AUGUSTIN—Soulanges.
BOYD, NATHANIEL—Macdonald.
BROCK, WILLIAM REES—Toronto Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BRODEUR, HON. LOUIS PHILIPPE—Rouville.
BROWN, JAMES P.—Chateauguay.
BRUCE, FRANK C.—Hamilton.
BRUNEAU, ARTHUR AIMÉ—Richelieu.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.

CALVERT, WILLIAM SAMUEL—Middlesex, W.R.
CALVIN, HIRAM A.—Frontenac.
CAMPBELL, ARCHIBALD—York, Ont., W.R.
CARBONNEAU, ONÉSIPHORE—L'Islet.
CARGILL, HENRY—Bruce, E. R.
CARROLL, HON. HENRY G.—Kamouraska.
CARSCALLEN, ALEXANDER W.—Hastings, N. R.
CARTWRIGHT, RT. HON. SIR RICHARD, G.C.M.G.—Oxford, S.R.
CASGRAIN, THOMAS CHASE—Montmorency.
CHAMPAGNE, LOUIS N.—Wright.
CHARLTON, JOHN—Norfolk, N.R.
CHRISTIE, THOMAS—Argenteuil.
CLANCY, JAMES—Bothwell.
CLARE, GEORGE A.—Waterloo, S.R.
CLARKE, EDWARD FREDERICK—Toronto, West.
COCHRANE, EDWARD—Northumberland, Ont., E.R.
COPP, ALBERT J. S.—Digby.
COSTIGAN, HON. JOHN—Victoria, N.B.
COWAN, MAHLON K.—Essex, S.R.
CULBERT, JOHN—Brockville.

DAVIS, THOMAS OSBORNE—Saskatchewan.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMEON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, LOUIS JULIEN—Lévis.
DEMERS, L. PHILIPPE—St. John and Iberville.
DESJARDINS, SAMUEL—Terrebonne.
DOUGLAS, JAMES M.—Assiniboia, East.
DUGAS, FRANÇOIS O.—Montcalm.
DYMENT, ALBERT EDWARD—Algoma.

EARLE, THOMAS—Victoria, B.C.
EMMERSON, HENRY R.—Westmoreland.
ERB, DILMAN KINSEY—Perth, S.R.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR C.—Two Mountains.

FARQUHARSON, DONALD—Queen's West, P.E.I.
FIELDING, HON. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.)
FISHER, HON. SYDNEY ARTHUR—Brome.
FITZPATRICK, HON. CHARLES—Quebec County.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FOWLER, GEORGE W.—King's, N.B.
FRASER, DUNCAN C.—Guysborough.

GALLERY, DANIEL, Montreal, St. Anne.
GALLIHER, WILLIAM ALFRED—Yale and Cariboo.
GANONG, GILBERT W.—Charlotte.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GEOFFRION, VICTOR—Chambly and Verchères.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLY—Welland.
GIBSON, ALEXANDER, JR.—York, N.B.
GILMOUR, JAMES—Middlesex, E.R.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GOULD, ISAAC J.—Ontario, W.R.
GOURLEY, SEYMOUR E.—Colchester.
GRANT, GEORGE D.—Ontario, N. Riding.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S.R.

HACKETT, EDWARD—Prince West, P.E.I.
HAGGART, HON. JOHN GRAHAM—Lanark, S.R.
HALE, FREDERICK H.—Carleton, N.B.
HALLIDAY, JAMES—Bruce, N.R.
HARTY, WILLIAM—Kingston.
HARWOOD, HENRY S.—Vaudreuil.
HENDERSON, DAVID—Halton.
HEYD, CHARLES BERNHARD—Brant, S.R.
HOLMES, ROBERT—Huron, W.R.
HUGHES, JAMES J.—King's, P.E.I.
HUGHES, SAMUEL—Victoria, Ont., N.R.
HYMAN, CHARLES S.—London.

INGRAM, ANDREW B.—Elgin, E.R.

JOHNSTON, ALEXANDER—Cape Breton.
JOHNSTON, ROBERT—Cardwell.
JOHNSTON, THOMAS GEORGE—Lambton, W.R.

KAULBACH, CHARLES E.—Lunenburg.
KEMP, ALBERT E.—Toronto, East.
KENDALL, ARTHUR S.—Cape Breton.
KENDREY, JAMES—Peterborough, W.R.
KIDD, EDWARD—Carleton, Ont.

LANCASTER, EDWARD A.—Lincoln and Niagara.
LANG, JOHN—Peterborough, E.R.
LARIVIÈRE, ALPHONSE A. C.—Provencher.
LAURIER, R. CHARLEMAGNE—L'Assomption.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID, G.C.M.G.—Quebec, East.
LAVELL, JOHN REEVE—Leeds and Grenville.
LAVERGNE, LOUIS—Drummond and Arthabaska.
LAW, BOWMAN BROWN, Yarmouth, N.S.
LEBLANC, OLIVER J.—Kent, N.B.
LEFURGEY, ALFRED A.—Prince East, P.E.I.
LEMIEUX, RODOLPHE—Gaspé.
LENNOX, HAUGHTON—Simcoe, S.R.
LEONARD, J. E. EMILE—Laval.
LEWIS, WILLIAM J.—Albert.
LOGAN, HANCE J.—Cumberland.
LOVELL, HENRY—Stanstead.
LOY, GEORGE M.—Beauharnois.

MACDONALD, PETER—Huron, E.R.
MACKIE, THOMAS—Renfrew, N.R.
MACKINNON, D. A.—Queen's, E.R. (P.E.I.)
MACLAREN, ALEXANDER F.—Perth, N.R.
MACLAREN, WILLIAM SCOTT—Huntingdon.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM F.—York, Ont., E.R.
MACPHERSON, ROBERT GEORGE—Burrard, B.C.
MCCARTHY, LEIGHTON GOLDIE—Simcoe, N.R.
MCCOLL, JOHN B.—Northumberland, Ont., W.R.
MCCOOL, CHARLES ARTHUR—Nipissing.
MCCORMICK, GEORGE—Muskoka and Parry Sound.
MCCREARY, WILLIAM F.—Selkirk.
MCEWEN, GEORGE—Huron, S.R.
MCGOWAN, JOHN—Wellington, C.R.
MCGUGAN, MALCOLM—Middlesex, S.R.
MCINTOSH, JOHN—Sherbrooke.
MCISAAC, COLIN F.—Antigonish.
MCLENNAN, ANGUS—Inverness.
MADORE, JOSEPH ALEXANDRE C.—Hochelaga.
MALOUIN, ALBERT—Quebec Centre.
MARCIL, CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCIL, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARTINEAU, PIERRE R.—Montmagny.
MATHESON, JOSEPH—Richmond, N.S.
MAYRAND, HORMIDAS—Maskinongé.
MEIGS, DANIEL B.—Missisquoi.
MIGNAULT, ROCH MOÏSE S.—Yamaska.
MONET, DOMINIQUE—Laprairie and Napierville.
MONK, FREDERICK D.—Jacques Cartier.
MORIN, JEAN BAPTISTE—Dorchester.
MORRISON, AULAY—New Westminster.
MULOCK, HON. SIR WILLIAM, K. C. M. G.—York, Ont., N.R.
MURRAY, THOMAS—Pontiac.

NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E.R.

OLIVER, FRANK—Alberta.
OSLER, EDMUND BOYD—Toronto, West.

PARMELEE, CHARLES H.—Shefford.
PATERSON, HON. WILLIAM—Wentworth and N. Brant
POPE, RUFUS H.—Compton.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W.R.
POWER, WILLIAM—Quebec, West.
PRÉFONTAINE, HON. RAYMOND—Maissonneuve and Terrebonne.
PRINGLE, ROBERT A.—Cornwall and Stormont.
PROULX, ISIDORE—Prescott.
PUTTEE, ARTHUR W.—Winnipeg.

REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
REID, JOHN D.—Grenville, S.R.
RICHARDSON, MATTHEW KENDALL—Grey, S.R.
RILEY, GEORGE—Victoria, B.C.
ROBINSON, JABEL—Elgin, W.R.
ROBINSON, JAMES—Northumberland, N.B.
ROCHE, WILLIAM—Halifax.
ROCHE, WILLIAM J.—Marquette.
RODDICK, THOMAS G.—Montreal, St. Antoine.
ROSAMOND, BENNETT—Lanark, N.R.
ROSS, JAMES HAMILTON—Yukon Territory.
ROSS, JEAN AUGUSTE—Rimouski.
ROSS, HON. WILLIAM—Victoria, N.S.
ROSS, WILLIAM—Ontario, S.R.
ROUSSEAU, JEFFREY ALEXANDRE—Champlain.
RUSSELL, BENJAMIN—Hants.

SCHELL, JACOB T.—Glengarry.
SCOTT, WALTER—Assiniboia, West.
SEAGRAM, JOSEPH E.—Waterloo, N.R.
SHERRITT, JOHN—Middlesex, N.R.
SIFTON, HON. CLIFFORD—Brandon.
SIMMONS, OLIVER—Lambton, E.R.
SMITH, ERNEST D.—Wentworth, S.R.
SMITH, RALPH—Vancouver.
SPROULE, THOMAS S.—Grey, E.R.
STEPHENS, GEORGE—Kent, Ont.
STEWART, D. A.—Lisgar.

SUTHERLAND, HON. JAMES—Oxford, N.R.
SUTHERLAND, ROBERT FRANKLIN—Essex, N.R.

TALBOT, ONÉSIPHORE ERNEST—Bellechasse.
TARTE, HON. JOSEPH ISRAEL—Montreal, St. Mary.
TAYLOR, GEORGE—Leeds, S.R.
THOMPSON, ANDREW THORBURN—Haldimand and Monck.
THOMSON, THOMAS INKERMAN—Grey, N.R.
TISDALE, HON. DAVID—Norfolk, S.R.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TOLMIE, JOHN—Bruce, W.R.
TOLTON, EDWIN—Wellington, N.R.
TUCKER, JOSEPH JOHN—St. John, N.B , City & Co.
TUPPER, HON. SIR CHARLES HIBBERT, K.C.M.G.—Pictou.
TURCOT, GEORGE—Megantic.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.

VROOMAN, ADAM E.—Victoria, Ont., S.R.

WADE, FLETCHER BATH—Annapolis.
WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE—Russell.
WARD, HENRY ALFRED—Durham, E.R.
WILMOT, ROBERT D.—Sunbury and Queen's.
WILSON, URIAH—Lennox.
WRIGHT, AARON ABEL—Renfrew, S.R.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION, NINTH PARLIAMENT

1903

ADDINGTON—Melzar Avery.
ALBERT—William J. Lewis.
ALBERTA—Frank Oliver.
ALGOMA—Albert Edward Dyment.
ANNAPOLIS—Fletcher Bath Wade.
ANTIGONISH—Colin F. McIsaac.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
ASSINIBOIA, EAST—James M. Douglas.
ASSINIBOIA, WEST—Walter Scott.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcil.
BEAUCE—Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—George M. Loy.
BELLECHASSE—Onésiphore Ernest Talbot.
BERTHIER—Joseph Eloi Archambault.
BONAVENTURE—Charles Marcil.
BOTHWELL—James Clancy.
BRANDON—Hon. Clifford Sifton.
BRANT, S. RIDING—Charles Bernhard Heyd.
BROCKVILLE—John Culbert.
BROME—Hon. Sydney Arthur Fisher.
BRUCE, E. RIDING—Henry Cargill.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—James Halliday.
BRUCE, W. RIDING—John Tolmie.
BURRARD—Robert George Macpherson.

CAPE BRETON—Alexander Johnston. Arthur S. Kendall.
CARDWELL—Robert Johnston.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frederick Harding Hale.
CARLETON (O.)—Edward Kidd.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Victor Geoffrion.
CHAMPLAIN—Jeffrey Alexandre Rousseau.
CHARLEVOIX—Charles Angers.
CHARLOTTE—Gilbert W. Ganong.
CHATEAUGUAY—James P. Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Joseph Girard.
COLCHESTER—Seymour E. Gourley.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—Robert A. Pringle.
CUMBERLAND—Hance J. Logan.

DIGBY—Albert J. S. Copp.
DORCHESTER—Jean Baptiste Morin.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Louis Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM, E. RIDING—Henry Alfred Ward.
DURHAM, W. RIDING—Robert Beith.

ELGIN, E. RIDING—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Jabel Robinson.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Robert Franklin Sutherland.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Mahlon K. Cowan.

FRONTENAC—Hiram A. Calvin.

GASPÉ—Rodolphe Lemieux.
GLENGARRY—Jacob T. Schell.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE, S. RIDING—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. RIDING—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. RIDING—Thomas Inkerman Thomson.
GREY, S. RIDING—Matthew Kendall Richardson.
GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.

HALDIMAND AND MONCK—Andrew Thorburn Thompson.
HALIFAX—Robert L. Borden. William Roche.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON—Samuel Barker. Frank C. Bruce.
HANTS—Benjamin Russell.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, N. RIDING—Alexander W. Carscallen.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—J. Alexandre Camille Madore.
HUNTINGDON—William Scott Maclaren.
HURON, E. RIDING—Peter Macdonald.
HURON, S. RIDING—George McEwen.
HURON, W. RIDING—Robert Holmes.

INVERNESS—Angus McLennan.

JACQUES CARTIER—Frederick D. Monk.
JOLIETTE—Charles Bazinet.

KAMOURASKA—Hon. Henry George Carroll.
KENT (N.B.)—Oliver J. LeBlanc.
KENT (O.)—George Stephens.
KING'S (N.B.)—George W. Fowler.
KING'S (N.S.)—Hon. Sir Frederick W. Borden, K.C.M.G.

KING'S (P.E.I.)—James J. Hughes.
KINGSTON—William Harty.

LABELLE—Henri Bourassa.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Oliver Simmons.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Thomas George Johnston.
LANARK, N. RIDING—Bennett Rosamond.
LANARK, S. RIDING—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Dominique Monet.
L'ASSOMPTION—R. Charlemagne Laurier.
LAVAL—J. E. Emile Leonard.
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. RIDING—John Reeve Lavell.
LEEDS, S. RIDING—George Taylor.
LENNOX—Uriah Wilson.
LÉVIS—Louis Julien Demers.
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA—Edward A. Lancaster.
LISGAR—D. A. Stewart.
L'ISLET—Onésiphore Carbonneau.
LONDON—Charles S. Hyman.
LOTBINIÈRE—Edmond Fortier.
LUNENBURG—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.

MACDONALD—Nathaniel Boyd.
MAISONNEUVE—Hon. J. Raymond Préfontaine.
MARQUETTE—William J. Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—Hormisdas Mayrand.
MEGANTIC—George Turcot.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—James Gilmour.
MIDDLESEX, N. RIDING—John Sherritt.
MIDDLESEX, S. RIDING—Malcolm McGugan.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—William Samuel Calvert.
MISSISQUOI—Daniel B. Meigs.
MONTCALM—François O. Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Pierre R. Martineau.
MONTMORENCY—Thomas Chase Casgrain.
MONTREAL, ST. ANNE—Daniel Gallery.
MONTREAL, ST. ANTOINE—Thomas G. Roddick.
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES—(Vacant).
MONTREAL, ST. LAWRENCE—Robert Bickerdike.
MONTREAL, St. MARY—Hon. Joseph Israel Tarte.
MUSKOKA—George McCormick.

NEW WESTMINSTER—Aulay Morrison.
NICOLET—Georges Ball.
NIPISSING—Charles Arthur McCool.
NORFOLK, N. RIDING—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. RIDING—Hon. David Tisdale.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—James Robinson.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Edward Cochrane.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—John B. McColl.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—George D. Grant.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Ross.
ONTARIO, W. RIDING—Isaac J. Gould.
OTTAWA (City) { Napoleon A. Belcourt. / Thomas Birkett.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Hon. James Sutherland.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, G.C.M.G.

PEEL—Richard Blain.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Alexander Ferguson MacLaren
PERTH, S. RIDING—Dilman Kinsey Erb.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John Lang.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—James Kendrey.
PICTOU { Adam Carr Bell. / Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, K.C.M.G.
PONTIAC—Thomas Murray.
PORTNEUF—Michel Simeon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Isidore Proulx.
PRINCE, EAST (P.E.I.)—Alfred A. Lefurgey.
PRINCE, WEST (P.E.I.)—Edward Hackett.
PRINCE EDWARD—George Oscar Alcorn.
PROVENCHER—Alphonse A. C. LaRivière.

QUEBEC, CENTRE—Albert Malouin.
QUEBEC, EAST—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.
QUEBEC, WEST—William Power.
QUEBEC (County)—Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.
QUEEN'S, EAST (P.E.I.)—D. A. MacKinnon.
QUEEN'S, WEST (P.E.I.)—Donald Farquharson.

RENFREW, N. RIDING—Thomas Mackie.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Aaron Abel Wright.
RESTIGOUCHE—James Reid.
RICHELIEU—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Joseph Matheson.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Jean Auguste Ross.
ROUVILLE—Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur.
RUSSELL—David W. Wallace.

ST. HYACINTHE—Hon. Michel E. Bernier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City—Hon. Andrew George Blair.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City & Co.—Joseph John Tucker.
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE—L. Philippe Demers.
SASKATCHEWAN—Thomas Osborne Davis.
SELKIRK—William F. McCreary.
SHEFFORD—Charles H. Parmelee.
SHELBURNE AND QUEEN'S, N.S.—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—John McIntosh.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—William H. Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—Leighton Goldie McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—Haughton Lennox.
SOULANGES—Augustin Bourbonnais.
STANSTEAD—Henry Lovell.
SUNBURY and QUEEN'S (N. B.)—Robert D. Wilmot.

TEMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Samuel Desjardins.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
TORONTO, CENTRE—William Rees Brock.
TORONTO, EAST—Albert E. Kemp.
TORONTO, WEST { Edward Frederick Clarke. / Edmund Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER—Ralph Smith.
VAUDREUIL—Henry S. Harwood.
VICTORIA (B.C.) { Thomas Earle. / George Riley.

VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
VICTORIA (N.S.)—Hon. William Ross.
VICTORIA (O.), N. RIDING—Samuel Hughes.
VICTORIA (O.), S. RIDING—Adam E. Vrooman.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—Joseph E. Seagram.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—George A. Clare.
WELLAND—William Manly German.
WELLINGTON, C. RIDING—John McGowan.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—Edwin Tolton.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH AND BRANT, N. RIDING—Hon. William Paterson.
WENTWORTH, S. RIDING—Ernest D. Smith.
WESTMORELAND—Henry R. Emmerson.
WINNIPEG—Arthur W. Puttee.
WRIGHT—Louis N. Champagne.

YALE and CARIBOO—William Alfred Galliher.
YAMASKA—Roch Moïse S. Mignault.
YARMOUTH—Bowman Brown Law.
YORK (N.B.)—Alexander Gibson, jr.
YORK (O.), E. RIDING—William F. Maclean.
YORK (O.), N. RIDING—Hon. Sir William Mulock, K.C.M.G.
YORK (O.), W. RIDING—Archibald Campbell.
YUKON TERRITORY—James Hamilton Ross.

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

BALL, GEORGES—Nicolet.
CHAMPAGNE, L. N.—Wright.
CHARLTON, JOHN—Norfolk, N.
CLARKE, E. F.—Toronto, W.
EARLE, THOS.—Victoria, B.C.
HOLMES, ROBT.—Huron, W.
LARIVIÈRE, A. A. C.—Provencher.
MACDONALD, P.—Huron, E.
MADORE, J. A. C.—Hochelaga.
MONET, D.—Laprairie and Napierville.
ROCHE, WM. J.—Marquette.
RUSSELL, B.—Hants.
SCOTT, WALTER—Assiniboia, W.
SUTHERLAND, R. F.—Essex, N.
TAYLOR, GEO.—Leeds and Grenville.

Chairman:—L. N CHAMPAGNE—Wright.

ERRATA

VOL. I.

Col. 2465, line 23 from bottom 'The people of the west have,' should read : 'The people of the west do not like to have it insinuated, &c.'

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 12, 1903.

The Parliament, which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 12th day of March, 1903, for the despatch of business.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

A Message was delivered by Molyneux St. John, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

Mr. SPEAKER,—I am commanded to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General desires and awaits the attendance of your honourable House in the Senate Chamber.

Accordingly the House went into the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned.

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that Mr. Thomas Barnard Flint, Esquire, has been appointed Clerk of the House, in place of Sir John Bourinot, deceased.

ELECTION PETITIONS—JUDGMENTS OF SUPREME COURT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a certified copy of the judgment of the said court in the election appeal for the electoral district of Two Mountains, by which the judgment of the lower court declaring the election void, was affirmed.

In conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, I issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, certified copies of the judgments and decisions of the said court in the matter of the appeals made from the decisions of the trial judges in the lower courts, relating to the elections :—

For the electoral district of Laval ; and

For the electoral district of St. James (two judgments) ;

by which the said appeals were dismissed, and the decisions of the trial judges were affirmed.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from the judges selected for the trial of election petitions pursuant to 'The Dominion Controverted Elections Act,' certificates and reports relating to the elections:—

For the electoral district of Addington ;

For the electoral district of Beauharnois ;

For the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of Durham ;

For the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of Hastings ;

For the electoral district of Laval ;

For the electoral district of Terrebonne ; and

For the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of York, Ont.

The said election petitions were severally dismissed, and the sitting members declared duly elected.

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that, during the recess, I have received communications from several members, notifying me that the following vacancies had occurred in the representation, viz. :—

Of Thomas Christie, Esq., member for the electoral district of Argenteuil, by decease ;

Of Edward H. Horsey, Esq., member for the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Grey, by decease ;

Of the Hon. Joseph Raymond Préfontaine, member for the electoral district of Maisonneuve, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit ; the office of Minister of Marine and Fisheries ;

Of Thomas Barnard Flint, Esq., member for the electoral district of Yarmouth, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown ;

Of Angus McLeod, Esq., member for the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Ontario, by decease ;

Of George Ritchie Maxwell, Esq., member for the electoral district of Burrard, by decease ;

Of the Hon. Joseph Raymond Prefontaine, member for the electoral district of Terrebonne, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit ; the office of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and

Of Joseph H. Legris, Esq., member for the electoral district of Maskinongé, by resignation.

I accordingly issued my several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have further the honour to inform the House that, during the recess, the Clerk of the House received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the election and return of the following members :—

Of Thomas Christie, Esq., for the electoral district of Argenteuil ;

Of Bowman Brown Law, Esq., for the electoral district of Yarmouth ;

Of the Hon. Joseph Raymond Préfontaine, for the electoral district of Maisonneuve ;

Of James Hamilton Ross, Esq., for the electoral district of the Yukon Territory ;

Of Hormisdas Mayrand, Esq., for the electoral district of Maskinongé;

Of Thomas Inkerman Thomson, Esq., for the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Grey ;

Of Robert George Macpherson, Esq., for the electoral district of Burrard ; and

Of Joseph Arthur Calixte Ethier, Esq., for the electoral district of Two Mountains.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. Joseph Raymond Préfontaine, member for the electoral district of Maisonneuve, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding).

Robert George Macpherson, Esq., member for the electoral district of Burrard, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Mr. Galliher.

Thomas Inkerman Thomson, Esq., member for the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Grey, introduced by Mr. Borden (Halifax) and Mr. Blain.

Joseph Arthur Calixte Ethier, Esq., member for the electoral district of Two Mountains, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine).

Hormisdas Mayrand, Esq., member for the electoral district of Maskinongé, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine).

Thomas Christie, Esq., member for the electoral district of Argenteuil, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier).

Bowman Brown Law, Esq., member for the electoral district of Yarmouth, introduced by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and Mr. Fraser.

Mr. SPEAKER.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—The Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I am glad to be able to congratulate you on the continued prosperity that prevails throughout the Dominion. Canada has received many blessings during the past year which call for the expression of our heartfelt gratitude to a kind Providence.

I had the pleasure of visiting London last summer in anticipation of the Coronation of His Majesty, and to meet on that occasion representatives from all parts of the Empire bringing with them assurances of the loyalty and contentment that prevails throughout His Majesty's widely extended possessions ; and though, at one time, fears were entertained that the King's illness would have involved a further postponement of the ceremony, it was a source of much joy and happiness to His Majesty's subjects that his health was so speedily and perfectly restored.

Representatives of this government participated in the important Colonial Conference which was called by His Majesty's Government in connection with the Coronation. The report of the proceedings of the conference, including the documents submitted by the Canadian representatives, has already been given to the public, by His Majesty's Government in London. I feel assured that much good will result from the bringing the leading public men of the great self-governing colonies into direct contact with each other and with the statesmen of the motherland.

The great influx of population into our North-western territories and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world, through Canadian channels. The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

A treaty has been entered into between His Majesty and the government of the United States, under which the proper delimitation of the boundaries between Canada and Alaska is to be judicially determined by a tribunal of six impartial jurists of repute.

As a result of the recent decennial census, the representation of the different provinces must be re-adjusted, as required by the British North America Act, and a Bill will be introduced for that purpose.

Bills with respect to the creation of a Railway Commission, the amendment of the Patent Laws, the Militia Act, Chinese immigration,

the reorganization of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the settlement of Railway labour disputes, and various other subjects will be submitted to you.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The public accounts will be laid before you and also the estimates for the coming year, which have been prepared with due regard to economy and the rapid growth of the Dominion.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I pray that in the consideration of these matters and in the performance of all the labours which will devolve on you, your deliberations, under Divine guidance, will tend still to increase the prosperity and happiness of our people.

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

That the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

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

That select standing committees of this House for the present session be appointed for the following purposes :—1. On Privileges and Elections. 2. On Expiring Laws. 3. On Railways, Canals, and Telegraph Lines. 4. On Miscellaneous Private Bills. 5. On Standing Orders. 6. On Printing. 7. On Public Accounts. 8. On Banking and Commerce. 9. On Agriculture and Colonization,—which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House ; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon ; with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That a special committee of five members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed a list of members to form the select standing committees ordered by this House this day, such select committee to be composed of the following members : Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Borden (Halifax), Sir Richard Cartwright, Hon. Mr. Sutherland (Oxford), and Hon. Mr. Haggart.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That a select committee be appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of this House during the present session, with power to report from time to time, to be composed of Messrs. Ball, Champagne, Charlton, Clarke, Earle, Holmes, La Rivière, Macdonald, Madore, Monet, Roche (Marquette), Russell, Scott, Sutherland (Essex), and Taylor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any change in the personnel of the committee ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is the same as last year.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Joint Librarians of Parliament for 1902.—Mr. Speaker.

Report of the Department of Public Works.—Hon. Mr. Sutherland, Oxford.

ADJOURNMENT—MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS—STEAMER STANLEY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the motion is carried, I would like to inquire of my right hon. friend when the usual explanations will be given as to the ministerial changes ? I think the course pursued last year was that the right hon. gentleman told us that he would give notice of a day, and subsequently he named a day on which the explanations were given.

The PRIME MINISTER. The first duty we have to dispose of is the presentation of an Address to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne. As soon as that duty has been accomplished, I shall be prepared to give the explanations immediately.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Mr. Raymond Préfontaine). If I may be allowed at this stage, I would like to give to the House the following information from Charlottetown, P.E.I., dated March 12th, 1903 :

'Stanley' got clear ice pack this morning, six miles east Cape Bear, and now alongside 'Minto.' Gulf ice very heavy to eastward.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 13, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before the presentation of petitions, I would ask hon. members to write down their names on the petitions which they present. This is in accordance with the rule, and, if attended to, it will avoid difficulty.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Samuel Desjardins, Esquire, for the electoral district of Terrebonne.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Samuel Desjardins, Esq., member for the electoral district of Terrebonne, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick).

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House proceeded to the consideration of His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. ANDREW T. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada in reply to the Speech from the Throne. At the very outset, Sir, permit me to say that I keenly appreciate the honour which has been done me in imposing upon me this pleasant task—an honour which I feel must necessarily have been intended chiefly for the worthy constituency of Haldimand and Monck, which I represent. Haldimand, Sir, deserves well at the hands of this House—a House standing for the free institutions which we enjoy; for it was Haldimand which returned to the parliament of old Canada, on his coming back from his exile in the United States, that true Canadian patriot to whom we owe so much of our present day privileges, the late William Lyon Mackenzie. Assaulted in Montreal, burned in effigy in Kingston, mobbed in Toronto, it was for our quiet rural constituency to recognize in this man the true flame of patriotism, unadulterated by self-seeking or self-interest; and so, Sir, I repeat, the county of Haldimand deserves well at the hands of this House.

But enough of this ancient history; let me come to the matter in hand. Once more we meet together, Sir, with little to regret, with much to be thankful for, during the year which has flown away so quickly since last we gathered here—with little to regret from the standpoint of the nation, but with sorrow in our hearts for true comrades stricken down by the hand of death—one in the fulness of years, one in the glory of his youth, and all at a time of usefulness to their country—a country which they, irrespective of party, deeply and truly loved. Of national calamities, Sir, I am pleased to say we have had none whatever. No volcanic eruptions have overwhelmed, with inconceivable destruction, whole prosperous communities in one brief day; no earthquakes have wrecked our cities, burying the inhabitants in their ruins; no cyclones have swept over our country, leaving death and destruction in their path; no plague has stricken our people in their thousands with its rapid death; no famine has slowly tortured them to the end of all things human; no war has prevailed in our boundaries leaving in its track burned homesteads and maimed and wretched humanity. By the association of ideas one passes very naturally from the fact of the absence of war in our country to its happy termination in another part of the empire, far-away South Africa. How greatly has our realm increased, Mr. Speaker, within the last few years. Canada is no longer, a number of semi-discordant provinces experimentally strung together by an Imperial Act of parliament, but a nation well knit and well balanced—and more than a nation, a nation within an empire. And so it is that we find ourselves taking the keenest of interest in a war waged on another continent and at a distance of thousands of miles from our shores, and able not only to congratulate England on the termination of her war, but to congratulate ourselves on the termination of our war.

Even were this the proper occasion for so doing, Sir, time would be altogether inadequate for the discussion of the merits of the quarrel between Britain and Boer, which culminated in that struggle in South Africa. This much at least, we may feel sure of—that we, confident in the righteousness of our own cause, were no more confident and honest than our brave foemen, who believe firmly in the righteousness of theirs. And, on this common ground, at least, we may meet and agree—that war is in itself a shocking thing, and its termination on terms favourable alike to conquerors and conquered a matter for heartfelt thankfulness on the part of all of us.

Since the birth of this parliament, now some two years old, Australia has federated. We remember that, on an occasion similar to this, the gentleman who was then moving the Address, referred with pride to the fact that the successful union of our own provinces had, to a very large extent, actuated our fellow colonists in the island continent in taking that momentous step, In Australia, however, they have but one race. In Canada, we are fortunate enough to have two. And so we sincerely hope that, having set an example of political confederation to one part of the empire, we may now, by our historical record, inspire another great part of the empire in such a way that these recently diverse warring races may for the future dwell in peace and harmony in a united South Africa. And here, Sir, let me, very briefly, trace the history of French and English with a view to applying to this case the lessons

which we gather from that history. It is but a century and a half ago since these imperial peoples were striving for the mastery with bitter hate. Each called to its aid the savage Indian as auxiliary, and in many a peaceful home women and children fell beneath the savage tomahawk or the bloody scalping knife, as the war-party of the one or the other made incursion in those iron days that are past. We know that after battles more creditable to the participants than these awful cruel forays fought by men brave and heroic, battles fought with varying success, won alternately by one and the other, victory perched on the banner of Great Britain; and, in 1763, by the treaty of Paris, Canada took her place among the family of young nations within the British Empire. What optimist, the most pronounced at that time, but would have prophesied nothing other than a century of strife and hatred, after a war so terrible as that which had just been concluded? But what was the event. In less than thirteen years after that, our French Canadian brothers repudiated with scorn the invitation to join the revolted colonies, and arming themselves to repel the invasion of the Americans, slew their leader below the frowning walls of old Quebec, and planted the British flag more firmly than ever on the ramparts of that world famous citadel. After less than half a century, came the war of 1812, that struggle of the few against the many. Once more our French Canadian brothers sprang to arms, and, under gallant DeSalaberry hurled back the alien foe at Chateauguay, a second time saving Canada to the British Crown. Very shortly thereafter, when our forefathers—then called rebels, now called patriots—took up arms for the achievement of those rights which they felt to be their due, Quebec, under Papineau, was no whit behind Ontario under Mackenzie, and, while both uprisings were for the moment failures, the seed watered by patriot blood has long since borne fruit in our splendid self-government of to-day, a self-government at the head of which sits our honoured chief, a true British statesman of French origin. And so, Sir, I think I may say that following a war so cruel as that I have described, when we find results so highly satisfactory, we are not mere idle dreamers if we look forward to the day when the two races in South Africa will be united as the two races are united here by ties of mutual respect and regard.

Among the chief event of the year that has passed one must give no secondary place to the crowning of His Gracious Majesty King Edward VII. of England, King Edward I., of United Canada. We can easily recall the sorrow that came upon us when we learned so unexpectedly that His Majesty had been stricken down with an illness which threatened to be fatal in its results, and I can assure you, that our loyalty to the King was increased by our sympathy with the man in proportion to this was our joy at his complete recovery, and I can say in all truthfulness that not one in all the long line of British sovereigns ever rode to the Minster with more sincere acclaims than did our King. From the standpoint of military representation, it is somewhat a disappointment to say that Canada was almost unrepresented at the King's coronation. But, for this, the untoward event of the King's illness was alone to blame. Composed of 657 picked men, the contingent of Canada almost doubled in numbers the contingents from the Cape, New Zealand and Australia, and almost quadrupled the forces from any one of these alone. I can assure you that if this contingent did have to come back owing to the fact that when the King's operation in June was announced we were assured on the highest authority that the coronation could not follow until October, it was not time and money wasted, for these men saw and were seen. Everywhere, in London, in Southampton, in Liverpool, they were met by people in huge crowds who turned out to give them welcome—to give them welcome as a demonstration of the feelings which were held toward them because of the achievements of our brave brothers in arms from Canada in South Africa, achievements freshened in the minds of the people by the recent events at Hart's River with which that whole country was then ringing. Now, Sir—and in making the remarks I am about to make I hope I shall not be accused of too plain speaking, or be held to belong too much to that modern school of diplomacy which believes in speaking the truth in the case of nations as well as individuals—I would call attention to the fact that five years ago a contingent was sent to England to celebrate the diamond jubilee of Her Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, and it met with a hearty welcome indeed. But what a difference between then and now! In the former case we found that hospitality was the keynote and that, while the air was friendly enough, it was, to some extent patronizing nevertheless. This came as a surprise to Canadians, because, arguing from the historical record and from race ancestry they knew that they were the peers of any within the broad confines of the empire. But they learned that the English did not know it. Meantime South Africa had intervened, and what a change had come over the spirit of the times. Our English friends had learned to recognize the worth of Canadians, and, with that honesty and generosity which is characteristic of them when they do know, they were not slow to extend to us full recognition for the work our men had done and to give Canadians due equality. And so, in this case, our men had the satisfaction of feeling the new state of affairs, where to some extent

at least, in the old days humiliation was their portion. And this brings me to that part of His Excellency's speech which deals with the colonial conference in Great Britain. It would be hard to overestimate the vast importance of the results likely to flow from a meeting of that nature—a meeting called together by the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain to take advantage of the gathering in London of so many leading statesmen from the outlying parts of greater Britain to attend the coronation. The work of this conference fell chiefly under three heads. First, the political relations of the mother country with the colonies; second, imperial defence; third, the commercial relations between the various colonies and Great Britain. With regard to the first, the colonial representatives felt in general, and the Canadian representatives in particular, that the existing political relations were satisfactory in the extreme. Under no conceivable circumstances could we enjoy greater freedom to take advantage of every opportunity to develop our enormous resources, and that for the present at least is all our people crave. In this connection it may be opportune for me to read the opinion expressed by the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain said:

> It would be a fatal mistake to transform the spontaneous enthusiasm which has been so readly shown throughout the empire into anything in the nature of an obligation which might be at this time unwillingly assumed or only formally accepted.

The good sense of that, I believe, must be evident to every one, and I cannot see why the sentiment should not have been carried further and applied to the matter of imperial defence also. This, I know, has been an oft mooted question. Various and many have been the schemes proposed in this connection. One frequently urged and strongly pressed has been the collection of a fund by taxation in the colonies to be handed over to the British government for expenditure, but I believe that such a scheme savors too much of taxation without representation to be popular on this continent where the application of that principle worked so great a trouble over a century ago. What money we have to expend must be expended by our own responsible ministers and by them alone, until that day shall come, which I fear is yet far distant—that day hoped for but hardly to be expected for some considerable time yet—when our own Canadian house is set in order in the matter of defence. The scheme propounded by the British government was the formation of an Army Reserve Corps in Canada, liable to special service across the ocean and specially trained, to be used by the imperial government in the case of war, but only with the consent of the colonial government to which the particular force belonged. At first blush the scheme, subject to that condition, seemed perfectly safe, but after all it was somewhat misleading. What colony would expend large sums of money in the creation of a force for a special purpose and then refuse that force to the imperial government when required? The acceptance of such a proposition would, as a matter of course, mean the granting the use of these men whenever the government which raised the force were called upon to allow it to be utilized. In the case of the South African war, we gave aid freely and spontaneously, but with the distinct understanding that our action should not create a precedent, and that we should be free to exercise our own judgement as to our course in the future. Were it not for that understanding, in what position would we find ourselves? Simply this that in the case of wars declared by the British parliament, in the declaration of which we had no say, which would be forced on us without our consent being asked, we would be in the very anomalous position of forced contribution, the equivalent of having consented to give up some of the rights of self-government which we so highly value.

As one having some experience in the matter of recruiting even for a twelve day camp, may I say, with all diffidence, that the raising of the Canadian quota, which was fixed at 10,000 men, subject to special training—which must take at least three months in every year—would be in busy Canada entirely impossible. I doubt if a tithe of that number of men could be got together to drill that number of months every year. Therefore, I think that our representatives were quite right in not consenting to the scheme propounded by the mother country. And, mark you, Sir, it was refused in no mean spirit, but simply because our representatives felt that they had a knowledge of the local conditions in Canada which the imperial authorities could not possibly have. And in order to convince the House of the absolute correctness of the attitude of our representatives as Canadians, let me read to you the closing paragraph of the memo presented by the Canadian ministers to the imperial authorities last summer. It is as follows:

> In conclusion the ministers represent that while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purposes of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the tax payer of the mother country from some of the burdens she now bears; and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities and under the advice of experienced imperial officers, in so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self government which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

With regard to the trade question, our representatives reaffirmed the principle of preferential trade and urged its adoption by the colonies and the motherland, reserving the right, in the event of this change of policy within the empire not materializing, to take such steps as they deemed expedient. I may say, Sir, that while our leaders were sitting behind closed doors, we of lesser responsibilities had excellent opportunities of gauging the political sentiment of the rank and file throughout all parts of the empire—at least from every state, province and dominion in the self-governing parts of that empire—and delighted were we to find that the splendid men from Ceylon and the Cape, from New Zealand and Australia, stand heart and hand with us, seeing eye to eye, willing and eager for a lasting partnership with Britain, but too much of British blood to stand for one moment the slightest imputation of inferiority, building up in each new nation upon the sure foundation of equality a patriotism and a loyalty as wide and as deep as those seas Britannia rules. Tried in the furnace seven times heated these men have proved their worth, worth which ought never to have been doubted, for their blood is of the best, their environment of the best. No slum-bred men they, but for the most part each a laird on his own broad acres, independent of all save law and order and God, like the true British yeomen of old.

Now, I come to the question of the Alaskan Boundary Commission. That commission is intended to deal with the dispute between Canada and the United States regarding the boundaries in that far away part of North America, concerning which both nations are now at variance. At any time the discovery of rich gold deposits in those territories and the consequent inrush of miners might lead to a conflict of jurisdiction which would be most irritating and dangerous to the people of both countries, and therefore we view with satisfaction the appointment of this commission. We wish in Canada to live on terms of peace with the other nations of the world. We do not want one single foot of the territory of the United States, but I say with equal emphasis that we do not want the United States to take one single foot of the soil of Canada, and so we are well content with the scope of this commission which has to do with the ascertainment of what is a matter of considerable difficulty, but after all is only one of fact, and that is the deciding of where the boundary line actually runs. It is true that finality may not after all be reached for the reason that the jurists from each country who are to sit on this comission are equal in number.

But why borrow trouble ? This much at least we know, that the present attitude of the United States, from the standpoint of friendliness, is far different from the position maintained by it for so many years in contending that there was nothing at all to arbitrate. So we say that even should this commission fail, it is quite possible that the door would be left ajar for the entry of some other commission, the results of which may be and we hope will be, more satisfactory.

Now, Sir, for me to sit down with no mention of domestic concerns, concerns which more nearly affect us than those imperial matters on which I have been touching, interesting as the latter are, would indeed, in my opinion, be a mistake. And first let me say a brief word as to the very satisfactory influx of immigrants now pouring into Canada. We have, as you know, vast areas of fertile, habitable land for which we must have a population if Canada is to take her place, as we confidently expect her to take her place, one day among the great nations of the world. But, Sir, in my opinion there is something even more important than the rapid settlement of Canada, and that is the proper settlement of Canada. I would infinitely rather see people coming into Canada belonging to those two great races which hitherto have colonized our land, than to see it filling up with off-scourings from the cities of foreign countries, the very class of people we do not want.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is not only my sentiment, but I believe it is the sentiment of everybody on this side of the House, including the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), who takes care that our settlers are all of the best. To what class do I refer, in chief ? The settlers that we are after are those able to till the fertile land of the Territories and Manitoba, yes, and of new Ontario and new Quebec, for we must not forget the undeveloped resources of the older provinces in our enthusiasm for the new. These settlers we want, and these settlers we are getting in many cases farmers with some means besides their own strong right arm, means which will enable them more rapidly to make wealth in time to come. And from what places are we getting these settlers ? From the inhabitants of the British Isles and the United States mainly, men living under institutions similar to our own, men speaking the same language, so that in a very few years they will be equally good Canadian citizens with ourselves ; and we will not have to wait, one, two or three generations for the complete assimilation of these people.

Now, Sir, the main and most important question for these new settlers, and for the old settlers too, for that matter, is the question of transportation. To what end the raising of 200 million bushels of wheat in the west unless the farmers there can

get that wheat to market in reasonable time and at a reasonable expense to them ? And the very same remark applies to the mixed farmers of older Canada. These men must get their varied products to the seaboard quickly and inexpensively, or forfeit the markets of Britain and Europe. Therefore it is with very great pleasure indeed that we heard the announcement in the Speech from the Throne, that the government of His Excellency will immediately appoint a transportation commission to deal with this very intricate question, for the purpose of its betterment.

I am very glad also that a reference has been made to the Militia Act. Framed in times long gone by, and under conditions totally dissimilar to those of the present day, the Militia Act was very unsatisfactory to the main body of the force to-day, and once more we are made to feel that the old dark days for the militiamen in this country are now gone by, and that at last parliament feels that it can deal without loss of dignity with matters pertaining to the active militia of Canada. For that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speech from the Throne.

As to the Railway Commission, that of course will be a permanent tribunal. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council has in times past given tolerable satisfaction; but so great is the increase in our commerce that the work thrown upon that committee is altogether too much, even for their broad shoulders to carry. And so this commission should be appointed, following in this respect the example of other countries, of older countries, which have gone through similar commercial conditions.

Next, I come to a subject which I fear is a very debatable one, the subject of the Redistribution Bill. I hardly expect hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to hail with joy the announcement of the advent of this measure. I feel that it would be impossible——

Mr. MACLEAN. Is it going to be fair ?

Mr. THOMPSON. I was going to say that no matter how fair that measure may be, we can hardly hope to meet all the aspirations and longings of hon. gentlemen opposite, including the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). Therefore I will say this much, at least, that I think the government surgeon will make the necessary amputations and ingraftments as painlessly as possible, and that, true to our Liberal conceptions, we will, as is our wont, try to remove the existing abuses without creating new ones. Further than that I cannot go.

The first reference in His Excellency's speech I had designedly left to the last, and that is the question of the general prosperity of Canada. I have done so because this subject is an extremely pleasant one to all good Canadians, to those both on the right and on the left of Mr. Speaker. First, I think I may say that for the bountiful harvests, for the peace within our borders, for the absence of disease and disaster already referred to, we desire with all reverence to thank the Giver of all good. But in honouring Divinity, let us not forget humanity. Let us remember that, prodigal as nature may be in its good gifts, these gifts may be wasted by a government inactive or slothful, or they may be taken the best advantage of by such a government as Canada is fortunately ruled by to-day. Take the question of mineral lands in the first place. How rich are the mineral resources of this country ? It is Providence that has hidden these riches in the bowels of the earth, but it is the government that has supplied the facilities for using these deposits to the very best advantage. Why, Sir, away up in the frozen Yukon—which, by the way, is now for the first time sending a representative to these legislative halls, a gentleman both able and affable—away up in the frozen Yukon, law and order are maintained as they have never been maintained before in a similar territory under similar conditions ; and for that we thank the government. The miner and his hard-earned gold are as safe in the streets of Dawson City as in any other part of the world. The same remark applies to the outlying camps in British Columbia and in New Ontario. More than this, not only has the government afforded protection to the miners in their industry, but it has helped them in another essential respect by reducing the prices of what they consume, and of the raw material that they use in their industry, by the improved tariff now prevailing. So we say that nature and the government are working hand in hand, the one supplying the ores and the other supplying the facilities.

Next we come to our forest resources. Who, a few years ago, was doing anything for the development of the pulp wood industry of Canada, an industry now running up into the hundreds of millions ? Our spruce forests are not necessarily a disappearing quantity, for the reason that this wood reproduces itself so rapidly that only thirty years have to elapse from seed time to harvest. With regard to lumbering proper, the magnificent prices recently received here in Ottawa for limits in this neighbourhood, are the very best gauge of the prosperity of this great Canadian industry.

The fisheries, Sir, have increased with everything else in Canada, but we cannot look forward to their increasing to the same extent as some other industries because they are very long established and they have been very successfully worked, but even if that is the case I am told that

we do not yet realize a fraction of Canada's wealth. We have our magnificent halibut beds, deposits, or banks—which shall I call them, I ask my friends from the sea—I suppose banks, recently discovered on the coast of British Columbia. We know that railways projected to James Bay must soon be built and that when they are built these inland seas will be opened up by the enterprising fishermen of Canada. We know that James Bay and Hudson Bay have an area three times as great as the North Sea and from the North sea in Europe every year upwards of $150,000,000 is taken in fish. We do not know these inland seas as I hope some day we will know them, but we are informed that cod and other fish of value are found there and we hope very shortly to take more advantage of these great seas which we possess. The government have not been idle, for they have provided the fishermen with cold storage for their bait so that they may take advantage of the run of fish all through the year, where before they were only able to work a little more than half that time.

In matters of marine Canada is bound to be a great country because she has large inland and outland seas. Here again prosperity on the lakes is very marked and the Department of Marine and Fisheries are doing everything they can to promote it by improving the harbours and channels and providing better lighthouses and buoys. Coming to manufactures, while we must congratulate ourselves that in the six years from 1891 to 1896 inclusive, the exports of Canada increased in all about $45,000,000, it is a matter for still greater congratulation that in the last six years they have increased by some $80,000,000. We have confidence in the ability of our captains of industry, in the intelligence and strength of the armies of workingmen whom they command, and so we say: On with the good work; go forth and conquer the markets of the world as your British forebears have done in days gone by.

As to farming, which I have left to the last because it is the great basic industry of Canada, in Ontario alone a billion dollar trust, I may say in sincerity, being the representative of an agricultural constituency, that while my heart warms to all the toilers of Canada, it grows warmer still towards the farmers, the men who till the soil. What a splendid prospect is theirs? It does one good to think of it. While the mortgages are going off the farms the bank barns are going on the farms, the savings bank deposits of the farmers are increasing, their houses are comfortably furnished, their children well educated, and we find prosperity everywhere—prosperity everywhere. I am free to confess that the bountiful crops of the past two years, added to a better knowledge of agricultural processes, have in a large measure been responsible for this improvement, but I assert also that the destruction of the cattle embargo in connection with the trade of the United States and the better system of cold storage in connection with our trade with the mother country, have to a large extent supplemented nature in her bountiful gifts and have brought about this better state of things for the toilers of Canada. So, Sir, summarizing the whole matter, we come to this, that our policy after all may be summed up in a phrase now tolerably well known—'Canada for the Canadians,' not Canada for some Canadians, but Canada for all Canadians—Canada for the miner and the mariner, Canada for the fishermen and the lumbermen, Canada for the manufacturer and the farmer with special privileges to none and equal rights for all.

In conclusion, with no war clouds hanging on our boundaries, with no serious domestic questions of race and religion such as we find in the Balkan provinces threatening our domestic peace, with capital and colonists seeking us where before we were the seekers, with waters, mines, forests and farm producing abundantly, with a government strong and united, administering impartially the free institutions of a liberty-loving people, with a king wise and gracious, possessed of a prime minister loved and revered by half the people of Canada, and honoured by the whole, we may well say it is good to be a Canadian, for verily we have a land flowing with milk and honey, and our lines are fallen unto us in pleasant places.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, to quote Monsabré, 'Harmony implies numbers; by itself a note may be sound, it does not give harmony.' Hence that old-time usage which enables me to repeat in my own tongue what my friend, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has so well expressed in his. While I appreciate the honour thus conferred on the constituency which I represent, I realize that the task entrusted to me is rather a difficult one for me to fulfil. I have accepted it, however, counting on the full measure of the indulgence which the House will grant. This, Canada's foremost assembly, should also be the one nearest to perfection. Its members may and should differ as regards points of management, but they are all bound by the same fruitful love for the institutions which govern us.

A policy, to be considered good, need not be accepted by all—including the Opposition. If it were so, no policy could be called good. A good policy is one which ensures general prosperity, and that we enjoy. It cannot be gainsaid that since 1896 our economic conditions have steadily improved. To convince ourselves of the truth of this statement, we have only to consider for a moment the three phases of our industrial ac-

tivity : Agriculture which supplies the raw material ; manufactures, which transform it, and commerce, which distributes the goods.

And, first of all, let us take agriculture, undoubtedly the primary and most important of the sources of production. For several years past our farmers had been left in painfully straightened circumstances. Those whose property had so far escaped the bailiff's hand, were intent on giving up farms inadequate for the support of their families. The exports of agricultural products, which in 1878 amounted to $18,000,000 had fallen in 1896 to $14,000,000. Scarcely had the Liberals come into power than affairs took another turn ; exports of farm products increased, reaching in the course of the last fiscal year the sum of $37,000,000.

Then, the manufacturing industries, whose ruin had been predicted, found a wider outlet in the home markets, while their exports rose from $9,000,000 in 1896 to $18,900,000.

Internal trade was in a bad way, as evidenced by the number of failures reported ; it is now once more sound and flourishing. Transportation facilities have become inadequate for the requirements of our trade. Shares of our large transportation companies are sold at a premium on the stock exchanges of the world.

As a last result, our export and import trade which, in 1896, aggregated $239,000,000, reached in 1902 the figure of $423,000,000, an increase of $184,000,000 in the course of the six years of Liberal rule, while for the eighteen years of Conservative rule, the outside trade had increased by only $67,000,000.

Last of all, by virtue of the principle that thrift engenders riches and plenty, the putting into operation of all the country's resources, coupled with good business management, has brought about an era of unprecedented prosperity and enabled our Finance Minister to announce each year a handsome surplus.

For that prosperity, we should thank Providence ; without its help, our efforts would have been of no avail. It is a principle which the Opposition have deeply impressed on their minds. However, I fear they are going too far when they endeavour to show that it is solely through Providence, independently of human effort, that these results have been achieved. They who so often taunt the government on account of short memory, forget that in 1877, when this country, like many others, was undergoing a severe economic crisis, the Conservative party took occasion of the condition of affairs to call for a change of rule. They forget also that 1897, when the present tariff went into force, they predicted the direst calamities as the outcome of it.

I do not mean to say, however, that in the mind of the Liberal party, all things are at their best, and that it only remains for the government to rest on its laurels.

Certainly not. We know that dormant waters breed death, and it is only by incessant tossing that the waters of great rivers retain their sweetness and freshness. Our efforts, then, should tend unsparingly to perfect the work without altering the substance. As the ancients said : 'Motus alit, non mutat opus.' The changes or reforms which it would be desirable to bring about are numerous.

The face of our western country is rapidly changing. It is being invaded by a throng of European settlers, and—a fact which should be a matter of congratulation to us—the great neighbouring republic which for so many years boasted of annexing us piecemeal, is now sending to our country thousands of settlers who take over with them some capital and the help of their strong arms.

The sudden increase in the output of farm products explains the inability of railways and inland navigation companies to keep up with the requirements of the trade. The providing of new transportation facilities for the purpose of handling our surplus production and at the same time opening up new districts, is one of the features of the government's programme.

Transportation agencies lose much of their usefulness if they do not provide the service which is wanted or if they exact exorbitant rates. The public will learn with gratification that a railway commission has been constituted, which, it is hoped, will remove all grievances in that connection.

These transportation facilities having been provided in the public interest should be available at all times. Labour disputes in connection with the operating of railways are of interest not only to the shareholders and employees of such railway companies, but to the general public as well. In order that business be not brought to a standstill, it is necessary that the government should provide some reliable system of arbitration.

Then, again, as a member from the district of Montreal I am gratified to learn that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is to be re-organized. The present government has done a great deal to improve the Montreal harbour. They realized that from the very nature of things, Montreal is Canada's seaport. Situated as it is at the outlet of the great lakes, at the innermost point that can be reached by sea-faring vessels, it is the meeting place of merchants from all parts of the world. I am confident the House will be willing to allow the Marine Department to exercise more complete control over our harbour and the great natural highway leading to it.

However satisfactory the state of our internal affairs, we should not lose sight of those international questions which concern us. The most important is, no doubt, the Alaskan boundary question. When, in 1867, Russia agreed to give away to the United

States that vast territory of Alaska for 37,000,000 francs, people in Europe wondered what could have induced such action. 'The explanation offered, says Elisée Reclus, was the desire on the part of Russia, then unfriendly to Great Britain, to show her sympathy for the United States, and to lay the foundation for future strife between two neighbouring states.' Two serious disputes have already arisen out of this cession: One relative to the Behring sea fisheries, has been, fortunately, settled; the other, relative to the boundaries, is now pending.

I am sure the House has learned with satisfaction that a treaty had been signed having for its object the settlement of this dispute. Statements have appeared in the newspapers to the effect that the treaty was one-sided, but no evidence has been furnished to support these statements. It has been said that the treaty had not been passed in good faith on the part either of the United States or of the mother country; that in virtue of a secret understanding, the jurists appointed by the United States were not to render any decision contrary to the interests of their own country, while the representatives of Great Britain were to concede everything. However, the provisions of the treaty, as I read them, seem to exclude the possibility of such an understanding. By submitting the question to three jurists from each country who are bound under oath to give their decision in accordance with the facts, neither of the contracting parties could have in mind to deceive the public. To make such a supposition is gratuitiously to insult two great nations. Why should they resort to such shameless trickery, the result of which would be to debase them both in the eyes of the world, as well as the members of the court appointed by them? Could they not have resorted to arbitration? Secret instructions may be given to arbitrators, not to jurists. Such are the reasons which make me believe that the treaty was initiated in good faith. Let us hope that it will be carried out in the same spirit. Let us hope that the press in both countries will show a spirit of fairness and refrain from any attempt at influencing the court.

The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) who takes special interest in military matters, has recalled an event which has been a cause of rejoicing throughout the country. I refer to the happy termination of the war in South Africa. The best minds were at variance as regards the justice of this war, a point which future generations will be in a better position to decide than we. However, the terms of peace, in the opinion of all, have been such as the world would expect the victor to grant to a courageous foe. The time is no longer when the conqueror could haughtily proclaim: 'Vae victis.' The enemy who has laid down arms is entitled not only to life, but to all that makes life worth living, that is to say, honour and liberty. By doing homage to a fallen foe, by pardoning generously, by closing its ears to suggestions of vengeance and listening only to the voice of mercy, Great Britain has at once regained the sympathy which she had lost at the outset of hostilities; so true is it that justice elevates nations.

That generous treaty was the forerunner of an event equally glorious. I mean the coronation of His Majesty King Edward VII. In congregating so readily to witness this great celebration, British subjects realized that it was not so much the apotheosis of one man for whom they have the greatest admiration, they saw in it the bright symbol of the union which is to bind the king with the nation. Indeed, when the king appeared before his people in Westminster Abbey and was met by that loud acclamation: God Save King Edward, a new compact was entered into. On the one hand there was the king pledging himself to observe the usages of the kingdom; on the other, there was the people of Great Britain renewing their faith in her governmental institutions; there was the people living in the colonies, proud of the liberty and self-government which they enjoy, asserting their loyalty to the British flag. Whatever was of a nature to enhance the friendly relations existing between the colonies and the mother country and between the various colonies, was a thing to be fostered. Whatever would alter the nature of these relations, was a thing to be avoided. Our government understood it so. More than once it had proven its devotion to the mother land; but at the same time as it accepted the invitation to take part in the Colonial Conference, it refused to discuss the question of contribution to the war expenditure of the empire, making clear its determination not to render compulsory deeds which had been accomplished voluntarily. That decision had been made known to the House at the preceding session and no exception had been found to it. Had we consented to share in the wars of the empire, our political future would have been jeopardized. Practically it would have been handing back to the authorities in Downing street the privileges which half a century of struggles have won for us. The wars which England is constantly waging in her various colonies do not concern us directly. We have nothing to do with the government of these colonies, neither are they governed on our account. Nothing could be more in contradiction with the principles of our government than for us to undertake to meet an expenditure to which we have not been called to give our assent. George III. lost his American colonies for having ignored this principle. An ill-fated day it would be when Great Britain would compel us to share in the expenditure incurred in her wars of expansion. British connection would thus become too burden-

some and would inevitably be severed before long.

I understand that for the Britisher, who has been only a few years in America, the interests of England remain paramount. But for the great majority of our people, for those whose ancestors opened up the country, for those who can say like the Roman orator 'Here are the footprints of my forefathers,' in a word, for the Canadian-born, whatever their origin, while their loyalty is assured to England, their energy, their prospects, their feeling all centre in Canada, their home their native country.

Such are, Mr. Speaker, the sentiments which the eloquent spokesman of Canada, the hon the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) expressed at the conference. Unfortunately the weariness of a long journey across the sea had impaired his precious health. I am sure I am voicing the feelings of my colleagues on both sides of the House when I say that the whole country, made anxious by the news of his failing strength, rejoices now to find him restored to health and capable of resuming the management of public affairs.

I have then much pleasure in seconding the motion of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, let me, in the first place extend the congratulations of myself and my friends to the right hon. the Prime Minister on his restoration to health. We are very glad indeed to know that his trip to the south has resulted in so very great an improvement to his physical condition, which was somewhat impaired by the toils, and I suppose also by the festivities, which he had to undergo during the past summer. I may say to you, Sir, and to the right hon. gentleman and his friends, that, however, sharp our political differences may be, no one will rejoice more heartily than my friends and myself at the good news that has come to us of the right hon. gentleman's improvement in health.

Let me also, Mr. Speaker, congratulate the mover and seconder of the address on the very eloquent speeches which they have delivered this afternoon. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson), always speaks well, and this afternoon he was even more eloquent than usual. I do not know quite, to what an extent he was willing to attribute to the present government the fact that we have been free from volcanoes and cyclones in this country during the past year, but I suppose it would be only in line with certain arguments which we hear on the public platform had he announced that our immunity from these evils has been to some extent at least due to the fact that there is a Liberal government in power in this country. I notice that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), whom I had the pleasure of meeting on certain public platforms recently——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, it is always a pleasure to meet my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) was inclined to give to a certain extent some credit to Providence for our prosperity, but I notice that he put the government a long way ahead, and Providence as a very bad second.

My hon. friend the mover of the address, referred to certain losses which this House sustained during the past year. I think we have to mourn the absence of four members, one on this side of the House and three on the other. My friend, the late Angus McLeod, who has been cut off in the prime of life, was a man who, while he did not take a very prominent part in the debates of the House, held a very high position in the business community of this country, and I believe he had the respect and esteem of every man on both sides of the House. The same is true of my late friend Dr. Horsey ; a gentleman who gave promise of very great ability in public life ; a gentleman who was cut off by a most unfortunate accident in the very prime of manhood, and whose death we on this side of the House deplore as much as our friends opposite. The revered figure of the late Dr. Christie is now missed from amongst us. He was a gentleman whose presence in this House dated from a very long time ago ; a gentleman who was honoured and respected on both sides of the House, and a gentleman whose loss I am sure we all deplore. The fourth hon. member whose absence we have to mourn is Mr. Maxwell, the late member for Burrard. My own personal acquaintance with Mr. Maxwell was not very great, but I am sure that his loss will be felt by the House as a whole and especially by my friends on the other side.

Now Mr. Speaker, with regard to the speech which has been placed in the mouth of His Excellency, I would like to call the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to the fact that there is no reference in that speech to a matter which was considered worthy of mention in the speech of last year. I refer to the proposed conference—not the colonial conference—but the proposed conference between the representatives of the government of this country and the governments of Australia and New Zealand. The speech of last year read as follows :—

I have also pleasure in informing you that the government of Australia and New Zealand have accepted an invitation from my government to attend a conference in London next June for the consideration of trade, transportation, cable and other matters of intercolonial concern, and it is hoped that the meeting may lead to an extension of Canadian trade with

those important portions of His Majesty's dominions.

I gather that that refers to an entirely distinct meeting from the colonial conference which had been summoned by the right hon. Mr. Chamberlain ; and I would like to ask the Prime Minister to state whether or not the expectations which were held out in the speech from the Throne last year have been in any way realized, and whether or not any progress has been made in these important matters as a result of that invitation which was extended by this government to the governments of the other colonies which I have named.

As to the colonial conference which has been held during last summer, that indeed, as my hon. friend from Haldimand has said, was an important gathering. I have examined with some interest the report of that conference which has been issued by the imperial government, and I am a little surprised to find that in respect to 23 subjects and motions which were made before that conference either by representatives of the imperial government or of the colonies, Canada took the initiative in not one. It does seem strange that the representatives of this country, the greatest colony of the empire, should sit supine while these matters were being brought to the attention of the whole world ; should not have a single suggestion to make, not one motion to put forward with regard to the very important subjects which were brought to the attention of the empire and of the world at that meeting. I may say that the only motion made by Canada at that conference was a formal vote of thanks to the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain at its close, moved by the Prime Minister of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this conference has a very important place, not only in the history of Canada but of the empire, and I desire to express my regret that it has been so barren of results in regard to matters in which Canada is deeply interested. In the first place, if there is one subject more than another which it was important to discuss at such a conference, it is the question of preferential trade within the empire. We all know the history of that question in this country. We all know that the Conservative party, as far back as 1892, brought a motion forward in this House affirming the advantages of mutual trade preferences between the mother country and the different parts of the empire. We know the stand which my hon. friends opposite took on that occasion, and we know the stand that was subsequently taken by the party of which the right hon. gentleman is and was then leader. In 1896 the right hon. Prime Minister, speaking for his party, or rather the party speaking through him, told the people of this country that they were as much in favour of preferential trade within the empire as was the Conservative party; and the Liberal party at that time promised to the country, through my right hon. friend, that if they were returned to power they could do as much, and would do every thing that they could to bring about the consummation of that great idea. Well, Sir, what happened? My right hon. friend went to London in 1897, and the government of Canada, speaking through him, told the people of the mother country that Canada did not want any preference in the markets of the mother country. The government is responsible for these utterances, and it is against the government that I now bring this charge. But that is not the last of it. After the Prime Minister had spoken on that occasion, one leading English statesman said that the idea of preferential trade within the empire or of an imperial zollverein was to be approached with all the reverence due to a corpse. Another great English statesman said that after Sir Wilfrid Laurier's utterances he would not touch the question even with a pair of tongs. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), speaking in Great Britain in 1901, repeated the statement made by the Prime Minister in 1897. And last year, when food products were for the first time in many years taxed by the imperial parliament, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was asked whether or not it was proposed to exempt Canada either wholly or partially from the operation of this tax. The gentleman who propounded that inquiry was told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that Canada was not to be exempted because Canada did not desire any exemption. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has a record on this also. My hon. friend caused himself to be interviewed on this subject at a time when Sir Charles Tupper was propounding the idea throughout Canada that a preference of this kind might be obtained, to the great advantage of Canada, and that all Canadians should join together for the purpose of bringing it about, if possible ; and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance expressed himself in that interview as follows :—

> There are three points which Sir Charles Tupper would like to make, but in not one of them is there any foundation for his efforts. He continues to talk about the Conservative party obtaining a tariff preference for Canadian products in England ; that is to say that Great Britain would impose duties on foreign foodstuffs while admitting those of Canada free. This is an old cry with Sir Charles Tupper, but no one knows better than he does that it is arrant humbug.
>
> Everybody who has had a correct view of English public opinion has been and is still aware that such tariff legislation in Great Britain for the present or the early future is impossible.

Why, within a few months, or within a year at least, after that, the imperial government had done the very thing which my hon. friend said was arrant humbug ; and within eighteen months after that, my hon. friend with his leader in London, was

asking the imperial government to adopt that very policy. That does not seem to exhibit a very great degree of foresight on the part of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The speeches which were made by the colonial representatives at the Colonial Conference have not been published. It has been said by a member of the imperial government that they were suppressed at the suggestion of the colonial representatives. Might I ask my right hon. friend whether or not the Canadian representatives made any suggestion looking to the suppression of their speeches ? It would have been very interesting indeed to know what was the attitude of the Canadian representatives at that conference. How does my right hon. friend explain the fact that the Canadian representatives at the imperial conference adopted a policy with regard to this matter which had been urged upon this House time after time by the Liberal Conservative party, and which this government had called upon its followers to vote down over and over again ? In the session of 1900 Sir Charles Tupper moved a resolution in this House to the effect that Canada would never be satisfied with any policy short of one giving mutual trade preferences throughout the empire. That was voted down by our hon. friends opposite ; and when we proposed a similar resolution in 1901, and again in 1902, it met with exactly the same fate. But let use see what the representatives of Canada themselves proposed at that colonial conference. The report of the conference, at pages 37 and 38, contains the following language, out of the mouths of the Canadian ministers who were present :

Meanwhile the Canadian ministers determined to present to the conference a resolution affirming the principle of preferential trade, and the desirability of its adoption by the colonies generally, and also expressing the opinion of the Prime Ministers of the colonies that His Majesty's government should reciprocate by granting preferential terms to the products of the colonies in the markets of the mother country.

After calling upon their followers in the House to vote down the proposals made by us in 1900, in 1901, and again in 1902, they go to this colonial conference, and propose the very thing they had voted down and derided as a humbug. How did my hon. friend expect to get a preference from the imperial government after telling them in 1897 that we had given our preference to the mother country in return for the splendid freedom bestowed on Canada. How could we consistently, as I pointed out last year, go to the colonial conference and ask for a preference for Canada in the markets of the mother country after we had told the people of the mother country in 1897 that Canada wanted nothing in return for the preference we had given, because it had been given in return for the splendid freedom bestowed upon us. But I will continue to quote the expressions which the Canadian ministers put forth at that conference :

The Canadian ministers desire it to be understood that they took this course with the strong hope and the expectation that the principle of preferential trade would be more widely accepted by the colonies and that the mother country would at an early day apply the same principle by exempting the products of the colonies from customs duties. If, after using every effort to bring about such a readjustment of the fiscal policy of the empire, the Canadian government should find that the principle of preferential trade is not acceptable to the colonies generally or to the mother country, then Canada should be free to take such action as might be deemed necessary in the presence of such conditions.

What is the meaning of the covert threat contained in the last sentence ? Will my right hon. friend, when he rises to address the House, or the Minister of Finance, if he speaks on this motion, tell us what is the meaning of this language ? We have been held up to derision and scorn in this House because we attacked the policy of granting a preference to the mother country without asking that there should be a preference to us in return. We have said that that preference should not have been given in pretended return for our freedom, that negotiations should have been carried on for a mutual trade preference throughout the empire, and that all our efforts should have been directed to that end, so that the whole empire, and Canada itself might in that way be strengthened. The jeers and scorn seem to belong rather to our hon. friends on the other side of the House at present.

If, after using every effort to bring about such a readjustment of the fiscal policy of the empire, the Canadian government should find that the principle or preferential trade is not acceptable to the colonies generally or the mother country, then Canada should be free to take such action as might be deemed necessary in the presence of such conditions.

That means, if it means anything, that the Canadian government, after telling the people of the mother country that they did not want any preference in the markets of the mother country, have now come to the conclusion that they do want a preference, and, wanting that preference, they threaten the mother country with a repeal of the British preference unless a corresponding preference in the markets of the mother country shall be afforded Canada. It means that if it means anything ; and if it does not mean that, I will be glad if my right hon. friend, when he rises to speak, would be good enough to inform the House and the country just what that sentence is intended to convey to the people of the mother country on behalf of the people of Canada.

There is another matter connected with the colonial conference on which we would like to have a little information from the

government, and that information we think we are entitled to. The President of the Board of Trade held certain conferences with the Canadian representatives, and at page 35 of the colonial conference report, we find this :

The result of the informal meetings with the President of the Board of Trade are set forth in the following memorandum :—

As a result of the communications which have taken place, it is understood that the representatives of the colonies hereinafter mentioned are prepared to recommend to their respective parliaments preferential treatment of British goods on the following lines :—

Canada : The existing preference on lists of cent and an additional preference on lists of selected articles—

(a) By further reducing the duties in favour of the United Kingdom ;

(b) By raising duties against foreign imports ;

(c) By imposing duties on certain foreign imports now on the free list.

That is merely a recommendation by the Canadian representatives to the Canadian government. We would like, and I think the country would also like to be informed, whether or not that suggestion has been acquiesced in by the government of this country, and whether we are to expect that that policy will be carried out by Canada ; whether or not it will be carried out without any corresponding preference to the products of Canada in the markets of the mother country, or whether it will only be carried out by Canada on the exemption by the mother country of Canadian food products from the tax which has recently been imposed.

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, upon which I would like to say a word. We know that during the last three or four years Canada has been subjected to a discrimination by the German empire. We know that the German empire has imposed upon Canada a maximum tariff, while she accords to all other portions of the empire and to the United States of America her minimum tariff. This matter has been discussed more than once in the House ; it has been brought to the attention of the government ; and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance took the position of almost justifying the action of the German government when the matter was brought up by my hon. friend from Pictou some two years ago. We have pointed out to the House and the country that this discrimination is unfair to Canada, because it is a discrimination imposed, according to the expressed words of the German chancellor, because Canada has granted a preference to the mother country. We have also pointed out to the House and the country on more than one occasion that German goods have been coming to Canada under this British preference with very little value added to them in the British islands. As a matter of fact, under the Customs regulations which were read to this House by my hon. friend from Toronto last year, all that is necessary is to change the label on the goods and add a profit, and then they come to Canada as British goods.

On the one hand we have Germany discriminating against Canada, and on the other hand, we have Germany getting the advantages of the preferential tariff. Now, a very important statement was made, and apparently acquiesced in by the Canadian representatives at this political conference, and I will read it to my right hon. friend and ask him whether or not the Canadian government acquiesced in that statement, and if so, whether it is the view which his government entertains:

In connection with the discussion of preferential trade, the conference also considered the point raised by the Commonwealth government as to the possibilities of the colonies losing most-favoured nation treatment in foreign countries in the event of their giving a tariff preference to British goods. As, however, the exports from the colonies to foreign countries are almost exclusively articles of food or raw materials for various industries, the possibilities of discrimination against them in foreign markets was not regarded as serious, and as the exports from foreign countries to the colonies are mainly manufactured articles it is recognized that if such discriminations should take place the colonies had an effective remedy in their own hands.

Thus my right hon. friend and his colleagues have acquiesced in a statement that with regard to this German discrimination we have an effective remedy in our own hands. During the past three or four years we on this side have pointed out to the government that we have in our own hands an effective remedy. In 1891 we moved a resolution which pointed out that the government of this country had an effective remedy in their own hands, and that resolution was voted down by my hon. friends opposite and no action has since been taken by this government. Neither have we information whether they ever made any protest with regard to this treatment, and I desire now to point out to my right hon. friend that according to the view acquiesced in apparently by himself and colleagues at the colonial conference, this government has the remedy in its own hands, yet it hesitates to apply it. It suffers German goods to come into Canada by the hundreds of thousands of dollars under the British preference, and at the same time suffers Canadian products to go into Germany under the maximum tariff, while goods from all the rest of the empire and the United States go into that country freely under the lower or minimum tariff.

There is one other matter in connection with the colonial conference on which I would like to say a word. The colony of Newfoundland, immediately after the conclusion of that conference, was permitted to enter into negotiations with the United States for the making of a treaty, very

similar in its terms to what was known years ago as the Blain-Bond treaty—a treaty under which, I venture to say, the interests of Canada would be very much prejudiced if it should come into operation. I would like to know from the right hon. gentleman what is the view of his government with regard to that. We know that when the Blain-Bond treaty was proposed, there was a strong protest against it sent from Canada to the mother country, on account of which further negotiations were stayed for the time being. Has this government taken any similar steps with regard to the present treaty? If not, does it propose to take any such steps. I think that the government might very much better occupy itself at present in negotiating with Newfoundland for the purpose of rounding off the Dominion by securing the entrance of Newfoundland into our confederation than in idle negotiations with the United States. That colony has important trade relations with many parts of Canada—not only the maritime provinces, but Quebec and Ontario as well. I believe that an arrangement could be made between Canada and Newfoundland which would be for the benefit of both countries, and I would like to see the government beginning those negotiations; and as a preliminary, I think that the government might very well enter into negotiations with the imperial authorities for the purpose of obtaining some honourable settlement of the difficulty known as the French shore question. Canada is interested in that question almost as much as Newfoundland. Canada would be specially interested if Newfoundland would become part of our confederation, and I hope to see that island enter the Dominion before many years. We on this side will give the government our cordial support in any movement to that end, and I hope that this government will take the initiative for the purpose of having this difficulty removed so that the island may enter confederation unhampered by any such difficulty as now unfortunately prevails on its western coast. I do trust that my right hon. friend will be able to give us some information with regard to that particular question, and to assure the House that the government is alive to the advantages which would accrue both to Canada and to Newfoundland by that island becoming a part of this Dominion.

My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has referred to the Alaskan boundary question. In common with every member of this House, I regret the position in which that matter stands at present. The attitude of this government upon it has been somewhat remarkable. Last year we submitted a motion for the purpose of bringing before the House and the country the papers relating to the abrogation of the Bulwer-Clayton treaty, and the government took the ground that Canada had no direct interest in the proposed canal across from the Nicaraguan peninsula. My right hon. friend said that Canada had no direct interest in the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty or in the construction of the Nicaraguan canal—that she had no more interest in that canal than she had in the treaty affecting the Suez canal or in any other treaty between Great Britain and a foreign power. I take issue with my right hon. friend. I say that Canada had a direct interest in the abrogation of that treaty. What interest has the United States in the Nicaraguan canal? She has the interest of her possessions on the Atlantic and Pacific and of the share which she expects to have in the future great trade with the Orient. I leave it to every hon. member whether Canada has not precisely the same interest in that Nicaraguan canal as has the United States. Our interests may be of a lesser degree, but we have great possessions on the Atlantic and the Pacific and we hope to get some share in the great trade of the Orient in the future. I know of no portion of the empire which has a greater interest in this canal and in the abrogation of the Bulwer-Clayton treaty than we have. The attitude taken by my right hon. friend was not that of Lord Lansdowne because in a dispatch to the British ambassador at Washington in 1901, Lord Lansdowne referred to the interests of Great Britain in this Nicaraguan canal and in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty by reason of her enormous possessions on the continent of America. The further language of Lord Lansdowne was quoted in the House last year. Lord Lansdowne said:

> Shortly afterwards Lord Herschell intimated that the difficulties with regard to the question of the Alaskan boundary seemed insuperable and he feared it might be necessary to break off the negotiations of which he hitherto had the charge. Upon this Lord Salisbury informed Mr. White that he did not see how Her Majesty's government could sanction any convention for amending the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, as the opinion of this country would hardly support them in making a concession which would be wholly to the benefit of the United States, at a time when they appeared to be so little inclined to come to a satisfactory settlement in regard to the Alaskan frontier.

My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) brought that to the attention of the government last year. And these are very significant words indeed. Apparently, at that time, the British government had taken a stand that it would not be a proper thing to abrogate the Clayton-Bulwer treaty without making some provision for the settlement of the Alaskan boundary. Now, I think it is due to the House and to the country that my right hon. friend should state frankly the influences, if there were influences, which led to that change of attitude on the part of the British government. And he should also, and more especially, tell the people of this country whether that change of at-

titude took place with the consent and concurrence of the government of Canada. I would not have brought myself to believe that the Canadian government had concurred, if it had not been for the language of my right hon. friend speaking for his government, which seemed to indicate that in his opinion Canada had no direct interest in the abrogation of the treaty or in the Nicaraguan canal. It may be that this government has concurred in the abrogation of that treaty without provision for the delimitation of the Alaskan boundary. All I can say is that, if the government has taken that attitude, I believe it merits the censure and condemnation of every true-hearted and loyal Canadian for so doing.

What is the position of affairs? The position is that Great Britain has made a treaty with the United States of America for the submission to six impartial jurists of the question of the position of the Alaskan frontier; three of these impartial jurists to be appointed by Great Britain and three to be appointed by the United States. Well, does my right hon. friend, or does his government, expect that there will be a verdict either one way or the other from a majority of these impartial jurists? What was the idea of the government on that point when it consented to this treaty? For I suppose that this treaty, which affects the boundary of Canada, was not made without the consent of the Canadian government. It is true it does not contain the provisions of the Washington treaty which make it necessary that it should be submitted to the parliament of Canada before it comes into force. Probably my right hon. friend will explain why that provision was not contained in the treaty which has just been made between Great Britain and the United States. The government have seen fit to make this treaty—it was made by the imperial government presumably with the concurrence of the Canadian government—but it is made without any reference to the parliament of Canada, and this parliament is helpless to touch the question one way or the other now that the treaty has been made.

Well, we have these impartial jurists to deal with this matter. And does my right hon. friend feel satisfied with the selection which has been made by the United States of America? It seems to me that the situation is rather an extraordinary one. I do not know, personally, anything about the three gentlemen who have been selected by the government of the United States; but I have a number of quotations from leading journals of that country which point out the fact that these gentlemen have, or at least two of them, prejudged the case. For example, the Detroit 'Tribune' says that the subsidence of opposition to the Alaskan treaty in the Senate is explained by the fact that word was secretly passed around who the American members of the commission would be, and the announcement of the names was a sufficient guarantee that, no matter what the Canadian case was, there was not the least danger that Uncle Sam would lose anything. This newspaper, the Detroit 'Tribune' also says:

> It may be assumed without the slightest hesitation that the convictions of these two gentlemen—(Lodge and Turner)—have been formed in advance and irrevocably. . . . If Secretary Root were to show any disposition to weaken or compromise they would doubtless break up the conference in a row before anything could be lost or gained.

That is the view which an important journal in the United States takes of the situation. Now, one of these gentlemen, Senator Lodge, a very prominent gentleman in the United States, is quoted in a public journal as having spoken as follows:

> The negotiations failed because Canada made claims in regard to the Alaskan boundary which the United States could not accept and which no nation with an ounce of self respect could have admitted. . . In 1867 we bought Alaska and the Russian title vested in us. For seventy years, in round numbers, that title was never questioned. Then gold was discovered. Then England set up a claim in complete contradiction to the treaty of 1825 which had been recognized for seventy years, and a more manufactured and baseless claim was never set up. If we should yield to it there is not a portion of our northern boundary which England could not attack. . . When an attempt was made to revive negotiations last spring, Canada came forward again with her Alaskan claim and President Roosevelt refused to recognize it, as any patriotic American would. . . . No nation can afford to surrender its territory on baseless claims.

Does my right hon. friend regard that as the language of an 'impartial jurist' about to pass on this question between Canada and the United States? Then the Minneapolis 'Tribune,' another leading journal of the United States, said:

> Secretary Root and Senator Lodge are men of high character, but they are not exactly the eminent and impartial jurists contemplated by the treaty. Besides they are connected with the government in such a way as almost inevitably to make them strong partisans of its case. Senator Turner is not even a man of high public character. . . Besides as a border senator, he is committed to the most extreme American interpretation.

And the Brooklyn 'Eagle,' in the forcible language which is sometimes found even in leading American journals expresses its view in this way:

> The chances of convincing American jurists of the rightfulness of Canada's claims are about the same as the prospects of a thaw in Hades.

The New York 'Commercial Advertiser' says:

> Secretary Root and Senator Lodge have been stubborn in believing that Great Britain has

no reasonable grounds for claiming under the treaty between Russia and Great Britain any territory other than has been conceded all along. Senator Turner comes from the extreme north-western state where the feeling against yielding any Alaskan territory has always been stronger than in any other part of the United States.

The 'Literary Digest' says:

As there is no seventh commissioner, a deadlock is regarded as almost certain in which case the boundary will remain, until further negotiations, where it now is, and it now is pretty near where the United States claims it ought to be.

The New York 'Evening Post' says:

Mr. Root and Senator Turner and even more, Senator Lodge, lack judicial quality in all this Alaskan dispute. All three in time past have committed themselves unequivocally against the Canadian contention.

We believe that it would be a very fortunate occurrence should trifling indisposition or press of other duties require the resignation of Senator Lodge and permit the appointment of an expert historical geographer.

The New York correspondent of the London 'Times' says:

If he (Lord Lansdowne) has conceded anything he has conceded it with the full consent of Canada, nay upon her urgency, and Canadian views have always had weight, perhaps too much weight, with the British Foreign Office, on purely Canadian questions.

Now, the question is, what do the government propose to do after they have got the matter into this muddle? Why did they not in the first place take a firm stand as Canadian governments in days gone by have taken, and insist that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty in which we were interested—because we are interested in the Nicaraguan canal—should not be abrogated until some fair settlement had been made, or at least, until some fair means of settlement had been found for the delimitation of the Alaskan boundary? Why did the government not take that stand? I cannot believe that if the government had taken that stand the treaty would ever have been abrogated as it was. The right hon. gentleman, however, will correct me on that point. But now that a reference has been made of the Alaskan boundary question to six men, what are we to do about it? Does the government propose to concur in the appointment of British arbitrators at all? I venture to suggest to the government of my right hon. friend that that may be a question for serious consideration. If we appoint the arbitrators we know pretty well what the result will be. The very best that we can hope for is an even division, but an even division will leave matters exactly as they are at present, with the United States in possession of the disputed territory, and will leave them in even a stronger position than they are at present, because they will be able to say that the matter had been referred to a tribunal which was unable to determine whether the present boundary was right or wrong. But of one thing I am absolutely certain, and that is that if Canada or the mother country do appoint arbitrators—and I doubt the expediency of their doing so under present conditions—they should not follow the example of the United States in this regard. If we appoint any one we should appoint men who can be fairly and honestly classed as impartial jurists. The fact that the United States have appointed men who do not seem to us to come within that category, is no reason why we should follow their example, because by doing so we would condone the course of the United States in the appointment of its arbitrators, and would place ourselves in the same position the United States occupies.

Now I think that the government of this country might at least have done one thing in regard to this matter which they have failed to do, and that is to take some effectual means of informing public opinion in the United States on this question. One reason why we have had so much difficulty in getting any reasonable settlement with the United States is that nearly everybody in that country believes that this is merely a trumped up claim on the part of Canada. Why did not the government of this country take some effectual means of informing public opinion in the United States with regard to this matter? They have taken a great deal of pains in proclaiming their political propaganda in our own country. If some of that energy had been devoted to making known the Canadian case through the leading journals of the United States, it might have been possible for us to make a better arrangement with the government of that country than we have been able to do. I regret the condition in which this matter stands at the present time. Whatever course the government proposes to take in the interests of Canada, even in the hopeless condition in which the matter finds itself at present, we will give them our cordial support. Upon a question of this kind the whole country should be united; and if the government, by means of a resolution of this House, or by any other means, desires to have its hands strengthened, even at this unfortunate stage of the negotiations, I am sure that I can say on behalf of every man on this side of the House that we are prepared cordially to sustain the government in any such course.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not much more to add. Reference has been made, in the proceedings of the colonial conference, to a proposal by the Canadian government to establish a local naval force. It is not necessary for me to read the quotations; my right hon. friend no doubt recollects what the proposal was. No reference whatever is made to that in the speech

from the Throne. I would think it of sufficient importance to have merited a mention in the speech. Would my right hon. friend, in addressing himself to the House, be good enough to give us any information which he may think proper to give at the present time in regard to that matter, so that we may know what we have to expect.

Reference is also made in the speech from the Throne to the question of transportation, and to the fact that there has been a great influx of population into our north-western territories. I visited portions of the North-west during the past autumn, and I was very glad indeed to know that we are receiving a great immigration from the United States of America. We are all delighted to see that immigration taking place. Those people who are coming into that country are good citizens. They are, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has said, people accustomed to govern themselves, people to whom representative institutions are no new thing. I am not at all afraid of the influx of these men to the North-west. I am very glad indeed that they are coming in great numbers, and I hope that their numbers will be increased during the coming year. I hope also that the government will take into early consideration the question of granting provincial autonomy to those great territories in the North-west. Those territories are filling up rapidly, the people are all accustomed to representative institutions, and a great many of them, at least, feel very keenly now that they have not the complete rights of self-government which have been conferred on the people of the other provinces. I regret that no mention of this important question has been made in the speech from the Throne. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior entertains the view that it is not wise at the present time to deal with the question. I do not agree with him, I do not agree with the reasons which he has stated, I do not see any force in those reasons. I hope and trust that notwithstanding the absence of any mention of this subject in the speech from the Throne, the government will upon reconsideration bring in a Bill during the present session for the purpose of conferring complete rights of self-government upon the people of the North-west Territories.

But, in regard to the question of transportation, which is one of very great importance, I find that these words have been placed in the speech from the Throne, in the mouth of His Excellency :

> The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

We will be glad to know what is the real significance of these words. Those of us who follow the trend of public affairs in the newspapers know that proposals will be made during the present session for charters to build transcontinental railways and it is also said that applications will be made to the government for subsidies, or other assistance, to aid in the building of these railways. I would like to ask my right hon. friend, what is the significance of these words. Do they mean that the question of these charters is to be referred to the commission; do they mean that the question of the subsidies or other assistance to these railways is to be referred to a commission? If that is not the significance of the language which has been used we would be very glad indeed to know what scope these words have and what is the purport of the measure that is to be brought before the House in that regard.

I suppose it could not be expected that we should have any reference to the tariff in the speech from the Throne, but I may say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we recall the fact that during the past session the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) practically announced to the House and to the country that there would be a revision of the tariff at an early day. I am not placing my own interpretation on his words because the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), speaking afterwards in the same debate said that the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance was a clear warning to every free trader in the country that the tariff would be revised and that the tariff would be raised. Certain events have transpired since then to which I need not refer, but which are intimately connected with fiscal questions. If my right hon. friend would give us any idea as to whether or not the language of the hon. Minister of Finance in his budget speech last year is to be taken seriously, and is to be regarded as an announcement to the country that a revision will be made during the present session, we would be very glad to hear from the right hon. leader of the government on that point. A great deal of the prosperity—of the alleged prosperity —of this country is based upon the fact that our trade has increased. While our trade has very greatly increased since 1896, so has the trade of every portion of the world. I have the figues before me and could give them at the present time if I though it wise. But, our trade may increase in Canada at the expense of our own industries. If a hundred of the leading factories in Canada were wiped out of existence at the present time, the imports of Canada would necessarily show an increase, but it would not at all follow that because the imports of the country were increasing the country was therefore more prosperous. We laid down our platform in regard to this question in 1901 and again in 1902, but that platform did not find acceptance with my hon. friends on the other side of the House. They disagreed with it very strongly and yet they do

not seem to agree very closely amongst themselves. We stand on the platform which we laid down in 1901 and in 1902, and if there is not a revision of the tariff upon the lines indicated in the resolutions which we moved we shall again state our views in this House by a resolution during the present session. I am glad to say that we have won a convert even within the cabinet, and that is the youngest member of the cabinet, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine). That gentleman while my hon. friend the Finance Minister was declaiming in favour of a low tariff in the county of Yarmouth, was announcing to the electors of Maisonneuve that he was in favour of legitimate protection to Canadian industries. Now, this is a very important announcement indeed and the significance of his language is all the greater because he included the right hon. leader of the government :

> I am, as I always have been, in favour of legitimate protection to our national industries and like my leader Sir Wilfrid Laurier I will ask and require protection for the interests of the different classes of the population.

My hon. friend the Finance Minister would not be very much pleased with a platform of that kind, if we are to judge by his recent utterances in the province of Nova Scotia, but, of course, so far as Ontario and Quebec are concerned the hon. Minister of Finance may have an entirely different platform, and in the constituency of Maisonneuve I am inclined to believe that he would stand on exactly the same platform as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other matters perhaps on which a word might be said, but I think I will not take up the time of the House further at the present time beyond this : I am very glad indeed to learn by the speech from the Throne that the government proposes to bring down a measure in regard to Chinese immigration. My right hon. friend, in the campaign of 1896, made a pretty definite promise to the people of British Columbia in regard to that question. He said that the question was not a question in the east but that as far as Chinese immigration was concerned the views of the Liberals of British Columbia would prevail. Well, my right hon. friend has a majority from that province, a very considerable majority indeed —and the views of the members from that province have been pretty freely expressed in this House. Nevertheless, no measure in regard to Chinese immigration has been brought down up to the present time. I am glad that the government are at last taking this matter into their consideration and we shall be very ready indeed to give any suitable measure of that kind our most careful and earnest consideration. The people of British Columbia, or a great many of them, feel very strongly on that subject, and those who have gone from the coast to British Columbia can readily understand that we in the east do not have a real conception of what that question means to the people of that province. It requires one not only to study the question from the reports of commissions and otherwise, but it also requires a visit to the province and a free statement of opinion from the people whom one meets of all classes in the province to understand how earnestly and how vigorously that question appeals to the large and important interests in the province of British Columbia. This speech does not in the least indicate what the nature of the measure is, but when it comes down we will be able to give it our attention and to criticize it if necessary. In the meantime we can only express our pleasure that the government have at last, in the seventh year after they have come into power, seen fit to deal in an effective way, we hope, with this question which is of such great importance to the west.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I shall detain the House further at the present time. I trust that my right hon. friend will see fit to give us frankly—as frankly as the interests of the country will permit—information in reference to the matters which I have mentioned and I trust especially that in regard to the present position of the Alaskan boundary he will speak openly and frankly to the people of Canada in order that we may know just how we do stand in regard to the people of the United States on the one hand and the imperial government on the other, on a question of great importance to the people of Canada, one which concerns the possible loss of a portion of their territory.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with the observations which the speech of the leader of the opposition call from me, I deem it my duty as it is my pleasure to at once thank my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) for the very kind reference which he has made to myself. I also thank his friends behind him for the manner in which they received these observations of his. I am glad to believe that this incident is a further evidence that the amenities of British parliamentary life are of so kindly a nature; and that in the hands of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition they are indeed in safe keeping. I trust it may always be, that we can recognize honourable differences of opinion in this country, and that though we may be divided upon many questions, yet we can be united upon one, and that is a mutual respect for each other. I also beg to thank the leader of the opposition for the observations which he has made with reference to the colleagues which it has been our

sad fate to lose during the recess, and I thank him all the more because his kindly remarks have dispensed me from dwelling further on that subject.

I am glad also to join with my hon. friend in the congratulations and the generous tribute which he has paid to the mover and seconder of the address. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) and my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) are still young members, and although their parliamentary careers have been short they have both taken high rank on the floor of this House. We have heard them before; we knew what they were and we knew what they could do. To-day we have had further cause for admiration, but we had no cause for surprise at what they said and how they said it.

I have, however, to take issue with my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) on the subject, matter of his speech, although as regards its tone and its language I think it was in excellent parliamentary style. On one or two points the hon. gentleman was hypercritical and perhaps even carping. But I must do the hon. gentleman the credit of saying that he is not half so bad as he makes himself out to be when he is speaking from his place on the opposite side of the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has been endowed by nature with a fair and judicial mind, and I readily believe that if he always spoke his own judgment from the seat which he now adorns, he would sometimes revise the opinions to which he gives utterance. But the hon. gentleman belongs to a party which a long possession of power has confirmed in the belief that they were born to rule; and so, regarding power as their own attribute they are ready to believe when they are defeated that they have been robbed of their own. Thus, whenever they have been deprived of power, they are more or less in a bad humour, and like Rachel mourning her lost children they refuse to be comforted.

My hon. friend has asked information from me on certain subjects, some of which are referred to in the speech and some of which are not. He has made an earnest appeal to me to give him a frank statement of the position which we occupy in regard to the Alaskan boundary. I shall answer that appeal in the spirit in which it was made.

At long last a treaty has been made for the settlement of that vexed question which has for years been pending. It is a question of great importance inasmuch as, if not settled, it could lead to very serious and even perhaps to very dangerous consequences. A treaty has been negotiated by His Majesty's ambassador at Washington and the Secretary of State of the United States for the settlement of that question. As to the treaty itself I am bound to say that in my opinion at all events—with the single exception of a very slight blemish to which I shall allude presently—the treaty is eminently fair. The treaty provides for a reference of the boundary to a court to be composed of six impartial jurists of repute, that is to say, the commission has been entrusted with the task of determining what is the boundary as created by the treaty of 1825 between Russia and Great Britain. It is not a compromise; it is not an arbitration; there is no giving and no taking; but it is simply to have a judicial interpretation of what is the true boundary; each party agreeing in advance to accept the boundary has it may be declared, and whatever loss it may give to the other. This is a great victory. I consider, in one way, that we have obtained over the pretentions which have been hitherto advanced by the United States. Up to the present time the United States have refused, steadily refused any kind of reference of that question if the consequences were to entail to them any loss of territory. This is one of the questions which was referred in 1898 to the Joint High Commission. We had it before us on more than one occasion, and we had discussions of long duration with reference to it, but it always came to this at the end: that the United States would not agree to any terms except on condition that the possessions that they have at the present time were made theirs beyond doubt. The question has involved some serious consideration from the fact that it is possible, that the boundary, after it has been delimited by the commission, may perhaps show that some territory which now is occupied by one party really belongs to the other. Take for example the town of Skagway, which is now in the possession of the United States. It is possible that the boundary which is going to be delimited under this commission may show that Skagway does not belong to the United States but to Great Britain. Up to the present time the United States would not agree to any treaty whatever which might place their ownership of Skagway, and similar territories in jeopardy. They wanted to make it sure, that in any event, whatever the result might be, their possessions, including Skagway, should remain in the teritory of the United States. The Joint Commission had proposed in 1898, and in 1899 when we sat at Washington, that as it was a case somewhat parallel to the case of Venezueala, the precedent of Venezueala should apply. The rule which had been laid down by the Venezuealan treaty under somewhat similar conditions to this was as follows:—there were three principles laid down but it is sufficient for the purpose of this discussion to cite only this one:—

In determining the boundary, if territory of one party shall be found by the tribunal to have been at the date of this treaty in the

occupation of a subject or citizen of the other party ; such effect shall be given to such occupation as reason, justice, the principles of International law and the equities of the case, shall in the opinion of the tribunal require.

It seemed to us that was a very fair rule, We proposed it to the American commissioners, but they would not accept it unless it were coupled with this rider :

That all towns and settlements on tide water, settled under the authority of the United States, and under the jurisdiction of the United States at the date of this treaty shall remain under the authority and jurisdiction of the United States.

We would not agree to such a condition. This condition has been maintained by the United States from 1899 up to the year 1903; but in the treaty which has been negotiated and signed by Sir Michael Herbert and Mr. John Hay, this rider has been removed; and now the United States go to the arbitration with Canada without any condition of that kind, but agreeing that both parties shall submit to the award which shall be given by those six jurists of repute.

Now, it seems to me that we could not have more than has been given by this treaty. As my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has said, we do not want any territory which is not ours; neither do we want to part with any territory which is ours. We are willing to take the consequences of this commission. We may lose or we may gain. If we lose, we shall pay the consequences; if we gain, our opponents must pay the consequences. This is the position in which we now go before the court to have this question determined. So far as the treaty itself is concerned, or that part of it at all events, there is no point that has been gained by anybody. It has been said by the press that Canada has made a surrender. I am glad to say, and the House will agree with me, that there is not a particle of surrender in this treaty. It is fair and honourable to both parties, and I am more than pleased that our American neighbours should have come to that conclusion. With regard to the composition of the tribunal, the article of the treaty referring to it provides for a tribunal of six impartial jurists of repute, three to be appointed by the United States and three by Great Britain; and therefore we have a fair tribunal. If impartial jurists are appointed on either side, we shall have as fair a tribunal as it is possible to have. I have said there is a blemish in the composition of the tribunal. The only blemish I can see in it is that it is not so composed as to ensure finality of decision. If there were seven jurists, or five, instead of six, there would be of a certainty a majority in any event, and the matter would be finally disposed of ; but as the tribunal is constituted, it is possible there may be three on one side and three on the other, in which case there will be no decision. But even if we have no decision, we shall have obtained what my hon. friend attaches some importance to—the best education possible for the American people, the British people and the Canadian people, as to the merits of this question. But I may say for my part that I do not apprehend any such result. It seems to me that six impartial men ought to be able to come to a conclusion on a question of this kind.

I agree with my hon. friend on one suggestion he made—that if we are to appoint commissioners on this tribunal, they must not be partisans, but they must be the best men and men of the highest character that the British empire can supply. We had at one time reason to believe that on the American side as well as on the British side the jurists of repute would be taken from the bench. We would have been glad indeed if the President had seen fit to take the commissioners from the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States.

But now I come to the crucial point of this question, the only one on which at this moment I feel some delicacy about speaking. It has been rumored in the press that the President had selected men who were not judges, and men who, from their previous record, could not be called impartial jurists. I am not aware that Mr. Root, the Secretary for War, has expressed any opinion at all ; but he is a member of the administration of President Roosevelt, and it seems to some of us anomalous that a member of a party who is before the court as a suitor should sit on the bench as a judge in the case. With regard to Mr. Turner, I understand that he has expressed himself somewhat against the Canadian contention. However, I have not seen any word he has spoken except something in the form of a short report in the press. As to Mr. Lodge, he has certainly given utterance to expressions of such a character as to cause some reflection upon the advisability of placing him upon that court. We have made representations to Great Britain upon all these matters. The correspondence in which we have been engaged was concluded only yesterday, and it is not yet possible for me to place it on the Table of the House. Perhaps it is preferable that I should not proceed any further on this question, until the whole of the correspondence can be placed on the Table of the House, so that members on both sides shall have an opportunity to judge of the action we have taken. Therefore I shall not say any more at present, but in a few days I will bring to the House the whole of the correspondence. In fact, I think I shall have authority to lay before parliament the whole of the correspondence which has taken place between the Canadian government and the imperial government from the time the Joint High Commission adjourned in Washington in 1899.

My hon. friend has called upon me also to give information on the subject of trade with Germany. It is quite proper that this desire of my hon. friend should be gratified. He has called our attention to a paragraph which is to be found in the blue-book containing the proceedings of the imperial conference, as follows :

In conection with the discussion of the question of preferential trade the conference also considered the point raised by the commonwealth government as to the possibility of the colonies losing most favoured nation treatment in foreign countries in the event of their giving a tariff preference to British goods. As, however, the exports from the colonies to foreign countries are almost exclusively articles of food or raw materials for various industries, the possibility of discrimination against them in foreign markets was not regarded as serious, and as the exports from foreign countries to the colonies are mainly manufactured articles it was recognized that if such discrimination did take place the colonies had an effective remedy in their own hands.

My hon. friend said a moment ago, if you recognized that you had an effective remedy in your own hands for the unfriendly attitude of Germany, why did you not make use of that weapon ? The answer is obvious. My hon. friend has not forgotten that last year he asked for the production of the correspondence which had been going on for some time between the Canadian government and the German authorities. At that time we were not in a position to bring down the correspondence; it was not complete; but at present it is complete, and we are ready to bring it down, and within a few days we shall lay it on the Table of the House. I may say also that this subject will be taken up again in the budget debate by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. My hon. friend has desired to have the correspondence with the governments of Newfoundland and Great Britain with regard to the new treaty negotiated by Newfoundland with the United States. I shall be glad to bring down any correspondence in the possession of this government, but with regard to the attitude we have taken on the subject, I may say that the question is one that has long engaged our attention and that we have obtained, as the result of our efforts, the assurance that if Newfoundland be allowed by Great Britain to negotiate a treaty with the government of the United States, there shall be no discrimination in it against Canada and that the same treatment given to the American republic shall be given to the Canadian confederation.

My hon. friend also urged that the time is opportune to reopen negotiations with Newfoundland with a view to its entrance into confederation. Let me say that the government of the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell lost a fine opportunity of settling that question. At all events there were then negotiations far advanced, and I believe that had a little more generous disposition been shown by Canada to Newfoundland, the question would have been settled there and then. But if Sir Mackenzie Bowell could have settled the question and did not do so, I cannot blame him very much, because so long as the French shore difficulty is not disposed of it, will always be a serious bar to the entrance of Newfoundland into confederation. I think that Newfoundland ought to be a part of confederation. I am prepared at any time to meet the representatives of Newfoundland in order to facilitate that end. But I would hesitate very much, even if it were in my power to complete the transaction, to do so unless this most irritating question of the French shore were removed from the probability of creating mischief in Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think my right hon. friend quite understands me. My suggestion was that this government should take the initiative in endeavouring to have the difficulty settled for the purpose of bringing Newfoundland into confederation.

The PRIME MINISTER. The correspondence will show something of this character, when brought down.

My hon. friend also drew my attention to the question of transportation and asked me the meaning of a paragraph in the speech from the Throne relating to that subject. That paragraph reads as follows :

The great influx of population into our North-western territories and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world, through Canadian channels. The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention. and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

The question asked by my hon. friend is quite legitimate. There are two ideas involved in this paragraph. In the first place, the rapid filling up of the North-west territories makes it absolutely indispensable that measures be promptly taken for opening up ways of communication into the prairie sections and for the extension of those communications to the sea board. Numerous projects have been placed before us, but up to the present the government have taken no position. The matter is one of too great importance, involving too many risks, involving large demands, for the government to lightly jump into new undertakings of any kind, and we thought it desirable to wait the opening of parliament in order to consult our friends and have the benefit of the advice of parliament before taking any steps. But we give due warning to the Canadian parliament—and I think it is not out of place—that new efforts have to be made by the Canadian people to meet the

new requirements resulting from the development of our country. What form we should adopt, whether the government should participate or not, whether the government should help or not, or what should be the form of assistance, are questions which present themselves and as to which we have taken no pledge, and as to which we shall have not only to consult our friends but have the advice of parliament at large. That is not all. There is another sentence in that paragraph to which I would call attention :

> The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

What is the meaning of this ? The House knows that we have expended a great deal of money in order to remove the congestion which is every year taking place at the head of Lake Superior, and provide terminal facilities ot the different ports of the country. We have expended at Port Colborne a great deal and also at Montreal, Quebec and at St. John, N.B. We are asked to spend more money in these and other places. Parliament will be called upon to make new sacrifices. But before we spend any money, whether at Port Arthur, Port Colborne or Montreal, Three Rivers, Quebec or St. John, we think it of the highest possible moment that we should have a committee of experts, the most experienced men the country can furnish, in order to obtain from them a full report as to what is required, so that, before another dollar is asked from parliament, parliament should know exactly what amount is required and how it shall be expended. I think that this is an idea which will commend itself to the judgment of members of both sides.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will we likely have that report this session ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is more than I can say. The commission will be announced probably on Monday, but whether we shall have a report this session I cannot say.

My hon. friend devoted a great part of his time to the conference which took place in London last summer. He said that this conference had been barren of results. I do not share that opinion. I do not share the opinion that the conference which sat in London, and at which the representatives of all the self-governing colonies took part, was barren of results. True it was void of such results as were anticipated by those short-sighted men who would cause England to revert to the fatal policy of the eighteenth century, whose aim was to saddle the colonies with burdens which do not belong to them, a policy which carried to extreme limits in that age, brought about the violent separation of the American colonies from the motherland. That conference settled the principle upon which the British empire alone can rest, the principle that the British empire is composed of a galaxy of free nations all owing the same allegiance to the same sovereign, but all owing paramount allegiance also to their respective peoples.

We were invited to discuss three subjects—the commercial relations, the political relations and the military relations which ought to exist between Great Britain and her colonies. As to the question of commercial relations, I do not propose to say much at this time, because I do not believe it can be discussed so well now as later. When my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) brings down his budget—and I hope to be able to say that that will be at an early day—we shall better be able to take up the question which has been referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden). In the meantime, I can satisfy him on one or two subjects as to which, perhaps, he has not all the information he might have possessed. The hon. gentleman says that the Canadian representatives do not appear to have made any propositions to the conference. Sir, we went to the conference without any propositions whatever ; we went to receive and entertain suggestions from the others. But, when we came before that conference we had suggestions to offer and propositions to make. The trade resolution passed by the conference was the work of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) introduced a resolution to reduce the postage on newspapers and periodicals between different parts of the empire, and I am glad to say that that proposal has already been acted upon, and my hon. friend has taken steps to give effect to the suggestion he then offered. The Postmaster General also introduced the resolution, which was carried, to have the metric system adopted throughout the British empire. These, of course, were minor points. Upon the main question at issue, I have only this to say in anticipation of the debate which will take place later on—that the conditions in 1902-3 in Great Britain are not the same as were the conditions of 1897. In 1897 Great Britain had nothing as to which she could make—if I may so say it—a reciprocity treaty ; but now the conditions are changed; Great Britain has imposed a duty on cereals and is now in a position to meet our views, and, perhaps have a reciprocity of trade between Canada and Great Britain. That is the reason why we have spoken differently in 1902-3 from the way we spoke in 1897. We are not flies on the wheel—we move with the times, and, the times having changed, we were ready to take advantage of the opportunity and place our views before the British parliament. Whether they will fructify or not remains to be seen. The new budget has not been presented by the

British Chancellor of the Exchequer. In a few weeks or months, we shall see what will take place, and, having seen that, it will be time enough to take a step.

Then, we were called upon to consider the political relations. As to the political relations which exist between Canada and the colonies generally and the mother land, they are perfectly satisfactory, they could not be improved, and any attempt which has been made with a view of improving them has only led to Utopia. I can dismiss this subject without further discussion and go on to say something with regard to the subject which was treated at some length by my hon. friend from Haldimand —the military relations between Canada and Great Britain. There is a school in Great Britain to-day, especially in the official world, whose object for years past has been to bring Canada into the military organizations of Great Britain. The views of that school and their expectations were presented to us by the Right Hon. St. John Brodrick, Secretary of State for War, and by Lord Selborne, First Lord of the Admiralty. But we could not see eye to eye with them, we could not approve their views, and had to propose an absolute demurrer to their contentions. I am aware that there are men, even in Canada, who use the argument that, because Canada is part of the British empire she should take part in the large expenditure necessary to provide the heavy armaments that Great Britain has to maintain because of her dominant position in the world. I can not see the force of that logic. It would imply that Great Britain and Canada were on a footing of equality, whereas we know that they are not on such a footing. Great Britain has powers that we have not. To mention no others, she has the treaty making powers which we have not. And the powers not being co-extensive, the obligations cannot be co-extensive. That argument would imply also that Canada and Great Britain have the same interest in all things. But we know by experience that we have not the same interests. The interests of Canada are divergent from those of Great Britain in many instances. This is seen in the fact that no two of the self-governing parts of the British empire have the same fiscal policy. That argument would imply also that Great Britain and Canada are on the same footing of development. Sir, we know only too well that we have obligations in this country which Great Britain is rid of. As a consequence of our geographical position, the immensity of our territory and the sparsity of our population, we have to assume obligations, to face difficulties and to perform works which in the parent country are left to private enterprise. But though, in all these, the position of the mother country and the colony may be unequal, yet, in the colony there is equal national pride and constitutional jealousy of our rights. This, therefore, makes it absolutely impossible to entertain the proposition made to us. But I confess that we owe it to ourselves as a nation—as we claim to be—to assume our own defence. And, so far as that goes, if we have to spend more money upon military and naval service, I am sure that parliament and the Canadian people will not grudge any sum demanded for that purpose. But, to spend money outside of Canada for military purposes is a proposition that the Canadian people, I believe, are not prepared to accept at this moment. When, in 1899, we took part in the South African war, we did it not under any obligation, not in the execution of any duty which rested upon us—and, to give Great Britain her due, she did not claim it on such grounds either —but we did it simply because we thought it was right and proper to do so. But we refused to be bound for the future, and the position we took then I maintain still.

Now, my hon. friend from Haldimand stated a moment ago that the country was prosperous. He gave us a very splendid picture indeed of the position of Canada on entering the twentieth century. Though vivid, the colours were not too bright in which he painted the extension of our commerce, the development of our agriculture, the increase of our population and the advance of our industries. In all these facts, however, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was judiciously silent. The progress of Canada is an inspiring theme, but it does not appeal to my hon. friend or his followers. If they had to speak of destitution, poverty and ruin, their language would have been jubilant and exultant. But prosperity makes them dumb, whereas adversity would set their tongues wagging with a merry clatter from this time to the end of the session. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition undertook a missionary tour a few weeks ago to a certain part of the province of Ontario. While there he did not speak much on the subject of Canada's prosperity, but he spoke repeatedly on the alleged divisions in the ranks of the Liberal party.

I have no doubt my hon. friend can speak feelingly upon that subject, because he speaks of a party which, during some ten years in the past, exhibited amongst its leaders the proverbial amity that exists between cats and dogs. My hon. friend made a missionary tour some days ago in the province of Ontario, and among the leaders of the Conservative party he was like the last rose of summer, left blooming alone. I do not quarrel with my hon. friend upon that point, because I am bound to tell him that as between Liberals and Conservatives we do not view in the same way the divergencies of opinion that may exist between men professing the same political allegiance. It is a principle of the powerful political organization calling itself the Conservative

Association that all minds must be cast in the same mould, that all wheels must revolve in the same groove, they must act like a flock of sheep, and wherever one jumps the others must follow. We have not the same standard of excellence, that is not the way we do in the ranks of the Liberal party, associated as we are——

Mr. COCHRANE. You can fight like blazes, and it will be all right.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh yes, we can fight like blazes, and then we peaceably settle our little differences. But we do not fight, as the hon. gentlemen opposite used to fight when they were in the council chamber they used to fight with their naked fists, and the walls of the council chamber could testify of some Homeric battle which took place therein when the hon. gentlemen could not settle their differences of opinion in any other way. My hon. friend, in the campaign which he made a few days ago, professed to be in ignorance of the policy of the Liberal party. I must say that his ignorance is surprising, occupying the position that he does, having been for seven years now, if I mistake not, a member of this parliament. His ignorance surprises me, for the policy of the Liberal party has been on the statute-book for six years. When it was introduced into this House it was discussed and debated, and was assailed by my hon. friend and his followers. My hon. friend has been assailing the Liberal policy for all these years, and must we come to the conclusion that he did not know what he was talking about? It is certainly in the public interest that an hon. gentleman occupying the position that he does should be informed of what was the policy of the Liberal party. Surely my hon. friend knows that on this side of the House there are men who believe that free trade is the soundest and sanest of all economical systems, and there are also men who believe that protection is a preferable principle. If I am told that it is a strange thing that there should be free traders and protectionists in the same party, I would reply that it is the policy of statesmanship to reconcile differences, and out of a diversity of opinions to elaborate a policy which may be satisfactory to the country, remembering that there are no absolute rights in this country, but that all rights are subordinate to the common welfare. But I may also say to my hon. friend, and in saying this I may perhaps claim to be more candid than himself or his friends, that whether we are free traders or protectionists, we are all agreed that in this country and under existing circumstances, it is as inadvisable as it is impossible to have either an absolute system of free trade or an absolute system of protection. Our system was embodied in the year 1897 in a tariff which will live in history as the Fielding tariff. It is well suited to the country, as is evidenced by past experience, and by the unbounded prosperity which the country has enjoyed under it. My hon. friend says that he has a recruit for his views in the person of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine). He says the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a protectionist, but if he had quoted the whole speech of my hon. friend he would have quoted that part of his speech wherein he says that in the present tariff there is enough of protection to satisfy him, and to satisfy anybody who looks only to the interest of the country and not to the interest of his party.

But my hon. friend says that we are divided on this question. What would my hon. friend say if I were to show him a man, not a party but a man, who is divided against himself on this question? Will he say it is impossible for a single man to be divided on that question? We can conceive it possible that a party might be divided against itself but surely it is a stranger thing to find a man divided against himself. Well, I have read the speeches of my hon. friend, I had that pleasure for some weeks after I came back from Europe, and I found that my hon. friend is divided against himself on that very question. He has not the same opinion in all parts of the country. I must, however, pay him this compliment, that in order to suit the views of an audience in one part of the country and then suit the views of another audience in another part of the country, he has performed some feats of acrobatic agility of which I did not suspect him capable. Let me quote the words of my hon. friend on this question. Last year my hon. friend gave us his views of what he thought ought to be the fiscal policy of Canada. He is a new leader, and of course he is trying to please all his friends, and he succeeds very well in doing so, I give him credit for that. He wished to lay down a policy upon which he could go before the country and the people, and so he moved this resolution:

This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians.

"Adequate protection." In the olden times it used to be called the National Policy. But it is the same old friend with a new name. "Adequate protection." Well, whether you call it adequate protection or the National Policy, it is still a debatable question as to what adequate protection means. I may say to my right hon. friend that he did not leave us in doubt as to what he meant by adequate protection, for in the course of his speech in support of this resolution, he said this:

We find that our rate of duty on total imports from the United States is about 12½ per cent, and on dutiable goods from the United

States 24·83 per cent, while on the other hand, the rate of duty on the total imports of the United States is 28·91 per cent, and on dutiable goods it is 49·83 per cent, or, more than double our rate in each case. As has been already pointed out, the United States has nearly three-fourths of the total importation of free goods into Canada, while Great Britain has to be content with some 15 per cent. One would expect that if we intend to maintain and build up our own products and manufactures against such powerful and tremendous competition as that which we must anticipate from the United States we would fix our tariff of customs against that country on a scale at least as high as is that of their tariff against us.

That is to say, we must have the American tariff. This is adequate protection. Forty-nine per cent is the American tariff, so that in order to be consistent and to build up our industries, we must have a tariff of 49 per cent against the United States. This is the policy of my hon. friend such as it was set forth on the floor of the House, and here in the east. But, during the recess my hon. friend went to visit the North-west. If I may be permitted to say so, I congratulate him for having done so. I have no doubt that the people were pleased to have an opportunity of seeing and hearing the new leader of the party and it was right that he should come into contact with them and right that he should visit these new communities. But, if his friends have reason to be happy over his visit his opponents have also reason to be gratified that he took that course, because, there is no experience like the experience of having to speak before different communities in different parts of the country to show the character of a policy, whatever there may be in it of good or bad. As my hon. friend proceeded westward, as he commenced to sniff the breezes of the prairie, as he inhaled the fragrance of the new ploughed soil, as he gazed upon the immensity of the new wheat fields, as he came in contact with the hardy settler, who has hewed civilization out of the desert, his ideas expanded with the views of the horizon before him, and when he came to Medicine Hat the medicine had already had its effect upon him, and I am happy to say—and I give him my compliments for it—new ideas had already sprouted under his hat. To the people of Medicine Hat he spoke, to the hardy settlers he came to preach the new gospel of the Conservative party, and here is the language he held. You have heard the language he held here on the floor of parliament, advocating a Canadian tariff of 49 per cent against the consumers of Canada. But, that is not the language he held to the people of the North-west Territories.

His policy was one of reasonable protection to all Canadian industries, and he was prepared to say this before any Canadian audience. Competition amongst Canadian industries had resulted in a marvellous reduction of prices, and he did not think the people of Canada would suffer by a moderate protective tariff. The Conservative party was in no way bound up with the interests of the manufacturers and he could tell the people in all sincerity that the Liberal party had received during the past six years, and was receiving support from the manufacturers. He was well applauded on taking his seat.

I believe so, but I do not know that he would have been so well applauded when he took his seat if he had advocated the American tariff of 49 per cent. We can make a comparison between the language he held here and the language spoken to the people of the North-west Territories. What a difference there is between the self-sufficient policy of 49 per cent in the east and the meek, moderate, humble, apologizing, protective policy given to the people of the North-west Territories! It is true the hon. gentleman is still in favour of a moderate tariff to keep the foreigner out so that the manufacturers may be cooped up in a small pit so that they can not viciously cut into each other's prices and the consumer may have the benefit of a lower tariff. Is this the boasted sincerity of the Conservative party when they speak of the policy of protection? It is one thing in the east, it is one thing in the west, and there, Sir, is the condemnation of the policy of the hon. gentleman and the vindication of the policy we have on this side of the House.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend never said a word on an important subject that is mentioned in the speech from the Throne; that is to say, the new Redistribution Bill which must be introduced during the present session. We have to introduce that Bill and we will do it, not of choice, but of necessity. The necessity is imposed upon us by the letter of the constitution. We know from the experience of the past, we know from the history of former Redistribution Bills, that there are several ways of introducing such a measure, but if there be several ways of introducing it there is only one way which ought to be accepted by the Canadian parliament; that is to say, the honest, fair way, so as to give no favour to anybody and to injure nobody. I have here a statement which has been placed in my hands of 42 counties in Ontario which at the last election returned 25 Conservative members and 17 Liberal members, whereas, in these 42 counties the popular vote gave an actual majority as recorded to the Liberal candidates. In these 42 counties 88,365 votes were cast for Liberal candidates and 86,392 were cast for Conservative candidates, showing a Liberal majority of 1,973 votes—result 25 Conservative members elected, 17 Liberal members elected; and majority of votes in favour of Liberal party; majority of seats in favour of Conservative party. That is the fairness of the redistribution that we have had before us for twenty years. The objects

of the government in introducing legislation shall be, first, to wipe out the injustices and abuses from which the Liberals in Ontario have suffered for twenty-one years, and next to devise a measure in such terms as to give no favour either to the party in power or to the party in the minority, but to devise a measure, which, whatever may be the question brought before the Canadian parliament at any time, shall make it certain that the views of the people shall upon every occasion prevail and the majority shall rule.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker. I wish to refer as briefly as possible to the address which is about to be adopted by this House in reply to the speech from the Throne. Let me say at once, that I feel convinced that I am but the faithful echo of all my friends sitting on this side of the House when I say that the tone of the right hon. Prime Minister's speech has brought to us gladdening news. I find in it the tone of a man who is returning to health and I am sure that that knowledge which was conveyed to us, and which will be conveyed to the country at large to-morrow will be received with great pleasure by all true Canadians. I am not a medical man, but I have heard it said that the first sign of returning health is a disposition on the part of the invalid to resort to facetiousness and in some of the remarks which fell from the lips of the right hon. gentleman I was pleased to find that indication of a sure convalescence.

We all listened with unfeigned satisfaction to the admirable addresses of the mover and seconder of this resolution. My hon. friend the gallant member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) rose to a high pitch of eloquence, and at times I had merely to close my eyes to see as it were before me a vision such as is depicted in some of Turner's landscapes--lands with clear skies, enchanting scenery, everything flowing with milk and honey. That feeling which I experienced with pleasure was in no sense diminished when I heard the member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) in the beautiful language of France, describe to us with even greater intensity the prosperity which reigns throughout the country, and the reasons we ought have to be perfectly satisfied and to seek no further improvement in the condition of this country. I remember long ago studying when at school the beautiful work of the Bishop of Cambrai, the Journey of Telemachus to the Isles of Calypso and when I heard my hon. friend from St. Johns and Iberville, my mind was recalled to the admirable description of the Paradisean lands in which Telemachus travelled : gods and goddesses, and everything that goes to make life fair and pleasant. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) to my right rudely awoke me from this dream by giving us some considerations which I have no doubt will impress themselves upon the minds of a great many thinking people, and a great many business people throughout this country. Of course that only lasted during the address of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) and I was again plunged into a trance by the satisfied speech of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government. He told us : We have made an admirable treaty in regard to Alaska, we have had a colonial conference replete with excellent results; the policy followed by this government in respect to that legislation which we claim is necessary to make our country what it ought to be, is a perfect policy; absolute harmony reigns not only within the cabinet but amongst all the members of the Liberal party and the government has nothing to do now but to set itself to work to repair the gross injustices which have been done by past administrations. Sir, I would like to join my right hon. friend in that song of happiness and perfect peace, but I think Sir, you yourself, as well as every man in this House is persuaded of that great truth which says : That we must follow the laws of progress; that we have here in Canada a great country with changing conditions; a young country the enormous resources of which have only within the past twenty years become apparent; that we have powerful competitors quite near us; powerful competitors in the old continent of Europe, in every line, industrial, agricultural, artistic. This century has begun an era of progress which is going to lead us to great changes and if we wish to keep pace with the rest of the world we cannot afford to remain satisfied ; we must set our shoulders to the wheel, we must realize our position as a small people in this great country, and we must still unsatisfied move forward, making important changes, and endeavouring by a policy which may be called a national policy, or a policy of adequate protection, or whatever you may choose to call it—we must endeavour to build up this country, to make of it a great commonwealth, and to realize the destiny which it seems to me is clearly pointed out to us by Providence when that great power gave us this immense inheritance. Mr. Speaker, taking the utterances of the two hon. gentlemen who moved the address ; can we say that there is throughout the length and breadth of the land entire satisfaction with the policy of the government ? Can we say that there is that feeling of satisfaction which does not betray throughout this country—not what the right hon. gentleman stated a few moments before he left the chair : That there are free traders and protectionists on the government

benches—but that there is throughout the entire country amongst thinking men engaged in business, (not only in manufacturing business but in agricultural pursuits as well) a great desire at the present moment to know what is in reality the preponderant element of that party which as the right hon. gentleman says himself is divided upon a question of vital moment in this country—and, whether we shall have in reality a policy of Canada for the Canadians, or whether this government is going to pursue a course which the right hon. gentleman sums up when he said: That the part of government consists in reconciling and in balancing these divided opinions which he himself admits exists in the ranks of his own party.

On this side of the House there is no difficulty of that kind. I will advert in a moment to this statement of policy, which is consistent throughout—frank and outspoken, and which won the praises, not only of the followers of my hon. friend at my right, the leader of the opposition, but the praises in many instances of numbers of the right hon. gentleman's own followers. The right hon. gentleman states that there are divergent views within his own party in respect to that most important principle of protection. He did not require to make that statement for us to know that that divergence exists, and it has produced within the ranks of my right hon. friend's own party divisions far deeper and far greater than any which my right hon. friend is able to point out on this side of the House. It is not with equal justice that my right hon. friend treats those who are in favour of a strong national policy, and those who on the contrary believe, as some hon. gentlemen who sit on the opposition benches believe, that the present tendency ought to be in favour of a lower tariff, and of admitting, as we claim the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite admits, the great competitors of our own country to a privileged position in our own markets. Mr. Speaker, we have had by-elections, and, speaking for myself, our party has not been as successful in my own province as I would have liked; but we have had the spectacle in the province of Quebec, which I have no doubt has been repeated elsewhere, which the right hon. gentleman claimed with pride as one of the great qualities of the party which he leads. In the electoral district of Argenteuil we had the members of the present cabinet and all their supporters speaking strongly in favour of a reduced tariff. I have not here with me, but I am prepared to lay on the Table of this House the campaign speech of my friend Mr. Weir who led the ministerial forces in the electoral district of Argenteuil; and what did he say in that pamphlet which was spread broadcast throughout the constituency? He stated that the party led by my right hon. friend was a party who remained faithful even to-day to the policy enunciated by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he quoted the minister's own words, which consisted in a repudiation of every element of protection, and in a condemnation of that policy as being a policy of robbery and scoundrelism. During the very time that campaign was being waged, we had the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine), in the division of Maisonneuve, a great industrial division of the city of Montreal, posing before the electorate as a man who would not adhere to any other policy than the policy of protection, and who was prepared at any moment, upon sufficient cause being shown him, to raise the tariff, and who went around begging the names of the manufacturers of the city of Montreal, imploring them to sign his requisition paper, in order, as he said, to show to the manufacturing people and to the workingmen of that important district, that the government were pledged to the protection of their interests, and going so far, as I am informed, as to write letters, pledging the government in certain cases to an increase in the tariff, in order to secure the support of those important elements of our population. Shortly afterwards, if not at the same time, down in the electoral district of Yarmouth, we had the Minister of Finance upholding the policy of a lower tariff, of a tariff for revenue only; and at a great banquet given to celebrate the victory of the free-trade candidate, my hon. friend the member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser) reproved the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and condemned the system pursued in the province of Quebec of pandering to the taste of those who wanted to build up once more the national policy, and stated that the result obtained in Yarmouth ought to encourage the party to which he belonged to fly frankly and boldly the colours of a lower tariff and even of a revenue tariff. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that we who sit on this side of the House should point out the inconsistencies of hon. gentlemen opposite, as it is our duty to do; and we shall endeavour to perform that duty in such a way as to give satisfaction. And I will say to the right hon. gentleman that if the improvement in the condition of his health depends on us, we will favour it in every way possible, and we will trust that the example which I hope we shall set patriotically, will be followed by his own friends, and that they will contribute, as we desire to do, to the complete restoration of his health.

But, Sir, it was said by the right hon. gentleman that divisions have existed in past cabinets. It may be so; but I took note of what the right hon. gentleman further said, that those divisions manifested themselves in the council chamber, where, as Lord Melbourne aptly said on a celebrated occasion, they should manifest themselves. But what of the divisions purport-

ing to exist upon that great question in respect of which there is a feeling of unrest throughout the country which it is the duty of the right hon. gentleman to set at rest? The divisions which existed, if they did exist, in the council chamber, have been intensified in the case of our hon. friends opposite, and we had the spectacle in our own province of these gentlemen not settling their differences in the council chamber, but going down when the right hon. gentleman was returning a sick man from Europe, and fighting out their differences, like the pilots of Capt. Marryatt, on the deck of a steamer. We had the spectacle of five ministers going down to meet the premier of this country and insisting that one of their own colleagues should withdraw from the cabinet because he belonged to that phalanx of his party which holds to the view that at present the great duty imposes itself upon all Canadians of determining whether this country is going to get the full benefit of its resources, or whether these resources are to continue being used to enrich our neighbours to the south, and we are to continue being made the slaughter market for the great manufacturers of Europe.

At present, under the preferential clause, we are sacrificed to the great manufacturers of Great Britain. I repeat to-day what I said on a former occasion, when challenged by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to express an opinion on this preferential clause, that if we gave a preference to Great Britain, we should in return have some corresponding advantage in the British market. That opinion, I believe, is held by many others, and that is the policy which my hon. friend the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and myself advocated in this House long ago. Ready and willing as we were to give Great Britain a preference, we were not prepared to grant such a preference as would imperil in any way our own great industrial interests. Take that great industry which is of particular interest to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. In the province of Quebec, owing to the antipatriotic conditions obtained from the local government, our immense wealth of pulp wood, sufficient, according to the calculation of reliable experts, to last over 800 years, is being taken over to the United States. We derive from that great natural resource the smallest amount possible of wealth to ourselves. We get for our pulp wood about $3.50 per cord and in the neighbouring republic, where it is manufactured, the American manufacturers add to that cord of wood the value of $45. And in many instances that pulp comes back to us in the shape of paper. We are entitled to know from the government whether it is prepared to come down with any new policy which would enable our workingmen to get the share they are entitled to out of the profits to be derived from the manufacture of pulp within our own border. When we know that we have immense deposits of iron in this country and that steel billets are being taken over to the United States where they pay a duty of $6 a ton, which is returned afterwards in the shape of a drawback, and that this steel is manufactured in the United States into rods and galvanized wire and afterwards sent back to this country for sale, is it not our duty to insist on the government adopting a policy which will enable the work of manufacture to be done in our own country and change the balance of trade which is at present $70,000,000 against us, with our American neighbour. In the recent campaign in the province of Ontario, when I had occasion to visit the northern part of that province, I was confronted with the fact that mattes of nickel, which cost Americans perhaps $125 a ton, are taken over in immense quantities to the United States, to the refineries of New Jersey, and there given a value of over $2,500 a ton. And it is a fair question for us to ask this government to alter that system and give us in Canada the full benefit of the manufacture and by-products of that great natural wealth, which we share with only one other country in the world.

Throughout the constituencies which I visited during the last by-election, it was stated that we who sit on this side of the House wished merely to favour the manufacturer to the detriment of the agriculturist. But I venture to say that, after my hon. friends who sit on the treasury benches have heard the complaint of the farmers and market gardeners of Ontario and also the similar complaints of the associations of farmers and market gardeners of the province of Qnebec who are coming up next Tuesday to claim the revision of the tariff in respect to their industry, we shall not hear formulated in this House the charges that were made during the last campaign. Then, allow me, in that connection, to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, what have been the results, as regards the agriculturists, of the policy pursued by this government during the last few years. In 1896, we had importations of butter, cheese, bacon and hams, beef salted, pork barrelled, meats dried, and other provisions the products of the fields of the American union, to the amount of $1,288,041. During last year, these importations have amounted to over $2,500,000 from the neighbouring republic. Let me give you in detail one or two of the items to which I have just adverted. In bacon and hams in 1896, we imported from the United States $143,000 worth, last year the importations of these articles, which, I claim, we ought to reserve the full benefit of for ourselves, amounted to over $650,000 worth, in barrelled pork, in 1896, we imported $270,000 worth, and, in 1902, we imported over $580,000 worth. What we claim and what has been claimed in the uniform manner by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, is that the time has come

for us not, as my right hon. friend has said, to adopt a policy of 49 per cent protection, and not as he said to preach one doctrine in one part of the country and another doctrine in the far west—we would be acting like hon. gentlemen opposite if we did that—but to preach the doctrine throughout the country, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition did in his memorable tour, of building up our own country, and, if we find a great and powerful community like the United States reaching the acme of prosperity, reaching the height of wealth which they have reached under a high tariff, not to sacrifice our own country to them, but to keep our own resources for ourselves and for our people and to take the means that may be necessary to achieve that end. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has never advocated any other doctrine but that either in this House nor anywhere else; and I am surprised at my right hon. friend speaking as he does. But perhaps he may be excused, because of absence from the country at the time of the memorable tour was made as far as British Columbia by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, for not knowing what everybody else knows and recognizes—that, whatever may be the reproaches cast upon my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) there was one unstinted praise accorded to him by everybody, and that praise was for his sincerity and for the sameness of his professions in every part of the country.

What did the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) say in this House?

> Now, I do not say that our policy should be framed on any principle of retaliation of tariffs——

How is that for my right hon. friend who claimed that the member from Halifax laid down a distinct doctrine of a 49 per cent tariff or any other fixed percentage of duty?

> I absolutely and decidedly dissent from that. I do say that our tariff should be framed from the standpoint of the Canadian people and with a view to the preservation of the Canadian market for the Canadian people themselves.

That is the doctrine laid down by my hon. friend and followed uniformly by every one of us on this side of the House. Does my right hon. friend or any of his colleagues pretend that in his tour throughout the country the hon. member for Halifax, the leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition at any time laid down a different principle? Let them, at least, if that is their contention, quote some word from my hon. friend in any of his addresses to the people of this country showing that he proceeded on any different principle from that, or laid down in the passage of his speech that I have just quoted. And, at Victoria, what do we find my hon. friend from Halifax declaring, speaking there as the mouthpiece of those who sit on this side of the House? He said:

> It is a matter of adequate protection——

That is not what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) takes pleasure in sneering at as he sneered here at Sir Charles Tupper's contention that we should have a preferential tariff arrangement with the mother country—but saw fit to entirely reverse his position with great humility and with ashes on his head when he went to the interimperial conference. The hon. member for Halifax, speaking at Victoria, went on:

> That is a policy which is held to be the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party. That is the pronounced and declared policy of the people of this country—adequate protection of Canadian industries, a protection which will ensure to Canadians of this country their own markets at all prices and under all circumstances.

That is real patriotism, and we never contended for any other policy so far as I am aware. I defy my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance to quote a single instance of a speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in which he propounded any different idea. The leader of the opposition came west and I had the pleasure of meeting him and those who accompanied him in the city of Winnipeg. We found out there that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) was not the great Bonaparte of the west that we had been taught to believe him. But what I wish to call your attention and the attention of this House to, in view of the declaration, accompanied with a certain amount of ridicule, made by my right hon. friend the leader of the government, is the language used by the hon. member for Halifax in his reported speech at the banquet which was tendered to him in the city of Winnipeg:

> The policy of the Conservative party was a policy of adequate protection, Canadian protection; and would it not be an estimable benefit if the lead mines, the gold mines, the iron mines, and other industries were developed? His party held no brief from any corporation, he believed that it received less support from the manufacturers than had the Liberal party during the last four years.

I am able fully to confirm that view expressed by my hon. friend.

> He supported protection because he believed it to be in the interests of the whole people of Canada. He wished to have the support of the North-west, but he absolutely refused to ask for that support by advocating a different doctrine to that which he advocated in other parts of Canada, notwithstanding the taunts which had been thrown out by his political opponents.

These remarks, Sir, made by my hon. friend in Winnipeg, in that province which, I am happy to say, is as anxious as we are in the east to build up a great and powerful commonwealth, these remarks he repeated at Lethbridge and everywhere else in the province of Manitoba. My hon. friend the

leader of the opposition said also in that province :

So far as our policy is concerned, we are not afraid to avow it in the east or in the west. It is the same everywhere. Our policy is that of adequate protection to all legitimate industries in Canada.

My hon. friend is more than right when he says that he has strong support for that view, which I venture to say will ultimately become the view of all those who desire the advancement of our country. He has strong support for it on the treasury benches where, as stated by my right hon. friend, people are free to entertain any opinion they like, and his mission is to bring them all together, and out of that chaos to evolve something which is satisfactory to the country. My hon. friend the present member from Maisonneuve, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine), whom I am glad to see in his place this evening, stated there that if any man had anything to complain of in respect to the tariff—and his speech was reported verbatim in one of his own organs—or if any legitimate industry could establish a claim for greater protection, he was prepared for his own part to confer with his colleagues in the cabinet and give them all the protection they wanted. The speech from the Throne does not refer to tariff matters specially. Sir, I claim in contradiction to what was said by my hon. friends who moved and seconded the address, that there is a feeling at present throughout the country, of which we would have been glad and the country at large would have been glad, to find mention in that ministerial programme of the session. We would have been glad to see that legislation was foreshadowed to carry out the idea that we must prepare to protect ourselves by law against the invasion of our markets by men more powerful than ourselves, and against the waste of the great natural resources given to us by Providence, and which it is our mission to make the most of as a young people.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot for my own part entirely agree with what my hon. friends have said in regard to immigration. I believe it is in the interest of this country that it should be settled, I believe that we should favour the advent to our country of men who are anxious to form part of our great commonwealth and to do their duty as citizens. But I do not believe in the present policy of the government in regard to immigration; and I would have been glad to hear in the speech from the Throne some announcement of a change in that policy which has been followed for too many years. We spend too much money in bringing people to this country without discrimination as to their character, as to whether they are fit to become inhabitants. For instance, I do not believe that it has been a prudent or proper step on the part of this government to spend so large a sum of money, over a hundred thousand dollars, to bring here a set of people like the Doukhobors, who, while we were travelling in the North-west, were leaving their settlements and picking up rocks, and stones, and stumps of trees, in order to find the Messiah on the plains of the North-west. I believe that most of the money we spend at the present moment on immigration agencies, and there is far too much spent, would be better employed in keeping our own people at home, in preventing the exodus, and in offering facilities to our own people to settle in those boundless and wealthy plains of the west.

Sir, I listened attentively to the right hon. leader of this House when he spoke in regard to the colonial conference. It seems quite apparent from what we find in the English blue-book, and from what we know of the results of that conference, that it has achieved very little of a practical nature. It is no doubt a great advantage for the people of this vast empire, living under the same flag, to confer together, for representatives of the great colonies such as Canada and Australia to meet in conference. But I think that we on this side of the House have a right to expect something more definite as a result of that conference to our own country. Thus, the steps taken by the hon. Minister of Finance and those who accompanied him on that distant mission in so far as the very important question of a preference is concerned, resulted in absolutely nothing. There was no result. I find on page 10 of the English blue-book that :

The representatives of the colonies are prepared to recommend to their respective parliaments preferential treatment of British goods on the following lines :—Canada——

That is ourselves.

The existing preference of 33⅓ per cent and an additional preference on lists of selected articles——

That is what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was prepared, as I understand it, to advocate as Canada's share—the maintenance of the present preference and an additional preference on certain selected articles.

(a) By further reducing the duties in favour of the United Kingdom ;

(b) By raising the duties against foreign imports ;

(c) By imposing duties on certain foreign imports now on the free list.

The real, practical, tangible result is nothing. We have no intimation from the government of any intention of carrying out that pledge mentioned on page 10 of the blue-book nor as to how they intend to implement that promise. There was no question of the embargo upon our cattle, a most unjust measure. Did they attempt, or achieve, anything as regards the removal of

that most unfair and most unjust impediment to our trade ? Nothing. No result. It seems to me that our friends might have availed themselves of the opportunity of that conference to urge upon the government of Great Britain some scheme, some plan, by which a great dependency, such as our own, might have had additional facilities, additional means of approaching to the sovereign power when it is a question of concluding commercial treaties in which this country is interested. Nothing in that regard. As regards the Alaskan boundary treaty with which my right hon. friend is so perfectly satisfied, I listened vainly to hear my right hon. friend make a distinct statement as to whether his government recommended that form of settlement of the difficulty or whether they did not do so. Do they recommend it ?" Have they taken any steps to secure upon that tribunal, or commission, or arbitration board, or whatever it may be called, the presence of two jurists at least from our own country, and what steps have they taken to secure that end, if any ; For my own part, Sir, what I respectfully submit to this House in regard to that most important matter is this: It may be that the tract of land as to which the dispute exists is not of very great value, but as far as I have been able to understand the very able arguments uttered and printed in favour of the Canadian contention, we are greatly interested in securing some of those bays which extend into the disputed territory as an outlet to the sea from that great Yukon territory which is known to be so valuable. Now, Sir, do my hon. friends think that, with such a commission as has been named and with, as is intimated to us, the presence upon that commission of two men who may be very estimable American citizens, but who are no doubt one-sided upon this question, they have taken every measure or precaution to protect our interests? The right hon. leader of the government laid great stress upon the fact that in respect to the proposal that when they submitted the Venezuelan difficulty there was a stipulation that the position occupied by those whose interests were adverse to our own would not be sacrificed in any event, and that by his efforts they had secured in the present treaty the obliteration of that obnoxious clause, but, how are we to couple that great claim made by the right hon. gentleman with the statement he made when he touched upon this subject that this commission was a commission of legal men named in order to determine where the limits were ? I ask this House whether if that, being the nature of a commission, it would have been very dignified for us to allow a stipulation to be made in the treaty that whatever might be the finding of the investigating commission, Skagway and such other ports as are at present in the hands of our American neighbours should under all circumstances remain therein. It seems to me that the claim that they have secured a great advantage for us is not one which this House will readily accept, but, what I am anxious to see, Mr. Speaker, is some proof of the steps taken by this government at the time of the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and also when this present treaty was under negotiation, to secure full protection to our rights. I moved, if my memory serves me right, last year, for the production of the correspondence that had taken place between this government and the imperial government in regard to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and I think I am right in saying that the motion was denied me. When the correspondence relating to that treaty, in which, perhaps, as my hon. friend at my right (Mr. Borden, Halifax) says, we have no practical interest, but, which may have been used as a powerful lever to help a useful solution of the Alaskan boundary difficulty, when the correspondence which will be brought down, as has been promised to my hon. friend, and when further correspondence in relation to this treaty is before us, we will be in a better position to see exactly what steps have been taken to secure our rights in that most important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I confess to some astonishment at the announcement made by the right hon. leader of the government that nothing has yet been determined by the government and that there is nothing which the government can lay before this House in regard to the additional facilities for transportation across the continent which are referred to in a dim and indefinite way in the speech from the Throne. I think I am not mistaken in stating that it is over three months ago that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) intimated to the public that some scheme was under consideration, and it was viewed favourably by himself, to give us a new route across the continent. Since that time we have had discussions galore throughout the press in this country. We have seen the head men of the two great railways existing in this country discussing publicly under what conditions these additional facilities are to be given to the country, and I think it is a fair matter of regret for us to see when we are summoned together that the government of this country, at this present moment, with a prospect of a long session before us has determined nothing definite whatever in regard to these additional facilities and cannot say when the commission, which is referred to in the speech from the Throne, will make its report, or whether the government will wait for the report or not, before it lays a definite scheme before parliament.

My right hon. friend closed his remarks by referring to the necessity of remedying an injustice in respect to the distribution of seats which took place years ago. As a proof of that injustice, he spoke of some

of the results of the last federal elections in the province of Ontario ; but my right hon. friend glided with a light step over the far more extraordinary phenomenon presented in the province of Ontario by which a government is returned to power in that province, which as a matter of fact has a minority of over 7,000 of the popular vote. That would appear to be a far greater injustice than anything that has ever happened in the federal arena. Nor did my right hon. friend see fit to refer in any way whatever to the far more deplorable spectacle of recent date, whereby the government of Ontario, in order to maintain its life and existence, has had recourse to methods which are not always discovered, but which we have seen practiced by the Liberal party, not only in the province of Ontario but in the province of Quebec and elsewhere. We have seen them, Sir, in the province of Ontario and elsewhere, maintaining themselves in power by a system of corruption which prevents, odiously prevents the free will of the people from being given expression to in this young country.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). I do not rise, Sir, for the purpose of engaging in a discussion of the tariff in connection with this debate on the address, believing as I do that such a discuison at this moment is premature. I have consequently no criticism to make upon the points made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. In many respects, of course, I sympathize with the views that gentleman entertains, but circumstances may arise and are likely to arise in the near future which will convince us that discussion of the tariff, or action upon the tariff is not advisable at the present time. We may find that we have not a proper knowledge of the premises that will exist, and that consequently we are not in a position to take the action which we will be required to take when we know exactly what the conditions are. Should we have a meeting of the Joint High Commission, it is evident to any member who will examine the facts that the result of a meeting of that commission will determine to a great extent the character of the fiscal legislation of this parliament. In case a favourable treaty was obtained with the United States, so far as I am concerned, my views would be quite different with regard to this matter, from what my views would be should the United States persist in continuing the policy that has been in force in that country for the last 35 years. In the latter case I would co-operate earnestly and heartily with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, and with those who believe as he does in regard to this matter. On the contrary, if the policy of the United States were to be reversed ; if their policy towards this country were to assume a liberal character ; if we were to enter upon fiscal relations with that country satisfactory to ourselves ; then, of course, the policy that I would favour would be quite different from the policy I would favour in the other case. I think it is not profitable or necessary to enter upon or to continue the tariff discussion upon the debate on this address. I do not think that the House is in possession of the information which would put it in a position to deal with this matter, to take action upon the fiscal policy of Canada as it ought to do ; and consequently I pass over the discussion of the tariff question for the reason, that so far as I myself am concerned, I am not able to say where we shall land, what the conditions will be, what will confront us, what course it will be proper for us to take. Our course will necessarily be governed by the conditions that will hereafter arise, and in my opinion we had better wait until these conditions develop themselves. So much for the tariff.

Now, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I should have risen at all on this occasion but for the desire I have to make a few remarks upon a certain phase of sentiment in this country, and upon a certain disposition manifested in certain quarters in this country which I think is regrettable, in reference to our international relations. It is quite common in Canada to criticise with some severity, often with a good deal of severity, the action of Great Britain with regard to this Dominion. Now, we should remember, Sir, that so far as Great Britain is concerned, so far as we ourselves are concerned, it is a matter of primary importance to maintain good relations with that great branch of the Anglo Saxon family to the south of us. That is especially the case with Great Britain. Great Britain has world wide interests ; interests that do not centre primarily and chiefly in Canada ; but interests that spread over the whole broad face of the world. Great Britain has interests in Canada, and I believe that Great Britain, so far as her policy towards Canada is concerned, has discharged her duty to this country faithfully and in such a way as to merit our thanks and approval. But we may, we naturally do magnify the importance of our own issues and of our own interests. We may, and we do sometimes think that England should sacrifice everything for the maintenance of some comparatively unimportant claim or interest that we think a great deal of. In the past, England has stood by our interests faithfully, in my opinion. In the past I do not think we have just reasons for complaint against the policy that Great Britain has pursued with regard to these colonies or this Dominion. For this reason, I think that England is often unjustly accused of failing to stand by our interests with that persistence and with that disregard of consequences that some expect she ought to do. It is a matter of primary importance to Great Britain, I repeat, to maintain good re-

lations with the United States. We perhaps do not realize how important that is. We do not realize how completely that is a factor governing the position of England and the conduct of England with regard to questions arising between these two countries. Consequently, Sir, we should deal with these questions in a temperate spirit. We should deal with these questions with a full knowledge of the facts. We should deal with these questions, giving to England the benefit, when we are forming our judgment, of their environment, of the necessities that confront her, and of the difficulties that surround her. If we were to do this, perhaps in some cases our judgment would be modified to a very great extent.

In the course of the admirable speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition this afternoon, I noticed his remarks with reference to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. As the position which my hon. friend took upon that matter has not been replied to, his remarks might go to the country with his assertions uncontradicted. The abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was an unpopular move in the estimation of the Canadian public, no doubt. That treaty had existed for a good many years. It imposed restrictions and conditions upon the United States with regard to various matters that the public men of all parties in that country chafed under. It was a source of difficulty and created conditions of a threatening character. By the abrogation of that treaty Great Britain gave to the United States a free hand in the construction of the Isthmian canal; and, following the conditions which the abrogation of the treaty created, the United States have proceeded to take the initial steps towards the construction of the canal by the Panama route. Now, the question is, had Canada any reason or any right to say to the United States, you shall not construct that canal ? Were we ready to construct it ? Was Great Britain ready to construct it? Was the United States, in offering to construct that canal, trenching upon our rights or upon any scheme we cherished for opening communication between the waters of the Carribean sea, and the Pacific ocean ? We have interests, of course, on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, and if we had been prepared to connect the two oceans by an Isthmian canal, there certainly would have been more reason for our finding fault with the arrangement made for the abrogation of the treaty. The United States possesses fifteen times our population; it possesses more than twenty-five times our wealth; it has vast interests on each coast; and its public men deemed the construction of that canal an essential requisite to the prosperity of the country and its progress in the future. It was a cherished scheme with the American people to open up what would practically be a communication between their territorial possessions on the Pacific and the Atlantic. I was in Washington the day Lord Pauncefote signed that treaty. I called upon his lordship, and he expressed unbounded satisfaction upon having, as one of the last official acts of his life, signed a treaty that was to set at rest a vexed question between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon family, and was to render improbable what would otherwise have been probable—friction, bad feeling, or a collision between the two countries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did he say anything about the Alaskan boundary at the same time ?

Mr. CHARLTON. The two questions were dealt with on their own merits. The Alaskan boundary has been dealt with since ; I will reach that question soon. But I will say, in answer to my hon. friend that Lord Pauncefote was not in a position to dictate to the United States government what their course of conduct should be ; and if they were unwilling to couple the Alaskan boundary with the settlement of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty question, I do not suppose Lord Pauncefote had it in his power to compel them to meet his wishes, and I doubt whether it would have been a politic thing for him to terminate the negotiations because he could not have his way entirely. The two questions stood distinct from each other, and were treated on distinct bases.

With regard to the Alaskan boundary question, as the premier told us this afternoon, the Joint High Commission at Washington in 1899 were unable to agree upon that question. It was the difficulty which broke up the sittings of the commission. The British commissioners refused to continue negotiations unless that question was set at rest. The American commissioners desired to let it stand in abeyance and go on with the other questions which had been referred to the commission. The British commissioners refused to do that, and the commission broke up. We had tentative agreements on many points which would have given this country a fairly desirable treaty. It was a fortunate thing, however, that we did not go on, that the British commissioners terminated the sittings of the commission and went home, because the condition of sentiment in the United States to-day is so much more favourable as regards the question of concessions to Canadian interests, that we shall now, in all human probability, get a very much more favourable treaty than we could have got at that time. Consequently, the deferring of the negotiations before the Joint High Commission will prove to be entirely in the interests of Canada.

With regard to this boundary commission, I was asked by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, if Lord Pauncefote had

insisted upon coupling the Alaskan boundary question with the question of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. I answer no, he had the good sense not to insist upon it, because, if he had, we would have had complications and difficulties of a character the consequences of which no man could foresee. The question had dragged along for many years. At the time the Joint High Commission was in session, the American commissioners refused to entertain any proposition made by the British commissioners with regard to it. They stood on their contention and refused arbitration. It is true, they did offer to refer the question to jurists, an equal number from each country, but with the reservation that any territory then occupied by the United States—and Skagway was one of the points—should not be included in the reference. Well, the reference has at last been made with that condition eliminated, and we have a reference to a tribunal composed of three jurists from each country. It was supposed in Canada that jurists independent of politics would be chosen by the United States, and a good deal of feeling has existed in consequence of the alleged failure of the President to make such a selection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Were they not to be three impartial jurists of repute ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. The President of the United States, it is understood, desired or requested justices of the United States Supreme Court to act on this commission, and they refused to act upon it. That is well known.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. How ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I will explain to my hon. friend privately how. It is a matter of current report in Washington. That is a statement which I heard from one of the justices of the United States Supreme Court himself. The President was left without the ability to select the members of the commission he desired to select, for the reason that they refused to act. He might, it is true, have selected other jurists. They might have declined to act for the reasons assigned by the judges of the United States Supreme Court, namely, that if they took the position, their functions would not be strictly judicial. But this treaty had not, up to the time when it was ascertained that the justices of the Supreme Court would not act upon the commission, been ratified by the United States Senate. That ratification, it is understood, was secured through the co-operation of Senators Lodge and Turner, and but for their co-operation and assistance it never would have been ratified. Now, the President of the United States was confronted with this situation. A great deal of trouble has been experienced with the United States Senate. Treaty after treaty has been hung up by that body. There are four or five reciprocity treaties, among them the Cuban treaty, which would be highly advantageous to the United States, but their ratification cannot be secured. It requires a two-third vote of the Senate to ratify a treaty, and so far, local and private interests have succeeded in preventing ratification in many instances. The question of the Alaskan boundary the administration of the United States desires to get out of the way. It is a source of irritation and danger and it is highly desirable to have it settled, and in order to get the treaty ratified and the first step taken towards the settlement of the question, it was necessary to get the support of the Senate. I am not in a position to say that Senator Lodge was promised a place on the commission if the treaty should be got through, but from the little I know about politics, no doubt the President of the United States would be anxious to secure the assistance of the only man who could get the treaty through the Senate. The treaty went through, and it is acknowledged on all hands that it went through in consequence of the support given it by Senator Lodge. Well, when the treaty was through, it was claimed that the final result had to be ratified at last by the United States Senate, that the United States Senate was a body with appellate jurisdiction, that the treaty must come before them, and would stand or fall in accordance with their decision, and it was claimed that it was a proper thing to have the body, which had the ultimate and unrestricted jurisdiction in the matter, represented on the commission. Whether that is a good contention or not it is not for me to say, but that is the contention that was made. It was contended that the United States Senate, which is the highest power in the United States, which must ratify every treaty, without whose concurrence no treaty can become law, was entitled to representation upon the Alaskan commission. That contention has been accepted by the United States, and two members of the Senate appointed, and besides these two members, Secretary Root. I do not think it can properly be claimed that these are not all men of high character, that they are not all of them jurists. They may not be impartial jurists.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not suppose that there are half a dozen out of the twenty million able bodied men in the United States who would be impartial on this question. They would all stand on the American contention. But Senator Lodge has expressed opinions on the question. He expressed those opinions in an electoral contest, and my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, knows what weight should be attached to statements made on the stump. He knows they can be put into one shape and then another to meet the exigencies and circumstances. Senator Lodge, when

on the stump in Massachusetts, appealed to popular prejudices by making certain statements with regard to the Alaskan boundary question. But he indignantly repudiates the idea that he is not impartial, that he is impervious to reasoning, that he cannot judge the case on its merits after having heard the evidence. I think it would be an aspersion on his character and that we would be entirely unwarranted in supposing this to be the case. I would just as soon trust the question to Senator Lodge as to a member of the United States Supreme Court. In fact I believe he would be more likely to take an impartial view of the case from the circumstances that as his character and his judgment and his methods have been impugned, he would be therefore more desirous to give a judicial and proper decision on the matter. The same language would apply to a large extent, if not to so great an extent, to Senator Turner of the Pacific coast. And as to Secretary Root, I am unable to understand how the slightest exception can be taken to his serving on the commission. The matter, so far as we are concerned, is in this shape. I presume we all desire to have this question eliminated from the great questions that promise difficulties and friction between the two countries. We have in our hands the choice of commissioners, and it should be our duty to select the very best men we have, as the leader of the opposition has said. We want to set the Americans the example of giving the best jurists we have in the British empire to sit on that commission.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why do not they set us an example ?

Mr. CHARLTON. They do.

Mr. MACLEAN. When—in Canadian matters ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that we are in a position to dictate to the United States the course they should pursue or to give an opinion as to who is fit to sit on that commission or who is not. We are dealing with a nation of 80,000,000 people and we are but a nation of 5,000,000 to 6,000,000. Great Britain is anxious to maintain friendly relations with that people, and for us to say that these men are not satisfactory would defeat the consummation desired and put an end to all negotiations. We may regret that men not entirely acceptable to us were not appointed, but it is not for us to say who should be appointed, and we are deficient in the sense of proportion when we suppose that five million people can dictate to eighty million the course they should pursue. Whether we be satisfied with the commission or not, there are circumstances which, in the opinion of the United States, have rendered it proper and desirable and politic to appoint these men on that commission, and we are prejudging the case when we assume that they are not fit to perform the functions and not capable of giving an impartial decision. I am sorry myself that the Supreme Court judges of the United States declined to act. I am sorry the commission is not one that suits our purposes and desires, but it is a matter for the United States to select their own commissioners to attempt to adjust, and I hope and anticipate a favourable and satisfactory result from the appointment of this commission.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition quoted to us this afternoon a large number of extracts from American papers with regard to the character of the commission and the views entertained by the commissioners. Well, I do not attach a very great degree of importance to extracts from American, or Canadian newspapers either, for that matter. Editors, sitting in their sanctums, write with an air of supreme wisdom and authority, but they are often very much mistaken, and I look at the matter from a broader standpoint than the opinion of editor this or that, or any other scribbler in an editorial sanctum, who prejudges the case himself and imagines he knows all about it. Of course I do not intend any reflections on any editor present. Present company is always excepted. But what I say is that these quotations from American newspapers are entirely unreliable and not worthy of consideration.

Mr. MACLEAN. How does the hon. gentleman prove that there is a better feeling in the United States towards Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a self evident fact.

Mr. MACLEAN. In the press, I suppose ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that Canadian papers, even the one managed by my hon. friend opposite, are an exception to the rule. I notice often a tone which I greatly regret—very flippant, cynical and unfair—with regard to things American, which does not elevate the paper in my opinion and certainly does not tend to create good feeling. And that thing, to some extent, has existed in the United States. The tone of the Canadian newspapers I know, produces irritation, and those who desire better relations between the two countries look upon this matter with regret. And I can say, Sir,—and I think that perhaps no person in this House is better able to give an opinion on the subject than myself—that the sentiment in the United States towards Canada is rapidly growing more friendly, and that their ideas as to the relation between these countries have grown broader and more correct during the last three years than they were before, that the knowledge of Canada, the absence of which gave them false ideas, as to the relations of the countries previous to that time is growing. And I believe it is to our in-

terest to cultivate friendly relations and ascertain how far that growth of sentiment favourable to Canada in the United States will lead, and whether the outcome may not be something desirable. If we find we cannot get it, if we find that there is not a feeling in the United States friendly to Canada sufficiently potent to bring about favourable relations, it will be time to take the position that many parties in this country assume it is best to take by prejudging the case now.

So far as the other points made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier are concerned I do not know that it is necessary to allude to them now. As I said at the outset, I think it is premature to discuss the fiscal policy of this country. I rose, as I have said, for the purpose of correcting what I considered to be misapprehensions with regard to matters that require delicate handling and that can be best understood when regarded in the spirit of fairness and concession.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, I do not purpose speaking at length upon the various subjects that have been brought up in this debate, but I wish to say a few words upon the subject of the imperial conference.

I may say at the outset that the view I take of this matter is just the opposite of that expressed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) and his first lieutenant, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). Both these gentlemen have expressed the opinion that the results of that conference were very poor. Of course one's opinion would depend altogether on the point of view taken at the commencement of the conference last year. Those who founded hopes on the past attitude of the British parliament or the British government, and upon the past attitude of the Canadian parliament or the parliaments of other British colonies, may be disappointed. But those who, all through the discussion of imperial progress that has been going on for the last three or four years, have entertained the hope that the moment will soon come when the true principles of real British imperialism will take hold of the common sense of the people, have no reason to be disappointed. For my part, I entirely agree with these words that have been put into the mouth of His Excellency :

> I feel assured that much good will result from bringing the leading public men of the great self governing colonies into direct contact with each other and with the statesmen of the motherland.

That bringing together has been the means of clearing the clouds, the delusive clouds, that have been raised by the conference of 1897 as well as by the South African war. Colonial statesmen have had reason to see that the only practical British imperialism, as it existed in the mind of Mr. Chamberlain and his associates, meant simply and solely a contribution by the colonies to the British army and navy with a few compliments here and there to satisfy them in return. And British statesmen have been made to understand that we have passed the period of excitement, to which I do not wish to refer now, when popular feelings were aroused to the highest pitch by excited speeches of public men in this country as well as in other parts of the British empire. Then perhaps the British public and the British parliament had been led to understand that we were ready to sacrifice something of our autonomy and self government, and of the respect we owe to the past and the future of our country; but now those delusions have been dissolved by the firm, discreet and dignified attitude of the colonial statesmen and especially the statesmen of Australia and Canada.

In that report which has given so little satisfaction to the hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier there are many interesting things. I have read that document with care, and I have found that though, in the resolutions adopted, very little of new policy is proposed for Great Britain or the colonies, yet, a good deal of common sense understanding has been arrived at between the imperial authorities and the colonial authorities. I must, however, express immediately my dissent from one decision which was arrived at unanimously by the members of that conference—and in this I agree with the leader of the opposition. I mean that the discussions of the conference had better been made public at once, and that a full report of the discussion should have been published ; especially when I see that a motion was proposed and adopted unanimously that like conferences should be held every fourth year. If the colonial representatives are to meet the representatives of the British government to discuss matters of imperial interests. I hold that the principle should be laid down at once—at the very least it should be insisted upon by the Canadian parliament as well as by other self-respecting parliaments of the British empire—that no discussion that may have as a result a change of policy of the empire shall be carried on in secret. I think it should be a well understood principle of imperial conference that the people of the British empire at large should know from day to day what is going on among their representatives.

The speech that was delivered at the opening of that conference by the Colonial Secretary is a very interesting one, as all the utterances of that statesman are. And I think it is quite illustrative of what I said at the opening of these remarks as to the real aims of the British imperialists, and the real meaning of British imperialism as it exists in the mind of Mr.

Chamberlain. As the hon. member for Jacques Cartier says, Mr. Chamberlain referred to three main subjects that were to be discussed—the political relations, the military relations, and the commercial relations. So far as the political relations are concerned, he thought that we should allow matters to move very slowly indeed. As to the military relations, he thought the time had come when the colonies should tax themselves to contribute to the British army and navy. But in commercial matters, he thought that Great Britain could do nothing for the colonies unless the colonies should adopt a policy that, admittedly, it would be suicidal for them to adopt.

As I have said, the only resolution that was adopted, so far as political relations were concerned, was one in favor of a conference being held every fourth year between representatives of the colonies and of the British government. I may say at once that I have no objection to conferences being held when they are required. But I say that no Canadian statesman should leave the soil of Canada to represent the Canadian people in any assembly of that kind, without having previously stated clearly to the people of Canada what policy he was prepared to support, what propositions he was ready to make or to oppose. Before leaving Canada on such a mission, Canadian statesmen should have from this parliament a clear mandate to guide them, which should definitely point out what conduct they are to pursue. That is what was done last session by this government, that is what was done by the government of Australia on the last occasions ; but unfortunately that was not done before the conference of 1897.

On the ground of military relations, the right hon. leader of the government stated this afternoon that propositions were made by the British government for contributions by the colonies in support of the army and navy. These propositions were strongly supported by the first Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Selborne, and by the Secretary of War, Mr. Brodrick. The Prime Minister of New Zealand supported Mr. Chamberlain on this occasion and moved two resolutions, found on pages 9 and 27, of the blue book, one referring to the army and the other to the navy. The reply of the Canadian government was exactly what was expected of it by the Canadian people. This afternoon we heard from the member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) the conclusion of that reply, and I will read to the House the first paragraph, which indicates still more clearly the position of the Canadian government :

> The Canadian ministers regret that they have been unable to assent to the suggestions made by Lord Selborne respecting the navy, and by Mr. St. John Brodrick respecting the army. The ministers desire to point out that their objections arise, not so much from the expense involved, as from a belief that the acceptance of the proposals would entail an important departure from the principle of colonial self-government. Canada values highly the measure of local independence which has been granted it from time to time by the imperial authorities, and which has been so productive of beneficial results, both as respects the material progress of the country and the strengthening of the ties that bind it to the motherland. But while, for these reasons, the Canadian ministers are obliged to withhold their assent to the propositions of the Admiralty and the War Office, they fully appreciate the duty of the Dominion, as it advances in population and wealth, to make more liberal outlays for those necessary preparations of self defence which every country has to assume and bear.

To this, Mr. Speaker, no Canadian has any objection to make. For my part I may say that as long as the Canadian government remains within the bounds fixed by themselves on this occasion, they will receive my hearty support. But the course is not yet clear. Every one knows that Mr. Chamberlain is not a man to abandon, upon the first repulse, any scheme upon which he has set his heart. Even recently, during his trip to South Africa where he went to enlighten himself upon some problems which, unfortunately for his country and the honor of the empire, he did not study some three or four years ago, he has thought proper to address what I may call a lesson of warning to the other self-governing colonies, stating that they must realize what their duties are. The Minister of Militia and Defence, since his return from the old country, has clearly stated upon two or three occasions what he thought the duty of Canada was in regard to defence. With the general tone of his argument I agree entirely. I would have no objection whatever to the Canadian government taking hold, for example, of the fortifications of Esquimault and Halifax, and relieving the British government of the expense of defending those fortifications. I have no objection whatever, on the contrary I am desirous that the Minister of Militia and Defence should take steps to put the Canadian militia upon a proper footing, provided always that he sticks to the principle he has laid down himself that these preparations and this expense are made with the sole view of enabling Canadians to defend the soil of Canada. Well, Sir, in the very report we have here, in the paper which was presented to the conference from Col. Altham, Assistant Quartermaster General, we find these paragraphs.

> In the event of war with the United States it is on this Canadian militia that must depend the entire safety of Canada until reinforcements arrive from England. It may, therefore, be concluded that the best way in which Canada can co-operate in imperial defence is by making her militia an efficient force. It is more important that the Canadian ministers should be strongly pressed to take this reasonable precaution than that they should maintain

contingents for general imperial service. . . . The strategical position of Canada makes it however, unwise that any very large contingent should be drawn from her defence force unless the strength of that force should in the future be increased. It is suggested therefore that if a Canadian imperial force be organized, it should be limited, for the present, to a brigade division of field artillery and a brigade of infantry. The force might be organized on lines similar to those suggested for Australia.

So we find in a report from one of the officers of the British army, made at the request of the British Minister of War, who was so anxious to obtain a permanent contribution from Canada, that the only safe way in which Canada could contribute to the defence of the empire was by looking after her own militia and keeping her soldiers at home.

But as I have already said, we must not be too confident. True, the wind has changed, and I am glad of it. There are many people now in Canada saying exactly what I said some three years ago. But when we speak of the defence of Canada, even then we should not lose our heads, and should not ask the Canadian people to make a large expenditure of money upon the organization of their militia without having some idea of what that militia would be required for. In one of the speeches that we find coming from the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) he has gone a little farther than that. He has gone to the point of saying, if we are to believe the reports of his speech published in the Canadian papers, that not only should we organize a proper militia force for the defence of this country but that we should put it upon such a footing that in case of an imperial war we would have an army ready to go to the defence of the empire elsewhere also.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). I was not correctly reported.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am glad to have given the hon. minister an opportunity to deny that report, because it was received with confidence by some people in Canada. Some few years ago General French made a similar suggestion under the inspiration of the enthusiasm then prevailing in the colonies. To quote his own language, he said :

Having had an experience of a dozen years in Canada, and a similar amount in Australia, mostly with colonial forces, I would like to make two points clear : (1) It is idle to hope or expect that any large force of imperial troops, paid at imperial rates, could be raised in these colonies for ordinary garrison work or duties in peace time. (2) It is equally certain that thousands of men can be raised in war time, who will engage for the war at a fair rate of pay.

. . . . . .

The real way, in my opinion, to help Old England to keep the flag flying all over the empire is to form war reserves in the colonies. In doing so the specialities of the colonies should be borne in mind. Thus Canada, with her 75,000 sailors and fishermen on the Atlantic seaboard, should provide a large war reserve for the fleet, and probably would do so if the Admiralty, instead of framing cast-iron regulations suitable for Great Britain, would appreciate the fact that the most suitable time to carry out the training of these fishermen would be the time of year when they could not carry on their usual avocations.

According to General French and several other authorities in England, the best way to carry out their scheme is not to go further with a straight demand or request from the colonies and from Canada in particular to supply them either with contributions or an organized imperial corps to be at the disposal of the imperial government; but the scheme is to stir up the spirit of militarism, to increase the number of the militia, to create a large naval reserve, and thereby to have always a prepared ground in order to fill the deficiencies which they find increasing every day in their army and navy. We have seen a delegate from the Navy League of England who came to Canada to organize a branch of the league. Of course, I suppose gentlemen who have been lately in England know that the Navy League is not taken very seriously in the old country; in fact, I might say it is considered a little ridiculous, and therefore I do not think that by joining the league several of our public men have acted very judiciously. But if the matter is going to be no more ridiculous, it is simply because it will become obnoxious. The now avowed purpose of that league is to come and find in the colonies the men for the army and the navy which the people of Great Britain refuse to supply. Seeing that they cannot find among the English and Scotch population the required recruits for the army and navy, their purpose is to come into the colonies to further the sentiment of militarism, to work upon some of that imperial sentiment which was raised by the South African war, in order to find amongst the sturdy population of the colonies what they cannot find at home. Therefore, as far as that matter is concerned, though I do not imagine that great results will come out of it, I regret to see that the names of four of our ministers are connected with it. In one of the reports it was said that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was the honorary president and the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence was the ice-president; in another report the positions were reversed, the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence being at the head, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries coming after. Perhaps it is that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not quite ready yet to take the lead of the army and navy and I have no doubt that the league has relied more on the soldierly disposition of the Minister for War. I also find the names of the hon. Minister of

Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher). I would simply beg of these two gentlemen to wait a little before going into the Navy League. I would ask the hon. Minister of Justice to wait and see what the result will be of the Alaskan tribunal, to wait and see what is the policy of the British government as regards Canadian interests towards the United States, before he shows too much zeal for the British navy; and I would ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture to await the results of our efforts to have the embargo removed from Canadian cattle before he accepts any high position in the navy of the empire.

Mr. MACLEAN. The fishermen ought to be in the navy.

Mr. BOURASSA. I may say that the whole movement, as far as military defence is concerned, and as far as British interests in that defence are concerned, may be summed up as an imperialistic policy as Lord Rosebery put it so well some nine years ago when he left the Liberal party and before he made up his mind to become himself one of the upholders of the imperialistic movement. The British government have trebled the area of the empire and have therefore increased in a great way the burdens of the British people as far as military defence is concerned. The land owners of England stick to the most stubborn and the most antiquated land tenure which now exists in any civilized country. They have been the cause of depopulating the farming districts of England, of sending to the colonies the most energetic and intelligent men of the kingdom, and of dividing the others between the skilled labourers and the inhabitants of the slums of the big cities. The skilled labourers and farm labourers will not enter the army and navy; and therefore the British authorities have to rely on the slums to supply recruits for the army and navy, and British politicians are scared at the idea of adopting the only policy that is possible for an imperial country which is bent upon conquest and the acquisition of territory, and that is conscription. Now, because of the indifference or incapacity of the British people, because of the selfishness of the British land owners, because of the timidity of the British politicians, we, the settlers of the colonies, we, who have so many sacrifices ahead of us yet to make in order to develop our country and to contribute to the real glory of the empire, we would be bound to make up for these deficiencies and to bleed ourselves in order to do what the British people are either unable or unwilling to do.

Now, Sir, as far as the requirements of defence in Canada are concerned, without giving any advice to the Minister of Militia, I simply say this: That as Colonel Altham says, and as any man who is a little observant of the politics of the world would say, the only enemy which Canada may possibly have to confront is the United States. Is the hon. minister, or is any man of common sense in this House, prepared to say that by increasing our militia by 25,000 or by 50,000 men, we are going to lessen the danger of invasion by the United States? We might benefit by that increase for a fortnight or for a month, but when every one knows that the state of New York alone could throw upon the soil of Canada as many soldiers as we could enlist to defend our frontier from Halifax to Victoria, it is just as well we should not lose our heads when we speak of defending ourselves against the United States—even with the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) and his whole family in the trenches. As to a war with the United States being caused by Canada, is there any government either Conservative or Liberal that would act so foolishly as to bring about such a calamity upon the people of Canada? And so far as the motherland is concerned, when we see that year after year our interests in connection with the United States have been sacrificed by the imperial government in order to secure the friendship of the United States, we need not be too much excited as to the danger of war between Canada and the American republic. Sir, if the day should come when we shall be able to withstand an attack from the United States, it will be when we have developed our resources, and increased our population; and the best way for us to do that is not to induce the young men of Canada to enter the militia or the navy, either British or Canadian; not by expending the money of the people upon military preparations; but it is by devoting every cent we can take from the people to develop Canadian industries, Canadian agriculture, Canadian manufactures, Canadian transportation, thus increasing in so far as we can the population and wealth of the country. That is the best way to contribute to the defence of Canada; it is the best way to contribute to the defence of the empire, and it is the way by which we will prove that we are not only true Canadians, but also true imperialists in the real sense of the word.

Now, Sir, in so far as trade relations are concerned, I may say that I was pleased at the position taken by our delegate at the imperial conference. In his opening address, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain referred in a somewhat patronizing way to the policy which had been adopted by Canada towards the motherland in trade matters. He said that, of course, as a matter of sentiment he was quite happy that Canada had adopted a preferential policy, but he intimated in so many words that he did not care much for it. I am very glad that the Canadian representatives gave the proper answer to the Colonial Secretary when they said:

If after using every effort to bring about such a readjustment of the fiscal policy of the empire, the Canadian government should find that the principle of preferential trade is not acceptable to the colonies generally, or the mother country, then Canada should be free to take such action as might be deemed necessary in the presence of such conditions.

The leader of the opposition has found fault with this reply. He says that it was not clear enough, that it did not intimate the course that the Canadian government was going to follow. Well, Sir, it is not too strongly expressed to say that it would have been a piece of impudence on the part of our representatives to announce the policy of the Canadian parliament to the Colonial Secretary without coming back to Canada and taking parliament into their confidence before deciding what course they were going to follow. The language of the reply of the Canadian representatives is exactly what it should have been. It intimated to the British government that under a change of conditions, the position of the British government being different from what it was when we adopted our preferential policy, that the Canadian government would remain free to adopt whatever course it thought best. Of course, I am not in a position of a minister of the Crown, and consequently I may express my opinion more candidly, and so I say that in the face of the declaration of the Colonial Secretary, in the face of the now clear policy of the British government not to sacrifice one iota of their foreign trade in favour of the British colonies, I hope the time is not far distant when we will prove to the British people that we are as much attached to our interests as they are to theirs; and if we do not repeal immediately the preferential treatment of British goods, I hope we will at least come back to the common-sense policy that was adopted by this government in 1897, when they offered the preference to any country which would give in return fair trade arrangements with Canada. That was a true liberal policy. That was a true liberal stand to take, when we said that we were ready to deal on fair terms with any country, foreign or British, that was ready to deal on fair terms with us. Under a wave of loyalty, we changed that policy; but having come back to our senses, we should also come back to that common-sense policy as originally adopted in 1897.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has found fault with the Canadian representatives because they did not bring before the conference the matter of the embargo. I am afraid that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has been too busy lately in the counties of Maisonneuve, Two Mountains, Argenteuil and Terrebonne, to study the report carefully, or else he would have found that the question of the embargo was brought before the conference by the Canadian representatives. At page 41 of the report he will find :

The representatives of Canada desired to bring before the conference the question of the law under which live cattle imported into this country from Canada are required to be slaughtered at the port of landing.

It was considered, however, that the matter was not of sufficient general interest to be dealt with by the conference, and arrangements were made for its discussion privately with the President of the Board of Agriculture.

Therefore, if fault there was, it did not lie with our representatives but with the other members of the conference, who put that matter aside. Of course, I suppose informal negotiations were held between the president of the Board of Agriculture and the Canadian representatives, but the result is, as hon. gentlemen know, that the British minister declared positively and bluntly that he would not change the law, and put Canadian cattle on a fair basis, but that he would still go on stamping Canadian cattle as diseased, when it is a well known fact that Canadian cattle are perfectly free from disease, while British cattle are diseased. But there is something which was not known then and which is known now, and which throws a clear light upon the conduct of the British government, and especially of Mr. Hanbury. That is, that cattle from the Argentine Republic are now admitted to the British market on better terms than are Canadian cattle. Without wishing to hurt the feelings of any members of this House who have found fault with my attitude towards the mother country during the past three years, I may be allowed to ask them : What is the result of our great loyalty ? Where is the return for our great sacrifices, when we see that a foreign government which has contributed nothing else to an imperial war but agricultural products for which they got well paid, is now receiving better treatment from the British government than is loyal Canada ?

But Sir, this is not the only instance which should prove to us that if we want to have our own interests protected we should ourselves look to our own interests and not expect any great favour from the British government. What did we see last fall ? After the treaty of peace was concluded in South Africa, after the British government had pledged themselves to restock the farms in South Africa, 18,000 ploughs were bought from a single manufacturing house in the United States. I ask my good friends, the representatives from Ontario, either on one side of the House or on the other, what they think of that action of the British government, in passing over all the good Canadian manufacturers, to go and ask our American neighbours to help them in re-stocking the farms in South Africa which our soldiers helped to conquer for Great Britain ? We have also seen,

in the month of September last, a cattle dealer from the Argentine Republic coming to Montreal and boasting that he with some of his associates had made a contract with the British government for $1,000,000 worth of cattle to be sent to South Africa for the purpose of re-stocking the farms. We have seen also that with a single milling house of the United States the British government made a contract for 75,000 bags of flour ; but we do not hear that any contract has been made with any Canadian house. We have also seen in the papers that since last session our flour dealers made an application to the British government, through the proper authorities, for exemption from the registration duty on the flour shipped from Canada to European ports, and simply passing through England ; just as we allow goods from England to pass in bond through Canada to the United States without charging any duty upon them. But our dealers have still to pay the duty of 18 cents to the British government on flour which is not to be consumed by the British people, but is shipped to the markets of continental Europe. Lord Strathcona applied to the British government, and was told that nothing could be done.

But I think that good will which was to be secured for us by our loyalty was shown in an ironical way when it was announced by some of the Toronto papers last year that the mule camp which had been established in Montana during the South African war, was to be transferred to Canada. In fact, it was transferred, but a few days later peace was concluded ; so that the American dealers had the good fortune of making profitable contracts with the British government without contributing a cent or a man to the war, while Canadians are still waiting for their profits.

I need not refer to the reception which was given to our Canadian officers and soldiers in London at the time of the coronation. We have heard a great deal of that in the press. We have been told, though I hope that before the session is over we shall be informed that the statement is not true, that our representatives on the Canadian contingent were quartered near the Alexandra palace, and that the good Londoners were charged a shilling apiece to see them. I hope at least that we have the proceeds of that show, because I think that they should be used to put up a monument in Canada in remembrance of the great reception accorded to our soldiers in London. We were told also that had the coronation taken place at the time fixed for it, it being delayed unfortunately by the sickness of the King, our soldiers, who had gone there in the expectation that they would parade nobly along with the other representatives of the colonies in London, were going to be used as a police force at the corners of the London streets in order to prevent the rowdies of Whitechapel from obstructing the members of the British aristocracy in passing through the streets. I was told that this was so true that our representatives had to protest strenuously, and that it took them a long time to bring the British officials to understand that our men had not been sent there to act as policemen.

The question of treaties has been dealt with at length, and I am not going to speak at any length upon it. I have already spoken, during the last two or three sessions, on the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and on the Alaskan boundary treaty. On the Alaskan question especially, I am not free to say all I would like to say. I merely wish to add this, that taking the situation that was made for us by the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty without any compensation being granted to Canada in the way of a fair settlement of the Alaskan boundary, the Canadian government could not do otherwise than accept the constitution of the tribunal as it is now. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has made a slight mistake in his reply to the Prime Minister. He has stated that the Prime Minister, in accepting the constitution of the tribunal as it is, simply removed from the present treaty the impediments which existed in the Venezuela treaty. But there is something more than that which the hon. member has forgotten or perhaps does not know—that there were not only those impediments in the Venezuela treaty, but that still more impediments were added by the American commissioners on the Joint High Commission—that in the last protocol which has been read in this House by the Prime Minister himself, it was stated that the American commissioners would not consent to any tribunal of arbitration, either of six jurists or of any other number, without the condition that any territory occupied by the United States, not only for ten years or thirty years, but at any time,—such as Dyea and Skaguay,—should remain the territory of the United States, wherever the line of demarcation might be fixed by the tribunal of arbitration. Now, I am not prepared to say that the proposed tribunal will give us satisfaction or that the treaty is the best that could have been secured two or three years ago ; but what I am prepared to say is this, that taking the position in which the British government placed themselves when they denounced the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, the Canadian government achieved a great success when they secured the removal of the condition which had been fixed by the Americans four years ago.

We must not forget one thing, that the position of England towards the United States is not to-day what it was four years ago. When I am making references to the bad will of the British government towards Canada, especially in connection with our relations to the Ameri-

cans, I am simply stating the facts as they are. If I were called upon to pass judgment on the policy of the British government, many things could be said in favour of that policy. The government of England and the people of England do not occupy a position in which they can do as they like. The last war in South Africa has not made for Great Britain throughout the world such a glorious and safe position that she is able, for the sake of a strip of territory claimed by Canada, to exact from the government of the United States conditions which she might have exacted some years ago.

And the Canadian people, who did so much to fortify the position of the British government, at the time of the South African war, and the Canadian parliament who supported the British government in its South African policy, must abide by the consequences of that policy. And, if today, Great Britain is not in a position, either from a diplomatic or military point of view, to take a self-assertive policy towards the government of the United States, the people and parliament of Canada cannot have much to say. I have no desire to develop among Canadians any feeling of hostility to Great Britain, but we may as well realize once for all that, so far as our relations with the United States are concerned, it is perfectly useless for us to expect any strong support from the British government. Great Britain is not in a position to give us that support. All our public men who went to London last year, whether ministers of the Crown or ordinary members of parliament, whether in favour of an imperial policy or against it, would, if they were free to speak their minds, admit that their intercourse with British public men has convinced them that the one great object of British policy for many years to come is to secure at any cost the friendship of the United States. When in England myself, I was told by Liberals and Conservatives and even by men close to the government, that it was useless for Canadians to indulge in the expectation that Great Britain would do anything in the way of treaties or trade which would offer the slightest impediment or friction to her relations with the United States. Therefore we may as well at once make up our minds to look to ourselves alone, save what we can and sacrifice what we cannot help.

There is one point upon which I regret somewhat that a resolution was not adopted by the imperial conference. I refer to the subject of martial law and the suspension of the constitution of Cape Colony, which involved the right of the imperial authorities to suspend the constitution of any free British colony. Unfortunately the subject of martial law has not been discussed in this country. It has been a subject of discussion in England, and came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which gave a decision that reversed the hitherto recognized principle of colonial self-government. The agitation for the suspension of the constitution of Cape Colony fortunately was stopped. Although no resolution was adopted by the conference, I was glad to read in the London newspapers that our representatives were consulted as well as the Australian delegates, and that they gave Mr. Chamberlain their straight opinion that the policy of suspension would be most improper. We are interested in that question because it involves the right of the British parliament to suspend or alter in any way the constitution of any British colony. I agree entirely in the opinion of Mr. Haldane, one of England's authorities in these matters, that once a free British colony has been given representative institutions these institutions cannot be altered or suspended by any authority other than its own parliament.

On the whole, Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly satisfied with the result of the imperial conference and the position taken by our representatives. That position may be criticised in certain quarters, but the vast majority of our people will say that our delegates did their duty as Canadian statesmen and British citizens. We may differ on many points of the imperial question: we may have differed bitterly on the policy of the government during the South African war, but those days have passed. As my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has said, peace is made in South Africa, and I am glad that peace was concluded on terms that were acceptable. For my part, I am anxious that peace should also prevail in Canada. Whatever may be our theories as regards imperialism, we should all meet on one common ground and that is that our only policy should be to protect our interests against those of any other part of the empire, even Great Britain.

The reaction of Canadian sentiment against imperialism has made itself felt, not only upon this side of the House, but also the other side, and is particularly noticeable on the part of the two leaders of the Conservative party. This afternoon the leader of the opposition referred to the question of Japanese immigration, although he did so in much milder terms than when he spoke in British Columbia. On the 8th of September there was a meeting in Victoria, at which he made a very eloquent and able speech. Referring to the disallowance of the Immigration Act of British Columbia by this government, he said:

> I venture to think that so far as this province is concerned, and dealing with the question of disallowance of your statutes, there is no imperial consideration which should prevail against your views or your wishes, as there was no imperial consideration to prevail against similar legislation in Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand and Natal. Why was not

the Natal Act disallowed ? And if there be no answer to this question, why should the federal authorities disallow your Act.

I am happy to see that the hon. gentleman is becoming an anti-imperialist. And as far as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is concerned, I was glad also to see that at two meetings held in the province of Quebec—at St. Eustache and St. Jacques de l'Achigan—he opposed the scheme of imperial defence and protested against any other than trade questions being discussed by the conference.

I hope that this sentiment of Canadianism will prevail on both sides, and that in matters of political and military organization and fiscal policy, the one object we shall have in view will be to safeguard the interests of Canada above every other.

Motion of Mr. Thompson (Haldimand) agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved :

That the said address be engrossed and be presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this House as are of the honourable the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved :

That this House will, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a committee to consider of a Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved :

That this House will, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

The Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1902.—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

The report of the Auditor General for the year ending 30th June, 1902.—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending 30th June, 1902.—Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock.

Report of the Department of Interior for the year 1901-2.—Hon. Mr. Sifton.

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ending 30th June, 1902. —Hon. Mr. Sifton.

Reports of the Department of Inland Revenue for the year ending 30th June, 1902. —Hon. M. Bernier.

Report of the Department of Justice as to penitentiaries for the year ending 30th June, 1902.—Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Trade and Navigation tables for the year ending 30th June, 1902.—Hon. Mr. Paterson.

Report of the fisheries branch of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year 1902.—Hon. Mr. Préfontaine.

The report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ending 31st October, 1902. —Hon. Mr. Fielding.

ADJOURNMENT—MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. Before the motion passes, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance when we may expect the explanation of ministerial changes which we were told by the right hon. leader of the House would be given after the adoption of the address.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was about to say that by direction of the Prime Minister I am to inform the House that on Tuesday next that right hon. gentleman will make the customary statement of ministerial changes.

Mr. MONK. The reason I ask is that the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is obliged to be absent on Tuesday, and if it would be as convenient to make the explanation on Wednesday, it might better meet his wishes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps we might let the matter stand until Monday, when, if it be desired, across the floor, arrangements may be made to meet the convenience of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax). For the present, I would not like to depart from the information that the right hon. the leader of the House gave me.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 16, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—MAIN ESTIMATES—INTERNAL ECONOMY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1904, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, March 16, 1903.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the message of His Excellency and the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved minute of Council, appointing the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, G.C.M.G., Minister of Trade and Commerce ; the Hon. William Stevens Fielding, Minister of Finance ; the Hon. James Sutherland, Minister of Public Works ; and the Hon. Raymond Préfontaine, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and provisions of the 13th chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled : 'An Act respecting the House of Commons.'

Government House,
Ottawa, March 16, 1903.

ELECTION PETITION.—JUDGMENT OF SUPREME COURT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received from the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada a certified copy of the judgment of the said court in the matter of the election appeal for the electoral district of St. James, by which the judgment of the trial judges in the lower court annulling the said election was affirmed and the appeal dismissed.

And on the appeal from that portion of the judgment of the trial judges in the lower court wherein the appellant has been found guilty of corrupt practices, the judges of the Supreme Court being equally divided on the said question, the appeal stands dismissed and the judgment of the Hon. Sir Melbourne M. Tait and the Hon. L. O. Loranger, declaring that the appellant was guilty of corrupt practices was affirmed.

The trial judges having reported that corrupt practices extensively prevailed in the election, I have, in conformity with sections 48, chap. 9, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, withheld the issue of my warrant for a new election, pending any action to be taken by the House in the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the North-west Mounted Police for 1902.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ended 30th June, 1902.—Hon. Mr. Blair.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ended 30th June, 1902.—Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 3) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—Mr. Charlton.

Bill (No. 4) respecting telephone companies.—Mr. Maclean.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.—PROGRESS ESTIMATES.

Mr. J. CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 2) to amend the Railway Act as concerns the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of railways therein mentioned, 63 and 64 Vic., chap. 8.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Explain.

Mr. CHARLTON. It refers to grants made upon progress estimates, subsidy grants. It merely asks to have the minimum sum changed from $60,000 to $30,000.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.—TELEPHONE COMPANIES.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 5) to amend the Railway Act. He said : The substance of this Bill is that every railway company that gives any facilities to any telephone company shall give equal and the same facilities to any other company applying for them on exactly the same conditions. At the present moment the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and other railway companies in this country have made an agreement with the Bell Telephone Company whereby the latter has a monopoly in telephone entrance to the stations of these companies. I say that is against public policy, it is an unfair discrimination, it is against the spirit of the Railway Act which holds a railway company bound to give all express companies equal facilities. This Bill simply provides that equal facilities shall be given to all telephone companies or persons who desire access to the railway stations of the various railway companies. I would like to know from the Minister of Railways and Canals whether he will accept this principle, especially in view of this fact, that if the government were now to say that they would accept the

principle of this Bill a large number of private independent telephone lines would be started all over this country. It would be a great assistance to trade and to the social life of this country if these telephone systems were inaugurated.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CATTLE GUARDS ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This is the same Bill that was discussed in the House last session with regard to cattle guards on highway crossings.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

JUDGES RETIRING ALLOWANCES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to amend chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes with respect to retiring allowances of judges.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the nature of the Bill?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The object of the bill is to provide that judges of the Superior Court who have attained a certain age, for instance, 75 years, and who have served a certain number of years on the bench are authorized to retire on full pay.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXPROPRIATION ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) to amend the Expropriation Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the nature of this Bill?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This Bill is a reproduction of a Bill introduced last session to enable the government to expropriate in trust a limited estate in property; for instance, if the government wishes to expropriate a quarry only for a limited period of time it will enable the government to do so. If the government give notice of expropriation and afterwards ascertain that the property is not required for public purposes, this Bill wil enable the government to withdraw from the expropriation and abandon the property subject to the usual condition, that it will pay the damages incurred in the interval. Provision is also made to enable the government in the event of a property having been expropriated, to remedy the damages which have been incurred through addition of other works which may be necessary.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

YUKON TERRITORY ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to amend the Yukon Territory Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the nature of this Bill?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. An ordinance has been passed by the local authorities of the Yukon in respect to the summoning of jurors, as some doubt has been expressed about the rights of the Yukon council to pass such legislation, this Bill is introduced to give full effect to it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS—NEW BRUNSWICK.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 10) to amend the Act relating to the custody of juvenile offenders in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose this is in consequence of the recent difficulty in that province?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, as a result of the Godsoe case in New Brunswick. There is an omission, evidently, in the Criminal Code. In the Criminal Code provision is made for the removal of juvenile offenders from the penitentiary to the reformatory, but there is no provision for the converse case; that is to say for the removal from the reformatory to the penitentiary.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUBLICATION OF THE REVISED STATUTES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 11) to amend the Act respecting the publication of the Statutes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the nature of this Bill?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is merely to make provision for the payment of certain fees to which a certain official is entitled when he is applied to for a copy of a Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMMORAL ENTERTAINMENTS.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) introduced Bill (No. 12) to amend the Criminal Code of 1892.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Explain please.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This Bill is directed against the immoral and indecent plays and entertainments that occasionally take place in some large cities. It is for the purpose of providing more severe punishments for those who indulge in that pastime, and it is introduced at the suggestion of the recorder of the city of Montreal, and approved by other persons in that city.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 13) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the nature of the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is to settle a mere matter of procedure. Under the Election Act now it is necessary that the trial should take place in the county where the election is held, and it is at times more convenient that the election trial should be held in the city adjoining the county. The Election Act makes no provision for transferring the trial from a place within the county to a place outside the county, or vice versa. Take for instance the case of the county of Quebec ; if an election takes place in the county of Quebec, which is my own county, and there is a trial, it will be necessary for the judge to sit within the county, whereas, the city of Quebec is immediately alongside of it and has all the conveniences necessary to the holding of a court, and it is to enable that to be done that this Bill is introduced.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There are never any election protests in the province of Quebec?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not now, but then we never can tell what may happen in the future.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked (Translation.) :

Is it the intention of the government to introduce, during the present session, legislation amending the Act respecting Judges of the Provincial Courts, with a view either to increase the salaries of the judges generally, or to equalize the said salaries according to circumstances of residence, cost of living, &c., &c.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.) (Translation.) In answer to the hon. gentleman, let me tell him that the matter is now under consideration by the government.

TICKET OF LEAVE SYSTEM.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. How many persons have been released from imprisonment under the Ticket of Leave Acts, since the first of January, 1902, to the 12th of March, 1903 ?
2. What are the names of such persons ?
3. Of what offences had they been convicted, and at what dates were they so convicted ?
4. At what dates were they so released from imprisonment ?
5. Have any of the licenses or tickets of leave so granted been revoked ; and if any, how many ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The information necessary to enable me to answer the first and fifth paragraphs is not now available, but it will be here in a few minutes. As to the second, I do not think it would be in the public interest that the names of the persons should be given. In respect to paragraphs 3 and 4, I think it would perhaps be more convenient if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) would move for a return, because we find it practically impossible to give, within the brief scope of an answer to a question, the information he asks for.

EXERCISE OF PREROGATIVE OF PARDON.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. In how many instances was the prerogative of pardon exercised by His Excellency the Governor General in cases of conviction for offences against Federal or Provincial Laws since the first day of January, 1902, to the 12th of March, 1903 ?
2. What are the names of the persons in whose favour the prerogative of pardon was so exercised during the said period ?
3. Of what offences had the said persons been convicted ?
4. To what penalties had the said persons been condemned ?
5. At what dates were the convictions pronounced against the said persons ?
6. At what date was the prerogative of pardon exercised in each case ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The answer to the preceding question will practically apply to this one. With respect to the first part of the question, I shall have the information in a few moments; with respect to the second, I do not think it would be in the public interest that the names of the persons should be given; and, with regard to the third, fourth, fifth and sixth parts, a return will probably be the most convenient form for giving the information.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

In view of the judgment delivered on the 15th of December, 1902, by the Supreme Court of Canada, in a case of Michael Power, appellant, and Judson McGriffin, and another, respondents, is it the intention of the government to introduce, at the present session, an Act to amend subsection one of section thirty-seven of the Patent Act, as amended by section two of chapter thirteen of the statutes of 1890, and amended by section one of chapter thirty-three of the statutes of 1891, and amended by section six of the statutes of 1892, so as to provide :—

(a.) That no patent shall be held to have been avoided by reason of the failure of the patentee or his assigns to commence and carry on the construction of the patented invention in Canada, unless such patentee and his assigns be shown to have failed to supply such patented invention on demand duly made to them ?

(b.) That more than one extension of such delay to manufacture may be granted ?

(c.) That extensions of the delays to manufacture and to import, signed by the acting deputy commissioner of patents, be declared to be valid for all purposes ?

(d.) That such intended legislation be declaratory of the law as contained in the Acts hereinbefore mentioned ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It is the intention of the government to introduce a Bill to amend the Patent Act during the present session, and to include some amendments arising out of the judgment to which my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) refers.

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN ONTARIO PORTS, 1902.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What were the grain receipts of all kinds at the Ports of Midland, Depot Harbour, Collingwood, Owen Sound, Meaford, Goderich, Sarnia, Kingston and Prescott, during the season of navigation of 1902 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). When the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bennett's) question was observed on the order paper, the following telegram was sent to the collectors of customs at the ports referred to :

Wire total quantity of grain of all kinds received at your port during the season of navigation, 1902.

To this we have the answers, as follow :

	Bushels.
Midland	15,017,760
Depot Harbour	12,710,303
Collingwood	2,447,824
Owen Sound	1,794,381
Meaford	2,563,311
Goderich	2,226,660
Sarnia	
Kingston	6,848,000
Prescott	97,749

An answer has not yet been received from Sarnia. But I can, perhaps, hand that to the hon. gentleman when it is received.

MANUFACTURE OF WOOD ALCOHOL.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. At what places, if any, in Canada is wood alcohol manufactured ?
2. What is the output of said article, if any, at Longford, Ontario ?
3. Is the output of said article purchased exclusively by the Department of Inland Revenue?
4. Is any person or persons free to embark in such business in Canada ; and if so, subject to what regulations, if any, or restrictions, if any ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In the absence of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Bernier), I beg to answer the hon. gentleman's questions as follows :

1. So far as the department is aware, wood alcohol is manufactured at Deseronto, Fenelon Falls, and Longford, in the province of Ontario, and at Cookshire, in the province of Quebec.
2. The department has no data as to the output at Longford.
3. No.
4. The production of wood alcohol or wood naphtha is not subject to excise, and any person may embark in its manufacture in Canada.

VALLEYFIELD POST OFFICE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the government finally decided to build a post office at Valleyfield, in the county of Beauharnois ?
2. If not, when was that decision arrived at ?
3. Has the government purchased a piece of land for that purpose ?
4. From whom did the government buy that land, and for what amount ?
5. How long has the person who sold that land to the government had possession of it, and from whom was it obtained by him ?
6. Was the land so purchased by the government the property of Mr. George M. Loy, M.P.?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Yes.
4. R. W. Johnston, $10,000.
5 and 6. From the 14th July, 1902; from the then owner, Mr. Loy.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A LAW LIBRARY IN LONDON, ENGLAND.

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN moves for (Translation.) :

Copies of all documents, letters, correspondence and papers in connection with the establishment in London of a law library for the use of counsel retained in cases before the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

The motion which I am now making aims at having certain papers laid on the table which concern the Minister of Justice, the Solicitor General, lawyers and their clients, that is to say, those who are amenable to

tribunals and the general public in Canada. As is well known by members of the bar engaged in cases before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England, it is extremely difficult for them to have access to the London law libraries, where they could find proper authorities to bring in support of their cases, to their own satisfaction and that of their clients. With the hon. minister's leave (Mr. Fitzpatrick), I would tell the House I had several interviews with the hon. gentleman on the matter, and there is, I think, in his department, a correspondence bearing on the same. As I said, it is no easy task for members of the Bar visiting London in connection with the proceedings of the Privy Council—and here I refer not only to the lawyers from the province of Quebec, but also to those from the other provinces—to have access to the required law books and judicial reports. True, there are to be found large law libraries at Lincoln's Inn and Temple Bar ; but the trouble is that, for one to have access to such libraries it is necessary to be introduced by a London lawyer or barrister, who is a member of that corporation, without mentioning the loss of time involved in going so far from the place where the Privy Council sittings are held. Now, as to the members of the Quebec Bar, I may say that they experience a still greater inconvenience, and as a matter of fact, it is almost impossible for them, as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is well aware, to have access to the desired law books. That some of those law books are to be found in the large libraries just referred to is quite true ; but the few works one may find there, are only such works as may satisfy the curiosity of a chance reader, or be serviceable to such students as wish to pursue their studies in comparative legislation. So, for instance, I may say that the last time I visited London I noticed that in the catalogue of Lincoln's Inn there were no such works as Dalloz's repertoire, Laurent, Beaudry-Lacantantinerie, and the French Pandects and Sirey. Those works which are of great value, and I may say indispensable to those who have cases to argue before the Privy Council, are not to be found in those libraries. Under those circumstances, it often happens that lawyers are under the necessity of bringing across with them a pretty large library, or else to have the required extracts copied out of those works. In the former cases, it is easy to realize the inconvenience experienced by counsel who are engaged in cases before the Privy Council. Then as to having such extracts as are required for the pleadings copied out of the law books, there is this draw-back that, when they appear before the Judiciary Committee, they experience some trouble in having those extracts accepted by the tribunal ; so that high as may be their standing at the Bar, they are nevertheless open to suspicion. So, I think, under such circumstances, it is highly desirable that a law library should be established by the government in the High Commissioner's office in London ; not a very large library, but one at least in which the best French and English law books would be at the disposal of members of the Bar. Should one find there a collection of the standard works and reports of French courts, it would undoubtedly be quite sufficient. It would also be exceedingly convenient for us to have access to the standard English law books and to the statutes and reports of all our provincial courts as well. I think this would give the members of the Bar engaged in cases before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council ample satisfaction. I do not think the establishment of such a library would involve considerable expenditure, as I have reason to believe, from an estimate which I have been able to control, that $5,000 would cover the whole outlay. Desirable as the establishment of such a library may be from the standpoint of lawyers retained in cases before the Privy Council, I say that to their clients it is a matter of considerable interest, the more so that upon the pleadings of counsel before the tribunals, the issue of the cases argued depends to a very large extent.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I quite appreciate what my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) has said with respect to the inconveniences which members of the bar who visit London in connection with the proceedings before the Judicial Committee are under, because of the lack of material with respect to our judicial reports. So far as the Dominion government are concerned, we have sent over each year a copy of our Supreme Court reports and Exchequer Court reports to the High Commissioner's office, and we also provide the High Commissioner's office with our statutes. It seems to me that some of the inconveniences referred to could be more properly met by action of the provincial authorities. They are very largely interested in these appeals, and it is, to a large extent, the legislation passed by the provincial legislatures that is subject to appeal to the Judicial Committee. If my hon. friend would take the suggestion I would be very glad indeed, if the local legislatures were moved in the matter, to confer with the attorneys general in the provinces and have an understanding with them for the purpose of remedying the undoubted inconvenience to which my hon. friend has referred.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). It would be very desirable that the local legislatures should send over sets of their statutes, as far as possible. Also any statutes of Canada that are not there already should be sent over. It does seem strange, considering that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has jurisdiction over about

half the world one might say ; that counsel coming from Australia, from Canada and from India, should not have some library there at their disposal. I would like to know whether the Minister of Justice has ever taken up the matter with the imperial authorities. I myself have experienced the same inconvenience to which my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) has referred. For the most part you can get access to these libraries through the courtesy of the English counsel engaged in the case, but even that is inconvenient because it is almost impossible to carry books forward and backward from one place to another which are quite a distance apart. I might remark also that it would seem to us that a body so important as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council should be a little better housed for the purpose of hearing appeals. That strikes all colonial lawyers on the first occasion on which they are engaged before that body. I understand that there is some talk in England at the present time of having that remedied. At all events it is certainly very desirable, that whether by the imperial government or whether by joint action between the imperial government and the colonial governments, there should be a library placed at the disposal of the colonial counsel who are engaged in causes before the Judicial Committee.

Motion agreed to.

CASE OF ARTHUR BRUNET—DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, 1900.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency) moved for :

Copies of all petitions, Orders in Council, correspondence, documents and papers in connection with the conviction and imprisonment of one Arthur Brunet, of the city of Montreal, convicted of offences against the Dominion Elections Act, 1900 ; and the pardon, reprieve, or release of the said Arthur Brunet from jail.

He said : A simple reading of this motion will show that it is of vast importance to this House and to the country at large. Hon. gentlemen will remember what took place when Mr. Brunet was elected a member to this House from the St. James Division of Montreal. It will be remembered that a preliminary investigation was held into certain acts of corruption committed at that election and during the course of that investigation it was found that two important witnesses who were to give evidence with regard to the corruption that took place had absconded from the country and had been sent over to the United States. The preliminary investigation, nevertheless, went on, and Arthur Brunet, who had been charged with gross acts of corruption in that election was returned for trial to the Court of King's Bench. It was proved that personators had been hired; that they had been given tickets by the central committee of Mr. Brunet, the late member, to vote at certain polls in the division, and that they successfully accomplished gross election frauds to a very considerable extent. It was also proved that in one poll the deputy returning officer and the poll clerk had been hired and paid money to switch ballots. The consequence of this was that one of the polls, when the ballot box was open, it was found that Mr. Bergeron, the candidate opposed to Mr. Brunet, had only four votes cast for him, that Mr. Brunet had an overwhelming majority, and all this despite the fact that a number of reputable citizens deposed that they had voted for Mr. Bergeron at that poll. In order to better carry out this corrupt scheme it was found advisable to bring whisky into the poll, so that the deputy returning officer and the poll clerk were so intoxicated that they hardly knew what was going on; at all events they did not realize the seriousness of the crime which they were committing. I may state also that an effort had been made by those interested in Mr. Brunet's election to hire young students to do this dirty work, but I am happy to say that although the students were offered considerable sums of money to switch ballots or to personate electors, they had the manhood and the honesty to refuse to be connected with such an outrage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was highly creditable to these students that they did so refuse, and I am glad to be able to mention this fact on the floor of this parliament. At the close of the poll one of the leaders of the gang who invented this nefarious system of switching ballots and personating electors, declared openly and publicly that Mr. Brunet's election was sure because the system which had been adopted in this particular poll had been carried out in eighteen other polls, and therefore the Liberal candidate was sure of his election. This showed that it was not an isolated system of corruption at one poll, but that it was part of a general and organized system carried out at that election. Here we had in this election, personation of voters, subornation of perjury, corruption of public officers, and other heinous crimes against the rights of the people. I must say that the press of all political shades of opinion denounced these crimes. Now, Sir, some of the offences which had been committed at this election were punishable, under the Dominion Elections Act, by a maximum fine of $200 and by from six months to two months' imprisonment, and for other offences there is a maximum penalty of three years in prison, a minimum of six months and a fine of $300.

Now, Sir, who was the instigator of all these crimes ? Who was the arch-con-

spirator ? Who was the man who hired these unfortunate returning officers and poll clerks to violate the oath they had taken to honestly discharge the duties of their office ? Who had hired these men to telegraph votes; who had induced these men to personate other electors, and who had gone to the students to tempt these young men to commit high crimes against public morality ? It was Mr. Arthur Brunet. To the credit of the province of Quebec be it said that Arthur Brunet was brought to trial, and notwithstanding that some witnesses had absconded, his trial took place, and upon his own confession he was found guilty of three distinct offences under the Dominion Elections Act, and sentenced to six months' imprisonment on each indictment. I am not here to judge whether the punishment meted out to him was sufficiently severe, but I have no doubt that the chief justice who conducted the trial took into consideration all the extenuating circumstances which were laid before him, and so he condemned Arthur Brunet to almost the minimum punishment which the law provides. Be that as it may; here was a man convicted of the most serious crimes; here was a man sentenced to jail for six months for crimes which upon his own confessed he committed. The people of Canada believed at the time that Arthur Brunet had been rightly and properly punished. It was notorious that this ballot switching and personating of voters was prevalent not only in the province of Quebec but in other provinces as well. Not so many years before this House was seized with the question as to whether or not an inquiry should be held into certain election frauds which had been committed in the province of Ontario, and the offences were considered so grave that this House instituted an inquiry with a view of discovering the guilty parties and the extent to which this particular crime prevailed. Therefore, when Arthur Brunet was sent to jail, all good citizens rejoiced that at last it had been found possible to convict a man who was guilty of such crimes against the franchise of the people of this country as he had confessed to. I bear no malice whatever towards Brunet ; I do not even know him. But his offence was serious ; he was caught red-handed ; he was one of that gang of men who are going around, through the length and breadth of this Dominion, stealing the votes of honest men, and preventing the free expression of public opinion upon the administration of affairs in this country. No doubt, as I said before, due weight had been given by the chief justice to all extenuating circumstances when he condemned this man to six months only in jail. Notwithstanding all this, upon petitions which were sent to the government—and this is the reason why I am making this motion—the government thought fit, after this man had been in jail four months, if my information is correct, to pardon him and set him at liberty. Now, Sir, it is important that the House be put in possession of these petitions. The government may seek to shield themselves from responsibility behind the men who signed these petitions ; but those who are entrusted with these matters are given a sacred trust, and they alone have the responsibility of showing this country that a man convicted of such offences as those I have described, must suffer the full penalty of the law, or at least the full penalty inflicted upon him by the courts before which he has been tried. I say the government cannot shield themselves behind the petitions which have been presented to the proper authorities, because any one who has had any experience of such petitions knows very well how they are gotten up and signed. An intimate friend, a relative, perhaps a brother of the accused man, goes about with a petition and asks people to sign it. He uses all kinds of influences and persuasions, and it is very difficult and requires a great deal of moral courage in many instances to refuse to sign the petition. In other instances, a man may be very busy when asked to sign the petition, and instead of entering into a long argument on the gravity of the offence which has been committed, he signs the petition in order to get rid of the man who has approached him. All these facts should be taken into consideration by the authorities to whom the petitions are presented and due weight should be given to the circumstances under which they are signed. But this fact, I say again, cannot relieve the proper authorities from the responsibility resting upon them of maintaining the dignity of the law, and the due severity of the punishment which should be meted out to all who have committed such offences as those for which Brunet was convicted. It was a relief to the common morality and to the conscience of the country when Brunet was caught, tried and sentenced to jail for those offences ; but the community was scandalized when, after having been in jail for four months, he was liberated by the government.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is better than they do in Ontario, where they do not imprison them.

Mr. CASGRAIN. As I said before, a great deal of credit is due to the province of Quebec for having caught this man and convicted him. Another object which I have in moving for the papers in this case is this. It must be made known that those who sign petitions of this kind undertake a grave responsibility, and in this instance I think their names should be placed before the House, so that in future, when people are asked to sign such petitions, they may realize that their names will probably be placed before parliament, and they shall

have to take their share of responsibility for the result of their actions.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker, the practice established in England in respect to cases of this sort is not to produce the documents upon which the prerogative of mercy is exercised, and that practice has been also fairly well established in Canada. It was established by Sir John Thompson in a case to which I shall have occasion to refer when the documents are brought down. I think, however, I ought to be under great obligations to my hon. friend for having asked that an exception be made in this case. I agree that this is an exceptional case, and one that ought to be dealt with in exactly the same way as the case of McGreevy and Connolly was dealt with by this House. I think I agree also with what my hon. friend has said as to the propriety of producing the petitions presented to the government. I may say that I did not myself sign this recommendation, though I assume all responsibility for what was done. I think it is advisable that we should have the petitions, because then my hon. friend will have an opportunity of seeing that they were not signed exclusively by persons who support the government, but were signed by persons high in the counsels of the Conservative party, and occupying high positions in this House. I agree with all my hon. friend has said about the propriety of punishing criminals who have been proven guilty of offences such as those which this gentleman was convicted of. But these offences are not new. I myself had occasion in the province of Quebec—and the law reports will bear me out—to prosecute gentlemen who were guilty of even worse offences, in 1880 and 1881 ; but they escaped at that time. Of course, the Liberal party was not in power in the province then.

Mr. HUGHES. Would that have made any difference ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, but my hon. friend called attention to the fact that when the Liberals were in power, Brunet was punished. I think the proper time to discuss this question will be when all the documents are before the House. It is possible that in this case the government assumed some responsibility, for which they must of course account to the House ; but I think it would be easy to show that the responsibility does not rest exclusively on the heads of the gentlemen connected with the government. I think it will be shown also that there have been other cases equally serious in which clemency was exercised under circumstances less defensible than in the present instance. I ought to say here that Brunet was represented at the time by medical certificates to be in a very precarious condition of health. Men are not sent to jail for the purpose of dying there ; they are not sent to jail to be executed ; they are sent there to be punished, and if a man is sent to jail for six months and medical men testify that his life is imperilled in consequence, it behooves the executive to take that fact into consideration. I ought to say also that in the Court of King's Bench of Quebec at the same time, a man who had been tried for a similar offence connected with a municipal election was sent to jail for two years. I have not the name, but I will get the name. He was sent to jail for two years, and Mr. Brunet, who was tried after him, was sent to jail for six months. Another man connected with the same offence, was tried in the term following, and went to jail for twelve months. All these things will be discussed at the proper time, and we will find out how these inequalities of sentences came to prevail and see whether or not, in view of these inequalities, it was necessary for the executive to occasionally interfere.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Inasmuch, Mr. Speaker, as the Brunet sentence was very much shorter than the sentences in the other cases, it seems to me it was hardly necessary to interfere in this case, whatever might be said of the others. If what my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has said as to the gravity of Brunet's offence be correct, the sentence of six months was very short. And considering what was said in this House some two or three years ago, by my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, with regard to the gravity of offences of this kind, it is somewhat astonishing that, after a six months' sentence had been imposed on this man—a very short sentence—the government should have seemed fit to have shortened that sentence by a period of two months.

I agree with my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, that this case might perhaps be better discussed when the papers come down, but the hon. gentleman has undertaken to discuss it to some extent himself and he must pardon us if we say a few words about it now. The hon. Minister of Justice seems to take a somewhat peculiar view of the responsibility of the government and of himself in this matter. Does he consider that if every Conservative in the city of Montreal signed a petition for this man's release, that would lessen his responsibility one whit ? If he does, he takes a view of the duties of his position absolutely different from that which I entertain. Here is a man convicted of a very serious crime—crime of a character which unfortunately has prevailed very largely throughout this country during the past five or six years, and in reference to which the Prime Minister said in this House a few years ago, that no matter could better engage the attention of our judges than an investigation into charges of that kind, because no

fountain could be pure which was tainted at its source.

Well, we have had a criminal convicted at last. Those in Ontario have for the most part, gone scott free. Every criminal involved in the case which I brought to the attention of the House at that time, has gone scott free. The investigation was burked in the committee at that session, and the hon. gentlemen opposite, by their votes prevented its being proceeded with during the following session. My right hon. friend and his colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, both arose and said when I first brought up the matter, that no matter could better engage the attention of the House. But they sat dumb the next session when I asked to have the matter proceeded with, and they voted that no investigation should be had. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has never explained his position from that day to this. His leader did get up, at the conclusion of the debate and attempt to explain why he then voted down a motion for an investigation which a year before he had been so willing to grant. We all know the reasons. We all know that the investigation into the West Huron election before the Committee on Privileges and Elections did not have the result the hon. gentlemen opposite expected. We know how they prevented my witnesses being called until their own were summoned, in order that the criminals might be heard first, yet we had proof from the inspection of the ballots and out of the mouths of their own deputy returning officers that frauds had been committed. Certain revelations were made, more particularly with regard to the Brockville election, which made it very undesirable to the hon. gentlemen opposite, that the investigation should proceed further. None of the men implicated have been prosecuted since. There is a Liberal government opposite and one in power in Ontario, and the curtain has to some extent been lifted during the past few days, with regard to certain matters going on in that province. I do not take the view of the Minister of Justice, that he can relieve himself from responsibility by saying he has petitions from any number of Conservatives. The responsibility is not on these gentlemen but on the government. My hon. friend says that he did not sign this recommendation. Are we to infer that he did not concur in it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not at all. I take full responsibility for it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend must take full responsibility, so long as he remains a member of the government, but it may nevertheless be the case that he did not concur, so far as his personal opinion is concerned, in the recommendation that this man should be released. I do not know that what took place in 1880 has much to do with the position of affairs in 1903. The question is whether Brunet was properly released from custody. We can judge of that when the papers come down. There was something said about his health. Hon. gentlemen opposite will remember how they sneered when the question of health was raised in the McGreevy case. They charged collusion, they said that certificates were procured simply for the purpose of releasing this man. I have not read the certificates in the Brunet case, and I do not know whether they afford any justification on the ground of health, but I venture to think that unless there is some very strong justification from the condition of this man's health, no greater outrage was ever perpetrated than to release him from prison before the expiry of his very short term. When the papers come down, it will behoove the Minister of Justice to deal with this matter more fully, because it is one which calls for our most serious attention.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). The hon. Minister of Justice has told us that he did not personally sign the report, but that afterwards he concurred in it. This will throw a flood of light into the Department of Justice and enable us to form some idea of how certain judicial appointments came to be made. There was a time when the Judiciary of Ontario was looked upon with a great deal more respect than it is to-day. But, hon. gentlemen opposite have seen fit to make appointments which have aroused the adverse criticism of not only the party press, even the independent and law journals. Let me quote from the 'Canada Law Times' with reference to one appointment recently made in Ontario. I know not whether the hon. Minister of Justice has concurred in all the demands that have been made from time to time. But let me call attention to what is said by the 'Canada Law Times,' which is certainly not a political journal, with reference to the non-promotion of Mr. Justice Osler :—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that the discussion upon which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has entered is not quite in order. The question now before the House is the conviction of Mr. Brunet and his pardon. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to that and would remind him that he is not allowed to discuss any other question on the present motion. It is not the Department of Justice we are discussing, but the pardon of this man.

Mr. BENNETT. With all due deference, I would submit for your consideration, Mr. Speaker, one point which, I hope, may alter your view. The hon. Minister of Justice has made the statement—and it is a very striking statement—that he had not seen or approved the report in question. I do not give his exact words, but—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. Minister of Justice took the responsibility of the action of the government, and I do not think that any necessity arises for discussing on this motion the affairs of the Department of Justice itself. That may come up on some other motion, but not on the one now before the Chair.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand the statement made by the Minister of Justice, he said that, while, in the first instance, he did not concur in the report of Council, he is now willing to shoulder all the responsibility in connection—

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perhaps I may be allowed to repeat the statement I made. I may explain, as, perhaps, the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) is not familiar with the procedure, that the exercise of clemency by the Governor General is on the report of the Minister of Justice—it never goes to Council, but goes from the Minister of Justice to the Governor General. In this instance, the recommendation was made in my absence by another minister—I simply made that statement before the House to explain the facts, but I said that I accepted full responsibility.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The report was made by another minister acting as Minister of Justice ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, and for that report I am responsible.

Mr. BENNETT. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if you rule that I am out of order I shall be obliged to reserve what I have to say for another occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER. It may come up upon some other question.

Motion (Mr. Casgrain) agreed to.

EXTRADITION OF GAYNOR AND GREENE.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved for :

Copies of all papers, documents, letters, correspondence, &c., in relation to the proceedings for the extradition of one John Francis Gaynor, and one Benjamin D. Greene.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I shall reserve any remarks I have to make on this subject until the papers are produced.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all contracts, agreements, deeds, correspondence, documents and papers in connection with the establishment in the city of Quebec of a factory for the manufacture of rifles, by Sir Charles Ross, or by Sir Charles Ross and others.—Mr. Casgrain.

Copies of all correspondence relating to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.—Mr. Bourassa, by Mr. Monet.

Copies of all correspondence exchanged since last session between the Canadian government and the British authorities on the subject of the embargo on Canadian cattle.—Mr. Bourassa by Mr. Monet.

Copies of all correspondence exchanged between the Canadian government and the British government on the subject of the organization of a naval school, of training-vessels, and of a naval reserve in Canada.—Mr. Bourassa by Mr. Monet.

Copy of the full and each partial report of half-breed commissions for each of their sittings since the first of January, 1900.

Also, a list of all applications made for scrip, names and residence of applicants whose applications have been received ; and class of scrip issued in each case.

Also, a list of all applications made for scrip, names and residence of applicants whose applications were not accepted ; and the reason or reasons for refusing the same.—Mr. LaRivière.

ADJOURNMENT—MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to move that the House do now adjourn. It was stated the other day on my behalf by my hon friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that it was the intention of the government to give the explanations with regard to recent changes of the cabinet to-morrow. But I understand that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will be absent to-morrow. If convenient to him, and also to my hon. friend the member for St. Mary's Division, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte), I shall give the explanation on Wednesday.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will be quite convenient, so far as I am concerned.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And also so far as I am concerned.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNORSHIP OF ONTARIO.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Before the motion to adjourn is adopted, I would call the attention of the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the present condition with regard to the Lieutenant Governorship of my own province, Ontario. To-day, a great political crisis exists there, and his Honour the Lieutenant Governor is ill and unable to discharge the functions of his office. It is essential that we should have a Lieutenant Governor in the full vigour of his powers at this moment. The discussion as it comes up before the House there—

Mr. SPEAKER. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that on the motion to adjourn which has now been made by the Prime Minister, discussion can only take place on the question whether we should now adjourn or not. The question which the hon. gentleman wants to discuss

now, I think is not in order. Such a question could be brought up by special motion for an adjournment, made for that special purpose, but it cannot be brought up on the present motion to adjourn.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think I will be within the courtesy of the House when I point out that there was no order on the Orders of the Day which would enable me to bring up this question. It is a matter of emergency, the Lieutenant Governor is unable to discharge the functions of his office, and the discussion now on in the Ontario Legislature turns on an issue that he may have to decide. I think in view of the fact that his term of office has expired, and that he is unable to discharge the duties of his office, the government should appoint another gentleman to fill the position.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In answer to my hon. friend I have only to say that I do not think he has warrant for stating that the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario is unable to discharge his duties. It is a purely gratuitous insinuation, to say the least of it. The Lieutenant Governor of Ontnario is not physically strong enough to go out of his house, but apart from his physical infirmity, his mind is clear, and his judgment is just as good as ever, and his faculties are entirely unimpaired. I would say moreover that in view of the distinguished career of Sir Oliver Mowat and the high functions he has discharged, it would perhaps be more becoming on the part of any hon. gentleman in this House to speak of him only in a respectful manner.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think the House will allow me to answer the insinuation made by the right hon. gentleman. I have not spoken disrespectfully of the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. I have as much respect for him as has the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has only a right to make a personal explanation.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to make such explanation now. The leader of this House has questioned my conduct in bringing this matter before the House, and has said that I reflected on the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. I have not. I am dealing with the office of the Lieutenant Governor, and the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario to-day is not accessible to the people of Ontario.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. MACLEAN. He is not able to discharge his duties—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. MACLEAN. And it is in the public interest that this question should be brought before the House.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I desire to call the attention of the right hon. premier to the fact, in view of what has been stated by him in answer to the hon member for East York (Mr. Maclean), that the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario was not able to open the legislature the other day, and his duties had to be performed by a substitute in the person of the Chief Justice of the province of Ontario. Under these circumstances I think it was quite proper that the premier's attention should be called to the fact that another Lieutenant Governor should be appointed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand that the hon. member for East York cast the slightest reflection in the world on the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, and I think it was gratuitous on the part of the right hon. gentleman to suggest that he did so. What language of the hon. member for East York conveyed any such insinuation—was it the mere statement of the physical condition of Sir Oliver Mowat ? As you are aware, his condition has been announced by members of the family of the Lieutenant Governor, announced only a few days ago—

The PRIME MINISTER. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I am speaking of a matter which I know. I am not making this statement without the book. I think I know about as much of what I am speaking as did the right hon. gentleman a moment ago when he spoke of the condition of the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. Every one respects that hon. gentleman, he has had a great career in public life in Canada, but surely it is no insult to him to say that his physical condition is not at the present time such as would enable him to discharge the very trying duties that possibly he may be called upon to discharge in the near future. No one supposes a statement of that kind involves any discredit to Sir Oliver Mowat. I think the remarks of my right hon. friend were not in very good taste when he undertook to lecture the hon. member for East York as he did. Now, unless matters have changed a good deal within the last few days, it is certain that the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario is in a very week physical condition, there is no doubt about that. We are al sorry for it, we regret that it should be so, but our regret does not alter the fact. Under these circumstances, I consider the observations of my hon. friend from East York were pertinent and in perfect good taste, and I trust the government will take them into consideration.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I would ask the hon. leader of the opposition to remember that it is a reflection upon Sir Oliver Mowat to say that he would continue to occupy his position if he were unable to perform the duties of his office. My hon. friend says that a gentleman occupying the high position of Sir Oliver Mowat should not continue to occupy that position if he is unable to perform his duties. That seems to be a distinct reflection upon him. Either he is competent to discharge his duties and should continue in the office, or he is holding on to an office that he ought not to retain.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He might be physically so weak that he could not take the matter into consideration at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It is another reflection on the Lieutenant Governor, I submit, to say that he is holding on to the office under these circumstances.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe). The leader of the opposition said he was speaking by the book when he said that Sir Oliver Mowat was in such a physical condition that in all probability he would not be able to perform the functions of his office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I said I knew that he was physically very weak, and that it had been so announced in Toronto by members of his family.

Mr. McCARTHY. He is either in one condition or the other, either in a condition to discharge his duties, or in such a condition that he is not fit to discharge them. If he is in a condition which enables him to discharge his duties, there is no need of calling the attention of the House to the matter ; if he is in the other condition, then he is not fit to fulfil his public duties. I desire to say, speaking by the book, that I have been told by relatives of the Lieutenant Governor that he is much better, that within the last three days his condition has improved, and that he has been writing letters, personal and otherwise, with his own hand. His condition is much improved from that which prevented him from opening the House last week.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 17, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 14) to amend the Canada Temperance Act.—Mr. Law.

Bill (No. 15) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—Mr. Clancy.

Bill (No. 16) to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 17) to aid in the settlement of Railway Labour Disputes.—Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Labour for the year ending June 30, 1902.—Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock.

SUPPLY—THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNORSHIP OF ONTARIO.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say, in order to put myself fairly before the House, that I intend to make some remarks followed by a motion, unless the Prime Minister now says that he will move the House into Committee of Supply, when I would rather speak to the question I have in view.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We are going into Supply.

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

Mr. MACLEAN. On this motion to go into Supply, I propose to call the attention of the House and the country to a grave condition of affairs that exists in my own province, that of Ontario. A political crisis exists there to-day that is attracting the attention of all the people of Canada. Certain circumstances have been made public which reflect on the moral tone of that province, which reflect on the political tone of that province ; and I say a crisis has arrived in which the honour of the province is involved, in which the honour of politicians is involved, and every one must be concerned in the settlement of that crisis. At the present moment the Lieutenant Governor of that province has exceeded his term. He was appointed about November, 1897 ; his five years consequently are up, and he is holding office, I think, very improperly. Not only is he holding office after his term has expired, but his condition of health, I believe, is such that he is unable to discharge the high functions of his office. Certainly he was unable to open the legislature last week and it had to be opened by commission. After what transpired not long ago in connection with this affair, I think it is my duty now to call the attention of the House to this condition of affairs in Ontario ; and also to call the attention of the House to the record of the hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to that question. On a motion to go into Committee of Supply, in the year 1895, I find that Mr. Mills (Bothwell) submitted the following resolution :

That, in the opinion of this House, section 59 of the British North America Act of 1867, which prevents the removal of a lieutenant governor of a province for five years from the date of his appointment, except for cause assigned, and communicated to the House of Commons by message, was intended to prevent the undue influence of federal ministers in provincial affairs; and the practice which has become prevalent, of permitting lieutenant governors to continue in office for long periods of time after the expiry of their commissions, by which they become removable at any time, without assignment of cause, is an abuse of authority calculated to impair responsible government in the provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. Mills supported that motion by an argument, and I propose to read a few sentences from that argument. He said:

Now, the objection I make to the existing condition of things is that in the case of many of the lieutenant governors of provinces, they have been permitted to hold office for several years after their commissions have expired, and at the moment the commission expires, it is in the power of the government to remove a lieutenant governor without assignment of cause, and without any report to either House of parliament. Now, I say that this is a highly objectionable condition of things. If it is proper during the five years that the commission is in existence that the lieutenant governor should not be removed without adequate cause being assigned, and without that cause being reported to both Houses of parliament, it is obviously improper that the lieutenant governor should continue to hold office after that period has expired. If the government desire that the lieutenant governors shall hold office for a longer period than five years, they should issue to him a new commission, they should put him beyond their power of removal for any subsequent period, just precisely as he was beyond their power of removal for the period for which he was appointed in the first instance. What is the object of the provision of the law? The object is to make the lieutenant governor independent of the government here, and solely subject to the advice which his constitutional advisers may think proper to give him.

Then he went on:—

Sir Leonard Tilley held office in the province of New Brunswick from 1885 to 1893, a period of eight years; so that for three years of his term of service he was liable at any moment to be removed from office by the administration; and therefore, if the administration had chosen to interfere in local affairs, they could have brought pressure to bear upon the lieutenant governor if he desired to continue in office, which was altogether inconsistent with the duties that are assigned to him, under the law to discharge. In 1888, Mr. Schultz was appointed lieutenant governor of Manitoba, and now, in 1895, at the end of seven years, he is lieutenant governor still. For the past two years he has held office by the sufferance of the ministry, he is liable at any moment to be removed without assignment of cause; and that being so, I say that this condition of things has become an abuse which ought to be corrected, and for that reason I put into your hands this resolution.

Then Mr. Laurier continued the debate. And here is what he said:—

Mr. MACLEAN.

The lieutenant governor of Manitoba has for sometime occupied his position by sufferance of the administration, and not by his commission upon which he was appointed. He can be dismissed to morrow and a successor can be appointed to him the day after to-morrow. He may be retained for one day or for one year, just as suits the convenience of the party in power. I ask the Minister of Justice, is that a practice which should be tolerated? The hon. gentleman says that so far no evil has flown from this, but does my hon. friend argue that because no evil results follow from the breaking of a law, that it is right and proper that the law should be broken? Will he maintain that because no evil results have followed that therefore we should go on without any rules whatever. If the provision of the constitution which says that the lieutenant governor shall be appointed for a term of years by commission, can be violated with impunity, and if no evil results flow from such violation of the law, the law might as well be dispensed with at once. But Sir, laws exist in all cases because if there are no laws, abuses may result, and I call the attention of my hon. friend that he has given no reasons whatever why such a practice should be defended. Indeed he has not defended it. His only argument is that no evil results have flown from it and I submit that is no argument at all.

Mr. McCarthy spoke, and I am going to quote a couple of sentences from him:—

It may be felt that when it was brought to our notice that lieutenant governors have been permitted to hold office, after their terms have expired, and during pleasure, and subject to removal of course without notice; that we did not think it of sufficient moment to give it any attention. I therefore desire to say that I believe it to be a matter of the very gravest importance that this provision of the statute should be definitely adhered to. It does not prevent a gentleman who is lieutenant governor being reappointed, for we know that in the case of Sir Leonard Tilley that was done twice or thrice, but what is calculated to degrade the high and important office of the representative of the Crown in the provinces is that he should be in the position that he could at any moment be recalled; and that in that sense he is put in a position to perhaps obey directions from the central body, which in his duty to his province he should wholly and absolutely disregard. The case that has been referred to in the province of Manitoba is a very striking one, and one which exposes the mischief and danger to follow from a continuance of this practice. We are told in this House and we have been told elsewhere, that the gentleman who holds the office is most anxious for reappointment.

I wonder if there is any anxiety in this special case for reappointment.

We were told not very long ago that this gentleman had come to Ottawa for the purpose of trying to be continued in his office and was willing under these circumstances to bargain away his functions and the rights of his province. I do not know whether these charges are true, but this I do know; that the fact that these charges could be made tend to degrade and lower the dignity of the high office which the lieutenant governors occupy. For that reason, and that alone, I think that we should require that the statute should be

adhered to, and that the abuse should not be allowed to continue to exist.

Sir Richard Cartwright continued the debate. Let us read a few sentences from his speech :—

In particular I thought that the Minister of Finance, who admitted substantially the correctness of my hon. friend's position, was exceedingly weak when he contended that no man's impartiality, no man's independence was liable to be impaired by the fact that he was a mere occupant at pleasure.

And then :—

There can be nothing more calculated to degrade the office of lieutenant governor than to allow those who hold that office to remain there at the mere pleasure of the ministry of the day. And I am very far indeed from believing that no evils have arisen when ministers, as we have seen on various occasions, hold their office to a certain extent at the mercy of the lieutenant governor, who in turn holds his absolutely at the mercy of the government here. Because no evil has been stated to have occurred, it does not follow that no evil has occurred. . . . Under circumstances such as are occurring to-day in Manitoba to keep in office a gentleman who holds it absolutely and mainly at their pleasure, they will expose themselves very justly to the charge of having interpreted for purposes of their own, the plain intent and spirit of the British North America Act in a manner in no way contemplated by the constitution, and utterly repugnant to the spirit of the constitution ; and their action may produce very grave and mischievous results. . . .

If it is of any use to have lieutenant governors—a thing which may be doubted and which is under discussion at present—if these officers are of any value, if it is desirable that they should be continued, if it is desirable that these petty mock courts should be maintained at considerable cost to the country, then at least the men who preside over them should be independent of the government here, or at any rate only subject to removal under such circumstances as the constitution prescribes. It is an evil—and one which may prove a serious one before we meet again—that the governor of one of our provinces should be in a position entirely fatal to independence ; and this parliament will be false to its duty unless it expresses a strong opinion as to the inexpediency of allowing such a state of things to continue for one hour.

The vote was taken. Among those who voted in favour of Mr. Mill's motion were Borden, Cartwright, Charlton, Laurier, Mulock and Sutherland. Mr. Speaker, I intend to hold these gentlemen to their vote on that occasion. They laid down a certain doctrine in regard to the lieutenant governors, yet, now that they are in power, and the terms of office of their first batch of lieutenant governors are running out—the terms of two or more of them are running out—we find those gentlemen still continuing lieutenant governors in their places under conditions which these gentlemen on a motion of a want of confidence in this House declared were disgraceful. Now what does the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) intend to say ? I am not here to say anything against the character of Sir Oliver Mowat. I respect his character as I do that of any other man. He has a great record ; and I am not here to throw dirt upon it in any sense. But I am here to say something for the people of this country and for my own constituents, and to demand the vindication of the constitution. And am I to be insulted in this House, when I but ask that the constitution shall be maintained ? Am I to be told that I am going out of my way to make an attack upon the holder of a high office ? Why, those who make such an attack upon me are not defending the constitution ; they are defending the office holder. There is a lust of power in the Liberal party that is something alarming, and the condition of affairs that now exists in Ontario is due to this lust of power and of office. I am well within my rights as I stand here, and I repudiate the Prime Minister rising in this House and saying to me, even though I am a private member, that when I attempt to defend the constitution——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has no right to refer to a past debate.

Mr. MACLEAN. I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker, I did not refer to a past debate. But I am told that I am doing something improper and gratuitously insulting to the holder of a high office. I am doing nothing of the kind ; as I have said, I am demanding the vindication of the constitution. I am asking hon. gentlemen opposite to immediately remove the stigma that they have put upon Sir Oliver Mowat—for they stigmatize him when they keep him in office without renewing his appointment. They must do one thing or the other—they must give Sir Oliver Mowat another term of office, or they must appoint his successor. Most of all, they ought to put his successor in office. I have no objection to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) going to government house in Toronto and setting up one of these 'petty courts' to which he referred in the speech I have quoted. I would like to attend his 'petty court,' if he would be good enough to send me an invitation when he goes to occupy that position. I call on these hon. gentlemen to-day, in view of the grave crisis that exists at Toronto, to vindicate the constitution, to put a new man in office, and not to keep Sir Oliver Mowat in the position in which he is to-day. He is entitled to better treatment. For all we know he may have asked to be relieved of the duties that are devolving upon him at the present time. At all events, the situation is serious, the duty is plain, the constitution has been violated, hon. gentlemen have once again, as many a time, been convicted of being untrue to their pledges, to their professions, to the votes and to the speeches

which they have made in this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up any more of the time of the House, and yet I feel justified in going as far as I have done out of regard for the honour of my province, and out of regard for the honour of the first man in my province, and I call upon the Prime Minister to tell this House that he intends to put a stop to the condition of things that exists in the province of Ontario at this moment.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have in the first place, to express my regret to my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) that he has not accorded me the usual courtesy of giving me the notice which is generally given when an important member occupying the position which he occupies in this House—I do not know if it is the position of a prominent supporter of the opposition, or the leader of a new party; at all events whatever the position may be, it is an important one—is about to bring up a question of this kind. I regret, as I have said, that he has not given me the opportunity of knowing beforehand that he was bringing up this question. The hon. gentleman has spoken with a great deal of vehemence on this question. He has spoken of the outrage that has been committed upon our constitution. I do not know if I shall do an injury to my hon. friend or not—if I do I beg in advance to apologize, but I do not believe that my hon. friend has read the constitution of which he pretends to be such a champion. I do not believe that my hon. friend has read the clause of the constitution which provides for the appointment of lieutenant governors, because, if he had read that clause of the constitution he would have spoken differently. He would have known that the lieutenant governor is not appointed for five years, that he is not appointed for four years, nor for a term of years, but that he is appointed during the pleasure of the Governor General. He would have known that during five years he is not removable except for cause, and that after five years he can be removed for cause, that he is appointed not for a term of years but so long as the Governor General thinks that it is to the advantage of the public service that he shall continue in office. Let me therefore call the attention of my hon. friend to this clause in the constitution, which, I am sure, if he has read it, he has forgotten it. Clause 59 of the constitution is as follows :

> A lieutenant governor shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor General ; but any lieutenant governor appointed after the commencement of the first session of the Parliament of Canada shall not be removable within five years, from his appointment, except for cause assigned which shall be communicated to him in writing.

And so on. You see, therefore, that within five years he cannot be removed except for cause, but the moment the five years have expired he can be removed at the pleasure of the Governor General. That is all the difference in the world. But, what we called attention to in 1895 was a very different condition of things from that which now exists in the province of Ontario. In 1895 we called the attention of the House to the fact that some lieutenant governors, for one, Sir John Schultz, Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, for another, Sir Leonard Tilley, Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, had been allowed to remain, not for days, not for months, but for years, after the expiration of the supposed term for which they had been appointed. In the case of Sir John Schultz he had been allowed to remain in office for two years, and in the case of Sir Leonard Tilley, he had been allowed to remain in office for a longer period, and we thought under those circumstances it was quite justifiable and proper that new power should be exercised and that lieutenant governors should be appointed under a new commission. But, I call upon my hon. friend to show me a case in the long history of confederation, in the thirty-five years during which it has existed, where the lieutenant governor has been removed from office immediately at the expiration of five years during which he has been occupying that position. Such a case is not in existence. It has never been considered to be according to the courtesy of the office that the incumbent should be removed the moment the five years during which he has occupied the position have expired. On the contrary, we have granted, as a rule, to all incumbents of this office some time before we have felt called upon to name their successors. The usual course has been followed in this case. Sir Oliver Mowat was removable when the day expired; the day expired in November—November, December, January, February; March has not even passed. Yet we are told that we must appoint a successor to fill the position, that because the lieutenant governor has been four months in office, an old and venerable man as Sir Oliver Mowat is, immediately as soon as his term of five years has expired we must apply the axe, remove him and put some one else in his place. If Sir Oliver Mowat has not discharged the duties of the office with satisfaction to everybody there might be some cause which would justify the hon. gentleman in making this demand, but the hon. gentleman does not base his case on the fact that Sir Oliver Mowat has now come to the time in which he may be removed without cause, but he states that Sir Oliver Mowat is not fit to occupy the position which he occupies. Why is he not fit ? Has anything been said in the press, in parliament, or anywhere else, against the mental capacity of Sir Oliver Mowat ? Not a word has been said against that. It is known and acknowledged that his mental

faculties are bright and keen, although Sir Oliver Mowat is not physically as strong as he was at one time. He is not as young as he was at one time and we all deplore that fact, but I say again, that no insinuation can be thrown against Sir Oliver Mowat, and if Sir Oliver Mowat were physically incapable of administering the office he has too high a sense of honour to occupy the position one day more than he felt himself able to discharge the duties attaching to it. But, if he is occupying the position to-day it is because he thinks he can fulfil admirably the duties which he has in charge. Moreover, it is true, as has been said by my hon. friend, that there is a crisis in the province of Ontario, an important crisis in which the honour or the life of a government is at stake. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, is this the time, is this the moment, when there is a grave crisis in the province of Ontario, to remove from the helm a man of such experience, of such knowledge, and of such unimpeachable honour as Sir Oliver Mowat ? If we were to remove Sir Oliver Mowat in the midst of such a crisis, I think we would be committing a grave crime against the province of Ontario, if we were to take away at this moment the firm and experienced hand that is at the head of power in the province of Ontario to-day, I believe the Conservative party themselves would protest against such a course, and at all events it seems to me that it would be the part not only of courtesy but of duty for the hon. gentleman to wait until that crisis is over before he calls upon us to remove Sir Oliver Mowat from the position which he occupies and adorns. We are familiar with these tactics; we remember them long ago, and this is only another repetition of the cry with which we have been familiar for twenty years that 'Mowat must go.' This is a new version of the cry 'Mowat must go.' How many times did we hear that cry in the old days ? How many times have we heard the hon. gentleman himself and his associates declare to the people of the province of Ontario that 'Mowat must go' ? The people would not sanction such a cry at that time, nor do I believe they would do so to-day. Sir Oliver is not as vigorous as he was, but still he is deep in the affections of the people of Ontario, who would resent any action we would take in following the advice of hon. gentlemen opposite; advice which we shall not follow.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It is not pleasant for the hon. gentlemen opposite to have their past record thus brought before them, and the dying words of the premier is the best evidence in the world that they do not like to be reminded of their past. The Prime Minister tells us that we are familiar with these cries and these tactics. Yes, we are. They were admirably played for 18 years in this House by the Liberals in opposition. What troubles these gentlemen now is that their chickens have come home to roost, and that no stronger condemnation can be given of their inconsistency than the very position which they have taken to-day. The hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) distinctly declared that he made no insinuation against Sir Oliver Mowat, but what he denounced was the pernicious principle which these gentlemen on the treasury benches themselves denounced in this House some years ago. Not a word was said disrespectful to the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, but it was said that in view of the most imminent crisis now pending in that province, it is regrettable that Sir Oliver Mowat is at the present time holding his place by sufferance of the present federal government, for it is needless to say that Sir Oliver can be removed at any moment that the government here intimate to the Governor General that he should be removed, and so if Sir Oliver Mowat does not carry out the wishes of the powers here, he is at their mercy. The parallel cases cited were most apropos. They were argued at great length in great vehemence, and with strong logic by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) by the present Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), by the Postmaster-General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) and by the leaders of the opposition of that date. Will they say to-day that they were entirely wrong, or else that they were insincere. Which horn of the dilemma will they hang themselves on. If they were sincere then according to their own reasoning they made out a good case, and if their case was good then it is equally good to-day. What glaring inconsistency do we not find here ? The right hon. gentleman tells us that the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba was then overholding his office for two years, he points out which is not so in the case of Sir Oliver Mowat. What has the length of time got to do with it ?

Mr. MACLEAN. That argument is absurd.

Mr. SPROULE. Sir Oliver Mowat's time expired last August, and the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba was overholding his office several months longer than that. What has that got to do with the principle at stake ? If it is wrong to hold an office of that kind for two years over the allotted time, it is equally wrong to overhold it for six months, because the same principle is involved. It is not the length of time that is questioned, but it is the system that is denounced. There is no logic in the argument of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister complained that the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) had not given him notice of the question. Well, the right hon. gentleman had a stack of books in front of him from which he essayed to quote, but probably

finding that the quotation did not suit his purpose he refrained. Be that as it may, the incident of the books in front of him indicated that he got notice from some source. I do not believe that the Prime Minister, even with all his great ability could, no matter what notice he had, present arguments sufficiently strong to convince the House and the country, that the system which he is carrying out to-day, and which on a previous occasion he and his colleagues denounced, is right now, and was wrong then because the Liberals happened to be in power and not in opposition.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Without in any way endeavouring to controvert the proposition in law laid down by the mover of this motion, I may call attention to the fact that Bourinot evidently takes the same view as was held by the hon. gentlemen opposite some six or seven years ago. We recognize perfectly that while the statute does not say in so many words that the Lieutenant Governor is to be appointed for five years, yet on a fair construction of the language used in the British North America Act, we are led to the conclusion come to by the hon. gentlemen opposite in former days; come to by Bourinot in his work, come to by the late Mr. McCarthy and other prominent parliamentarians: That when a term of office is expressed as it is in the British North America Act, that although nominally appointed during the pleasure of the Governor General, yet within the five years the Lieutenant Governor is practically irremovable, because unless good cause can be shown he cannot be removed. Therefore it is perfectly clear that at the expiration of the term, he stands on a different footing from the footing he held up to that time. The view that strikes me in connection with the matter is simply this: That while in one sense it might be an important matter in this present crisis to the province of Ontario, yet a higher and better view can be taken on the subject.

We are living at present in a time of change. We know that our institutions are as it were on trial, and we know that the permanence of our institutions must to a great extent depend on the manner in which they work out. Now, Sir, if the present Lieutenant Governor of Ontario were a man twenty years younger; if having occupied the position which he has occupied in that province during all these years; while admitting his ability and admitting his integrity as I will without the slightest hesitation—still any man in the province of Ontario who takes a dispassionate view would say, that it was unfortunate, that it was regrettable, that at such a peculiar crisis as this, the Lieutenant Governor should have been one who had been so long and so intimately connected with the party in power in Ontario, and with the gentlemen who are now the leaders of that party.

Mr. SPROULE.

I do not find any fault at the appointment of Sir Oliver Mowat, and while I admit that it was a proper appointment at the time, still I think that had it been possible for the leaders of the government to have foreseen that during his term of office such a peculiar crisis as this would have arisen, I venture to say that out of regard to the opinion of the country; out of regard to the national reputation; out of regard to the stability of our institutions, the government would have designated some lieutenant governor other than Sir Oliver Mowat. If that be the case, how much more is it the case now when he is remaining in office as it must be admitted on the sufferance of the federal government, when this unfortunate crisis has arisen. I am not prepared for a moment to suggest that the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario would not do his duty; I would not suggest that he is not physically and mentally competent to do his duty; but I do say that it is an unfortunate thing for a healthy public opinion in the stability of Canadian institutions and the manner of their working, that just at this time matters should be in the position they are in. I do not know that the hon. gentleman who moved the motion had any intention of suggesting that during this crisis the federal government should intervene. I take it rather that his object was to call attention to an omission on the part of this government in not filling the office of lieutenant governor, an omission which has led to the present unfortunate state of affairs. I do trust that the crisis will so work out in the province of Ontario, that the people of that province may not be hereafter led to think that if the lieutenant governorship had been kept freer from the hands of politicians that perhaps in this peculiar time a different conclusion might have been come to from that which may perhaps be come to. For, Sir, we must not forget that if the persent lieutenant governor should support his present ministers, even supposing he was perfectly right in so doing, and if he were doing what any dispassionate, impartial man would do under the circumstances, still, many people in the province might think, and not unnaturally, that with another man as lieutenant governor, a different conclusion might have been come to. If that be the case, if any large portion of the people of Ontario should come to the conclusion that the influence and the authority of the Crown were in any way affected by such political considerations at a time when the fair fame and reputation of our province is at stake, I venture to say that one of the strongest blows at the stability of our institutions that could possibly be given would be found to have been given.

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

The PRIME MINISTER. I know that the leader of the opposition is away on im-

portant business. I do not know the assistant leader, and I do not know whether our hon. friends on the other side are ready to go on with the estimates. We are in their hands to proceed or not as they think best.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that they are not ready to go on with the estimates.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and Committee rose and reported progress.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 18, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Civil Service of Canada for 1902.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Report of Secretary of State for 1902.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

INTERPRETATION ACT—SUING RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 18) to amend the Interpretation Act.

He said: This is the same Bill which was introduced last year, and only passed its second reading. The object of the Bill is to make railway companies liable for damage, subject to the civil law in each of the provinces. The Bill was suggested by a judgment of the Privy Council referring to a decision in the province of Quebec under the Civil Code of that province. I will go into further details when the Bill is advanced a further stage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

PAY OF POSTMASTERS IN MANITOBA AND NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked:

1. Has the honourable the Postmaster General received the following communications?

Winnipeg, Man., February, 1903.

To the Right Honourable Sir William Mulock, Postmaster General, Ottawa.

Sir,—We, the undersigned accounting postmasters of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, beg to bring to your attention the following statement of facts regarding our work which goes to show that the remuneration is most inadequate, in the hope that you may be able to grant us substantial and immediate relief. We do this the more hopefully in view of the stand you have taken on the question of the hours of labour, etc., of the working man.

1. The postmaster is responsible for the safe handling of many important letters, and valuable parcels. In this country large amounts of money formerly sent by express, are now sent by registered mail, to wheat buyers, to enable them to carry on their business. In many places branch banks remit to, or receive from, the head office, large sums of money. This increases the postmasters' responsibility, and where help is employed, necessitates care in the selection. The money order business necessitates the handling of large sums of money for the miserable pittance of 25 cents per $100. The amount of stamps kept on hand must always be large with the source of supply so far away. In no other line of work would persons be held responsible for the proper handling of such large amounts, with the same possibilities of irregularities and losses, without remuneration at least from five to ten times greater than the postmaster receives for his money order work. In many cases there is added responsibility to the handling of customs parcels for which there is practically no remuneration. The postmaster is expected to provide a roomy, centrally located office, without any regard to the rental which that office would command if leased for other purposes. The necessity for the correct and prompt despatch of all mails, regardless of hours of arrival and departure, is in many instances a very grave responsibility. Understanding that the present basis of remuneration has been in vogue for a quarter of a century or more, we would respectfully point out various increases in work which clearly show that although it may have been sufficient then, it is utterly inadequate now.

Firstly—In connection with newspapers and periodicals we think it a conservative estimate to assume that a family will now receive an average from six to eight times as many periodicals as a family would be receiving twenty-five years ago.

Secondly—The use of the mails as a means of distributing advertising matter is a practice of recent years entirely and the quantity handled is simply enormous and constantly increasing. These increases affect both local distribution and assorting of matter for forwarding to outside offices.

Thirdly—The recent reduction in the rate of letter postage necessitates (in the matter of Canadian and United States postage) an increase of fully 50 per cent in the number of letters handled before an increase of revenue can accrue, or an increase of salary be hoped for. In the case of British and some other lines of foreign postage, the increase in the number of letters must be 150 per cent before we have established a basis for any possible increase in salary. A working out of the figures in this connection will establish that the postmasters are bearing from 30 to 40 per cent of the expenses of the reduction so appreciated by the public. This appears to be an altogether undue proportion.

The introduction of the postal note system has increased the amount of labour out of proportion to the revenue attached. This method of remitting small amounts (chiefly to the city offices) has largely curtailed the sale of

stamps which were formerly used. At offices where customs parcels were handled and distributed by mail to smaller offices, stamps are usually sent in payment of duty, and cash is remitted to port of entry, again curtailing the sale of stamps received from the department.

2. An examination into the method of handling customs parcels and the remuneration (even where any is allowed) will reveal the fact that the work actually required to be performed, which is considerable, is practically unpaid for. This is one of the points which we desire to bring to your attention, that unremunerative work of this sort is being multiplied while the revenue of the office is being held down by reduced rates of postage.

3. In a number of the offices, besides keeping the office open throughout the regulation hours, the postmasters are compelled to await the arrival of a late evening train and again in some instances have to get up at five or six o'clock in the morning to despatch a mail, thus imposing unduly long hours of service without any allowance for any class of assistance, to say nothing of a competent assistant. In some offices, owing to the arrival of several different mails the public is entitled to call and demand individual attention several times during the day, whereas the basis of remuneration makes no special provision for this. In places where tri-weekly trains carry the mails, the postmaster is compelled to remain eleven hours a day for six days a week and provide (if he would give the public anything approaching satisfactory service) for a portion of three days a week, one or more duly qualified assistants. His allowance is inadequate for his own support at present cost of living, thus providing nothing for the payment of assistants.

4. In view of the amount of mail matter to be re-sorted and forwarded, the forwarding allowances do not begin to pay for the work done or the extra office room required. Another department with a deficit.

5. The allowance for rent, fuel, and light is decidedly inadequate. In practically every town where the post office is kept in a separate compartment, the room occupied could be leased for a rental in excess of the full allowance for rent, for heating and for lighting. In the town of Morris, the postmaster is allowed $100 for rent, fuel and light. For less space in the same building he receives from the Merchants Bank $350 a year for rent, alone. At Melita the postmaster cancelled a lease bringing him a net annual rental of $180 to use the building for post office purposes on an allowance of $125 for rent, fuel and light. Other similar examples could be cited. Fuel and light are costly here.

6. In the matter of securing proper assistants, we could point out that labour readily commands far larger remuneration in any market than it did a few years ago. To have experienced help available is a severe drain upon the limited exchequer of the postmaster who is unfortunate enough to require it, as nearly all do. Even where help is not regularly required, competent assistance must be had if the postmaster is ever to seek recreation or relief from duty.

7. There is another matter which affects postmasters in the west more particularly, namely, the increased cost of living. This has frequently been brought to the attention of yourself and colleagues in various ways, and we note that already you have conceded the point as in the case of the 20 per cent increase allowed the letter carriers of Winnipeg. In our opinion this does not represent the actual amount of difference, but is a recognition of that difference. In all lines the cost of living has advanced during the past years, while the postmasters are receiving less pay for more work.

8. A comparison with salaries paid in other departments of the public service and even in other departments of the postal service give an idea of our disadvantages. For example. First-class railway clerks receive $960 and mileage, second-class clerks $880 and mileage. In the city of Winnipeg, the assistant postmaster gets $2,000, first-class clerks, $1,500, second-class, $1,320, third-class, $880, and letter carriers, $720.

We do not think these are too highly paid, but an office with a revenue of $2,000 not only absorbs all of one person's time, but requires an additional clerk at least a portion of the year. The postmaster of such an office receives for salary, commissions and allowances an average of less than $700 or less than half the amount received by a first-class city clerk, $100 less than a second-class railway mail clerk, and a trifle less than is paid to the city letter cariers, and out of this modest income he must employ whatever additional help is required and furnish a suitable office and office equipment. In most cases his hours are longer and his responsibilities greater than those of any of the officials referred to. In one town where the train arrived late and departed early, the postmaster until recently received $3.50 per month for overtime, while the railway agent received $19 a month extra.

In view of the conditions and facts set forth above, we would respectfully suggest the following changes as tending to bring about a redress of our grievances :—

1st. That the straight salary allowance be based on 50 per cent on the first $1,000 worth of stamps sold, and 40 per cent on all additional sales. This would barely off-set the loss resulting from the reduction of letter postage. 2nd. That in Manitoba a special increase of at least 20 per cent be allowed to cover extra cost of living. 3. That the allowance for rent, fuel and light be doubled so as to provide a reasonable rent for the office, and a provision for the cost of light and fuel in this country. 4th. That the money order system be simplified so as to lessen the amount of work performed for the small remuneration allowed and also to increase its popularity with the business public, who now object to the restrictions hedging it around. 5th. In addition to the regular and general scale of allowances we would request, that a special allowance be granted for each extra mail which tends to bring the public again before the wicket for individual attention during the day. That the forward allowance be materially increased to distributing offices. That a special allowance be given to postmasters who are compelled to work before 8 a.m., or after 7 p.m. Among the mechanical industries the special allowance for overtime is very marked. That in the case of offices where mails are so infrequent as to have large quantities of mail matter delivered at the office at one time, so that the public convenience really requires the employment of one or more assistants, an allowance be given towards the payment of such assistant or assistants. 6. In addition to the above we feel that there are a number of cases of special minor grievances which we cannot enter into in detail, but in which we think that a little

investigation would show that redress could be effected so as to relieve the postmasters concerned without in any way impairing the efficiency and safety of the public service, which grievances have probably continued to exist because they have not been brought to your honourable attention.

And we would respectfully urge that the above matters be duly considered and that a large measure of redress be granted in the very near future. And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

MANITOBA AND NORTH-WEST ACCOUNTING POSTMASTERS ASSOCIATION.

Supplementary suggestions passed by executive.

1. That all accounting offices be given an allowance for rent, fuel and light.

2. That twine, mucilage, pens, ink, pencils, etc., for post office use be furnished by the department and not at the expense of the postmaster as at present.

3. That the department make it more clear to all publishers that newspapers must be suitably folded and that they must be addressed plainly. That where labels are used they must be in large clear type, and that if possible uniformity of colour in labels be secured.

4. That a full list of "Suggestions to the Public" be printed by the department and supplied to all postmasters for display in their offices as tending to make it clear that certain regulations are found necessary by the department and are not based on the caprice or convenience of the postmaster. For instance, that stamps and money orders may not be purchased during the distribution of a newly arrived mail, and that money orders and postal notes are not available for purchase after the registered mail closes for an outgoing mail. Also some suggestions as to the age of children who are to be considered as proper persons to receive mail from the wicket.

5. That when instructions are sent out for the weighing of all mails that facilities for such weighing be afforded by the department.

6. That in view of the large sums of money at times in the mails in this country and hence often stored in the post office, and in view of the value of the stamps and the importance of the books now to be kept that safes be provided for accounting postmasters or an allowance be granted to pay for use of same when provided by postmaster.

2. Have the requests and suggestions made in these two documents been considered ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to propose such amendments to the law as will remove the cause of complaint ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Such a petition has been received and is under consideration at the present time.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. WARD asked :

1. Has the Department of Railways and Canals issued an advertisement for tenders for the construction of any portion of the Trent Valley canal, between Hastings and Trenton ?

2. If so, when ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair).

1. Yes.

2. Tenders were invited for the construction of the section of the Trent canal between Trenton and Frankford on the 24th of November, 1899.

Mr. WARD asked :

Is it the intention of the government to have any further survey of the proposed continuation of the Trent Valley canal between Rice lake and Lake Ontario, before proceding with the work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The question is under the consideration of the government.

POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY PIER, N.S.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. Has Peter J. Carlin been dismissed from the position of postmaster at Whitney Pier, in the county of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia ?

2. If so, when was he dismissed, and for what reason or cause ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Mr. Peter J. Carlin, late postmaster, without the consent of the department, removed the post office some distance from the old site. It was considered that Mrs. Gallivan's building was a more desirable location and the change was accordingly made.

MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker. In pursuance of the notice which I gave some few days ago in answer to a question from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), I shall now proceed to give to the House the ministerial explanation which the House expects from the government as to the changes which took place some few months ago in the composition of the cabinet. In these modern days such explanations have not the importance which they had at one time, because, in these modern days, with the methods of publicity there is nothing that I could tell the House of which the House has not already been informed. In the month of September last, whilst I was in Europe, on the continent, I received several communications from Canada calling my attention to the course pursued by my hon. friend the present member for the division of St. Mary's (Montreal), at that time my colleague in the cabinet and then Minister of Public Works. It was represented to me that my hon. friend was pursuing a course which was not consistent with the rules of parliamentary government inasmuch as he was advocating a policy which was at variance with the policy hitherto followed by the government of which he was a member. I thereupon ordered that all the Canadian newspapers should be sent to me in London to await my arrival there on my way back to Canada. When I returned to London from the continent I found these news-

papers and on the long passage I had abundant time to acquaint myself with the new situation which had been created by the action of my hon. friend, the then Minister of Public Works, and I had to come to the conclusion that the representations which had been made to me certainly required an investigation on my part. The policy of the government on the fiscal question was laid down for the last time during last session by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in making the budget speech, and on that occasion he made use of the following language:

We do not propose to make any changes in the tariff this session. I do not for a moment claim that the tariff is perfect. I think, that, on the whole, it has proved a very good tariff. Indeed, when we recall the circumstances under which our tariff revision took place, when we remember the very complicated and difficult problem with which we had to deal, we may well congratulate ourselves upon our success in devising a tariff so well adapted to the requirements of the country, a tariff under which Canada has prospered in a greater degree than in any previous period in her history. I have occasionally pointed out the desirability of a reasonable measure of tariff stability. Nothing would be more likely to unsettle business than a practice of introducing frequent tariff changes. Hence, we have resisted applications for many small changes and we think it well to do so to-day. But I would not have it understood that this view can always be held. As time passes, conditions change in our own country and it will be well for us to take note of this, so that we may adjust the tariff accordingly. Nor is that the only reason that might require some change. Conditions arise in other countries of which we are obliged to take account. We do not propose that we shall stand still and that this tariff shall remain unchanged, but we think the time is not opportune for making changes at present.

Then, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance went on to say that at that very moment it would not be advisable to make tariff changes, amongst other reasons, for this reason that we had just completed the census and that we had not yet before us the condition of the industries of the country revealed by the census. Another reason was that at that very moment we were engaged in some correspondence with some foreign countries, amongst others, Germany, with the view, if possible, of bettering the condition of our trade with them, and another reason was that we were engaged to proceed at short notice during the then coming summer to London to engage in the approaching conference, and we knew for a certainty that the tariff conditions which prevailed between the motherland and this country would be examined. These were some of the reasons why my hon. friend, speaking for the government, did not deem it advisable to have a tariff revision and he concluded as follows:

For these reasons we postpone for the present the question of tariff revision. When the moment for revision arrives, the public of Canada may rest assured that the government will undertake the work in the spirit of moderation and caution that has prevailed in their past actions in tariff affairs, avoiding the extremes which almost always find advocates, and having regard to what is best, not for particular industries or particular sections of the country, but for the interests of the people of the whole Dominion.

I have only to remark at this moment that in holding this language my hon. friend was speaking officially, that he was giving the result of the determined policy that for the present no tariff changes should take place and that we would stand by the policy which was then on the statute-book and that this was to be the case until the condition of the country might require us to recommend a departure from that policy. Such being the condition of things and the policy so laid down in the course of that summer, my hon. friend the then Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and the present member for St. Mary's division of the city of Montreal, entered into a campaign advocating the immediate revision of the tariff in the sense of higher duties and more stringent protection. For the purposes of the present question—for the purposes of the constitutional question which is the only question at present before the House and with which I intend to deal—it was of no circumstance whatever whether my hon. friend advocated an increase of the tariff or a decrease of the tariff. The error; the constitutional error was the same; it mattered not whether he advocated to revise the tariff up or down. The one important thing was that being a member of the administration he was bound by the policy laid down by the member of the cabinet who had authority to speak upon this subject and whose voice had been heard upon the floor of this House in no uncertain tone, and who had laid it down as plain as language could make it: That the government would not under existing circumstances admit of any tariff changes.

I know very well, Sir, and the House need not be told by me, that the gentlemen who are assembled at the council board are not expected to be any more unanimous in their views because they sit at council, than would be expected from any other body of men. It is in human nature to differ. It is in human nature, even for the best of friends; even for men professing the same views politically to differ and to differ materially on some points. But the council sits for the purpose of reconciling these differences—the council sits for the purpose of examining the situation and having examined it, then to come to a solution which solution then becomes a law to all those who choose to remain in the cabinet. It would be a mere redundancy for me to affirm that the necessity for solidarity between the members of the same administration is absolute; that the moment a policy has been determined upon, then it becomes the duty of every member of that

administration to support it and to support it in its entirety. It can be possible that a member of the cabinet who assented to that policy may not be convinced that it is for the best; it may be possible that he thinks a wiser course could have been taken. But if he remains in the cabinet, it is because he thinks that on the whole it is better that his views on that subject should give way to the views of others, and that whilst his own judgment is not in accord with the judgment of his colleagues, still it is for the best interest of the country that he should resign his judgment to theirs, and continue to occupy a position in the cabinet.

I am also aware that in some instances—not in many instances I must say—a man speaking upon the impulse of the moment may perhaps be led to take a view which is not the view which would be entertained by his colleagues, but if that remains an isolated instance no serious harm could come of it. An appeal from the Prime Minister to the man who has so spoken is generally sufficient to promote harmony and to make him understand that whether he agrees or not he must come to the view held by the cabinet. But when a policy has been determined upon; solemnly agreed upon and solemnly promulgated to the House and to the people, I need not tell the House—and I think my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) ought to be the first to agree—that under such circumstances it is not only the duty politically of a member of the cabinet, but it is his duty both as a friend and as a member of the party, to stand by that policy. And, if at a later stage he thinks that the policy is wrong, that it ought to be improved, that it ought to be amended; then the battle, or the action is to be taken, not before the public, not before the constituencies, but the reform has to be advocated in the first place in the cabinet of which he is a member.

My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) however did not follow these rules. My hon. friend took another course and I think he will agree with me that the language is not too strong when I say, that he started upon a campaign for the purpose of advocating a policy in favour of immediate revision of the tariff in the sense of higher duties and higher protection. At the banquet of the Manufacturers' Association in Halifax he declared for such a policy. He repeated the same theory at Gananoque, at Chatham, and at several other places. If it had been an isolated expression, not repeated, not followed by any other, I think the evil done, the course pursued might have been susceptible of being reclaimed. But as my hon. friend started upon a campaign and repeated the course which he had first adopted, and made it plain to the country that what he was aiming at was an immediate revision of the tariff in the sense I have indicated against the stated policy of the administration of which he was a member; there was no course for me to take but the course which I thought it advisable to take as soon as I landed in Canada. And as soon as I landed into Canada I came to the conclusion that the conduct and language of my hon. friend made it imperative upon me to take action immediately in that way.

I arrived in the city of Ottawa on the 18th of October. On the 19th, that is to say the following day, I had an interview with my hon. friend and I met him at his own house. The following morning my hon. friend called at my office early in the morning before his departure for the city of Toronto where he was to speak that same evening. The next stage which I had to take in the discharge of my duties, such as I understand them, was to call upon His Excellency the Governor General to acquaint him of the situation and the judgment which I had formed upon it, and then to meet my colleague which I did upon the same day, namely, the 20th. On the following day, the 21st of October, I received by mail from my hon. friend the following letter:

Toronto, 20th Oct., 1902.

My dear Sir Wilfrid,—I feel it is my duty to place my resignation in your hands, and to ask you to be good enough to have it accepted by His Excellency the Governor General.

In the interview which I had with you, you expressed the opinion that I should not have spoken on the tariff as I have done, that the government had not as yet come to any definite understanding on their fiscal policy for the future, &c.

I shall not discuss with you at the present time, the question as to whether I was right or wrong in the course I have followed.

You are the leader of the government, and your opinion, as far as my attitude is involved, must prevail.

You told me that my utterances are causing you trouble. I have no right and no desire to be a source of embarrassment to you or to the party with which I have been connected since 1892.

My views on the tariff are well known to you. I have, on several occasions, stated them publicly in your presence and discussed them often privately with you.

Entertaining the opinion that the interests of the Canadian people make it our duty to revise, without delay, the tariff of 1897, with the view of giving a more adequate protection to our industries, to our farming community, to our workingmen, I cannot possibly remain silent.

I prefer my freedom of action and of speech, under the circumstances, even to the great honour of being your colleague.

Before severing my official relations with you, allow me to express my sincerest hope that you will soon be restored to your health of former days.

You would greatly oblige me by conveying to my colleagues my best wishes for their welfare and their happiness. My personal relations with most of them have been of a pleasant and cordial nature. I hope they will continue to be the same in the future.

Believe me, my dear Sir Wilfrid,

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

Immediately I answered in the following manner :—

Ottawa, October 21, 1902,

My dear Tarte,—After having seen you on Sunday last and having expressed to you my well settled opinion upon the consequences of your recent attitude, my first duty was to wait upon His Excellency the Governor General to inform him that I was obliged to demand the resignation of your portfolio.

After having seen His Excellency, I had to acquaint my colleagues of the interview which I had had with you.

In accepting your resignation, it is well to emphasize the points of difference between us.

During my absence in Europe, without any communication with me, and without any previous understanding with your colleagues, you began an active campaign in favour of an immediate revision of the tariff in the direction of high protection.

I regret having been obliged to observe to you that this attitude on your part constitutes a self-evident violation of your duty towards the government of which you were a member.

I repeat to you here what I told you on Sunday : I do not wish to discuss, at this moment, the economic theory of which you have made yourself the champion. This question, however important it might be, is subordinate to one still more important.

If you had reached the conclusion that the interest of the country demanded without delay, an increase of the custom duties, the first thing for you to do as a member of the government, before addressing your views to the public, would have been to place them before your colleagues, with the object of obtaining that unanimous action of the cabinet which is the very foundation of responsible government.

If you had not been able to obtain from your colleagues their assent to the course which you recommended you would have been obliged then either to accept their own views or to sever your connection with them, and then for the first time would you have been free to place your views before the public.

Such was the very simple course which was binding upon you ; but to remain a member of the government, and, at the same time, to advocate a policy which had not yet been adopted by the government, was an impediment to the proper working of our constitutional system, and implies a disregard for that loyalty which all those who are members of the same administration owe to each other and have a right to expect from each other.

I thank you for the good wishes which you express for the improvement of my health, and I will make it my duty to convey to your old colleagues the wishes which you express for their welfare and their happiness.

Believe me,

Yours very sincerely,

WILFRID LAURIER.

The Hon. J. I. Tarte,
Ottawa.

Upon this the portfolio of Public Works being vacant, and also the place in the cabinet occupied by my hon. friend, I asked the assent of my colleagues to my recommending His Excellency—advice which was accepted—to call to be Minister of Public Works my colleague who was then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Sutherland, and to appoint to the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries the hon. member for Maisonneuve, Mr. Préfontaine, who has since been returned for that constituency.

Hon. J. ISRAEL TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker, it will be no surprise to the House if I beg leave to offer a few observations to supplement and perhaps to answer the statements which have just been made and read by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. My right hon. friend had been abroad for several months. On his return he reached the city of Montreal on the 18th of October. As it was my duty and my pleasure, I went to meet him and to welcome him. We arranged and agreed that both of us should be in Ottawa on the following day, that was Sunday. On that day he telephoned me that he would come to my house at five o'clock in the afternoon. The right hon. gentleman reproached me—informed me, rather—that some of my speeches made in his absence had annoyed several of my colleagues and were causing trouble to him. He expressed his regret that I should have made those speeches which had been pronounced on the fiscal policy. He thought I should not have taken the position I had taken. I informed him at the outset, that I had no desire to remain any longer a member of his administration—that, in fact, I had waited till he was back in order to hand in my resignation. I then endeavoured to explain my position to him—not, as I told him, with a view to asking to be kept as a member of the cabinet, but to make my position clear to him. I reminded him then, in answer to the expression of his regret at the speeches which I had made, at what he called my new departure, that the speeches which I had made when he was abroad were not stronger, were not as strong, as several other speeches which I had made when he was here and in his presence. I told him that I thought a cabal had been organized against me, and that under the circumstances I was sure he would understand why I had no desire to remain any longer a member of the cabinet. I said to him : "My resignation is in your hands ; you are a sick man ; I am in the best of health ; take my resignation at once, to-day ; do not worry ; appoint in my place anybody that you like ; I will do every thing that I can to save worry and trouble to you." These were the very words I used. The Prime Minister did not agree with that view. He told me that it was preferable to leave things in abeyance till I was back from Toronto, on Wednesday. As he stated a minute ago, on Monday morning, before I left for Toronto, I called at his office, and he told me again that it was preferable to leave matters in abeyance till I was back from Toronto. On my way up, the conclusion came irresistibly to my mind that it was better for all concerned that the situation should be relieved without any more

delay. I concluded then not to comply with his wishes, and I dictated to my secretary the letter of resignation which my right hon. friend has just read. Let me read that letter again, as it is of great importance to me that the statement I make to-day should be as complete as possible :—

Toronto, 20th October, 1902.

The Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

My Dear Sir Wilfrid,—I feel it is my duty to place my resignation in your hands, and to ask you to be good enough to have it accepted by His Excellency the Governor General.

In the interview that I had with you, you expressed the opinion that I should not have spoken on the tariff as I have done, that the government had not as yet come to any definite understanding on their fiscal policy for the future, etc.

I shall not discuss with you, at the present time, the question as to whether I was right or wrong in the course I have followed.

You are the leader of the government, and your opinion, as far as my attitude is involved, must prevail.

You told me that my utterances are causing you trouble. I have no right and no desire to be a source of embarrassment to you or to the party with which I have been connected since 1892.

My views on the tariff are well known to you. I have, on several occasions, stated them publicly in your presence, and discussed them often privately with you.

Entertaining the opinion that the interests of the Canadian people make it our duty to revise, without delay, the tariff of 1897, with the view of giving a more adequate protection to our industries, to our farming community, to our workingmen, I cannot possibly remain silent.

I prefer my freedom of action and of speech, under the circumstances, even to the great honour of being your colleague.

Before severing my official relations with you, allow me to express my sincerest hope that you will soon be restored to your health of former days.

You would greatly oblige me by conveying to my colleagues my best wishes for their welfare and their happiness. My personal relations with most of them, have been of a pleasant and cordial nature. I hope they will continue to be the same in the future.

Believe me, my dear Sir Wilfrid,
Yours very sincerely,
(Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

This letter was mailed on the 20th October, in Toronto. It reached my right hon. friend's office, I suppose, about ten o'clock in the morning. At one o'clock in the afternoon, my right hon. friend's answer was taken to my house. I was away. The right hon. gentleman knew that I was in Toronto. My right hon. friend wrote me in French, and I shall read the translation published in the 'Star.'

Ottawa, Oct. 21st 1902.

My Dear Tarte,—After having seen you on Sunday, and having expressed to you my well-founded opinion of the consequences of your recent attitude, my first duty was to call on His Excellency the Governor General, and to inform him that I was obliged to ask you for your portfolio. After having seen His Excellency, I informed my colleagues of the interview I had had with you. In accepting your resignation, it is well to precise the points of difference between us.

During my absence to Europe, without warning me and without any previous agreement with your colleagues, you commenced an active campaign in favour of the revision of the tariff towards very high protection. I regret to have had to point out to you that this attitude on your part constitutes an open violation of your duty towards the government of which you are a member.

I now repeat what I told you on Sunday. I do not wish to discuss at this moment either the value or the opportunity of the theory of which you have constituted yourself the champion. The question, important as it may be, is overshadowed by considerations of much greater importance.

If you had reached the conclusion that the interests of the country demanded without delay the increase of the custom duties, the first thing for you to have done, as a member of the government, before addressing yourself to the public, was to have submitted your views to your colleagues for the purpose of securing a unanimous action of the cabinet, which is the very basis of a responsible government. If you have failed in securing the assent of your colleagues to the new policy which you recommended, you would have had to choose either to adopt their way of viewing the matter, or to part from them, and then for the first time it would have been open to you to address yourself to the public.

Such was the simple conduct which was imposed on you, but to remain a member of the government, and at the same time advocate a policy which has not as yet been adopted by the government constitutes an obstruction to the working of our constitutional system and implies a breach of that loyalty which all those who form part of the same administration owe each other and have the right of expecting one from the other.

I thank you for the wishes which you express for the improvement of my health, and I will make it my duty to transmit to your former colleagues the wishes which you express for their prosperity and their happiness.

Believe me,
Yours devotedly,
WILFRID LAURIER.

To Hon. J. I. Tarte,
Ottawa.

By the direction, I have no doubt, of my right hon. friend, both his letter and mine were handed over to the press. They were given to the press on the 21st, the very same day that my right hon. friend's letter was written. On the 23rd October, I wrote over my own signature an article in 'La Patrie' headed "a word to the country." Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote the following paragraphs, which refer to the letter of my right hon. friend :—

I see that some reproach Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the tone of the letter which he addressed to me.

The Prime Minister is fatigued—harassed—ill. The undeniable harshness of some of his words by no means changes my personal feelings towards him. I have grown old enough to take circumstances into consideration.

The Prime Minister had no right to tell me that I had failed in loyalty towards my colleagues, in using the language which I recently did on the fiscal question.

To this unjust reproach I have the right to oppose the numerous speeches which I made, in the same sense, during the last few years.

I did not organize a campaign in Ontario. I went into that province last year and this summer at the urgent invitation of the agricultural societies, of chambers of commerce, of ministerial members.

I am of the opinion that parliament is the proper place to discuss, at first, matters of this kind. I beg, then, to be allowed to emphasize as energetically as I can my objection to the Prime Minister's letter. I am speaking in all deference to him. I have a great deal of respect and consideration for my right hon. friend. I take direct issue with the statements contained in his letter as it has just been read to the House. Let me quote some of his words again :

During my absence to Europe, without warning me and without any previous agreement with your colleagues, you commenced an active campaign in favour of the revision of the tariff towards very high protection. I regret to have had to point out to you that this attitude on your part constitutes an open violation of your duty towards the government of which you are a member.

I did not commence, I did not carry on any new campaign. I went on repeating speeches that I had made before in the presence of the right hon. gentleman, of many members of the House, and of several of my colleagues on repeated occasions. There was a banquet given by the Manufacturers' Association in Montreal, in the month of November, 1901. I had the privilege of being one of the guests and one of the speakers on that occasion. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) attended that meeting. I was called upon to speak, and in the course of my speech I said :

Shall I be accused once more of being a 'Confounded Protectionist ' if I say openly, as I generally try to say things, that the main dogma of my political creed is ' Canada for the Canadians ?' Canada for the Canadians and for those who want to become Canadians. (Cheers).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. Cheers from whom ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. From everybody in the hall. I went on :

I say let us be Canadians in our customs laws, let us stand by Canadian capital, let us stand by Canadian industry (hear, hear) ; let us stand by our Canadian manufacturers (prolonged cheering), and we shall, therefore, in every sense be standing rightly. We shall be standing rightly for the labouring classes, for the farming classes, for the manufacturing classes, for we ought to be one, and we are one.

I went on again :

Are the people to depend for all time upon the United States of America, our neighbour ? Our friends on the other side of the line have raised a wall against us, they show no disposition to lower it, and, if I am not mistaken, Sir, I would say that they take us by the throat every time that they can. Now, I want to know why our Canadian custom laws are not to be just as self-protecting as theirs ? I have not been able to see for the life of me, why our laws should not be as protective as those of the United States. We want to advance ; I do not care much about words, I care less about theories ; theories and words have given precedence to circumstances, and I say these are circumstances which we have to confront. I say why should the Americans invade our markets ? They would not invade our market if we can sell to the consumer just as cheap as the American, and I want to know why we cannot. I am not discussing the tariff in detail, I am laying down principles. I say that the first principle for an individual, as for a nation, is to defend himself (hear, hear). In speaking as I do, I know I am speaking for the very large majority of the Canadian people. Now, do not believe, gentlemen, that I belong to a government where every one takes the same view. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has very rightly stated that questions of this kind are generally settled by compromise. I have been brought up a protectionist—in a protectionist school—and I have not renounced my faith (cheers), and I do not mean to renounce it. (renewed cheering). The Prime Minister is a cabinet maker of the first rank and if I were ever to have a government I would try to have all the shades possible represented. You have no idea what a cabinet meeting is like—people fighting like blazes at times.

Let me say immediately that these last words have been, on several occasions, the subject of observations which have no foundation whatever. For, let me assure the House—and I am speaking in the hearing of my former colleagues—that we never had any such fighting as has been described in the press. I was speaking, of course, in a jocular way when I used those words.

The Prime Minister also made a speech on the same occasion. He made, forsooth, a fighting speech—a fiery speech. He said :

In connection with this, there is another feature which is now taking place. I remember, and you remember also, that since the abolition of the reciprocity treaty in 1866, we have sent delegation after delegation to Washington to obtain reciprocity. We are not sending any more delegations (loud and continued applause). But I rather expect, and I would not be surprised if the thing were to take place, even within a few years. I say, I rather expect that there will be delegations coming from Washington to Ottawa for reciprocity (wild cheering). Having learned the lesson from our friends to the South how to receive such a delegation, we shall receive them in the proper way (cheers), with every possible politeness (laughter).

After the speech from which I have quoted, I remained a member of the administration. After that I made several other speeches on the same line, advocating the revision of the fiscal policy of this country on strong Canadian, national lines. Time went on. Dele-

gation after delegation came to meet the government in Ottawa. I generally attended when meeting these delegations. On not one occasion was there a request that the tariff be lowered ; far from it ; on every occasion business men, manufacturing associations, farmers, asked for a revision of the tariff in the direction of higher protection. The government were pressed pretty hard. I know what was going on just as well as any of my former colleagues know. We were hard pressed. The London conference was on. The session of 1902 was called. The situation, as my right hon. friend has said, was discussed. Of course, none of us is free to say what took place in the council, but I remember very well what took place ; yes, and my former colleagues remember what took place too. The result of our deliberations was the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in his budget speech. Let me read it at some greater length than my right hon. friend has read it to the House.. The budget speech was delivered on March 17th, during which the Minister of Finance spoke as follows :

We do not propose to make any changes in the tariff this session. I do not for a moment claim that the tariff is perfect. I think that, on the whole, it has proved a very good tariff. Indeed, when we recall the circumstances under which our tariff revision took place, when we remember the very complicated and difficult problem with which we had to deal, we may well congratulate ourselves upon our success in devising a tariff so well adapted to the requirements of the country, a tariff under which Canada has prospered in a greater degree than in any previous period in her history. I have occasionally pointed out the desirability of a reasonable measure of tariff stability. Nothing would be more likely to unsettle business than a practice of introducing frequent tariff changes. Hence, we have resisted applications for many small changes, and we think it well to do so to-day. But I would not have it understood that this view can always be held. As time passes, conditions change in our own country, and it will be well for us to take note of this, so that we may adjust the tariff accordingly. Nor is that the only reason that might require some change. Conditions arise in other countries of which we are obliged to take account. We do not propose that we shall stand still and that this tariff shall remain unchanged; but we think the time is not opportune to make any change at present. There are several reasons which operate in our minds against entering upon a policy of tariff changes to-day. We have just completed the taking of a census, and while some of the results are available, others of much importance have yet to be prepared. Among these are the returns of the operations of our industries. In considering the tariff in relation to the industries of the country, it is desirable that we should have before us, with ample time for consideration, the industrial statistics of the recent census

That session came to a close. My right hon. friend and some of his colleagues went abroad ; I remained in Canada. After having settled the more pressing business of the Department of Public Works, I started on a tour of inspection, and also in search of information concerning the transportation question to which I had given as much time as I was able to do. Naturally I was called upon to answer addresses and make speeches, and I often expressed the opinion, which I had expressed in the House, that the transportation question and the fiscal policy of this country were intimately bound together. Perhaps on this occasion the storm has come from the west. Speaking at Port Arthur I had under my eyes an interview given by Mr. Greenway, former prime minister of Manitoba, in which he advocated a lower tariff. I said to the large audience before me that in my humble opinion Port Arthur and Fort William, and not Duluth, should be the centres of exchange on the great lakes for the trade between the west and the east. It was that way I was led to speak of the fiscal policy of the government. Mr. Speaker, my speeches, most of them at any rate, have been reported, and I invite criticism of my utterances during the absence of my right hon. friend. I state here that I never said in his absence what I did not say when he was here, what I would not have said had he been in this country. I have acted in perfect good faith. I advocated the policy that I had reason to believe, that I still believe, has the policy of this government before the Prime Minister and my colleagues went away. I did not advocate an increase of the tariff all along the line—and I again invite criticism of my utterances—I went on to say that this country should have, must have, a strong Canadian fiscal policy. That was the gist of my utterances, and I never went further. The right hon. gentleman reproaches me in his letter, and in his statement to-day, with having advocated an immediate revision of the tariff. Sir, the true facts of the case are these—I have already referred to them. The statement of the Minister of Finance last year was a formal promise to the country that during the present session of parliament, then the coming session of parliament, a revision of the tariff would take place. I made bold to say that I would be able to find a clear expression to that effect in some of the reported interviews that took place when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and myself, with others, were present. It was a settled matter. I take the responsibility of saying here that it was a settled matter that a revision of the tariff should take place this session.

I am prepared to take the responsibility of the mistakes I have made. If I have made mistakes I am prepared to pay the penalty of these mistakes, but, I am not ready to stand without protesting with all my energy and from the bottom of my heart under the

imputation that I have been disloyal to my colleagues. I cannot stand that. Whatever the position of the right hon. Prime Minister may be, and he has achieved a very high position in this country, his words cannot turn into accuracy statements that are not borne out by the facts. During my right hon. friend's absence I advocated for Canada a policy that would give us the best available means of transportation and a strong Canadian fiscal policy. I do not regret a word of what I have said. I know that I have acted loyally, I know that I have endeavoured to serve my country and that I have tried to serve my party to the best of my ability. I may have made mistakes, but, am I the only man after all who has talked tariff in the government? I have advocated a strong Canadian policy on the floor of parliament and outside of it. Other members of the administration have talked fiscal policy. The Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton) also talked about the tariff, and I suppose that those who hold the view I hold are not the only ones to be excommunicated if any are to be excommunicated for discussing this question. The hon. Minister of the Interior, speaking on the 12th December, 1901, only a few days after I had talked in Montreal, spoke as follows: And this is not the only speech he made on the great desirability of having a lower tariff. I do not blame him. He is perfectly entitled to his opinions. I would like to have the same privilege. He was a minister as much as I was. He said:—

I desire before this representative convention to say a few words to put before you fairly and squarely the position of the government.

The different provinces have different interests and with these presented in parliament, it is impossible to weld them all into legislation.

If we are to have government, harmony and progress we must do in respect to fiscal legislation just what Sir Wilfrid said in regard to race and religion:—

'We must find a common ground upon which to stand.'

If you have followed the discussion in the press, you will know that there is a strong agitation for the purpose of placing a duty on lumber and increasing the duties on agricultural implements and woollen goods.

They say the reason is that they have not sufficient protection. I say it is not. If they cannot live on a 23 per cent tariff they had better shut up.

The government had never decided that if the woollen industry or any other industry in the country could not live on a tariff of twenty-three per cent, they had better be shut up. We had never decided anything of the kind. The government had not pronounced more on the policy of my hon. friend—it had pronounced less, perhaps, because I verily believe it is the intention of the government to raise the duty on woollens. My hon. friend spoke in that way. Well, he has not been excommunicated.

The lumber interests are demanding a tariff of from 20 to 30 per cent.

The lumber representatives come down twice every session to see what influence they can bring to bear to have a duty placed on lumber. Sir Wilfrid sends them to me telling them that I represent the people who do not want a duty on lumber.

The government having arrived at this position on the tariff, the important thing for the people of the west is to stand firmly at our backs and assist us in preventing any encroachment upon the position we have taken.

'Stability and no change' is the policy of the government.

We had never decided that we should not have any change, far from it. The Minister of Finance had announced that there would be a revision of the tariff later on.

The Conservatives are in favour of a very decided advance in the duties of important commodities all along the line.

British preference would be done away with if the Conservative party were returned to power.

Well, Sir, I made those speeches to which my hon. friend has alluded and on which we will have further opportunities to pronounce. On the 4th of September my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, the youngest member of the administration, perhaps, not the least influential, but the youngest member of the administration, gave an interview which was circulated broadcast all over the land in which he took strong ground against any increase in the tariff. It was a signal for personal attacks directed against me in several newspapers of importance. The Manitoba 'Free Press,' which is the personal organ of my hon. friend, the 'Globe,' the Montreal 'Herald' and other papers attacked me very severely. Knowing well the influences that are behind the scenes in the Liberal party, as I should know them, having been six years amongst them—

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who is behind the 'Globe'?

Mr. BENNETT. Hypocrisy.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I understood at a glance what was going on and I resolved to withdraw from the government at that very time, not because I had differed in the past in many points with the government policy, but, because I felt then and I feel now that when things have come to such a pass that members of the same administration are assailing each other, either in the newspapers, or elsewhere, they must part. It is better for all concerned. I then fully resolved to withdraw from the government, and it will be within the remembrance of some of my former colleagues that at an informal meeting of the cabinet, presided over by Hon. Mr. Scott, the Secretary of State, I told my colleagues of my determination. I consulted some friends who were good enough to take some interest in me. They represented to me that it was better that

I should wait the return of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. I waited. I have explained the circumstances under which my resignation was placed in his hands. My right hon. friend states in his letter that after having met me at my house on Sunday and on Monday in his office he thought it was his duty to proceed to His Excellency and inform him that he had to ask for my portfolio. Sir, I handed my resignation to my right hon. friend both on Saturday and Monday morning. He asked me to delay, to leave things in abeyance till I would be back from Toronto. I ask him now, would it not have been fair on his part to state at least to His Excellency that if he thought my resignation should be handed to him, that I had handed such resignation to him. It may not have a material effect on the question, but I state the facts as my right hon. friend knows they are.

I said a minute ago that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) had talked of the tariff. A good deal of freedom has been used perhaps by members of the administration. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has been rather free upon pretty broad questions. Not very long ago he made a speech on the railway policy of the government. When I left the cabinet, the government had not decided to build out of the public exchequer a trans-continental railway. The Minister of Railways and Canals speaking on the 2nd of November, to a reporter of the Sunday 'Sun,' of Montreal in his own house in Ottawa, said this—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me. I never had any interview with that gentleman, and never authorized the publication of such an interview. I was amazed later when I heard that such an interview had been published. I paid no attention to it, but I certainly did not have the interview.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, I am amazed at the amazement of the Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. gentleman never took care to state that he never had that interview which was of a grave nature and which has been discussed generally in the press. Of course I accept the statement but I will read the interview just the same.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If I had chosen to do so, it would have been most convenient for me to deny the reports of my speeches on the fiscal question. Of course I will accept the statement of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair), but I will read the interview for the information of the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not object to my hon. friend reading it, but I say that I had no interview with any gentleman at all representing the Montreal 'Sun' in my life.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Montreal 'Sunday Sun,' however, published a long interview which took place after a speech which was delivered by the Minister of Railways and Canals at Vancouver on the same lines. I read the speech as I read the interview, and the speech and the interview are built out of the same material. I will perhaps quote the speech later on, but here is the interview :

One of the things that pleased me most of all was that everywhere an almost general, if not, in fact, a general opinion was to be found in favour of a government railway right through to the Pacific coast. The people want such a railway because they are convinced that it is the one great thing that will bring about the equalizing of rates, that will prevent the farmers from continually being at the mercy of the railways. They even claim it as their right to have one, and after seeing what I have of the country I agree with them. There cannot any longer be any doubt that there is a great future before a government railway in that country. As a result of my visit, I hope, as Minister of Railways, to show parliament the necessity for a government railway through the west, for there cannot any longer be any doubt that the future of the Dominion lies greatly in the districts beyond the great lakes.

I say again that this interview is but a repetition of the speech that the hon. gentleman delivered in Vancouver. However he states that he did not have that interview, and I accept the statement.

I fully grant, Sir, that the members of an administration must be agreed on their policy. Now, in the speeches which I have delivered, have I disagreed with the policy for which the Liberal party as constituted to-day is responsible. The right hon. the Prime Minister said on another occasion that the policy of the present administration has been laid down and propounded in the tariff of 1897. I grant that. The Liberal party—the ministerial party as constituted to-day is not responsible for the utterances that may have been made previous to the adoption of the fiscal policy of 1897. But the fiscal policy of 1897 has been supplemented by the statement of the Minister of Finance in 1902, which was, which is for all men of good faith; for the business community who read it, a promise to revise the tariff and to increase the tariff on many lines. That was the promise; the country took it as a promise; I did not advocate anything else. I have advocated a policy for which I am responsible; that is to say the tariff of 1897 supplemented by the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance last year.

I ask : Are then the statements of my right hon. friend's letter fair to me ? I speak here with no spirit of regret or rancour, but simply to put my position right as it is my duty to do. The right hon. gentleman has reproached me for advocating what he styled in his letter, a new policy. I am within the judgment of the House, within the judgment of the country,

and within the judgment of history when I say: That I had advocated years and years before to his knowledge the same policy that I have advocated in his absence. Then, Sir, he says in his letter, and he has repeated it on the floor of the House today, that he had informed His Excellency that he had asked for my resignation. I say again that my resignation was in his hands. He had it, but he thought fit to leave the matter in abeyance. Again I ask him whether he has been fair to me. I am, I repeat, within the judgment of the country and of history on these two points.

Sir, I have quitted office without regret. I know that as long as I occupied the important position of Minister of Public Works I endeavoured to the best of my limited ability to do my duty towards my country and my duty towards the party with which I have been connected. My aim has been to promote and complete a system of transportation which would make this country independent of the United States. My aim has been, through a strong Canadian policy, and through the best possible means of transportation, to unite more and more the different parts of this Dominion, and the Dominion with the British empire. I do not say that I have always fulfilled the expectations of some of my opponents in the Liberal party; but I believe that I have left the treasury benches with an honest record. My department has been administered honestly and squarely. I am able to say, without any fear or hesitation, that to my knowledge not one single dishonest act was committed while I was at the head of that important department.

Before taking my seat I wish to thank on the floor of parliament, as I have done elsewhere, the right hon. gentleman for the great honour that he did me when he chose me as one of his colleagues. We are all glad to see him restored to health. So far as I am concerned, whatever the differences of the past have been, whatever the differences of the future may be, I will keep an affectionate souvenir of my relations with him and with most of my colleagues. Let me also thank the members of the House on both sides for the support that I have received at their hands on all the important questions with which my department was connected. I have left in the hands of the right hon. gentleman a report in which I have mapped out a plan of improvements which I had made up my mind to try to persuade parliament to proceed with. That document is a public document. I hope that my former colleagues will take up the various important questions with which I have dealt in that document. I am sure that my successor at the head of the Department of Public Works will give to the transportation question the earnest attention that I have always tried to give to that important national matter.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend who leads the government sometimes expresses surprise because we on this side of the House do not understand what the fiscal policy of the Liberal party is. May I be permitted to draw to his attention a circumstance that occurred during the recent visit to England of himself and some of his colleagues? One of the admittedly ablest men in the cabinet made an absolute and utter mistake as to what the fiscal policy of the Liberal party was; and I suppose, after that somewhat singular circumstance, we shall not in the future have from my right hon. friend any expression of surprise that we on this side of the House are not able fully to understand what the fiscal policy of the Liberal party is at the present time.

It was well known, Sir, that the Minister of Finance made an important announcement in his budget speech of last year. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) arose in his seat during the budget debate and stated that he understood that announcement to be that the tariff would be revised this session, and would be revised along the line of higher duties; and although members of the cabinet were sitting in the House at the time, not one of them ventured to put aside the interpretation placed upon the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance by the hon. member for Alberta. I can bear testimony to the accuracy of at least one portion of the remarks of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Hon. Mr. Tarte), because I myself had the pleasure of being present at that banquet in the city of Montreal to which he has referred, and of saying a few words on that occasion. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister and I responded to a certain toast. The toast, I think, was the toast of Canada; but my right hon. friend's remarks were directed altogether to the question of the tariff, on which he made an exceedingly non-committal speech. It is true, he did venture to suggest to the manufacturers there assembled that the tariff was almost perfect, having regard to the present condition of the country. That remark was met with vigorous cries of dissent, whereupon my right hon. friend, with that readiness which has always characterized him, remarked that there were even spots on the sun, and, therefore there was no occasion for surprise that some gentlemen in Canada might find fault even with the tariff. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance spoke afterwards in response to another toast, and his speech was equally non-committal. He wanted the tariff taken altogether out of politics, and he wanted to have it understood that the tariff as it then existed was as good a tariff as could be had for Canada. His remarks did not find much favour. Then my hon. friend who has just spoken rose and made in the presence of his leader and in the pre-

sence of the Minister of Finance, one of the strongest protectionist speeches I have ever heard in my life. My right hon. friend has sought to shake the force of that circumstance by saying that an isolated remark does not call for action by a leader of a government, but that a campaign is necessary. What does my right hon. friend think constitutes a campaign ? Is it not enough that a member of his cabinet in his presence makes a speech which, as distinctly as words could do so, advocated a very great increase in the customs duties of this country ? Was it necessary to make that speech twice or three times in order that the right hon. gentleman who leads the government might be made acquainted with the opinions and the policy of a member of his cabinet ? What does my right hon. friend mean by a campaign ? If he wanted any campaign does he not know that even before he went to the mother country, the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) again spoke in Montreal and used language, as reported in one of the Montreal papers, as follows :

Our American friends are making tremendous efforts to crush this country. We who are in office know that they are leaving no stone unturned to crush this Dominion, both industrially and commercially.

I have been accused of talking too much, but I may tell you that it is never a crime to speak the truth, and I do not believe in secrecy in public affairs.

There is a crisis at hand. Our American friends are endeavouring to make a slaughter market of this country. In consequence of this attempt let us have a tariff that will protect our natural industries and waterways, that will protect our national trade.

Language could not be very much more explicit. Yet my right hon. friend says that a campaign is necessary. But the position which the right hon. gentleman takes is really the result of an attempt on his part to bind together in the one cabinet men of exactly opposite opinions with regard to the fiscal affairs of this country. My right hon. friend seems to think that such is the highest aim of statesmanship. He seems to think that the ideal cabinet is that which has been described by Mr. Burke in a famous speech —

He made an administration so checkered and speckled; he put together a piece of joinery so crossly indented and whimsically dovetailed; a cabinet so variously inlaid; such a piece of diversified mosaic, such a tesselated pavement without cement; here a bit of black stone, and there a bit of white; patriots and courtiers, King's friends and republicans, Whigs and Tories, treacherous friends and open enemies, that it was indeed a very curious show, but utterly unsafe to touch and unsure to stand on.

Is that the sort of ideal cabinet which the right hon. gentleman has endeavoured to create, because some of the characteristics described by Mr. Burke are not wanting in the present cabinet, if we are to believe my hon. friend from St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte). Has not my hon. friend, in an article replying to a letter addressed to him, and published in the newspaper which he controls, called attention to the cabals and conspiracies against him which had been going on in the Liberal party many years ? Did not the hon. gentleman, in an editorial in his own paper, signed by his own hand, call attention to the fact that one of his own colleagues in the cabinet had paid the rent of a hall where a club met weekly for the purpose of heaping abuse on him ? Does my right hon. friend know any circumstance of that kind ? Is he able to indicate the member of his cabinet to whom my hon. friend has referred ? The country would like some information on that point. My right hon. friend is not able to furnish it, but surely the colleague who took that somewhat extraordinary course might have the manliness to stand up and say that he is the person who did that important work on behalf of a certain section of the cabinet and party.

It is quite evident that the attention of my right hon. friend has not been directed to the utterances of two members of his cabinet, which have been referred to by the hon. member for St. Mary's division this afternoon. We can well understand that on account of the right hon. gentleman's absence, and on account of the enormous number of newspapers he had to peruse when crossing the Atlantic, and by reason of the fact that his attention was mainly directed to the utterances of the hon. member for St. Mary's division, he has not, up to the present, become aware of the utterances of the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton). Has the cabinet decided that there shall be no increase of duty on woollen goods or lumber or agricultural implements ? Will my right hon. friend now stand up and say that such a policy has been decided on by the government ? If so, I shall sit down and give him an opportunity to do so. My right hon. friend does not avail himself of the opportunity. It necessarily follows, if his reason for the dismissal of the hon. member for St. Mary's division be correct, that he should, on the adjournment of the House this afternoon, instantly call upon the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) for his resignation. It is a mere matter of forgetfulness that he has not done so already, and I know that my right hon. friend, with that high regard for constitutional principles which he so well expressed in his letter to the hon. member for St. Mary's division, will not lose a moment after the House adjourns in calling on His Excellency and informing him that he cannot any longer conscientiously avail himself of the services of the Minister of the Interior.

And what of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair),

who thought, as he said to the people of New Brunswick not long ago, that the resignation of my hon. friend from St. Mary's division would not create even a ripple. Well, did it not create something more than a ripple on the part of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, this afternoon. And what of the very important project which he has launched on the country ? I would like to ask my right hon. friend whether or not the cabinet has decided to build, as a government railway, a transcontinental line across this continent ? Will he get up and declare that any such policy has been decided on ? Again I give my right hon. friend the opportunity to rise in his place and make that declaration if he sees fit. Again he does not avail himself of the opportunity I give him, and therefore there exists every ground for the immediate dismissal of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who has committed this cabinet to the project of building out of the moneys of this country a transcontinental line across this continent. Not only that, Sir, but it was announced by every Liberal paper in the west that that railway was to be built by this government for the purpose of keeping down rates on other transcontinental railways, and the admiration of Liberals was called up in all our western country because of the magnificent, bold and patriotic course which the Minister of Railways and Canals had announced on behalf of his government. Is there any reason why the right hon. gentleman who leads this government should not immediately proceed to His Excellency and inform him, that having been made aware this afternoon, for the first time, of the fact that one of his colleagues had laid down a policy in so important a matter, which, to use the right hon. gentleman's words, has not yet been adopted by the government, he deems it right that he should no longer avail himself of the services of the Minister of Railways and Canals. If my hon. friend is to be consistent, surely he must deal out the same justice to the Minister of Railways and Canals which he has already meted out to his long, tried friend the hon. member for St. Mary's division in Montreal.

But there are somewhat curious circumstances in connection with the incident which occurred this afternoon. We all know that my right hon. friend who leads the government began his career in public life as a protectionist. He has not, I think, been remarkable for his consistency in public life with regard to trade questions. But he seems to have developed, during the past few weeks, a great love for consistency on the part of public men. His first utterance in public life on fiscal questions in this country was this :—

> What my hon. friend has said as to my protective proclivities is perfectly true, and I do not deny that I have been a protectionist.

His next was :

> Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).
>
> We have within ourselves the ability to create an industry. If it be shown that we cannot maintain it, unless by legislation either in the way of premium or prohibitory tariff, then I should be prepared to take that into consideration.

And again later on :

> Although nature has been marvellously prodigal in her gifts and has done so much to make this a manufacturing country, we are yet dependent on foreign countries. It is our duty to foster our national industries.

And then in his letter to the late Mr. Bertram in 1896, he said :

> Whether a policy of absolute freedom of trade would or would not be injurious to the manufacturing industries of this country is a question which I will not stop to discuss here. There is no occasion for such a discussion as the intention of the Liberal party is not and never was to establish free trade in this country. * * * * * I submit also that, apart from the community as a whole, the manufacturers have not only not to suffer, but much to gain from the substitution of a revenue tariff for the present system.

And his last utterance, conveyed to this country by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) was this :

> I am, as I always have been, in favour of legitimate protection to our national industries and like my leader Sir Wilfrid Laurier I will ask and require protection for the interests of the different classes of the population.

I have in my hand a number of utterances of exactly opposite tenor given by my right hon. friend during his political life, and a few of them at least I think it is well to bring to the attention of the right hon. gentleman and the country. At the Liberal convention at Ottawa in 1893, he said :

> Let it be well understood then that from this moment we have a distinct issue with the party in power. Their ideal is protection; our ideal is free trade. Their immediate object is protection, ours tariff for revenue and for revenue only. Upon this issue we engage in battle.

Brantford, in 1894, he said :

> I propose that we should follow England's example and open our ports to the products of the world.

And at Quebec, on the 20th January, 1894, he said :

> Gentlemen, the only way in which Quebec can recover its old time prosperity as a maritime city is by adopting the policy of freedom of trade as it exists in the mother country, Old England * * * * * The system of protection has been the bane and curse of Canada * * * * * The Liberal party believe in free trade on the broad lines such as exist in Great Britain.

But he spoke also in the cities of the west. At Winnipeg for example, he said :

> I come before you to-night to preach to you this new gospel of freedom of trade, new—yes—new to this country. New on this continent, new on the other side of the line—the American republic, but not new on the other side of the water, in the Old Country * * * In

the American republic you have the line of cleavage which exists between the Liberal party and the Conservative party—the question of free trade.' We stand for freedom. I denounce to you the policy of protection, as bondage—yes bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which the American slavery was bondage * * * * You have to toil and sweat for the privileged masters ; you have to toil for those who use protection which I claim is bondage * * I protest against this policy of protection—protection cannot be attained on any fair principle. What has protection done for your own Manitoba ? Manitoba is a young giant manacled * * * Can you expect reform from those who do not believe in reform ? Can you expect reduction of taxes from those who have always told you that taxation makes a country prosperous ? * * *

I would invite my right hon. friend's attention especially to these words of his uttered two years before he came into power :

Although it will be a hard fight we shall not give in one inch or retrace one step until we have reached the goal and that goal is the same policy of free trade as exists in England to-day.

Now, I mention this to my right hon. friend because I think his memory is bad. He sometimes has cast the reproach upon me across the floor of this House that my memory is not very good. I think from some recent utterances of his that the right hon. gentleman's own memory has become very bad indeed. And, as touching the question of consistency, I would like to call his attention to the fact that, in 1894, he told the people of this country by his speech in Winnipeg that free trade was the goal which the Liberal party was looking forward to, and within eighteen months after that he had written to Mr. Bertram, of Toronto, and told him that no party in the country had the slightest idea that there could be any such thing as free trade for Canada. Does not my right hon. friend think that is a delightful exhibition of consistency ? I have some more of his record here, but I do not think it necessary to use it. Perhaps, if his memory proves bad, I may use it on some future occasion ; but I may tell him that it exhibits as distinctly contradictory statements on important public questions as these utterances which I have just read.

Here we have six utterances, every one of them a strong pronouncement in favour of free trade; here we have six other utterances, every one of them a strong prononuncement in favour of protection. To use the common phrase : You pay your money and you take your choice. Some of these utterances are available for one part of the country, and some for another part of the country. And it is upon principles of this kind that the right hon. gentleman has seen fit to build up his cabinet. He seems to regard it as a great act of statemanship that he has brought within that cabinet men who possess such absolutely different opinions upon vital public questions. Sir, I do not consider the creation of a cabinet on such lines a very high achievement in statecraft. It seems to me rather that the cabinet should contain men who, on all important questions—on all questions of principle at least—have the same ideas and follow the same ideals. I do not think, for example, it a great act of statesmanship, after my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) had proclaimed, in 1896, on the floor of this House, that the independence of parliament was being sacrificed by reason of the appointment of members of this House to offices of emolument under the Crown, after he had pledged his faith to this principle and had staked his reputation as a public man upon it, that my right hon. friend should succeed in inducing the Postmaster General to remain in a cabinet, which, from 1896 down to the present time, has appointed to offices of emolument under the Crown no less than twenty-one members of this House of Commons. Does not my right hon. friend think that it would be better that the Postmaster General, in this House or elsewhere, should take an early opportunity of stating whether or not he was sincere when he professed these principles in the House and introduced a bill for the purpose of remedying the evil he complained of ? We have a right to believe he was sincere. If he was sincere then, does he adhere to the same principles at the present time ? If not, when did he change, and what was the occasion of that change ? I do not think I am exceeding my duty in bringing to the attention of the House and of the country this instance as an illustration of the wonders which the right hon. gentleman thinks he has accomplished by bringing into his cabinet men of so diverse ideas on great public questions.

Now, the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has told us that the announcement made last session by the hon. Minister of Finance was properly understood by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). It was intended by the cabinet as an announcement to the country that the tariff would be revised, and that it would be revised along the line of higher duties. Well, Sir, what then was the meaning of the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) last year ? In replying to me he called the attention of my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to his speech in Winnipeg from which I have just quoted. He said that those words when uttered by the right hon. gentleman were true and just words that he believed them to be true and just words still. Does this mean that at the present time the Minister of Trade and Commerce still retains the enmity which he expressed for eighteen years against anything in the nature of protection ? Take

every one of his free trade speeches of days gone by, and you will not find in them anything stronger than the pronouncement against protection which was made on that occasion by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a member of the cabinet in this very House. He told this House that protection was inseperable from corruption, inseparable at least under existing conditions in this country. We have the statement on former occasions of my hon. friend who has just sat down (Hon. Mr. Tarte), we have the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), we have statements from other members of the Liberal party, that the present tariff is a protective tariff, and every one knows that it is so. So we have in the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce another illustration of the kind of policy which this party has pursued on the fiscal question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that it is a good thing for this country to have a ministry which either has no policy on fiscal questions, or which is afraid to announce that policy openly and fearlessly to the people of this country. As for the Conservative party, we have announced our policy on the floor of this House over and over again, and I have already pointed out that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) has made a declaration in a manufacturing constituency during his recent election which brings both himself and my right hon. friend who leads the government into the Conservative ranks on that important question. I have under my hand the utterances of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in which he told the people that he like his leader (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was in favour of legitimate protection to Canadian industries. And almost while he was uttering these words, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was telling the electors of Yarmouth that the sole difference between the two parties in Canada was that the Conservative party advocated a higher tariff, while the Liberal party advocated a low tariff. My right hon. friend is not correct in stating that the announcement last session was the latest announcement by the Minister of Finance, because the Minister of Finance has made the later announcement to which I have referred in the county of Yarmouth, in a recent by-election. Now, we have the present attitude of the right hon. gentleman as defined by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries during the recent election, namely, that the right hon. gentleman is in favour of legitimate protection to the industries of Canada. Does my right hon. friend hold to that doctrine to-day? That statement was made two months and a half ago, I do not know whether he entertains the same opinion still, but if he does, it is in striking contrast to that which is entertained by his Minister of Finance who, on questions of this kind, as my right hon. friend has properly said, speaks for the government at all times and on all occasions.

Now, I will not take up further the time of the House with regard to this incident, but I will close by reading to the House an extract from the words of a great Englishman of 50 years ago, with regard to an administration then carrying on public affairs in England; and I would ask my right hon. friend to consider whether these words have or have not an application to the administration which has conducted the affairs of this country from 1896 down to the present time:

> It is an administration totally without principle, refusing to put in practice what it pretends to support in theory, bound together and bound to office only by the vulgarest and lowest motives—the love of place, or of patronage, or of money. If a party be allowed to remain in power without any policy, or, if it have a policy, without attempting to act on it, to ask for support in one place as the friends of protection and to disarm opposition in another by treating free trade as a fait accompli, the people of England will become as indifferent to parliamentary government—at least to parliamentary government on the existing system—as those of France were.

With regard to the attitude of this government on fiscal questions at the present time, those words seem almost prophetic. We have seen Ministers of the Crown, as I have pointed out, within the last two or three months going to different constituencies in this country and advocating different policies. In this constituency of Argenteuil the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Agriculture told the people that this was a free trade government, and if I am correctly informed, they carried on a free trade campaign. My hon. friend for St. Mary's division, Montreal, says, I know not with what truth, that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs is a protectionist at heart. I do not know whether that is the case, I do not know whether he is one of those who have fallen under the malign influence of my right hon. friend who leads the government and whether he has therefore abandoned the principles which he has at heart. I understand that at least with regard to some articles in the tariff, he did not shed any tears when the duties were maintained, and when the duty was on one article increased. But these gentlemen have gone into Argenteuil and carried on a free trade campaign. They have carried on a free trade campaign in the county of Yarmouth. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance summoned to his assistance the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and the member for Guysborough conducted a thoroughly free trade campaign, and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was not far behind him. Then, in the constituency of Maisonneuve, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries conducts an exactly opposite campaign, and tells the people of that constituency that

both himself and the right hon. gentleman who leads the government are in favour of protection. Now, which of these gentlemen are we to believe ? My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) has also conducted a free trade campaign in the west, although I believe his ardour in favour of free trade is not as great as it was in 1896. In 1896 my hon. friend conducted a campaign for the late Dalton McCarthy, in Brandon, I believe, and he had posters up all over the town : 'Vote for McCarthy and free agricultural implements.' Lately, however, he has been explaining to the people of that part of the country that really it will not do to take the duty off agricultural implements because to do so would close up certain important Canadian industries. My hon. friend seems to have become confused. He wants the woollen industries closed up unless they can exist under 23½ per cent of protection, but he seems to place the agricultural implement industry on a somewhat different basis. My hon. friend some years ago in the House used a well known expression which he will pardon me if I apply to him to-day. He said, referring to some gentlemen on this side of the House, that he appealed from Philip drunk to Philip sober. Now I appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, I appeal from the hon. gentleman in 1902 to the hon. gentleman in 1896 ; and I trust that some time during the progress of this session he will be willing to make known to the people of this country whether he is in favour of removing the duty from agricultural implements or whether he thinks that duty should remain ; whether he believes it should be increased, if necessary, to protect those industries, and whether he is in favour of the announcement made by the Minister of Finance last year that there should be at an early date a revision of the tariff in Canada along increased protection lines.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with one more remark. What are the facts ? A Minister of the Crown has been removed, according to my right hon. friend, or has resigned, according to my hon. friend from St. Mary's division. At all events, a vacancy has been created in the cabinet. For what alleged reason ?—for the reason that the policy which my hon. friend from St. Mary's division (Montreal) has been advocating for four or five years at least, a policy which I believe he always advocated, had been announced by him in the absence of the right hon. leader of the government during the past summer. Well, under these circumstances another gentleman is appointed to take his place, and the hon. gentleman who takes his place announces to the people of this country practically the same policy as that which my hon. friend from St. Mary's division announced. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) shakes his head. Does he say that he did not advocate, in the constituency of Maisonneuve, such adequate or legitimate, protection as would be sufficient to maintain and preserve Canadian industries ? Will he deny that ? No, he will not deny it. Did my hon. friend the hon. member for St. Mary's division go farther ? His position, as I understood it, was this : At the present time we have American manufactured goods coming into this country to the extent of $65,000,000. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is correct in that estimate. The hon. member for St. Mary's took the position which I have taken myself on more than one occasion in this House, that when the inevitable time of depression comes, when prices are lower, when the protection for that reason will be decreased, when the Americans will be slaughtering their goods in Canada, we will stand a very good chance indeed of having a number of our industries crushed out, and for that reason he urged that the immediate revision of the tariff was necessary, because, not only he, but his late colleagues in the government, have been telling the people in this country that they must expect a period of depression at an early day. Then, where is the difference between my hon. friend from St. Mary's division and the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries ? The hon. minister seems to think there is a difference. Will he be good enough—I will move the adjournment of the House if necessary—to stand up in this House and tell us in what respect the policy which he advocated in Maisonneuve during his recent election differs from the policy which my hon. friend from St. Mary's division advocated ? I am not very much in the habit of throwing challenges across the floor of the House, but I do almost feel inclined on this occasion to send a little challenge to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries n regard to that matter. I do not think that he will accept, and I am certain that if he does accept he will find himself in very great difficulty indeed and that he will sit down without enlightening the House very much as to what the actual difference is. I think when we have this extraordinary state of affairs existing under which one minister of the Crown is, according to the word of my right hon. friend who leads the government, dismissed from his position as a cabinet minister and another hon. gentleman takes his place avowing what I consider exactly the same principles that an occasion of that kind surely would justify an appeal to my right hon. friend to state fully and frankly to the House what the policy of the government is on fiscal matters provided it has any policy. I admit that if it has no policy my right hon. friend is in a hopeless difficulty. I believe he is in that difficulty to-day because I do not think, judging by the course of his party from 1896 down to the present time, that it has any policy at all in regard to the fiscal matters of this country except such a policy

as it thinks from time to time will give it a longer lease of power. It is willing to appeal for support to free traders, it is willing to appeal for support to protectionists, and any policy which for the time being will tend to serve its political fortunes, any policy which will give it a longer term of office is the policy and the only policy it is prepared to adopt on any particular occasion. I do not believe, notwithstanding the lessons which my right hon. friend has given us in regard to the best method of forming a government, that this a right state of affairs. The question of the tariff is a great question in this country. Situated as we are alongside the United States of America, situated as we are with enormous resources of our own we are surely entitled to have the government of the day inform the people whether or not they propose to adopt the policy which will give our industries a fighting chance for existence and which will enable the people to develop the resources of this country as they ought to be developed. Not one word has fallen from my right hon. friend with regard to that matter to-day. He says his policy is embalmed in the tariff; therefore, he never can alter an item of that tariff without changing his policy. Surely my right hon. friend will draw some distinction between a policy and the result of a policy as exemplified in the tariff. Is there no such thing as principle which is to be acted upon in fiscal matters? Is there no such thing as a tariff which is adopted because it is a fair result of the working out of a broad principle? My hon. friend the leader of the government has not given the country one ray of light on the policy of the government, he has not given the country one ray of light as to what we may expect in the future. Last year we were to expect a revision of the tariff at the present session. This year we do not know what we are to expect for the present. I conclude by expressing for the future my very great regret that under the very peculiar circumstances which have been disclosed in the remarks of my right hon. friend the leader of the government and my hon. friend the member for St. Mary's division, and which have been accentuated by the avowed policy of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, we have not had a single word from the right hon. gentleman which would give to this House or the country the slightest light as to what the fiscal policy of the government party really is.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) who has just taken his seat has spoken upon almost every conceivable subject except one and that is the subject at issue. The hon. gentleman has travelled the old record, has gone back almost as far as the deluge, in order to discuss questions which are not to-day before the House. The last words spoken by my hon. friend are to the effect, forsooth, that I have not declared what is the fiscal policy of the government. Certainly not! I have done nothing of the kind, and if it be a crime on my part on such an occasion as this not to have given to the country what is the fiscal policy of the government I am guilty to the hilt. But, I ask my hon. friend is it his conception of parliamentary government, is it his conception of the duties of the leader of a great party that when I rise to make the usual ministerial explanation as to the crisis which took place some time ago I must launch into the fiscal policy of the country? My hon. friend knows that there is no sense in that and I must express to him my surprise because his mind is usually logical. How can we expect, on this occasion, when the object of the present debate is simply to make the ministerial explanation as to the reasons why there were changes in the government, that I should make a statement as to the fiscal policy of the government? Yet, at the last moment, my hon. friend makes it a matter of reproach to me that, forsooth, I did not tell him what would be the policy of the government. Let me tell him once and for all to satisfy his fastidious curiosity that the policy of the government is to-day what it was last year when announced by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding). Such it was on the 17th of March, 1902, and such it is on the 18th of March, 1903, and there has been no discrepancy since that time. But, my hon. friend, in the course of his remarks, after having dilated upon diverse subjects which had no more connection with the question at issue than with the man in the moon, made a long speech on what he calls my inconsistency. I must admit to my hon. friend that I have sometimes been inconsistent in my career, and I may tell him that to-day after having had a good deal of experience of life I have not the same ideas which I had when I was a green young boy. In my young and verdant days I was a protectionist as he is to-day, but I have learned since that time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have learned; I have grown old, and I hope my experience is not in vain. In those days of my youth I held the same heresy that my hon. friend holds to-day, but as I say, I have learned. Sir, am I the only man in this House who has changed his views upon fiscal questions? I know that in other countries precedents may be found. Sir Robert Peel grew from a protectionist to a free trader; not a mean authority. Mr. Gladstone grew up to be a free trader from being a protectionist; not a mean authority either. For my part I rather admire the man who has the courage to grow into better ways of action and better ways of thought. But

what shall I say of the man who falls from grace ? What shall I say of the man who was once a Liberal and who becomes a Conservative ? What shall I say of a man who was once a free trader and becomes a protectionist ? These things will happen, but it is not for the man who is inconsistent himself to tax me with being inconsistent. I will not be wanting in courtesy; I will not say who that man is, but my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), who has spoken of inconsistency, can perhaps point the moral of the tale.

But, Sir, all this is not relevant to the question; I care not to go any more into it, and I shall come at once to the speech of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works. There is some discrepancy between the versions of what took place between him and me when I came back from Europe. I care not to enter into a controversy as to that, but I will come at once to the defence which my hon. friend made, and it consisted simply in this : That he had not in my absence advocated anything else than he had been advocating all through; that in my absence my hon. friend had stated what he had stated before me publicly on several occasions and in numerous private conversations. As to the private conversations, I will not mention what took place. As to what took place publicly that is a fair ground for discussion. I do not remember that my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) upon numerous occasions took the same line of argument which he did in my absence, although I will do him the credit of saying that on one occasion he took exactly the same line. At the Manufacturers' Association banquet in November, 1901, my hon. friend made a speech which he quoted from to-day, advocating a higher tariff and a higher protection. That was in the month of November, 1901. Sir, I cannot go into cabinet secrets, but the result of what took place in the cabinet was laid before the House. On the 17th of March, 1902, the Minister of Finance made a declaration upon this question, and he stated in this House that there would be no change in the tariff. This was three or four months after my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) had spoken; and now I ask my hon. friend, when having spoken two or three months before and having given his views in favour of higher tariff, and the government having by the mouth of the Minister of Finance declared that there would be no increase in the tariff, was it justifiable——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Minister of Finance said 'this session.'

The PRIME MINISTER. Was it justifiable——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. 'This session.'

The PRIME MINISTER. Was it justifiable on his part to take the attitude of advocating a higher tariff ? Sir, it was the duty of every member of the administration, so long as he remained a member of the administration, to remain firm by what had been said by the Minister of Finance and to advocate the policy which had been advocated by him. Why, Sir, where would we be and what would become of parliamentary government, if after the policy of the government has been declared, solemnly declared by the minister who has authority to do so, what would become of our institutions if it were allowable for every member of the cabinet to then advocate any policy which he thought would be wiser than the policy which had been resolved upon by the government. There could be no such thing as parliamentary government under such circumstances. But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) said 'this session.' If it were to be 'this session,' then my answer to the hon. gentleman is simply this : He should wait. It was not to be 'this session,' and he should have waited until the time came for the Finance Minister to make a declaration of the policy of the government. As to the words of the statement of the Minister of Finance upon that occasion, which in the judgment of my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) implied or meant that it was a promise of a tariff revision this year, it is more than I can understand how he draws that conclusion. If the language has any meaning at all, there is no meaning to it but that the government was not prepared to go into a policy of revision then, and that this policy of revision would be taken at the proper time as soon as the circumstances would warrant. The Finance Minister said—and I quote his words again :

> We postpone for the present the question of tariff revision. When the moment for revision arrives, the public of Canada may rest assured that the government will undertake the work in the spirit of moderation and caution that has prevailed in their past actions in tariff affairs, avoiding the extremes which almost always find advocates, and having regard to what is best, not for particular industries or particular sections of the country, but for the interests of the people of the whole Dominion.

Sir, if my hon. friend was not satisfied with this decision—this is my last word to him upon that question; I appreciate the manner in which he has spoken this afternoon, for notwithstanding the differences we have had we have remained personal friends.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I appreciate all that, but let me tell the hon. gentleman this as a friend : That if he was not satisfied at the position then taken by the government; if, as he says, at a certain moment he had made up his mind to resign from the cabinet, and if as he stated—though I am sorry to say I cannot follow him upon this ground—he had made a statement to members of the cabinet when I was in Europe (first of all I do not conceive how he can mention here what passed in the cabinet)

but if my hon. friend had made up his mind to resign, if he thought that the policy which we were pursuing was not consistent with the best interest of the country, then he lost a good opportunity to resign when the Finance Minister delivered his budget speech last session. That would have been the time and the occasion for my hon. friend to have carried out his views. However, the hon. gentleman thought well to act differently. I shall not question his conduct any further. It was with regret I had to take the position which I did take, but I have to say that in my interpretation of the parliamentary system of government under which it is our privilege to live, there was no other course for me to take than the course I did take; and since my hon. friend thought we were not acting wisely to let him have all the opportunity he wanted of advocating the interests of the country as he thought best. But so long as he was in the cabinet, so long as it was his decision to remain as an adviser of the Crown, he could have no other views and no other words than the views announced in the words which had been spoken by the Finance Minister, speaking in the full sense of his duty.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise, with the indulgence of the House, to make a few words of personal explanation. The point I want to make clear is : That I never intended to advocate a policy which I did not think was the policy of the government as announced during last session of parliament. My hon. friend the Finance Minister then said to the House, to the country, to the business men, to the manufacturing community of Canada, that there would be no revision of the tariff during 'this session,' meaning of course last session of parliament. If it meant anything, it meant that during the next session a revision of the tariff would take place. I know large interests which took great risks after having read that declaration. They were losing money and went on losing money with the expectation, or rather the certainty, that a revision of the tariff would take place. And not one of my former colleagues who followed the deliberations closely will rise in the House and on his honour state that it was not understood that we should have a revision of the tariff in that way. It was understood in that way, and, as I honestly believed it, I went on advocating the policy which I had advocated with the knowledge of the Prime Minister.

Now, my right hon. friend says, and very rightly, that we have remained personal friends. The friendship of long days, of young days, cannot be broken by political differences, I hope. He has said that I have been of some service to him. I endeavoured to be so at any rate. When he read my utterances on the other side of the Atlantic, why did he not cable to me that I was wrong ? If he had done so, I would immediately have stopped talking or would have resigned. Why did not the acting Prime Minister, Sir Richard Cartwright, tell me that I was wrong ? If I was wrong, I say it again, why did not the Liberal members who invited me to their ridings and who listened to my speeches, tell me so ? Why did the Prime Minister of Ontario welcome me to his own riding ? Because they thought, as I think now, that I was advocating the policy of the Liberal party.

Now, I may be wrong, but I think I am right. The government will carry out the revision of the tariff in the way I have said—not because I have said it, not by any means ; I am only a very feeble factor in the political arena of this country ; but because they know that it is the right policy. My speeches will be scrutinized. I ask my right hon. friend, now that he has been restored to health, to scrutinize my speeches, not as they may perhaps have been reported to him privately, but as I have pronounced them. I have not said one word more than I would have said on the floor of parliament after the statement of the Minister of Finance last year. If I was trespassing on the proprieties of parliamentary or ministerial life, how is it that he, an old friend of mine, did not warn me ? How is it that he only found that I was trespassing on the constitution when he was on the soil of Canada ?

Sir, I hope that this incident is closed. I have acted in good faith. I do not ask anything else from my political friends than to believe that I have been in good faith. If I have made a mistake, so much the worse for me from a certain standpoint. I am out of ministerial life. I am a private member of parliament. In that capacity I will go on advocating the policy which I think is best for this country. My friends on the treasury benches having the responsibility of being at the head of affairs, I will give them credit for their good faith, as I ask them to give me credit for my good faith.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of engaging in the general debate, for I think that would be out of order, no motion being before the House, and it is only by the courtesy of the House that we are permitted to have this discussion. On the occasion of a formal ministerial explanation, we are properly confined to the constitutional question, and that question has been so fully dealt with by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that I would not think of entering upon it at all. Neither would I think of following my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in his wide discussion of the fiscal question in which we are all interested. There will be a proper time for the discussion of that question ; but, as my right hon. friend has pointed out, we

can surely all realize that on the occasion of merely formal ministerial explanations, it is not the time for entering into a general discussion of that character. I would not say a single word but that the attitude of my hon. friend and late colleague, the ex-Minister of Public Works forces me to say a word or two on one point. I have observed that my hon. friend, in defending what we understand to be his mistake, has quoted my speech made in the House of Commons last year as a justification, claiming it as a promise that there was to be a revision in the following session. In the first place, I hold that if he was right in that it is no vindication of his action, because if there is a promise, as there was not, and if there was to be a revision of the tariff, it does not follow that it would be on the lines which my hon. friend has stated at all. But I want to go beyond that. The speech has been read by the Prime Minister, and also by my hon. friend from St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and no reasonable man who reads it can find in it any promise beyond the engagements of the then present session. I am not a lawyer, but I understand that good judges agree that it is not well to decide anything beyond what is before them ; and, I dealing last sesion with the events of the session, stated that we had decided that we would make no revision of the tariff that session. What we should do in another session was to be decided when another session came. Whether we shall make tariff changes this session or not is a question yet to be considered. and it will be dealt with in due course. But there is nothing in the speech of March 17, 1902, to justify the statement of my hon. friend, though I know he makes it in good faith, that it was intended to be a promise. I noticed to-day that, feeling apparently how weak that proposition was, my hon. friend introduced another. He stated that he could find in reports of interviews with deputations the statement made by me that the tariff would be revised this session. I want to tell my hon. friend that he cannot find any such statement ; I do not believe it exists, but if it exists, it is a fabrication, for no such statement was ever made. I think hon. gentlemen who know me at all, will believe that I am not in the hablt of making statements beyond what the occasion requires. It was known that I was to speak last session of the policy of the government ; but it is never the part of wisdom for any public man to make engagements as to what he will do in the future until he is fortunate enough to have the light of the future to assist him in his judgment. So I stated last session that, for the various reasons set forth, there would be no tariff changes that session. We did not claim that the tariff was perfect; but as the days rolled on, and as matters should be presented to us under changing conditions, changes might become necessary ; but when those changes should be made, or whether the tariff should be increased or reduced, were questions which were not discussed in that speech at all, and no intelligent person can truthfully say they were. I am just reminded that my hon. friend said that that was intended to be a pledge for this session. I do not wish to differ from my hon. friend. We have been good friends, and I desire, as no doubt he does also, that we should continue good friends, but I am bound to say that that in that respect he is mistaken.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If my hon. friend will allow me, would the Minister of Finance undertake to say that he did not tell several deputations to wait until next year ? Will he deny that it was told to deputations, who came here asking for an increase in the tariff, to wait until next session ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I never made any statement which would convey the impression that the government bound itself to do anything with regard to the tariff this year. I have no doubt told deputations that we could not do what they wanted at preseut, and of course, I knew that they would come back next year, and every other year until they got what they wanted. But if my hon. friend wishes to convey the impression that, either directly or indirectly, speaking either for myself or the government, I ever gave any assurance which would bind the government beyond the then existing session, I am bound to tell him that he is entirely mistaken. The object of any statements of mine was to deal with the occasion as it presented itself, and when the future would come, we would deal with that future in the light then before us.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, in the discussion which took place this afternoon we heard a good deal about the loyalty of a member of the cabinet to his colleagues and to his chief. But there was something else which was not referred to, but which I think is equally important. and that is the loyalty of the head of the cabinet to a former member of his cabinet. If there was ever an exhibition of disloyalty to a former colleague, that exhibition was made here this afternoon. An attempt was made, in the explanations offered to the House, to show that, in some way the Prime Minister had dismissed a colleague, when the facts go to show that that colleague the late Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) had tendered his resignation to his chief and that the chief had asked him to hold his resignation in abeyance, that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) went on

a journey, and that opportunity was taken to make it appear that he had been dismissed. I think that is one of the most discreditable things in the history of cabinet government of this country. And not only have we seen an exhibition of disloyalty on the part of a chief to his colleague, but we have also seen a case of disloyalty manifested by one member of the cabinet to another. It comes to this, that, as between the late Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) on the question whose view is to be accepted, I am inclined to take the view of the Minister of Public Works instead of that of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding). The late Minister of Public Works has this in his favour—that he resigned to maintain a principle, while the other hon. gentleman holds his position through a lack of principle. There is no possible explanation of his position before us to-day except that he is a free trader by profession and a protectionist by practice. Let me show the evidence on which I charge the Minister of Finance with being unfair to the late Minister of Public Works. The late Minister of Public Works says that it was clearly understood in the cabinet when he was a member of it that there was to be a revision in it and that revision was to be on the lines of protection. The hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) says that that is not the case. The late Minister of Public Works makes of his case but he is not the only witness that we can call. We have the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) also. That hon. gentleman himself is not here, but we have his words, and I propose to read these words. On March 21st, last, discussing this very declaration of policy which the leader of the House says is their policy, the hon. member spoke as follows :

> Therefore when the Finance Minister speaks of changes, he is not referring to changes brought to his notice by the low tariff friends of the government, and consequently he must refer to those asked for by their high tariff friends * * * * Those of us then who are in favour of a low tariff are in a serious position, and I would like to say to the Minister of Finance that in making the announcement which he did, in his presentation of the budget, he has placed every supporter of the government, representing a constituency in which the low tariff idea predominates, upon the defensive in his own constituency before his own friends. It is, therefore, necessary on this occasion that members holding that position should make themselves understood, so that whatever misunderstanding there may be as to the intentions of the government, there should be none as to their position with regard to those proposed changes.

I cite that statement of the hon. member for Alberta as in every way confirmatory of the statement of the late Minister of Public Works. And, above all when we have the fact that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) sacrificed himself for principle while the man who disputed his position refused to sacrifice himself for principle, the weight of testimony is altogether on the side of the late Minister of Public Works. And, if the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance are guilty of being unfaithful to a colleague, they are guilty also of this—that they sacrificed a colleague because he was a protectionist. That is a thing that the people of Canada will be interested in and will take into account—namely, that a member of the cabinet was sacrificed because he had declared in favour of a policy of protection. The hon. gentleman, so far as we can gather to-day was sacrificed to duplicity. He was a member of the cabinet in which two views were held—in that cabinet there were both protectionists and free traders. The duplicity with which he was treated is far from creditable to the government, and the people of Canada will not lose sight of it. And what about the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) who has lately come into the cabinet? Is he to be sacrificed also ? If what the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) tells us is correct, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is liable to be sacrificed any day, for he too professes to be a protectionist. He told the people that he believed in adequate protection. He is not only liable to be dismissed, but he is liable to be treated by the leading paper of the Liberal party as the late Minister of Public Works was—and that paper called the hon. gentleman 'The Busy Izzy of the Cabinet.' And what were the relations of this so-called 'Busy Izzy of the Cabinet' to the leader of the party ? If ever there was a man who saved his party and carried his province for the support of his leader, it was the late Minister of Public Works. Yet the reward he gets is that he is sacrificed because the charge is laid against him that he is a protectionist. The Prime Minister this afternoon appealed to the record of Mr. Gladstone and to the record of Sir Robert Peel. We know that both these gentlemen changed their opinions on the tariff question. And the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) claimed that he had changed his opinion. But there is this difference—that when Sir Robert Peel changed his opinion or when Mr. Gladstone changed his opinion, the whole world knew exactly where he stood. I defy any man to say where the right hon. gentleman is. I ask any man who sits behind him to-day to say where the right hon. gentleman is, whether he is a protectionist or whether he is a free trader. He is everything, he is both, he is nothing, he is what circumstances happen to require. The government is nothing but a cabinet of latitudes and longitudes. The greatest latitude, apparently, was to be allowed to every man on that question. The late minister took the opportunity to avail himself of that latitude.

Now, last session a very interesting spectacle took place in this House. It has been referred to this afternoon, and I again recall it. It was that celebrated speech made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It reminded me very much of the circumstances attending the falling of Elijah's mantle upon Elisha. You remember the story. Elijah crosed the river and Elisha followed him. And Elijah said: What would you have from me? Elisha answered: I pray that I may have a double portion of your spirit. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was the Elijah, and the Prime Minister was the Elisha, upon whom the mantle was to fall. But we have never yet found out whether the Prime Minister desired a double portion of the spirit of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to fall upon him. Indeed the Minister of Trade and Commerce was suspicious of his leader, and he took occasion to tell him so in a fatherly way. This is the substance of what he said: Remember, my boy, you said in Manitoba that protection was corruption, that protection was bondage. Remember that you said the two things must go together, you said that in Winnipeg; and remember that I intend to hold you to it. That is what the declaration meant last year, and it was supposed to be the final deliverance of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Somehow the ascension which was to take place about that time did not take place. Why it did not, is clear to-day. But the whole country knows that the Minister of Trade and Commerce suspected his colleague, and others in the cabinet suspected him in regard to this matter, and he tried to hold him to the one view or the other. So to-day their position, if it is anything, is that they believe that protection is slavery, that protection is corruption, that protection is not in the interest of the country.

Now, if these hon. gentlemen did not intend to introduce a protectionist policy or to consider the question fully this session, what did they mean? The late Minister of Public Works certainly thought that they intended to adopt a protectionist policy and to give the country more protection this year. The great question before the people to-day is not one of a constitutional issue, but it is whether there is to be a revision of the tariff, and whether it is to be on protectionist lines. The right hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and like most lawyers he takes refuge in a constitutional issue whenever a question of great public interest is involved. He has always taken refuge in constitutional issues, and always fails to tell the people in clear-cut language what his views are in regard to great public questions of present importance. What do the people of Canada care about the constitutional issue? The people of Canada care everything about the fiscal policy of this country, and they do not want to hear more talk about constitutional issues, and rebukes of colleagues for violating constitutional practice so much as they desire to get a clear-cut statement of the intentions of the government upon this great public question.

Now, there are to be a great many deputations visiting this government from now on. We are told the budget speech is soon to be delivered. Are these deputations coming here to be told, as we have been told here to-day, that a protectionist minister cannot continue in the cabinet? Of what use is it for deputations to come this week, or to come next week, if the only answer they are to get is the one that was given here to-day, that protection is a fraud, that a protectionist minister is deserted by his colleagues and has to be read out of the party? Hon. gentlemen will say that this is a constitutional issue. Sir, the public want more than that, they want a definition. They want more than a statement that there was a constitutional disagreement and that the late minister acted in an unconstitutional way. There is more than a theory, there is an actual fact, involved in this question, and it is incumbent on the right hon. first minister, notwithstanding what he said this afternoon, to say whether he is a protectionist or a free trader, whether he desires to promote the interests of the people of this country, or whether he will simply get rid of the responsibility by saying that he believes in free trade as they have it in England. He cannot escape that issue to-day. The people wish to know what the position of the government is in regard to that question, and particularly do they expect from the Prime Minister a statement of his position in regard to it. Now, I have no hesitation in telling this House, and the people of this country, where I am. There is no trouble about the Conservative party here to-day in regard to their policy, both in regard to protection and in regard to free trade.

The hon. gentleman takes pride in the fact that he has changed his opinion. I thank God that I hold the views my father taught me on this question. He taught me that if a thing is good it is to be adhered to, and to be taught by one man to another, I was taught the principle of protection as being beneficial to this country. No one who holds that view is ashamed to declare it. It is the view that all nations take to-day. The right hon. gentleman makes a nice exhibition of himself when he talks about the humanitarian idea and the brotherhood of man. The principle that rules the world to-day is the struggle for existence between nations. Life is a struggle, both as between men and between nations, and so great is that struggle to-day that all the nations of the world are either protectionists or becoming so. England is becoming protectionist, and the greatest statesman in the British empire, the man who is destined to consolidate the British empire, Mr. Chamberlain, is fixed in the view that the

only way to bind the empire together is by a policy of protection. Mr. Speaker, I believe in protection, I believe in a customs tariff, I believe in bounties, I believe in export duties, I believe in reciprocity of tariffs, I believe in the maximum tariff as applied to nations that are unfair to us and I believe in all these things because I think they will make the nation great. I believe in these things because I think they will build up this country as we expect it to be built up. I believe the principle of protection is good for the English speaking people and that it is good for the French speaking people of this country. I believe it is good for the east, I believe it is good for the west, that it is good for the interior, that it is good for the frontier, that, in short, it is the one kind of fiscal policy that is good for all of the country and will build it up. We have the example of the United States, we have the example of all the rising and great countries to-day and that example is all in the direction of protection. No man need be ashamed of protection, or need be afraid to let the people know where he belongs. No, it is the men who are double-faced on this question, the men who are guilty of duplicity, who are guilty of disloyalty to colleagues by reason of this duplicity, that have not the hardihood and the courage to stand up and declare where they are. We, at least, have clear cut views on this question and the people of this country want clear cut views, an out and out explanation, no such exhibition as we have seen this afternoon and no such disagreement as appears to have resulted between the late minister and his colleagues. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House need never fear any reproach in regard to a question of this kind. It has been a painful exhibition that we have had here this afternoon. I do not think we have often seen a similar spectacle, but it was a painful spectacle to see the right hon. leader of the House try to convey the impression that he dismissed a colleague for being a protectionist, when, as a matter of fact, that colleague offered his resignation and his chief at the next moment asked him to hold it in abeyance and then gave the public to understand that he had dismissed him. The whole public of Canada, under these circumstances, will side with the late Minister of Public Works. The whole public of Canada will see that the Liberal party is not to be relied upon on an issue of this kind, the whole country will see that the late member of the cabinet was sacrificed because he was a protectionist and the new Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see, if he is long in the government, that he is liable to be sacrificed in the same way. Cabals will be formed against him and we have been told that cabals exist. I wonder who is the minister referred to in connection with the cabals. I wonder if he came from the North-west. Perhaps before this discussion is over we will know who really was at the bottom of these cabals and who it was that sacrificed the late Minister of Public Works. I see the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) there and he takes all the responsibility of the statements made by the right hon. the first minister this afternoon. Let me read a short extract from a speech made by the late Minister of Public Works in Toronto, less than a year ago, in connection with the United Boards of Trade. The late minister and the hon. Postmaster General were invited to the dinner as representatives of the government and here is the speech made by the late minister in the presence of his colleague. It was on June 5th, 1902, and it was reported in the papers of June 6th. The late minister said:

> We must have a Canadian policy on every line, in every direction. We must have a Canadian tariff. We are not here to discuss the principles of free trade or protection. Free trade may suit certain countries ; it suits England ; another system, the protective system, may suit other countries. I suppose that we have made up our minds to suit ourselves. We have in French a proverb that my friend, Mr. Mulock, who is a French scholar, will understand : 'Charite bien ordonne, commence par soi même.'

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Read it again.

Mr. MACLEAN. Let the hon. Postmaster read it. Here is the translation :

> They must fight their opponents with their own weapons. He could not understand why Canadians were obliged to give markets to a people who raised barriers against them. He had been accused of being an inconsistent man, Mr. Tarte went on. He did not care, so long as he was regarded as a practical man. 'Down with theories ; theories are no good. (Applause and laughter). Business is business. (Laughter). That is to say, if my hon. friends and neighbours want to strangle me, my first duty is to prevent them. Canadians must have a tariff to suit themselves, Mr. Tarte went on. If 25 per cent was not enough-speaking for himself alone—he would have no hesitation in raising it to 30 per cent or 40 per cent. 'I don't care,' he said, amid the laughter of the audience.

The hon. Postmaster General never repudiated that speech on that occasion. Why did he not repudiate that speech on that occasion if he did not think his colleagues in the right ? We have not been told by the hon. Postmaster General that one of his colleagues had been driven out because of his heresy on this question and it is quite evident now that what the ex-minister said this afternoon is true that he did nothing but what he had done all along, that the greatest latitude had been allowed, that he never said anything but what he had said long before in the presence of the right hon. first minister before he went to England. He had made no change, he had only acted at that time as he had acted in the past. But, he confesses that he had found out that his colleagues were not true to the principle of protection and that he intended

to leave them. That is the serious fact which is presented to this country to-day. That is the fact that will go to the people of Canada from one ocean to the other that a member of this government was sacrificed by free trade colleagues because he was a protectionist, that he was sacrificed because they did not believe in protection and the lesson which this teaches to all those people who are seeking protection in this country and think protection ought to be employed is that the Liberal party are not to be trusted on this question. It also shows that if the people of this country desire a policy of protection they must go to that party which has always been true to the great national policy of this country.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, in the month of November last past, the newspapers of this country were crowded with information in reference to the withdrawal of the then Minister of Public Works from the cabinet and there was great diversity of opinion as to whether the minister had been dismissed or whether he had by his own free will, quitted the administration. It is quite true that the Liberal press of the country stood to gain by making out that the late minister had been driven from the Laurier government and to that end every means, of course, was taken. In the great province of Quebec, from which both of these hon. gentlemen come, there was a great diversity of opinion as to what the facts really were. I am free to say that after the discussion that has ensued to-day and the statements that have been made by the right hon. leader of the government and the late Minister of Public Works the general public will be as much in the dark to-day as they were then. On the one side there is the clear cut statement of the right hon. leader of the government that having been, as he had been, in the old country, that having been acquainted with certain facts relative to the conduct of the late Minister of Public Works the decision brought about by himself, namely, the dismissal of the minister was arrived at upon his return to this country.

Now, the statement of the Prime Minister is lacking in definiteness. He told us that some one supplied him with newspapers whilst he was in Europe, but he neglected to tell us who they were who were caballing against his colleague (Hon. Mr. Tarte). The Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) were on this side of the water then, and the pointed remarks of the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to-day would lead us to think that he had these two ministers of the cabinet in his eye. It is an accepted theory that there can be no effect without a cause, and considering the relations which have existed between the Minister of Railways and the ex-Minister of Public Works since they were thrown together in the cabinet, it might fairly be said that these relations were somewhat strained. The Department of Railways is intimately associated with the idea of transportation in which the great province of Ontario is deeply interested, but I will be bound to say that the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) might promenade through all the towns and cities in Ontario without causing a ripple, while, if the Minister of Public Works appeared anywhere his presence would be the event of the day. From the first there seems to have been animosity between these two gentlemen. We all remember when the Minister of Railways came to the committee in connection with the Kettle River Valley Bill and there announced that the policy of the government was that the Kettle River Company should be granted its charter. But shortly afterwards the Minister of Railways was forced to admit that he could not get the followers of the government to support him—the reason being because the ex-Minister of Public Works was against the policy of the government thus announced and so the Minister of Railways was defeated and his colleague (Hon. Mr. Tarte) triumphed. We saw what happened in connection with the Intercolonial Railway deal. It was first introduced by the Minister of Railways but it was soon dropped by him and relegated to the ex-Minister of Public Works, who took it in hand. I am fairly within the judgment of the House when I say that in regard to the question of transportation which has been engaging the serious attention of the people of Canada, the Minister of Railways played only a second part. Where was the Minister of Railways when the ex-Minister of Public Works announced the policy of the government as to the construction of the canal system by way of the French River ? Sir, it is patent to us all that a deep gulf separated the friendly relationship which ought to exist between these two ministers.

Sir, the Minister of the Interior made a certain amount of capital for himself in the North-west by his advocacy of a lower tariff, and while the Minister of the Interior was advocating that gospel in the west the ex-Minister of Public Works was busily engaged propagating the high tariff theory in the east. The Minister of the Interior found it necessary to be interviewed by the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' and in it he announced that his policy would in the end prevail against the policy of his colleague (Hon. Mr. Tarte). But if the Minister of Railways and if the Minister of the Interior were placed in an unenviable position, what have we to say of the humiliating position into which the cabinet ministers from Ontario were placed. Last year after the session, when it was announced to all deputations that came here that they might hope for tariff revision, throughout the whole province of Ontario boards of trade and cor-

porations of one kind and another held meetings at which they wished to obtain the views of ministers upon the most interesting of public questions. My hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Ross) was to have a demonstration in the town of Oshawa in his constituency. In Oshawa there is a large carriage establishment, one of the largest not only in the province but in the whole Dominion, and to the humiliation of the cabinet ministers from Ontario, especially the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), who, one would think, had a special interest in the matter, they were placed aside by the member for South Ontario, they were not invited, and in their stead the member for South Ontario brought forth the Hon. Mr. Tarte, because that minister held a larger place in the public eye. The hon. member (Mr. Ross) passed over the Minister of Customs and the Postmaster General, and he invited the ex-Minister of Public Works to perform the interesting ceremony of laying the corner stone of an addition to the factory of McLaughlin Bros. At the public meeting which was held the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Beith) and the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) were side by side with the ex-Minister of Public Works, and as if to add eclat to the occasion, the Hon. John Dryden, minister of the Ontario government, came along also. Now, what passed on that occasion——

An hon. MEMBER. Money.

Mr. BENNETT. My hon. friend is thinking of Mr. Stratton when he talks about money having passed. This was Mr. Dryden who was present. Here was the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who was not connected with the Finance Department or the Customs Department, who was not even an Ontario minister, here he was invited because he was an advanced protectionist and because the member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) believed that his presence would be acceptable to the people of the constituency. Judging by the report in the local papers and by the report in the 'Globe' also, the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) made one of his characteristic speeches prophesying high protection, and the newspapers tell us that that speech was cheered to the echo. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) pointed out that $1,000,000 worth of carriages had been imported to Canada the preceding year, and he told the people of Oshawa and the people from the rural districts there assembled, that if they had more protection for that industry more hands would be employed and greater prosperity would follow. And then we saw the Hon. John Dryden announcing that although he had been a free trader in the past, the light had come to him at last, and he was thoroughly in accord with every statement made by the Hon. Mr. Tarte—and the member for South Ontario applauded. After that there was to be a demonstration in your town of Goderich, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the Minister of Public Works was invited. I am sure that the gentleman in whose constituency Goderich is had something to do with the invitation which was tendered to the ex-Minister of Public Works. Again the Minister of Customs and the Postmaster General were overlooked. Why ? It was because they occupied such an inferior position in the public eye of their own province, that the hon. gentleman from West Huron (Mr. Holmes) thought it better to invite the protectionist Minister of Public Works. At the Goderich meeting the Hon. Mr. Tarte was cheered to the echo. Then there was to be a large demonstration in the city of Brantford to advocate protection of the manufacturing industries. On that occasion there sat at his feet the hon member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) applauding every statement to the echo. Why, Sir, these hon. gentlemen all know that their very existence in nine out of every ten counties in the province of Ontario depends on this very question of protection. This was the unkindest cut of all administered by the citizens of Brantford, for this reason, that the hon. Minister of Customs was a very Ishmaelite in that city, having been driven out from it by the electors, and to his mortification he had to suffer the agony of hearing the ex-Minister of Public Works applauded to the echo in the town in which he had lived almost his whole lifetime. But that was not the only place. In the town of Berlin the ex-Minister of Public Works was brought before the public and again applauded. But perhaps it was in the town of Orillia, which is in the riding that I have the honour to represent, that the Minister of Public Works received one of the greatest ovations given to him in the whole province ; and that must have been gall and wormwood to the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), because he was overlooked and did not appear. Take up the public press of Ontario during the past year, look where you will, and you will find reports of receptions tendered to the ex-Minister of Public Works in almost every county in that great province. One can imagine the painful feelings of the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Customs, under these circumstances, in taking up the public prints every morning and seeing how they were being sidetracked by their own supporters, while in almost every public demonstration an opportunity was afforded to the ex-Minister of Public Works to impress himself upon the public as the big man in the cabinet, the power behind the throne, the one who could wield an influence. What happened ? Not only did they show that they were in accord with him, in public demonstrations, but where demonstrations were not held these gentlemen went out of their way to show that they were in entire harmony with the sentiments he expressed. The hon. Minister of Finance this afternoon tried to make out

that no intimation was given last session that there was to be a revision of the tariff. Then the ex-Minister of Public Works must have been extremely dense, because he does not seem to have arrived at a correct idea of what the change in the tariff was to be. But I am going to read what another hon. gentleman on that side of the House thought was the view of the administration and what was the promise made. He is a gentleman whose political existence in this House depends on protection being adopted by the government to a greater extent than it is to-day. The gentleman I refer to is the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). In that hon. gentleman's riding the city of Guelph, a city of considerable proportions, depends for its very breath of life on the continuance of a protective tariff. That hon. gentleman as reported in the 'Globe' of the 21st of October last, said :

> There is no concealing, and there is no use in denying, that the province of Ontario is protectionist. There would be no sense in hurting ourselves by mere blind retaliation against the United States. What we must do is to frame our tariff for our interests, keeping in view the fact that from hard experience we are driven to conclude that our American cousins will hit us without hesitation whenever they think such a course to be for their own advantage. I am satisfied that in saying this I voice the general feeling of Ontario without distinction of party.

It will be for the hon. member for South Wellington to explain why he gave utterance to such an expression of opinion as this. Was it due to the fact that he had received an intimation, or had understood, as the ex-Minister of Public Works did, that there was to be a revision of the tariff ? If the cabinet intended that there should be no change in the tariff in the present year, would it not have been more honest and more decent on their part to have told the manufacturers long ago that they need not come here asking for changes ? That would have put an end to the whole business. But, according to the statement of the Minister of Finance to-day, the government stand convicted of giving those people to believe that they were going to make some changes in the tariff, while they intended to do nothing of the kind. Now, until this question is settled by a change of front on the part of either the first minister or the ex-Minister of Public Works, there must continue to be a strong doubt on the public mind as to which of these gentlemen is making statements in accord with the facts. The statement of the ex-Minister of Public Works is that there was a cabal instituted against him in the cabinet, that it has existed for a long time, and that it became so acute in the month of September last that he determined to sever his connection with the government. That statement is corroborated by a statement made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) in an interview with a reporter of the Montreal 'Herald,' which I will now read. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said :

> I unhesitatingly say that the removal of Mr. Tarte will make for the strengthening of the party, and especially in this province, where I verily believe Mr. Tarte has not a single partisan. You may remember the time that Mr. Tarte was taken into the cabinet. Well, I have been all my life on the best of terms with the financial and industrial interests of this country as a public man should who desired the prosperity of the country. When the Liberals were returned to power in 1896 these interests, or the representatives of these interests—expressed to me this feeling : 'We respect Sir Wilfrid, we believe him honest ; but there are certain elements in the cabinet which we distrust ; and this distrust has never ceased.'

From this statement I think it is plain that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was caballing against the ex-Minister of Public Works ; and I have seen a statement in 'La Patrie,' charging the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with having without cessation done all in his power to destroy the influence of the ex-Minister of Public Works in that province. Taking the extrinsic evidence, I think it is plain that there did exist a cabal or mutiny against the hon. ex-minister in the province of Quebec. But be that as it may, there is no doubt that in the cabinet last fall there was not displayed that loyalty or fairness towards one member of the administration which he had a right to expect, and the right hon. first minister owes it not merely to the ex-minister, but to the House and the country to state exactly who the members of the cabinet were who made the complaint to himself with respect to the conduct of the ex-minister. Times have changed very greatly the relations between the first minister and the ex-Minister of Public Works. It will be in the recollection of the public, more particularly in the province of Quebec, that a strong bond of friendship formerly existed between these gentlemen. One recalls an attack made on the ex-Minister of Public Works some years ago by a certain club in the city of Montreal, I think the Letellier Club, which demanded the ex-minister's head. I think it was the Letellier Club which demanded the head of the Minister of Public Works. What did the right hon. the first minister reply ? He replied unhesitatingly that if Mr. Tarte had to go out of the cabinet, he would go too. He raised no question then as to whether the Minister of Public Works was in accord with him or not, but made that reply without reserve. To-day the hon. member for St. Mary's Division (Mr. Tarte) has declared that a state of affairs was existing which the public will readily believe did exist. He declared that nearly a year ago at the Manufacturers' banquet at Montreal, he made a strong pro-

tectionist speech, and that the ideas and policy he then enunciated were not disproved by the right hon. gentleman, who was present. If the ex-Minister of Public Works committed an offence last year in making strong protectionist speeches throughout the country, why did not the other members of the cabinet bring these speeches to the attention of the first minister. Was it not their duty to have done so and had not the first minister a right to complain of this omission on their part? The public were left in the dark last fall as to the reasons why the ex-Minister of Public Works left the cabinet, and their doubts will certainly not be dispelled by the ministerial explanations given to-day. They will have to look to the extrinsic evidence for a solution of the question. On the one hand, we have the antagonism existing between the ex-Minister of Public Works and certain members of the cabinet, and on the other hand we have the fact that these discontented colleagues took the premier by the throat and compelled him to give up the head of the ex-minister. But there is this to be said to the credit of the hon. member for St. Mary's Division, that when he found his chief to be in a poor state of health on his return, he acted towards him in a much more decent and commendable manner than did these other gentlemen. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) had under his control the party affairs in the province of Quebec and possession of the state secrets of his party. Not one of those secrets has he divulged to the public, but in every way has preserved them inviolate and respected his honour. But there is no doubt in the mind of anybody that, if he chose, he could bring before the public certain facts regarding the government which would damn it in public opinion. Here we have evidence of the loyalty of the ex-minister as contrasted with the braggadocia and swagger of those mutineers who went to the first minister and threatened that if the hon. member for St. Mary's Division did not go out of the cabinet they would no longer remain in it; and to relieve the first minister of the dilemma in which he was placed, the hon. member for St. Mary's Division handed in his portfolio to the right hon. gentleman. The enmity shown towards the ex-Minister of Public Works emanated, I believe, chiefly from Ontario. If it did not, there was certainly abundant reason for it, because if ministers were ever humiliated it must have been the Minister of Customs and the Postmaster General, both from the great province of Ontario, who were tabooed in every city of that province, while the ex-Minister of Public Works was brought into the field in their place and occupied a position far higher than these two gentlemen did together.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I doubt very much if the explanation given this afternoon from the treasury benches will satisfy public opinion. It will not certainly in the great province from which I come. Will you allow me, Mr. Speaker, to say to the right hon. gentleman who leads this House that if he has passed the age of green boys, as he told us this afternoon, there are many green boys in the province of Quebec who will require something more than the explanation given by the Prime Minister to account for the retirement of the ex-Minister of Public Works. Let me briefly call attention to one phase of this singular question which was glided over very quickly by the right hon. gentleman, and to which none of his colleagues saw fit to allude. At the time when the dismissal or the resignation of the ex-Minister of Public Works was being prepared, the right hon. gentleman was in Europe. Who were those who denounced the ex-minister to the right hon. gentleman? They were surely not men sitting on this side, and I would ask my hon. friends opposite, who are not on the treasury benches, if they will be content to remain silent under the suspicion of having, during the absence of the right hon. the first minister, unknown to the ex-Minister of Public Works, denounced his conduct to their leader, and denounced it so artfully and cunningly that the first minister, on his arrival in this country, came to the conclusion that a great constitutional principle had been openly violated by the hon. member for St. Mary's Division, which demanded his immediate dismissal. I doubt whether the public at large will accept the superficial explanations given this afternoon. They will believe that within the cabinet there were men who were plotting the destruction of the ex-Minister of Public Works. And what we are entitled to know is who are those members of the cabinet who denounced the ex-minister. Who are those who, without giving the ex-minister a word or warning, saw fit, by correspondence and obscure denunciation—the secret of which we have not even now learned—to bring about his dismissal. Who are those men and why have they not to-day the frankness to explain their position and conduct? The ex-Minister of Public Works was not always in my province a persona grata with the mass of the Liberal party. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) was never very favourable to him, and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) has been on such terms with the ex-Minister of Public Works for a long time that he was known as one of those who anxiously desired his downfall. Is it in the province of Quebec, is it amongst certain clubs encouraged, maintained, helped along by hon. gentlemen opposite who occupy high positions in the Liberal party that this conspiracy was begun? Or is it in the province of Ontario, where I find my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) the present

occupant of that position ? Is it through the influence of the 'Globe' ? Is it through the influence of the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) ? Or is it possible that the heart of that conspiracy exists in the province of Manitoba and the Northwest, where, it is well known, by every means at his disposal, the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) sought to bring about the downfall and dismissal of his colleague. Or must we leave the immediate vicinity of Montreal and go down to the city of Quebec, where, as is well known throughout my own province, the present Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) was ready to join those who were willing to make efforts to obtain the effacement of the Minister of Public Works. Surely, when the right hon. the Prime Minister tells us that he acted upon denunciations received by him when abroad and verified by documents sent him, we are entitled to know who are the members of this House who played the part of spies and informers on that occasion. After all, will it be propounded seriously here that the utterances of my hon. friend from St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) were of such a character at that time as to make him so greatly at fault in regard to the constitution, to place him so gravely in error, that nothing but his immediate resignation upon the return of the Prime Minister could satisfy the ends of justice ? Why, Sir, what utterance have we had from the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) ? Has not the latter of these gentlemen, time and again in the west, in public meetings and in the newspapers which served him as organs of publicity, declared that the tariff was out of politics and that it was not to be increased ? What authority had he for that declaration ? Have we not, quite recently, the speech delivered in British Columbia by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) declaring his approval of a scheme for a new transcontinental railway ? And yet have we the declaration from that hon. gentleman that, at the time he made that important declaration he had the authority of the Prime Minister or the cabinet ? I venture to assert, without fear of being contradicted, that, if we turn up the utterances of the Minister of Finance since he introduced the tariff in 1897, we shall find, year after year, in almost precisely similar language, declarations by that right hon. gentleman that for that year at any rate there would be no increase in the tariff. And, if we couple that circumstance with the facts that have been declared here to-day, and not contradicted as far as I am aware, that when that hon. gentleman as the minister particularly charged with the fiscal policy of the government, received a deputation he postponed till another session the satisfaction of their claims, can we blame the ex-Minister of Public Works for having, when invited by his own political friends in the province of Ontario and elsewhere, proclaimed what was well known as his firm opinion, that the policy which he believed in was the one which was believed in in my own province, the policy of Canada for the Canadians and a tariff sufficiently strong and sufficiently high to prevent our being engulfed and ruined by our powerful competitors to the south and other countries ? Can we blame him, under these circumstances for having expressed his own opinion ? And will anybody familiar with the British constitution as it is to-day contend that under the circumstances of indecision which have existed on the treasury benches for many years past and with the reasons which hon. gentlemen have given us this afternoon, he was not entitled constitutionally and equitably to make these declarations of his own belief ? No, Mr. Speaker, I think we must go a little further for the real cause which brought about the expulsion—if it was an expulsion—or the resignation—for they are two totally different things, and the resignation was explained to us this afternoon by that hon. member—we must look a little further than the province of Quebec, and, no doubt, than the province of Ontario. We will look a little further for the real, true, and acting causes of that important movement.

Will you, Mr. Speaker, consider, and will this House consider, for a moment, what a strange position this administration occupies ? The very man who was called upon to replace the hon. member for St. Mary's division in the cabinet, in the constituency which he chose as the one in which he wished to be elected—the Maisonneuve division of the city of Montreal—in words of the very clearest character, in speeches reported verbatim in the paper which supported him in that contest, declared that, so far as the tariff was concerned, his position was too well known to require definition, that he was a protectionist and, if the tariff in its present form was not acceptable to those who had at heart the great industrial interests of our country, he pledged himself—and I believe pledged himself in writing—that he would be prepared to give a sufficient extension to that tariff to completely assure the protection required by our manufacturers in the city of Montreal. What kind of logic is there in such a position as that ? When we take the circumstance that, as stated this afternoon by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte)—and, as we all know, for it is a matter of notoriety—that, as stated by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) when he visited the province of Ontario a simultaneous campaign was begun against him by the 'Globe' newspaper, the Winnipeg 'Free Press' and the Montreal 'Herald,' I tell you, Sir, it will be very difficult for the public at large to believe that it was the speeches of that hon. gentleman and nothing more that

brought upon him the visitation referred to this afternoon by the right hon. premier in giving his explanation. There is something in all this that cannot be joined logically and legitimately under the circumstances. Why, Sir, the right hon. gentleman, in returning from Europe, never, by reproof, by admonition or in any other way, called upon that gentleman to restrict his utterances or to give some explanation of them ; but, according to the statement made to us this afternoon, immediately asked for his resignation. The public at large will believe, as we all believe on this side of the House, that beyond that trifling circumstance—because I think I can qualify it as such—there were in the cabinet a set of men, and perhaps some others outside of the cabinet, who had determined that on account of his public profession of these views the late Minister of Public Works should disappear. Sir, they went about it in a very singular manner ; and to the public at large I venture to say that it will appear strange that these men, whom we can suspect but whom we do not know, because they will not declare themselves—these men, instead of warning their colleague, instead of jointly calling upon him to moderate his utterances until the return of the Prime Minister, adopted instead a silent and hidden way of securing such a result that happened the moment the right hon. gentleman returned from Europe. I say that to a large section of the population it will appear that these men, who are probably better known on the other side than on this side, in proceeding in that singular manner, had something else in view than the preservation of a great constitutional principle.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Whether the change of portfolios that followed the return of the right hon. the Prime Minister from the motherland, be for the weal or for the woe of this country, at all events I think that on this side of the House we can congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite and congratulate the country that to-day, through this discussion, we for the first time since 1896, have been able to form a fairly intelligent opinion as to the fiscal policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. When the Prime Minister was speaking this afternoon, and when the Minister of Finance also spoke, for the first time I think we got an accurate definition, not only of what their policy was not, but also of what it is, when we were told that the government had not come to any definite decision as to the future, and that therefore the late Minister of Public Works was wrong in discussing fiscal questions before the country. We were informed by the Prime Minister that after six years tenure of office the party in power have not yet come to any conclusion as to whether protection or free trade is the proper fiscal policy for this country, and therefore they had not formed any plans for the future. Sir, when the right hon. premier, a little later, told us, pointing dramatically to the Hansard of last year, that there, in the speech of the Finance Minister, was embodied the policy of the government, then we at least knew what that policy was. For, Sir, I defy any man to read the speech of the Minister of Finance last session and come to any other conclusion than that the only policy so laid down was that policy of masterly inactivity of lying behind the lines of Torres Vedras, of which hon. gentlemen have been accused before. Why, Sir, the Minister of Finance did not even pretend to shed the faintest light on the vexed question as to whether or not, when the government did come to revise the tariff, they would do it in the interest of protection or of free trade. He told us nothing would be done last year, he told us something would be done in the future, he intimated very clearly that this year is the year that it would be done, because, from the reasons which he gave showing why they could not revise the tariff last year, the only possible conclusion to be drawn was that they would revise it this year. But beyond that opinion, not a word of information did he give. So we find that hon. gentlemen opposite are in this position, that to-day, in the seventh year of their office, they have no other policy than that of masterly inactivity, waiting like Micawber, for something to turn up.

Now, Sir, when the right hon. gentleman was speaking of his policy being embalmed in that speech of the Finance Minister, it did seem to me there was a striking illustration of the difference between the policies of the two parties. The Conservative party, go back as far as you will, has had a policy, be it right or be it wrong, so clearly defined, that every man in this country from one end to the other, knew what it was. Hon. gentlemen opposite not only have failed to decide on any policy, but they seem to think, from the premier down, that the word 'policy' means something entirely different from the meaning attached to it in all times gone by. I venture to say they pay a poor compliment to the intelligence of the people of this country when they refuse to deal with pressing questions, and there is none more important than the fiscal question. Yet they expect these people will go on year after year, and election after election, supporting sixteen or seventeen gentlemen who do not pay sufficient respect to the remaining five or six million people in this country even to tell them whether, when they come to revise the tariff, they will do it on protective or non-protective lines. Let me say this, for the information of hon. gentlemen opposite, who seem to be ignorant of the meaning of protection, that hon. gentlemen opposite to-day, in consequence of the lack of policy, which has characterized their legislation for years, are not in a position to give protection to the people

of this country even if they wished. For in protection there are two factors: There is the measure of protection, and there is the stability of protection. Hon. gentlemen opposite can give as large a measure of protection as they like, but in view of the dismissal from office of the late Minister of Public Works because of his advocacy of protective principles, it must be evident that no matter how great a measure of protection they may give the manufacturers of this country, that so-called protection must lack the element of stability, which is just as important a factor as the measure of protection itself. And if we are to see this country grow as we would like to see it grow, if we are to see capital unlocked and expended in promoting the various industries of which this country is capable, it is just as essential that the stability of the tariff should be assured as that protection should be given.

Now, I was rather surprised to hear the Prime Minister defend himself for his change of views by saying that when he was young and green he was a protectionist. If language has any meaning, if the people of this country who are deprived of the right which they should possess of hearing directly from the lips of the Prime Minister what his views are on fiscal questions, if they are obliged to do the best they can with the information given them, surely they can draw but one conclusion from such a description of protection as that, namely, that the Prime Minister is not a protectionist, and that therefore, so far as he has gone to-day, he has adopted the views expressed by the Minister of Customs in the debate last year when he said : We stand for a revenue tariff; and the views expressed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the same debate last year when he said that honesty and protection were simply incompatible in the administration of public affairs.

Now, Sir, when the Prime Minister referred to two great statesmen of the motherland, it occurred to me that we might draw both a lesson and a warning from the history of those two statesmen. In speaking of the propriety of a public man changing his views, he referred to the fact that W. E. Gladstone and Sir Robert Peel had themselves changed their views. Mr. Gladstone commenced life a Tory, and he ended life a Liberal. Sir Robert Peel commenced life a Tory and ended it outside the party ranks. As I said before, I think there is both a lesson and a warning in the history of these two great statesmen. When Mr. Gladstone went down to his grave he went down as the idol of his party, leaving a name honoured throughout the length and breadth of the empire; a name which the proudest families in the motherland might be proud to bear. And it is to be said of W. E. Gladstone when we come to read his epitaph, that if he had anything to say he so expressed himself that from the beginning to the end of his career the people knew where W. E. Gladstone stood. There was another statesman, Sir Robert Peel, who began his life a Tory and who ended it in the ranks of the opposition party. He left a name very different from that of W. E. Gladstone; he left a name, which, it is agreed by every historian of every school we have in Great Britain, was tarnished and disgraced by his conduct at the time he changed his political views. Sir Robert Peel had a perfect right, as we all will admit, after beginning life as a Conservative protectionist to change his views. If he honestly changed his views it was his right to do so, following up his new information and new light upon the subject, but, Sir Robert Peel did this : Sir Robert Peel, a Conservative, went to the people of Great Britain, asking their support, on the ground that he was a protectionist, and having come into power as a protectionist, he used the power and authority he had got on that ground to introduce an entirely different policy. Will the right hon. Prime Minister study the history of Sir Robert Peel, will the Prime Minister remember the fate that befell a British statesman who, appealing to the people on the ground that he was a protectionist, when he came into power betrayed those who had placed him in office on the ground of his being a protectionist, and will the Prime Minister remember that in this not distant part of the empire, having appealed to the people on the ground that :

> We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based upon that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours—

And having come into power and finding a protective tariff in which there are 448 items, leaves 244 untouched, increases 54 and decreases 34—will he ponder over the history, the promises, the faithlessness and the fall of Sir Robert Peel.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, naturally, both the House and the country had a great deal of interest in finding out if possible—and I suppose that is the reason why ministerial explanations are a recognized feature in parliamentary life—why our friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) left the government of the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have listened with a very great deal of care to the speeches made in the course of this debate, I have heard the statements made by the right hon. leader of the House and the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, and I must admit, that, so far as I am concerned, I am yet at a loss to understand why the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works has been required to leave the government. I think, generally speaking, that the country, after reading the report of this

debate, and even after a careful perusal of every word of this debate, will come to the conclusion that the true reason for the change in the government has scarcely been unfolded to the House when the Prime Minister has stated that in this matter he was vindicating the proper principle upon which parliamentary government by cabinet can alone be carried on, and that is that no member of a cabinet can, in the country or in the House, advocate views which are inconsistent with the general opinion of the cabinet. Now, that would be a very satisfactory answer and explanation of the matter if it could be made to fit in with all the facts, but, here, we have, in the course of this debate, discovered that not only the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works gave utterance to views in the country or elsewhere inconsistent with the course laid down by the government, but that other representatives of the administration have done the same thing and that while the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works has been called upon to resign on account of these utterances, others, notably the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and the hon. gentleman who at present fills the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) are still remaining in the cabinet, although, so far as I can understand, their offence, if offence it be, is precisely the same as that of the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works. Now, that being the case, I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that the explanation given by the right hon. leader of the government is not sufficient to explain all the circumstances. We know that members of the government and members of the party in the House are very much troubled to understand an expression that has been used by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) when he speaks of 'adequate protection.' It seems to afford these hon. gentlemen an immense amount of difficulty to understand what 'adequate means. I think we have in the course of the explanation made here to-day an excellent opportunity of learning what 'adequate' means; that is by its contrary, because, it appears, so far as I am concerned, that the explanations given by the right hon. gentleman are not adequate. They do not explain all the conditions of the circumstances leading up to the last circumstance why one member of the administration is compelled to withdraw from his position in the administration for doing precisely what other ministers are allowed to do without punishment of any kind whatever. The offence of the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works was, that, being a member of the administration and it at that time being determined upon doing nothing in the manner of tariff, he continued to advocate an increase of tariff. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) who filled his place, did not require to run an election; but the position of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was made vacant and the hon. gentleman who had to go to the people in order to have his seat given back to him, committed precisely the same offence, if offence it be, as that charged against the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works. In the course of the contest which was necessary in order to reintroduce him to the cabinet he took the same course which had been followed by the ex-Minister of Public Works. He secured a seat in Maisonneuve as an advocate of increased protection and he sits in the cabinet to-day, having, even at the time when the right hon. gentleman tells us the government had come to the conclusion upon this subject to do nothing, advocated increased protection to the same extent although not, perhaps, quite as frequently, as did the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works. Can it be possible for us to believe that there is nothing more in this matter than these utterances of the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, or are we not forced to come to the conclusion that the retirement of the hon. ex-Minister was owing to a struggle that had arisen in the cabinet, or in the portion of the cabinet which was left in Canada during the absence of the right hon. Prime Minister, resulting in the Prime Minister being called upon to make his choice between the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works and the other members of the cabinet who had determined no longer to remain in the cabinet with that hon. gentleman? We know perfectly well, it has been stated in the most open fashion, it has been circulated everywhere in the press, that a demand was made on the Prime Minister for the scalp of the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, and I must say, so far as the discussion to-day has gone, that I think every reasonable man who listens to the arguments and statements that have been made here to-day will come to the conclusion that it is the true explanation that a struggle had arisen in the cabinet in which one party or the other had to be defeated, and that the Prime Minister, being compelled to make a choice, did make a choice which resulted in the effacement for the time being, or for a long time, I dare say, of the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works. There is another explanation which may be possible; here, we have the case of a minister, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, advocating protection at a time when the government is said to have decided upon a position of inertia, or stability, by maintaining its present position on the tariff without change; the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is left unharmed while the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, on the other hand, for precisely the same offence, is called upon to retire from the administration. The offence is the same; the punishment is different. Why is it? It is believed that the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works was marked out for destruction, or else that there must be some difference between the quality of the offence in the hon. ex-Minis-

ter of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It may be that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not mean what he was saying and the fact was recognized at the time that he was using the license which members of the administration are using all the time by saying that they are protectionists or free traders, as the case may be, and as required for the purpose of carrying elections. A license is apparently given to them for that purpose. On the other hand it may have been believed that the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was honestly saying what he meant, that he was a staunch advocate of protection and that being in earnest he was introducing into the political arena a question which it was inconvenient for the administration to have discussed at that time. It was realized that the Minister of Marine (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) was ready to talk protection to-day and free trade tomorrow, but that the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) might be relied upon to continue his crusade for the protection of Canadian industries.

There has been in the course of this discussion a wide difference of opinion between the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding). The ex-minister pretends that he had every reason to believe that the announcement which was made by the Minister of Finance last session was an indication that changes were to be made this session in the direction of a higher tariff. The Minister of Finance explicitly stated to-day that no such intention exists, but so far as the opinions formed by hon. members are concerned--at least on this side of the House—they are in accord with the construction placed by the ex-minister on the language of the Finance Minister. A great many circumstances which arose in the course of last session indicated that we were to have tariff changes this year. Early in the session the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who has a close relationship with the cabinet, reviewed our commercial position and pointed out that our fiscal policy placed us at a tremendous disadvantage in doing business with the United States. His speech led us to the conclusion, that so far as he could influence the policy of the administration he would persevere in a course which would lead the government of the day to adopt a higher tariff. For some reason, possibly because of an understanding with the premier, the resolution was not pressed to a vote but it might fairly be looked upon as a feeler to discover what was the sentiment of the House and of the country. Here was a member of the Joint High Commission, associated with members of the government to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States, a gentleman who is in the next rank to that of a cabinet minister ; a gentleman who enjoys the confidence of the Prime Minister ; here was that gentleman arguing to show that there was in the Liberal party a strong impression that the present tariff was not sufficiently high to enable us to maintain our position in competition with the neighbouring republic. Then we had the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) advocating increased protection for the industries in which he and his constituents were interested. A thousand times over voices came from that side of the House during that session showing that pressure was brought to bear on the administration not to continue the existing conditions, but to give us higher protection. Deputations came without number, and we had the assurance of the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that these deputations were merely put off for the time, were given to understand that the government was not opposed to an increase in the tariff but might under certain circumstances grant it, and were not dismissed hopelessly with a refusal. The impression created on the public mind throughout the country was entirely in favour of the construction placed on the words of the Minister of Finance by the ex-minister. It is abundantly clear therefore that the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was absolutely justified in every utterance he made during the recess, which went to show that the intention of the government was to frame a higher tariff at this session. It seems to me therefore that he did not travel outside of a course consistent with perfect loyalty to his leader and to his party, when he tried to bring forward rapidly the day when a policy of high protection would be entered upon.

Then as to the manner in which the resignation was received or the dismissal accomplished. The hon. ex-minister said, and the premier did not deny it, that he had twice tendered his resignation and that his leader asked him to leave the matter in abeyance until he returned from Toronto. We find however from the premier's own words that so soon as his colleague had left for Toronto he put himself in communication with the Governor General in order to secure His Excellency's consent to his asking the minister for his portfolio. That is almost entirely a personal consideration, and it may be left for settlement to these gentlemen themselves. But there was one statement made by the ex-minister which struck me as of great importance. He stated, and repeated the statement, that if at any time when he was advocating increased protection he had received a request or an order from his leader he would have desisted. He even told the House that if the acting premier had given to him the slightest suggestion that his course was looked upon unfavourably by the cabinet, he would have stopped his advocacy of a high protective tariff. How can we doubt for one moment that when the ex-minister and the premier met in Ottawa the ex-minister did not state to the premier as he tells us he did state : If the

course I have followed in your absence has been inconsistent with your views of my duty to you ; if I have said or done anything other than I have said or done in your presence before you left Canada I am here now honestly holding these opinions but ready to desist from the further expression of them, and should I find it impossible to remain a member of your cabinet after giving up that propaganda, I am prepared to retire from your cabinet in an honourable manner. I think, Sir, that this much ought to have been granted by the premier to his colleague ; a colleague who has supported him as we have reason to believe with the greatest power, success and ability—it does seem that the premier should have given this colleague some decent length of time in which to make his exit in a dignified manner instead of pitch-forking him out of the cabinet as he did. Yesterday the Prime Minister told the House that he repudiated the idea that when the term of a lieutenant governor expired his successor should be appointed immediately as if the administration was anxious to get rid of him. Apparently, a lieutenant governor is to have months or even years to make a dignified exit from government house, but a gentleman who has been of the utmost service to the administration, who has probably done more than any member of the cabinet to preserve Canada from that destruction and ruin which an interruption of the National Policy would have brought on all its interests ; a gentleman, who, if I am not mistaken, has been an advocate of protection from the time he entered the cabinet, whose hand may be traced in every word of that tariff under which these gentlemen claim Canada has attained such prosperity—such a gentleman is to be pitch-forked out of the administration in the most unceremonious fashion, and even in violation of a courteous request made to him by his premier that the matter of his resignation should be left in abeyance until he returned from Toronto to the Capital. These, however, are largely personal matters. It strikes me that all we have heard in the course of this discussion tends to convince any reasonable man who has listened carefully to it, and who tries to make all the facts of the case fit in with the explanation offered by the Prime Minister, that we have not had the true reason given for the dismissal of the ex-minister, but it is an evidence of the fact that on this occasion at least, in the absence of the Premier, the members of the cabinet not only fought like blazes, but the end of it was that one of the combatants suffered very serious damage.

Mr. RUFUS H. POPE (Compton). Mr. Speaker, coming from the province of Quebec, I take particular interest in the shuffle that has taken place in the cabinet and in the difficulty that has arisen between the Prime Minister and the ex-Minister of Public Works. Since the days of confederation, the great Department of Public Works has been entrusted to a member from the province of Quebec, and as a rule if not invariably to one of French Canadian origin. Living among the French Canadian people, I can well understand that no kick would come from them on narrow lines ; but it is important to that province, as one of the large provinces of the Dominion, that it should have its fair share of the administration and of the patronage in the government of Canada ; and without wishing to raise the question on narrow lines, I simply wish to enter my protest against the removal of the portfolio of Public Works from the province of Quebec to another province, especially as the first minister called to his aid a man who is supposed to be well versed in public works, who has had large experience in the great city of Montreal, as mayor and leading alderman in that city for many years. Possibly the Prime Minister may have discovered in the administration of those public works in the city of Montreal some cause why he did not care to entrust that hon. gentleman with the larger public works of Canada. Of course, that is not for me to say ; but with the numerous applicants which the right hon. gentleman had for the vacant portfolio, he certainly was not confined to the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine). And it was humiliating to observe that after the services of the ex-Minister of Public Works were dispensed with in such a summary manner, it took something like three weeks to find a man to take his place, so great a factor had he been in the administration ; and after they had discovered him, they felt that they dare not trust him with the portfolio which had been vacated, but they took some of the patronage of the Department of Public Works, and by reconstruction patched up a special portfolio for the new minister. As the ex-Minister of Public Works says himself, he has made some mistakes ; but in my judgment, after hearing the speeches to-day, and casting my memory back over the record of the Liberal party in Canada for 25 or 30 years, I am convinced that the greatest mistake he ever made in all his life was when he joined that gang opposite. I venture to say that if the hon. gentleman could stand up in this parliament untramelled by his oath of office as a member of that government, he could tell a round of stories that would prove that statement to be correct. It is not my intention to take up much time in this discussion. The question has been threshed out very thoroughly, but very unsatisfactorily so far as the explanation of the first minister is concerned. We are left practically in the dark ; but what are we to expect ? The other day the right hon. gentleman made this astonishing statement in parliament, and to the country. He said :

What is my position ? I am first minister in what kind of a camp ? Part of it protectionist and part of it free trade. What is my great duty ? It is to conciliate—to maintain power at all costs by acts of conciliation. True you should have a bold national policy, a great policy of protection ; but I cannot give it to you and retain power. I am not here to lead public opinion. The time has gone by when it is regarded as the duty of a great statesman who is Prime Minister to lead public opinion. Instead of that, it is his duty to knuckle down to it, and reconcile the factions as best he can, in the hope of retaining power in this country at any cost. That is the confession of the Prime Minister, and under these circumstances you cannot expect to get from him a very clear statement of the reasons why he chose to decapitate the ex-Minister of Public Works. While I do not wish to enter into the family troubles of hon. gentlemen opposite, to any great extent, it is well to recognize that the ex-Minister of Public Works was of great service to the right hon. gentleman in the hour when he needed great services, when it was not " Laurier and luck " that carried the day, but when he needed an organizer in the province of Quebec for his special benefit. When I first read the letter which the right hon. gentleman addressed to the ex-Minister of Public Works, I said, it is ingratitude, such as I did not expect from him. The first minister must know better than I do the obligations he was under to the ex-minister. We regretted to see that the right hon. first minister, when he returned to this country, did not enjoy the health which we are all glad to see him enjoying at this moment. He was suffering extreme weakness, and I think he must have been visited in that hour of weakness by that miserable combination who had decided that the ex-Minister of Public Works must go. What did they care about their leader provided they themselves got rid of the hon. gentleman and secured the position he occupied and all the influence that goes with it. As has been shown over and over again, it was not the speeches made by the ex-Minister of Public Works which brought about his resignation. Why, last session we had speech after speech from the other side to exactly the same purport. We had only one free trade speech among the lot, and that was made by a gentleman who has since gone to the Senate to receive his reward as a free trader. He has passed from our midst and gone up above to remain there until he goes still higher. We had a good many speeches from these hon. gentlemen opposite and but one free trade speech among them all. There was not an hon. gentleman on that side, with the exception of the one I have just mentioned, who did not have a jack-knife or harness or carriage factory or horses in the great west or silver mines in British Columbia, or something else down by the sea, which wanted protection. All along the line we had protectionist speeches, not one of these men has been read out of the party, and yet we are asked to believe that the ex-Minister of Public Works lost his position because he attended public meetings at the request of these very men and delivered speeches along the same lines as those to which they had themselves given utterance in parliament. Such an explanation lacks honesty and frankness and is an insult to the intelligence of a democratically governed country like Canada. As to the future policy of the government, that will be precisely of the same indeterminate character as its present policy. You have got a cabinet composed of men holding the most contradictory views upon the vital question of protection. The right hon. first minister has told us that he has protectionists and free traders behind him in about equal numbers. From a government composed of such discordant elements, what else can you expect but a weak policy? And the manufacturers of Canada, the men who are interested in our natural deposits, the men who are waiting for government encouragement in order to develop our natural resources—these men will wait in vain. True, they may now and then get a little something but they will only get a half-hearted policy. We are to-day receiving hundreds of thousands of immigrants from the United States as well as from other parts of the world. There has been no time since confederation when wide-awake, energetic, broad-minded men were more necessary at the helm of state. There has been no time when a strong resolute policy was more required. We must not forget that these people are going into our North-west and that our great North-west is separated from eastern Canada by the rock bound shores of Lake Superior for about 1,000 miles. One would imagine that these were intended to be the divisions of two separate nationalities, and if we are to bring the west and the east into close unity, we in the east will have to adopt a broad national policy. What do these Americans tell us, who are going into our country ? Do they tell us that they have left their own because they are dissatisfied with it ? Not at all, they say that they are proud of the United States, and if they are leaving, it is because they can sell their farms in the United States at $50 an acre and buy farms in Canada at $5 an acre. How comes it that they are able to sell their farms at $40 or $50 an acre ? It is due to the industrial policy of the American government, and if we wish to satisfy these men, if we are to give a similar increase in value to our land in the west, we will have to adopt a similar policy, we will have to adopt a

policy that will build up industries in Canada which will rival those that a protective policy has developed in the United States.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I think, Mr. Speaker, that the House has made up its mind that the reasons given by the right hon. the first minister for the dismissal or resignation of his colleague are exceedingly weak and not acceptable in any shape or form. The ex-Minister of Public Works has thoroughly justified the course he took in advocating a protective policy. There can be no doubt that he had reason to believe that in so doing he was voicing the sentiments and opinions of his colleagues. He had reason to believe that in advocating a strong protective policy, he was paving the way for an increase of tariff, which they desired, to make during the coming session. I shall not go further into the arguments for or against the dismissal or resignation of the ex-minister, but wish to point out that the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. the Minister of Finance have again to-day shown that the policy of this government is one of uncertainty and vacillation. Their chief aim seems to be to keep the country in absolute ignorance as to what their policy really is. Let me give a practical illustration of the effect of this reticence on their part. Last week in Montreal a number of young men, who thought they knew something about finance, formed a combine to buy a very large block of steel stock of Nova Scotia. They got their friends young and old, into the deal to the extent perhaps of some $2,000,000. The reason they gave their friends for inducing them to go into that transaction was that they had the promise of the government to impose a large increase of duty on iron and steel during the coming session, which would make the stock of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company worth 80, 90 or perhaps 100 per cent. These young men were probably perfectly justified in believing that the government were quite capable of going into any one transaction of that kind and favouring one particular enterprise without adopting a broad protective policy for the whole country. Is it not a melancholy thing that after the government have been in power some seven years, they have so impressed the country with the conviction that they have no policy at all, that their friends are easily led to believe that in any one particular instance the government are ready at a moment's notice, and to benefit some of their supporters, to go back on their free trade principles and become protectionists to the fullest extent. The transaction which resulted so disastrously was absolutely and solely the result of this lamentable want of policy on the part of the government. These young men lost nearly half a million of dollars in the operation which they would never have entered into had the government adopted a fixed policy and stood by that policy and not been prepared to change it to suit any particular exigencies. If these young men had been a little older and had a little more experience, they would have known that although they might put some faith in the policy or promises of this government, it would not do for them to back their opinions by their money. They might back it, so far as swearing by it was concerned, but to bet on it, as the racing man says, that would not do—they knew they were liable to fail.

Now, this is, perhaps, all outside the question. But the discussion has drifted to question of policy and of the justification of the ex-Minister of Public Works in his public utterances. I contend that he was justified in giving voice to the views that he expressed. Up to a certain point he had the entire backing of the government in all his statements. He has told us that he was not called down by the Prime Minister or by the acting Prime Minister when the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was abroad. It was only on the return of the Prime Minister that, all of a sudden, this virtuous indignation arose as to one of the members of the cabinet daring to be a protectionist in the open, and it was decided that there must be this great punishment for it. I contend that it is the duty of the government to let it be known plainly and squarely what its policy is, and that they are only fooling the people and damaging the country by giving such answers as the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister gave to-day. Apparently they want to convince us that they are very clever, that they can receive a deputation of merchants or manufacturers or gardeners and give them such an answer that they will go away thinking that they have assurance of the Minister of Finance or some other member of the government of sympathy with their ideas of protection, while, at the same time, this member of the government is laughing in his sleeve and saying: How nicely I have fooled that deputation, and when they come back next year I can explain to them that what they thought I meant is exactly the opposite of what I really did mean.

Now, the ex-Minister of Public Works repeated what struck me as, perhaps, the most serious statement he made. He said with emphasis: I administered my department honestly. Why is it necessary to make a statement like that? Is a man to take credit to himself for administering his department honestly and doing what he can to prevent the public funds being stolen through that department? Yet, the hon. gentleman made this statement with emphasis, and, before he sat down he took occasion to repeat it with even greater emphasis—that he had administered his department honestly and had tried to let no man defraud it. Was that the reason of his resignation, or had it anything to do with that resignation?

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 19, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House as follows :

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs :

Alcorn,
Barker,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Blair,
Borden (Halifax),
Bureau,
Carroll,
Casgrain,
Cowan,
Dugas,
Emmerson,
Fitzpatrick,
Fraser,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gourley,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Lancaster,
LaRivière,
Lavell,
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Logan,
MacKinnon,
McCarthy,
McColl,
McIsaac,
Madore,
Malouin,
Martineau,
Monet,
Monk,
Morrison,
Mulock (Sir William),
Northrup,
Porter,
Pringle,
Russell,
Sifton,
Sutherland (Essex),
Tisdale,
Wade and
Ward.—46.

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs :

Archambault,
Avery,
Bazinet,
Bourbonnais,
Casgrain,
Christie,
Copp,
Earle,
Ethier,
Farquharson,
Gauvreau,
Hale,
Harwood,
Johnston (Cardwell),
Logan,
Lovell,
McCool,
McGowan,
Matheson,
Meigs,
Morin,
Robinson (Elgin),
Seagram,
Turgeon and
Vrooman.—26.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of seven Members.

No. 3.—ON RAILWAYS CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs :

Alcorn,
Angers,
Archambault,
Ball,
Barker,
Bazinet,
Beith,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bell,
Bennett,
Bernier,
Bickerdike,
Birkett,
Blaine,
Blair,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Boyd,
Brock,
Broder,
Brown,
Bruce,
Bruneau,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Calvin,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Carroll,
Carscallen,
Casgrain,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Christie,
Clancy,
Clare,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Copp,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Culbert,
Davis,
Delisle,
Demers (Levis),
Douglas,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Earle,
Emmerson,
Erb,
Ethier,
Farquharson,
Fielding,
Fitzpatrick,
Fortier,
Fowler,
Fraser,
Gallery,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gibson,
Gilmour,
Girard,
Gould,
Gourley,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hale,
Harty,
Harwood,
Henderson,
Heyd,
Holmes,
Hughes (Victoria),
Hyman,
Ingram,
Johnston (Cape Breton),
Johnston (Cardwell),
Johnston (Lampton),
Kaulbach,
Kemp,
Kendrey,
Kidd,
Law,
Lavell,
Lavergne,
Lefurgey,
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Lewis,
Logan,
Macdonald,
Mackie,
MacKinnon,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),
MacLaren (Perth),
Maclean,
Macpherson,
McCarthy,
McColl,
McCool,
McCormick,
McCreary,
McGowan,
McGugan,
McIntosh,
McIsaac,
McLennan,
Madore,
Malouin,
Marcil (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martineau,
Matheson,
Mignault,
Monet,
Monk,
Morin,
Morrison,
Mulock (Sir William),
Murray,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Osler,
Parmelee,
Pope,
Porter,
Power,
Préfontaine,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Puttee,
Reid (Grenville),
Riley,
Robinson (Elgin),
Robinson (Northumberland),
Roche (Halifax),
Roche (Marquette),
Rosamond,
Ross (Ontario),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yukon),
Rousseau,
Russell,
Schell,
Scott,
Sifton,
Simmons,
Smith (Vancouver),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stephens,
Stewart,
Sutherland (Essex),
Sutherland (Oxford),
Talbot,
Tarte,
Thompson,
Thompson (Haldimand and Monck).
Thomson (North Grey),
Tisdale,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Turcot,
Vrooman,
Wade,
Ward,

Lancaster, Wilmot,
Lang, Wilson and
Laurier (L'Assomption), Wright—182.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-five members.

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

Messieurs :

Alcorn, Kidd,
Avery, LaRivière,
Ball, Lavell,
Béland, Lavergne,
Belcourt, LeBlanc,
Bell, Lemieux,
Bennett, Logan,
Birkett, Loy,
Bourbonnais, Macdonald,
Brock, MacKinnon,
Brodeur, Maclean,
Bruce, McCool,
Bruneau, McCreary,
Calvert, McGugan,
Carroll, Marcil (Bagot),
Carscallen, Meigs,
Casgrain, Mignault,
Cochrane, Monet,
Cowan, Monk,
Culbert, Morin,
Desjardins, Morrison,
Douglas, Pope,
Dugas, Power,
Dyment, Pringle,
Earle, Proulx,
Ethier, Puttee,
Fitzpatrick, Roddick,
Fraser, Rosamond,
Galliher, Ross (Victoria),
Gauvreau, Russell,
Gibson, Schell,
Gilmour, Stephens,
Girard, Stewart,
Guthrie, Sutherland (Essex),
Hackett, Sutherland (Oxford),
Harty, Tobin,
Hughes (King's), Tolton,
Johnston (Cape Breton), Tucker,
Kaulbach, Turgeon and
Kendall, Wade.—78.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of ten Members.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs :

Ball, Lefurgey,
Bazinet, Mackie,
Brown, McEwen,
Cargill, McGugan,
Clancy, Marcil (Bagot),
Clare, Matheson,
Copp, Morin,
Davis, Puttee,
Demers (Lévis), Reid (Restigouche),
Demers (St. John), Richardson,
Douglas, Roche (Marquette),
Erb, Ross (Rimouski),
Fortier, Sherritt,
Gallery, Smith (Vancouver),
Grant, Stewart,
Guthrie, Tolmie,
Halliday, Tolton,
Hughes (Victoria), Tupper (Sir Charles
Ingram, Hibbert),
Johnston (Cape Breton), Turgeon,
Kaulbach, Vrooman,
Kendall, Wilmot,
Lancaster, Wilson and
Lang, Wright.—49.
Laurier (L'Assomption),

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

No. 6.—JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

(Members to act on the part of the Commons).

Messieurs :

Bennett, McColl,
Casgrain, Marcil (Bonaventure),
Clarke, Oliver,
Davis, Parmelee,
Holmes, Préfontaine,
Hughes (Victoria), Richardson,
Hyman, Scott,
Johnston (Cape Breton), Sutherland (Oxford),
Johnston (Lambton), Taylor,
LaRivière, Thompson (Haldimand
Lavergne, and Monck) and
Loy, Tisdale.—24.
Maclean,

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs :

Barker, Lancaster,
Beith, Laurier (L'Assomption),
Bell, LeBlanc,
Bennett, Lennox,
Bickerdike, Léonard,
Birkett, Loy,
Blain, MacKinnon,
Blair, Maclaren (Huntingdon),
Borden (Sir Frederick), Macpherson,
Campbell, McColl,
Carbonneau, McCreary,
Carroll, McIsaac,
Cartwright (Sir Richard), Madore,
Champagne, Malouin,
Clancy, Monk,
Clarke, Morrison,
Cochrane, Murray,
Costigan, Northrup,
Cowan, Oliver,
Demers (St. John), Porter,
Desjardins, Pringle,
Emmerson, Riley,
Fielding, Roche (Halifax),
Fitzpatrick, Ross (Ontario),
Fowler, Ross (Yukon),
Fraser, Sifton,
Ganong, Smith (Wentworth),
Geoffrion, Sproule,
German, Tarte,
Gould, Taylor,
Gourley, Thompson (Haldimand
Haggart, and Monck),
Henderson, Thomson (North Grey),
Holmes, Tupper (Sir C. Hibbert),
Hughes (King's), Turcot,
Hughes (Victoria), Wade,
Hyman, Ward and
Kemp, Wilson.—74.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs :

Angers, Kaulbach,
Archambault, Kemp,
Avery, Kendall,
Barker, Kendrey,
Beith, Lang,
Béland, Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bell, Laurier (L'Assomption),
Bennett, Lavell,

Bernier,
Bickerdike,
Birkett,
Blain,
Borden (Halifax),
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Boyd,
Brock,
Brown,
Bruce,
Bruneau,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Calvin,
Campbell,
Carbonneau,
Cargill,
Carscallen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),
Casgrain,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Christie,
Clancy,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Copp,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Culbert,
Delisle,
Demers (Lévis),
Demers (St. John),
Earle,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Farquharson,
Fielding,
Fowler,
Fraser,
Gallery,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gould,
Gourley,
Haggart,
Harty,
Henderson,
Heyd,
Holmes,
Hughes (King's),
Hughes (Victoria),
Hyman,
Ingram,
Johnston (Cape Breton),
Law,
Lefurgey,
Lewis,
Lovell,
Loy,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),
McCarthy,
McCormick,
McEwen,
McIsaac,
McLennan,
Madore,
Malouin,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Mignault,
Monk,
Morin,
Murray,
Osler,
Paterson,
Pope,
Porter,
Power,
Préfontaine,
Puttee,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Richardson,
Riley,
Roche (Halifax),
Rosamond,
Ross (Ontario),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Victoria),
Ross (Yukon),
Rousseau,
Russell,
Schell,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stephens,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Talbot,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Thompson (Haldimand and Monck),
Thomson (North Grey),
Tisdale,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Tupper (Sir C. Hibbert),
Wade,
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson and
Wright.—130.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 9.—ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs :

Angers,
Ball,
Bazinet,
Beith,
Bell,
Bernier,
Blain,
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Boyd.
Broder,
Brown,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Calvin,
Carbonneau,
Cargill,
Carscallen,
Charlton,
Clancy,
Clare,
Cochrane,
Davis,
Delisle.
Douglas,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Erb,
Ethier,
Farquharson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Gilmour,
Girard,
Gould,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Hackett,
Halliday,
Harwood,
Henderson,
Heyd,
Hughes (King's),
Hughes (Victoria),
Ingram,
Johnston (Cardwell),
Johnston (Lambton),
Kendall,
Kidd,
Lang,
LaRivière,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
LeBlanc,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Lewis,
Logan,
Lovell,
Loy,
Macdonald,
Mackie,
MacLaren (Perth),
Macpherson,
McColl,
McCool,
McCormick,
McCreary,
McEwen,
McGowan,
McGugan,
McIntosh,
McLennan,
Marcil (Bagot),
Martineau,
Matheson,
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Morin,
Mulock (Sir William),
Oliver,
Parmelee,
Pope,
Proulx,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Richardson,
Robinson (Elgin),
Robinson (Northumberland),
Roche (Marquette),
Rosamond,
Ross (Ontario),
Ross (Victoria),
Rousseau,
Schell,
Seagram,
Sherritt,
Simmons,
Smith (Vancouver),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stephens,
Stewart,
Talbot,
Taylor,
Thomson (North Grey),
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Tolton,
Tucker,
Turcot,
Turgeon,
Vrooman,
Wade,
Wilmot,
Wilson and
Wright.—119.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twelve Members.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

DRAINAGE ON AND ACROSS RAILWAY PROPERTY.

Mr. M. K. COWAN (South Essex) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 19) respecting drainage on and across the property of railway companies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. COWAN. This is practically a copy of the Bill which I introduced last session and which I explained on that occasion. I prefer to defer further explanation until the second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL (West York) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 20) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This is a Bill to regulate the size of milk cans and the quantity they shall contain. I will give further explanation at the proper time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

COST OF CENSUS OF 1901.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

How much has the cost of the taking of the census of 1901 been up to the first day of March, 1903 ? How much is estimated it will cost to complete it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It would be much preferable if my hon. friend would put this question in the shape of a motion for a return.

PRICE OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

Has the government published the prices of binder twine for the current year ? If not, when will they be published ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). To the first question the answer is : No. To the second question the answer is : When the spring trade in that class of supplies opens. The fluctuations in the fibre market have been such for some time past that it is not deemed advisable to fix prices at present.

THE SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCE OF JUDGES.

The PRIME MINISTER (for the Minister of Justice) moved :

That the House go into Commitee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution,

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to retiring allowances of judges, and to provide that, any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Superior Court in Canada who has :—

(a.) Attained the age of seventy-five years, and has continued in office as such judge, or as such judge and as judge of any Superior Court in Canada, or as such judge and as stipendiary magistrate of the North-west Territories, for twenty years or upwards ; or

(b.) Attained the age of sixty-five years, and has continued in office as such judge, or as such judge and as judge of any Superior Court in Canada, for thirty years or upwards,

May resign his said office ; and His Majesty may, by letters patent, under the great seal, reciting such judge's age and period of office, grant unto such judge an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his resignation, to commence immediately after his resignation, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved :

That the House go into Commitee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution,

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and to provide that if the period of service includes a fraction of a year less than one-half, the service shall be taken to be the number of years served, not including the fraction. And if the period of service includes a fraction equal to or greater than one-half, the fraction shall be deemed to be an entire year.

2. Resolved, that it is expedient to confirm all superannuation allowances heretofore granted, calculated in the foregoing manner.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

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

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to ask the Prime Minister, at how early a date we may expect the Redistribution Bill, which was referred to in the speech from the Throne.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not prepared to say what date we will be ready with that Bill, but it will likely be at an early date. Perhaps to-morrow I will introduce a resolution with regard to the Chinese Bill, and my right hon. friend the Minister of Railways will introduce at an early date his Bill with reference to the Railway Commission.

COST OF CENSUS OF 1901.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). When I put my question which is on the Order paper to-day, the Minister of Finance asked me to move for a return. I asked for that information in order that I might be able to base some remarks on it this session. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should ask me to move for a return when I simply want to know what is the expenditure on account of taking the census up to the 1st of March, 1901, and the estimated expense further. That is a very simple question and the minister should answer it without asking me to move for a return.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My remarks were not intended in the slightest degree to delay the information getting to the House. I can assure the hon. gentleman that when his motion is made there will be no delay in bringing down the return.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I will call the minister's attention to page 44 of the Public Accounts and he will find there, that the information with regard to the cost of the census expenditure has all been included under one item instead of being in a separate column as in the past. That is all the greater reason why the question of my right hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) should have been answered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there is any departure from the usual mode I will inquire what the reason is and I will let my hon. friend know.

THE SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Mr. VICTOR GEOFFRION (Chambly and Verchères.) Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to a state of things which he will agree with me demands immediate attention. We have a railway running from St. Lambert through the counties of Verchères, Chambly, Yamaska and Richelieu. That railway has lately been sold to some speculators from New York and other cities of the United States. They paid for it and commenced to operate it, but soon afterwards they became engaged in a lawsuit before the courts in regard to the ownership of the road, and ever since the road has been so neglected that it has become dangerous for the public to travel on it. Some of the employees of the road I know have not been paid for five or six months, and the result is that some sections of the road are left entirely unattended. I received telegrams and letters two or three days ago, and again yesterday, calling my attention to the dangerous condition of the road and bridges, especially at this season of the year. People who have examined it say that if it is not attended to immediately, some very disastrous accident may happen. I need not quote the law to the hon. Minister of Railways. He is familiar with that section of the Railway Act which says that the Minister of Railways and Canals, on being informed that any railway is in such a state as I have described, may send an engineer to inspect the road and make a report, and if the report is unfavourable, the minister shall have power to close the road. I am told also that the engines have not been cleaned for several months. In fact, the whole railway is in such a condition that the public are afraid to travel on it, while the owners are fighting among themselves, and in case of accident we do not know whom to apply to. We have been very unfortunate with that road. The gentleman who first promoted it, got the charter and had the first administration of it, expropriated lands belonging to some well-to-do farmers, and a good many of these farmers have not yet been paid. There is not a better locality in the province of Quebec. This gentleman ran the road for a certain time, not to suit the public, but to suit himself. Afterwards it was taken hold of by Mr. Beauchemin and other gentlemen, who gave satisfaction to the public. We had nothing to complain of so long as they managed the road; but unfortunately they sold it, and since then it has been going from bad to worse. I do not know whether or not there are any subsidies due to this railway; but if there are, I hope the hon. minister will see that those subsidies are not paid until the poor people who have been working for the road without wages for some time, are paid. I would especially mention the manager of the road, Mr. Lalonde, who has done wonders with the little means at his disposal. I hope the hon. minister will see that not a cent of subsidy is paid to the road until justice is rendered to these people.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I understand that my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères complains that the railway from St. Lambert to Sorel is not in a safe condition for traffic, and wishes that an engineer of the department should, in accordance with the law, be sent to go over the road and make an examination of it, and report to the department whether or not the information which has reached us is well founded. I understand that is my hon. friend's desire.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to give me in writing at his earliest convenience a memo. of the particulars in which he has been informed the road is in the condition he states, so that the attention of the engineer would be called to those particulars, when he goes to look over the road, I would be glad to take immediate steps to have the inspection made. The information given to me in that form would be a matter of record, and I think the law contemplates that there should be a written complaint to facilitate the work of the officer in making the examination. I assure him that the department will give the matter its immediate attention.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The whole plant is in bad order; but I will, as the hon. minister suggests, give him all the particulars I have in writing.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker, for two years in succession I have moved in the House of Commons for the return of certain papers relating to the late general officer commanding in Canada. In my absence certain garbled and distorted extracts were brought down to the House, while the papers I moved for were reported

not to have been found in the Militia Department. For two years in succession the House has ordered these papers to be brought down, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia why the order of the House has not been obeyed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). I can only say that the return to which my hon. friend refers was, I believe, prepared under the direction of the then general officer commanding. Last year I gave directions that a further return should be prepared and brought down, and I am surprised to hear that it has not been brought down. I will make inquiry, and be prepared to make a further statement to my hon. friend as to why the return has not been brought down.

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

Governor General's office including salaries, $10,900 ; contingencies, $15,100.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The increases are the usual statutory increases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are these statutory increases given generally or only in isolated instances ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are general. There is no exception where the party is eligible.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does that apply to all the departments ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the general rule has been to give them to all who are eligible.

Office of the King's Privy Council, Canada—Salaries, $31,875 ; contingencies, $9,300.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are no increases in that item except the statutory increases, with the exception of one junior second-class clerk transferred to the second-class.

Mr. INGRAM. Who was the clerk who was transferred ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. McElroy is promoted from one class to the other.

Department of Justice—Salaries, including one junior second-class clerk at $800, and allowance to the private secretary of the Solicitor General, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $35,390 ; contingencies, $12,370.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The increase is more apparent than real. It is due to a reorganization of the department. When we come to the penitentiary estimates, my hon. friends will see that the increase is more apparent than real.

Mr. BENNETT. As we are now on the items of the Department of Justice, would the hon. minister allow me to put a question to him on a matter indirectly connected with this expenditure ? The principle was laid down by the late Sir John Thompson, when Minister of Justice, that the government should go outside of the counties where the vacancies occur to find men to fill the position of county court judge. For a long time that principle was acted upon by Sir John Thompson and some of his successors, but it has been ruthlessly departed from by the present administration. Does the hon. minister think it desirable that the vacancies now existing should be filled up by gentlemen practising in those counties where there are vacancies ? That is certainly the course he has followed. Take the county of Huron, Judge Masson had retired on account of illness, and the then junior judge was promoted. It was expected that an outsider would have been appointed judge of the county court, but the government appointed Mr. Holt, who was practising in the county. I am acquainted with Mr. Holt and I know that his reputation at the bar was good, and that he could make an excellent judge. Still he had been a politician in the riding, he was a partner of Mr. Campbell who was long a member of this House, and had been spoken of frequently as a probable candidate for either the local legislature or for the House of Commons. The hon. minister, I presume, takes the responsibility for what goes on in his department. The other day, in the matter of Brunet's pardon, he said that although the recommendation did not come from him, he took any blame that might be attached to it. Is he going now to lay down the rule that these appointments will be made solely with the view of suiting political exigencies ? Because I am informed that in the case of Huron, the county judge was taken from the local bar. I need not go over all the arguments adduced in the past to show why this principle is a pernicious one. In appointing a man from the local bar, you appoint one, who in nine cases out of ten, has been prominent in politics, and the result is inevitable that the people will view such an appointment with suspicion. In Leeds and Grenville also, the county judge was taken from the town of Brockville, and lately in the province of Ontario a number of appointments to the position of county judge have been made from the local bars. If that is to be the policy of the administration, it will be well for the House to know it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that the rule contended for by my hon. friend, namely, that county court judges should be chosen as much as possible from the outside bar, is a very wise one. I quite agree that the late Sir John Thompson expressed the view that these appointments should, as far as possible, be made from the outside bar, and that view was concurred in by the different Ministers of Justice who followed him, but if my hon. friend

will look over the appointments, he will find that even in Sir John Thompson's time that custom was more honoured in the breach than in the observance. So far as I am concerned, I propose to follow that rule as closely as possible.

Mr. BENNETT. I have here a memo. of the various appointments lately made. Four have been made since the hon. gentleman's party came into power. Mr. Liddell was practising at the bar in Cornwall when appointed to a junior judgeship there. Mr. Reynolds was practising in Brockville and Mr. Holt in Goderich, and we have further, the case of Mr. Monk, who was made a junior judge at Hamilton when practising at the local bar in that district. There is at present a vacancy in the county court judgeship in the county of York. Has any decision been arrived at as to who is to get the office ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not yet, but my hon. friend will realize at once that the rule he advocates would be difficult of application, as far as the appointment to the county of York judgeship is concerned. It might be hard to go out of Toronto to find a man for that position, so that the objections to appointing a man from the district would not apply with the same force to the city of Toronto. With regard to the appointment of Mr. Holt, for which I was responsible personally, that appointment was made at the unanimous request of the whole bar of the county. I realize that because of the sympathy existing among members of the bar, irrespective of politics, there would naturally be a tendency to help one another in a case of that sort, and while that may not appeal very strongly, still it is some justification for departing from the principle stated by my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT. No doubt the applicant for judgeship, if prominent in the locality, will have the support of the local bar, who will be anxious to get him out of the way and share his clientele among themselves. What I would like to know is whether from this out there is to be any settled rule with regard to these appointments, or whether each case will have to stand on its own merits ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, but I would like to qualify that statement by the addition that I think the rule contended for by my hon. friend is a wise and salutary one.

Mr. BENNETT. But not to be followed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As far as possible.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This discussion is going entirely outside the resolution. As the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) rose to—

Mr. LENNOX. But is it going outside the resolution, Mr. Chairman ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We cannot, under this vote, if we are to observe the ordinary rules, discuss the policy of the government with regard to the appointment of judges.

Mr. LENNOX. We are dealing with the Department of Justice, surely—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is my decision. The item we are discussing is as follows :—

Civil government—Department of Justice—salaries, including one second-class clerk, $800, and allowance to the private secretary to the Solicitor General, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $35,390.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand we are discussing the estimates of the Department of Justice, and I do not see why this discussion is not perfectly relevant.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Strictly speaking, this does not cover the point, but I have no objection to the discussion.

Mr. LENNOX. I was going to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the statement he made that, as far as possible appointments to the position of county judge should be made from outside the county. I do not see why that rule should not be carried out and men appointed who are not practicing in the county. We are all aware that there are large numbers of persons who are eligible and desirous of becoming county court judges. I was informed the other day that the Department of Justice has a list of gentlemen desirous of taking that position. I understand that the names of some gentlemen have been upon the list for a number of years. Under the circumstances, I fail to understand how there can be any impossibility of securing suitable persons outside of the county. If we are to have the rule at all, we ought to have a full explanation from the Minister of Justice of the reasons for his action in any case where the rule is not observed. In the case of Mr. Holt I understand the hon. minister to suggest that the requisition presented by his brethern at the bar was, to some extent, the reason for Mr. Holt's appointment. But I do not understand the hon. minister to put it wholly upon that ground. I would therefore ask the hon. minister to inform the House specifically what reason was in Mr. Holt's case for departing from the very salutary rule which has been referred to. In addition to the reasons suggested by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) many others could be mentioned against the practice of appointing judges from their own county. For instance, it frequently happens that the person appointed has a large family, including a number of sons practicing at the bar. Or, if his own sons are not practicing, he has nephews or other connections.

This entails serious difficulties, and, at the very least, causes prejudice to exist in the minds both of other members of the bar and the public generally. The expediency of the rule is not questioned, as I understand—it could hardly be questioned. Nor can the expediency of carrying it into effect, except in special cases, be doubted. If, however, there is in any case, a good and sufficient reason against carrying out the rule, surely that reason can be definitely and distinctly stated. I fail to understand that, as yet, the hon. minister has given any reason why an exception was made in the case of Mr. Holt.

Mr. INGRAM. While the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was speaking. I could not see whether the Minister of Justice assented to what he said. But I take it that the hon. minister has a list of lawyers in the province of Ontario whom he proposes to promote to judgeships. I would like to ask if the name of Mr. Jackson of the town of Ingersoll is on that list.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like to gratify my hon. friend's (Mr. Ingram's) curiosity, but I do not think my memory enables me to state off-hand the number of applications I have had. But I may tell my hon. friend that the list to which he refers is one of very long standing and dates very far back.

Mr. INGRAM. If Mr. Jackson's name is on the list, I would suggest that his name be struck off at once. In the case of an appointment I suggest to the hon. minister the propriety of having the Act amended, or some legislation passed by which, if a member of this House is appointed to a judgeship, he shall be precluded from acting on an election trial for five years from the date of his appointment. Such a law, I think, would be in the interests of justice. It has been my painful duty to attend and observe some of the election trials that have taken place recently, and I have never experienced more partisanship in this House than I have seen in some of these trials. These gentlemen should not be allowed to act on an election trial until they have had time to forget that they are partisans.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There have been grievances on both sides. In my own province of Quebec I have never heard of such a thing, but I have heard of such things in Ontario, and I can say that the complaint does not apply exclusively to one side.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not wish to cast reflections on either one side or the other, but, whether regarded from a Liberal or a Conservative standpoint, the position I take is in the interest of the dignity of the bench. I think that if we refer to the election trials, the dates upon which they were supposed to take place, and the judgments which have been rendered as well as the peculiar method in which they are rendered are sufficient to confirm my complaint of partisanship shown by judges on the bench.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would ask the Minister of Justice if any appointment has been made of a county court judge in the county of Grey, or if the junior judge has been promoted?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. None made.

Mr. OSLER. I think that, notwithstanding the explanation of the Minister of Justice this is the proper time to give us the explanation of this increase of nearly $1,500. It is not wise to leave it until some other department or some other item is under discussion. We should have the details now.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am quite ready to give the information. In the first place there is the promotion of a 1st class clerk, Mr. Gisborne, to a chief clerkship.

Mr. OSLER. Where was he before?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He had been in the department ten or twelve years. He certainly deserved promotion. The statutory increases of $50 each have been given to three 1st class clerks, Mr. Chisholm, Mr. Narraway and Mr. Clarke. Statutory increases of $50 each are given to four 2nd class clerks, Messrs. Mullen, Burpee, Verret and Harris. A similar increase of $50 is given to one junior 2nd class clerk and $30 to each of two messengers. Then we have added to the department Mr. Creighton who was removed from the accountantship of the Kingston penitentiary and brought here not being replaced at Kingston.

Mr. TAYLOR, I believe there are seven 1st class clerks in the Department of Justice and only three of them allowed statutory increases. Why is that?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Every clerk in the Department of Justice who is entitled to a statutory increase has received it. The others referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) have reached the maximum of their class, and of course, they can not be given increases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if there has not been some delay in the appointment of a county court judge in the province of Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman explain what it was?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is the case of the appointment to the vacancy created by the promotion of Mr. Justice Prendergast from the county court bench to the Superior Court.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I knew that there was a vacancy, and that it has continued for some time. I would like to know during what time it continued, and what was the reason why the position was left vacant so long.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot give just the period of time, but I think it must have been almost a year. During that time the duties of the offices were performed by another county court judge who appeared to be in a position to fill the duties satisfactorily, and so the appointment was not made for some time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That seems a rather remarkable reason. I suppose that judge is as able now to perform his duties as he was before. If the reason is of any value, it would be a good reason for not making the appointment at all. Is there any political reason ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not that I know of.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then my hon. friend ought to have an assistant. He is evidently not able to discharge the duties of his office. Now, it has been openly charged in the west that this vacancy has remained unfilled for the reason that the gentleman who was slated for the position held a constituency which was doubtful, and this government colluded with the opposition in Manitoba to keep this appointment open and let the public interest suffer for the mere purpose of obliging the Liberal opposition in the province of Manitoba. I see no reason why we should not accept that explanation, unless the Minister of Justice can give us some better reason for his inaction than he has yet given us. There is a vacancy in the office of the county court judge and the vacancy stands for a year. We ask the Minister of Justice for an explanation, and the only thing he can say is that some other judge of a county court was able to perform the duties of the judge who had been elevated to the superior court. Well, surely this government don't want to place themselves in a position of that kind before the country. I trust before the item passes my hon. friend will try—I know it is a big effort—but at least that he will try to give the House and the country some better explanation than he has given up to the present time. We know pretty well what the real reason is, but will he not exert himself and try to put forward some plausible reason, at least ? He has not given any plausible reason so far, and for the sake of the Department of Justice, for the sake of the traditions of that office, I would like my hon. friend to make one more effort.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am afraid I cannot accommodate my hon. friend. He says he knows the real reason and he asks me to give a plausible one. I do not think I can accede to that request.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Perhaps I can throw a little light on the subject.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Thank you.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I hardly think the Minister of Justice is quite frank when he states there was no political reason. I happen to live in the town and in the constituency where the gentleman who has been appointed to this vacant judgeship resides, and it is a well-known fact that it was political exigencies alone which caused that vacancy to remain so long unfilled. Now, I have a question on the Order paper which the Minister of Justice will have an opportunity of answering. I think it was on the 21st of last February, 1902, that the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRiviére) asked the question in this House when the vacancy caused by the promotion of Judge Prendergast to the superior court bench, would be filled; the reply of the Minister of Justice was 'in the immediate future.' Some six weeks after that I asked a somewhat similar question, and the Minister of Justice replied, 'Forthwith, immediately at the close of the session.' Now we have waited anxiously for this vacancy to be filled; and I may just say that the Minister of Justice is hardly seized of all the facts when he states that the judge for whom assistance was required had made no complaint, because that same gentleman, Judge Walker, of Winnipeg, had given an interview to a reporter of a Winnipeg paper stating that he was overworked and actually could not take his holidays. We know that case after case, upwards of a dozen cases, went from one court to another because he was unable to handle them without some assistance. This interview appeared in the Winnipeg paper last fall. Now I will give the reason why this vacancy has not been filled. Mr. Myers, who has been appointed to the position, is a fellow townsman of my own. He had the promise of the position in his pocket since last summer, all his political friends knew that he had been slated for it, he has openly expressed himself in that direction. I do not blame the Minister of Justice, for I know he acted upon the advice given him by the Minister of the Interior, who states that he is going to look after western interests, and who undoubtedly did exercise his influence in order to have that vacancy remain open for Mr. Myers until it was impossible for the vacancy in the local constituency to be filled before the last session of the local legislature. Now, Mr. Myers did not receive his appointment until the beginning of the year, and this rendered it impossible for the local government to have the by-election to fill that vacancy before this last session. So that by the action of the Minister of Justice the administration of justice has been clogged in that province. As I said before, case after case has gone over

to the succeeding court; and not only that, but the people of the constituency of Minnedosa have been disfranchised, have not had the privilege of being represented in the local legislature during last session. Here is a local constituency unrepresented simply because the Minister of Justice has not filled that position last summer by the very gentleman who was slated to fill it, and he has been kept in that position until the beginning of this year, when it was too late to have the by-election, knowing that he could not possibly be succeeded by a gentleman on his own side of politics. This, I think, is the true reason, and the Minister of the Interior is fully cognizant of it, if the Minister of Justice is not.

Mr. BENNETT. Since my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) has given the information relative to the appointment that was delayed and has at last been made in that county, perhaps it would be well to let the House know how it came about that Mr. Holt was appointed in the county of Huron, because apparently the Minister of Justice is kept in the dark as to all the facts. I say it is unfair to the Minister of Justice, because he has a high reputation as a barrister, he has a high standing at the bar, and it is rather hard for that hon. gentleman that, on the threshold of making a great career for himself, as Minister of Justice of this country, party exigencies have to be considered on every possible occasion. The Minister of Justice stated with a certain amount of definiteness, when the hon. member for Marquette asked the question last year, that the position would be filled at once. Well, why was not the appointment made? It is plainly evident that it was delayed for one reason, and that was to meet the party exigencies of his Liberal friends in the province of Manitoba. Now let me tell the Minister of Justice the reason which caused that well-known principle of making legal appointments to be broken into in the county of Huron, although perhaps the minister may have had a hint of it. But the minister, of course, had to keep his eyes closed to a certain extent on that question. Now these are the facts of the case: There was a Mr. Cameron asking for the nomination to the local legislature. Mr. Cameron was very anxious to receive it; and at the same time Mr. Holt was very desirous of the nomination, and popular favour was directed towards Mr. Holt. But Mr. Cameron had a lot of facts in his possession, particularly facts in reference to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Was he not the Mr. Cameron who had helped to stifle the Cook investigation? Was he not the Mr. Cameron who had all the facts of that case, and was he not the Mr. Cameron who had taken the government by the throat and told them, here and at Toronto, that unless the Liberal nomination were given to him in West Huron all the facts were to be disclosed in relation to that Cook investigation? Perhaps the Minister of Justice may have heard of this. If he did not hear of it, it was well known, not only in the county of Huron, but throughout western Ontario. The fact is, that the Minister of Justice, if he intends to make a reputation for himself, in that high office, has got to assert himself. Let him put these party exigencies to one side, and let him assert himself. He will be called upon, and no doubt he is being called upon to-day in the county of York, and why?—because the junior county court judge, Judge Morgan, is aspiring to the senior judgeship. It is a notorious fact that Judge Morgan has been in the political field in the interest of the Hon. Mr. Davis and that there has been a departure altogether from the way in which a judge should act because he has been doing work for the Liberal party that certainly should never have been done by a judge. He has brought the judiciary of the county into disrepute by the course which he has pursued. We have seen the spectacle, because I was in the county myself, of a statement being made by Judge Morgan in the endeavour to bolster up and help the cause of the Liberal party in the local legislature, which has been used on every platform in the riding, and we have seen the spectacle further of the candidate on the Conservative side declaring that that statement was a tissue of falsehoods and daring the judge to come on any platform and defend it. Yet, party exigencies are behind the Minister of Justice in the endeavour to force his hand and to secure the appointment of Judge Morgan to this position. I hope for the honour of the judiciary of this country that the Minister of Justice will rise above party exigencies in the county of York in making the appointment of a senior judge.

Mr. BOYD. Before that item is passed I really think the hon. Minister of Justice should give some better explanation to the committee than he has given regarding the delay in making the appointment in Manitoba. I do not mind saying to the hon. Minister of Justice that the position he occupies in the eyes of the people of Manitoba, owing to his connection with this case, is not one that he should be proud of. I feel that he has been compelled by his political friends in this House to refrain from doing justice in regard to the appointment that has been complained of here to-day. Mr. Chairman, if we are to rely on anything in this country, must we not rely on the statement which the ministers of the Crown make on the floor of this House? If we cannot believe the statements that are given to us by ministers of the Crown in answer to questions across the floor of the House what can we believe? On two occasions the hon. Minister of Justice stated, and I believe at the time he made that statement he thought he was stating the fact, that the appointment was to be made immediate-

ly, but, it is held off to within a few weeks of the meeting of the legislature in Manitoba, until it was impossible to hold an election in the county of Minnedosa and for the reason which has been given by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) the county of Minnedosa was not represented in the legislature of Manitoba during the session just closing to-day. I would ask the honest members at the back of the government if they approve of using the judiciary of this country as a political machine to further the political interests of the party in different parts of the country. If any hon. gentleman on the government side of the House, or any member of the government, will stand up and defend the action of the government in this matter I would be very pleased to hear him do so and the people of Manitoba will be pleased to hear an explanation from the government and especially from the hon. Minister of Justice who stands very high in his own party. I look upon him as a young man who is bound to make a reputation for himself in this country but, it will not be by such explanations as the one that he has lent himself to and which he has given to the committee this afternoon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Justice, perhaps, would like to have his memory refreshed as to what he really did say on this subject last year. There was a previous reference which I have not been able to find, but on the 6th of May, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) said :

I believe there is a vacancy at present on the bench of Manitoba caused by the elevation of Judge Prendergast to the Supreme Court bench of the North-west Territories. I think about six weeks ago the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) asked the Minister of Justice if it was the intention of the government to fill that position, and the minister replied that it was the intention to fill that position forthwith. I would ask if the vacancy has been filled, and if not, is it the intention to have it filled at once ?

MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. It is the intention to fill it in the immediate future.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Forthwith ?

MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Practically. I want to wait until the session is over to be able to give the matter a little more consideration.

The session concluded about the 23rd of May and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice did not make the appointment until—how long ago ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The 3rd January.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the statement made to the committee, which has not been contradicted by the hon. Minister of Justice, is correct, if cases have been standing over in the county court and if the county court judge who has been performing these duties has been complaining that the public business of the country is being prejudiced surely we want something more from the hon. Minister of Justice than we have had already. There have been suggestions made throughout the country that this government has been willing on more than one occasion to deal with questions appertaining to the administration of justice for purposes of political expediency and this is one of the worst examples we have had of it. The Minister of Justice is not able to say one word in his defence. Surely he does not pretend that it has taken a whole year to select Mr. Myers for the position. It has been stated by the hon. member for Marquette, and the Minister of Justice has not contradicted him, that it has been well understood in Manitoba for nearly a year that Mr. Myers was to be appointed to the position and it has also been well understoood that Mr. Myers was not appointed because it was not desirable in the interests of the Liberal party that that particular constituency should be opened. Now, if that charge is correct, and the Minister of Justice has not denied it, I say it is a most disgraceful incident that an appointment to the judiciary should be delayed for months, for nearly a year, in order that a particular constituency might not change its political allegiance, in order that the constituency of Minnedosa might be nominally represented by Mr. Myers and might remain disfranchised during the present session of the legislature of Manitoba. Surely my hon. friend the Minister of Justice had better let this item stand until the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) comes in and gives us an explanation of it. The Minister of Justice does not seem to be able to say very much. Perhaps the hon. Minister of the Interior will tell us something about it. I should think that we ought to have some better explanation of what has taken place, or rather of what has not taken place, before the item is allowed to pass.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The statement as to the inconvenience occasioned to the business of the court because of that vacancy is not absolutely in accordance with the facts as I have them in the Department of Justice. Of course, I make this statement subject to the better information of the hon. member for Marquette who has been on the ground, but I may say to him that Judge Prudhomme was appointed for the purpose of assisting Mr. Justice Walker and I have never, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, received a single word of complaint in respect to the administration of justice there. If Mr. Justice Walker had any complaint to make it seems to me that the proper course would have been to make it to the Department of Justice and not through interviews in the newspapers. In respect to the delay in making the appointment, I quite admit that when I made the statement here to

the House last year my expectation was that the appointment would be made at a much earlier date. I can assure the House, and I am sure that the statement which I will make will be accepted in good spirit; that I know absolutely nothing about Mr. Myers being connected with the constituency of Marquette. I knew he was a member of the Local House but it never occurred to my mind that there was any political consideration in connection with the matter. I may say that I had in my mind another gentleman for the position. There were other names suggested of course, but so far as I was personally concerned I had the name of another gentleman in my mind. My hon. friend Mr. Roche, Marquette), must bear in mind that my knowledge of the bar of the provinces outside of Quebec, must of necessity be extremely limited, and when it comes to the selection of a man to occupy the important position of judge it is necessary for me to get information as to the qualification of the person to be appointed. It seems to me that out of necessity I am in that case limited to a large extent to the opinion of the members of the cabinet who represent the different provinces. If a colleague of mine from a particular province makes a suggestion to me, and if after investigation I find that the gentleman whose name has been suggested is worthy, I have not much else to do than to make the appointment. If his qualifications are such as in my judgment entitle him to the position, then I think the discretion of my colleagues should be exercised as regards the selection. My hon. friends have complained a great deal about the delay. The political history of this country so far as the criticism of the government is concerned seems to begin in 1896 with the hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not want to go back into ancient history. I have no reason to complain so far as I am personally concerned of the tone of the debate, or of the manner in which I have been treated, but at the same time I would remind the hon. gentlemen opposite of the delay connected with the appointment of Mr. Masson to the county court judgeship of Huron, and the circumstances under which the appointment was made. I repeat that I do not want to travel over the records, nor do I wish to apply the tu quoque argument, because I think the tu quoque argument is a very poor one indeed. However, my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) has got all the facts. If I have been remiss in the performance of my duty, I must bear the odium. I do not ask the Minister of the Interior or any other minister to defend me if I make a mistake. I have to take the responsibility for my own acts and no matter on whose suggestion I acted I am responsible for what I have done and I do not ask anybody to defend me. I will rely on the defence which I am able to put before the House, but I prefer to rely on a very broken reed so long as it is my own reed, rather than to lean on a heavier prop supplied by somebody else.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister of Justice was unfortunate in mentioning the case of Mr. Masson. The facts in connection with Mr. Masson's appointment were that certain legislation was enacted by the Ontario government which would have debarred Mr. Masson from receiving his appointment, but since these hon. gentlemen themselves came into power they have repealed that very legislation, and the evil complained of that there were too many junior judges in the province of Ontario was immediately accentuated by this very government with the result that they were able to fill up a number of junior judgeships.

Mr. HOLMES. The insinuation thrown out by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) concerning the appointment of Mr. Holt is entirely unfounded, and is purely a matter of imagination on the part of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett). If his facts on other matters are not more reliable than in the present case, there is not very much reliance to be placed on his statements. The hon. gentleman said that it was common rumour in the province of Ontario—

Mr. BENNETT. Common rumour is as good as your word.

Mr. HOLMES. As a matter of fact it was not common rumour in the province of Ontario. Mr. M. C. Cameron was brought out by the largest convention ever held in the county. Mr. Holt was never a candidate in the county of Huron. He expressed a desire not to be a candidate. His name had been mentioned but Mr. Holt determined a number of years ago that he would not be a candidate under any circumstances, and so his name was not mentioned at the convention because the people knew perfectly well that he would not accept the nomination. If Mr. Cameron was in possession of the facts, as the hon. member for East Simcoe said, how comes it that our Conservative friends did not elicit the facts from him when he was in the city of Ottawa. They apparently allowed that opportunity to pass. At all events the statement made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that this was a matter of bargain and sale, is altogether a gratuitous insult.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Another distinction between the case of Mr. Masson and the case of Mr. Myers is to be found in the fact that in the former case we have the definite promise of the Minister of Justice last session that there would be an immediate appointment, and in the other case there was no such promise. The Minister of Justice has given no valid reason to-day why that promise was not fulfilled. I have supplied the reason, and that reason he cannot controvert. He says that he had another gentleman in his mind and I have no doubt that the other gentleman that he had in his

mind was Mr. Royal of St. Boniface who openly stated that he had the promise of this position. When Mr. Myers heard this he took a hurry trip to the city of Winnipeg, saw some of his leading political friends, read the Riot Act to them, and had political pressure brought to bear on the government of the day so that he was promised that after the mid-summer vacation, which would be in the month of September, he would get the appointment. In the meantime some of these political friends had a little conversation together and had come to the conclusion that it would not be discreet to open the constituency of Minnedosa and Mr. Myers was therefore asked to do without this position until the beginning of the year when it would be too late to have a local election. He did so. This he stated openly as the reason, and in the meantime he made his business arrangements in order that he might accept this judgeship at the beginning of the year. The facts, as I have stated them, with reference to Judge Walker being overworked are undeniable. I do not know what facts the Minister of Justice has in his possession, nor am I going to discuss the propriety of Judge Walker giving an interview in the press. Such an interview appears to have been given, not voluntarily on his part, but at any rate it was clear that case after case was going over from one court to another, and he stated in his interview that it was a physical impossibility for him to get through the cases unassisted as he was. As a result he could not take his holidays and there is no doubt that he was overworked. Any person who lives in Winnipeg or in the province of Manitoba knows that what I am saying in this regard is absolutely true. Now, Sir, this is a most pernicious system. If there is any department of the government that should be kept free from political influences to as great an extent as possible, it is the Department of Justice. It is unfortunate that people who are engaged in cases before the court must have their cases held over from month to month at great expense and inconvenience, simply in order to suit the political exigencies of the government of the day. There is no reason to be seen, nor has any reason been given, why this vacancy was left unfilled for one year, except it be to suit the purposes of the local Liberal party in the province of Manitoba.

Civil government—Department of Militia and Defence—Salaries including A. O. Lambert at $800, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $48,300 ; contingencies, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir Frederick Borden). I desire to move to reduce this item by $2,000, owing to the fact that since these estimates were made up there has been a chief clerk superannuated. There are statutory increases in this item which amount to $1,490. These are the ordinary statutory increases except in two cases where there have been promotions from one class to the other, and in the third case, that of Mr. A. O. Lambert the increase is $100 instead of $50, because he had been brought to my notice as a very deserving clerk who was receiving only $700 a year. There is an increase of $1,000 in contingencies and it will be in future necessary to take this vote particularly with reference to the increased printing and stationery. I move that the amount of $48,300 be reduced to $46,300.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who was the first class clerk who was superannuated ? Why was he superannuated, and what was his age ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Mr. Benjamin Sulte was superannuated ; his age I think was 62 years ; he had served 35 years or over and he wished to retire on account of ill health.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did Mr. Lambert pass the Civil Service examination ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, but we are increasing his salary $100 instead of $50 and it is necessary to insert that provision in the item.

Mr. INGRAM. Does this item include travelling expenses for the minister ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that $1,000 was spent last year. I might draw the attention of the members of the government to the fact that there are a few sinners left yet. I remember when they used to find fault with these large items for cab-hire, but they still continue. Perhaps they can justify these items now. I see that the hon. Minister of Militia is down for $96. The Minister of Finance is also down for a handsome little sum.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I shall have great pleasure in explaining the items of my account. I had the misfortune, on the first day of the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, to have my leg broken. I was very anxious to attend the different military functions later on, and I got out at the end of three weeks, at considerable risk, and, not being able to walk, I thought perhaps the country would not object to paying my cab-hire.

Mr. INGRAM. And I wish to say that I have no objection to ministers having a reasonable amount of cab-hire. I am simply reminding hon. gentlemen of some of their old arguments.

Department of the Secretary of State, $47,940.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The increases are all statutory with the exception of the increase to Mr. Baker, for whom the Secretary of State recommends an increase

of $100. The contingencies are somewhat increased, owing to an additional amount for printing and stationery, due to the fact that the work of the department in connection with the issue of patents has greatly increased, though the number of employees has not increased and the expenditure has increased only to a very slight degree.

Mr. WILSON. How long has Mr. Baker been in the service, and what is the reason he is given this $100 increase ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Secretary of State has given me a memorandum in which he states that the only change in the salaries beyond the statutory increases in the case of ten clerks is an extra $50 to Mr. Baker, who besides being a third-class clerk, is an important shorthand writer, and as such often remains at work till six o'clock and sometimes later.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the hon. minister to say that the increase of the contingencies is due to printing and stationery. I observe that last year the expenditure for stationery increased $500, while that for sundries increased $1,400. I suppose that is for sealing wax, stamps, etc.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Probably some increase would be justifiable even for sealing wax, according to the figures furnished me by the head of the department. For instance, in 1896, there were 11,071 letters received, while last year there were 29,000. So that if a reasonable portion of the increase should go to sealing wax, it would probably be wisely employed, because it is well to seal these government letters. This is really becoming a self-sustaining department, because the memorandum shows that the receipts of the office, which, in 1896 amounted to $8,776, last year amounted to $35,800, and for the current fiscal year, up to the end of February, $31,000. All this shows that there is a much larger amount of business being done by the department, and the increase of expenditure is small in proportion to the increase of revenue.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery, $40,840.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Secretary of State informs me that there is practically no change in the salaries of this department, though the item seems to show an increase. The explanation is that three clerks, whose salaries were hitherto paid out of the vote for the House of Commons staff, have been transferred to the Printing Bureau, in accordance with a recommendation made by a committee of the House, who thought that these gentlemen were more properly connected with the Printing Bureau than with the House.

Mr. WILSON. Explain the $800 for Mr. Foran.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Foran is the housekeeper of the Printing Bureau, and his salary has been increased from $700 to $800.

Office of the Comptroller of the North-west Mounted Police, $12,550.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no increase except the statutory increases.

Civil government—office of the auditor general—salaries, $33,562.50 ; contingencies, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This represents the usual statutory increases and also some increases in contingencies which the Auditor General thinks have been made necessary by the growing business of the department.

Civil government — Department of Finance and Treasury Board salaries—The salaries of the staff of the department may be readjusted and appointments made notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $52,340.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am asking the House to give me the same privilege which they gave me several years ago with very excellent results; and I can assure hon. members that I shall be as anxious to administer the vote this time as I did before. Lest there should be any misunderstanding, I may say that I have not in my department a single clerk who has not passed the civil service examination. There are a couple of messengers who have not passed that examination. Under the liberty given me before, I employed one or two persons temporarily until the next civil service examination, but required them to pass that examination, which they did. I am endeavouring to readjust the service of the department by putting in a number of young men to fill the places of officers who have been removed either by death or superannuation. It is an advantage sometimes to give some of these young men a little more than the Civil Service Act will allow. Not long ago, we had no bridge between the $400 of a temporary clerk and the $1,100 minimum of a second class clerk. We created one bridge by making the third class or junior second class clerks. But all you can give a junior second class clerk when he begins is $600. Sometimes you can get a particularly good man who is not prepared to go in for $600, but you might get him for $700 or $800. If he cannot be got in this way you will be obliged to appoint him as second class clerk at $1,100. I may mention another case as an illustration. I desired to have in my service a gentleman who had had experience in banking and, naturally, I looked to the banking field for the person. I found a man who had many years experience in the chartered banks. But, of course, he had not a civil service certificate.

Mr. WILSON. How old was he ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Thirty-five or forty—he went into the chartered

bank service as a boy. Under the Civil Service Act he could not be appointed for he had passed the age allowed by that Act. But, it will be admitted, that a man with that experience would be admirably qualified for the appointment. That gentleman was appointed, but he has since retired because he found better employment outside. I may wish to renew that same class of appointment, and if I could find a gentleman who had had many years experience in a chartered bank that fact of itself would be ample guarantee of his qualification. But such a vote as this would be necessary to enable me to employ him. I assure the House that it is not my desire, except in some special case, to appoint anybody who has not passed the civil service examination. I value the examination, and my desire is to adhere to it very closely. If the House is good enough to allow me to have the vote in the form in which it is put here, as it did once before, the vote will be administered in the same spirit, and, I am confident with the same result.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is practically a repeal of the Civil Service Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As respects this department and temporarily. My hon. friend was not present when I began my explanation—

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But I am sure I have heard some things as good in previous years, because they are the same every year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I have not had this every year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should be glad to hear something new.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) needs it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On this point I certainly do. For this thing goes on year after year in the same way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, not in my department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) Why, we have it in every department every year. The hon. gentleman knows it. Take up the estimates any year during the past five or six years, and you see in the votes for practically every department this same provision, 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' I have brought this to the attention of the government time and time again. It is a most irregular proceeding. The effect of it is that one branch of the legislature repeals an Act of Parliament. For the Senate cannot deal with this provision in the estimates—they must either reject or accept them in their entirety. And so, year after year this branch of the legislature repeals the Civil Service Act. Surely my hon. friend the Minister of Finance can devise some better system. There may be something very new or valuable in the first part of his explanation which I missed. I shall read it with a great deal of care. I must say that I have great doubt that I shall find in it sufficient reason for following in this case the example of other years. I wish to enter my protest against this provision, subject to having my opinion altered by reading what my hon. friend has said.

Civil government—Department of Finance and Treasury Board—contingencies notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $8,510.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, why does this also apply to contingencies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That point I did not explain, and my hon. friend has not missed anything with regard to it. Temporary clerks and messengers are paid out of this contingent fund. They do not go on the ordinary civil service list. There are two young ladies who have hitherto been employed in another branch of the service who are to be employed in the Department of Finance as stenographers. Their salaries are something less than $900. That is the chief item in this vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why must they be removed from the operation of the Civil Service Act ? Why do we need to repeal the Civil Service Act with regard to them. I may be very dense but I confess I do not understand that point so far.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The necessity for this provision here arises from the case of the two messengers to whom I referred who have not civil service certificates. I do not think that it is so important in the case of a messenger as it is in the case of a clerk, and these men are thoroughly capable messengers. The provision is not for the young ladies, both of whom have certificates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And, so far as the young ladies are concerned the Civil Service Act may remain ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, this covers the case of two messengers who have passed the age limit provided for by the Civil Service Act. They have been in the department for a number of years and are eminently fitted for the position.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, I do not see why the hon. gentleman introduced the young ladies at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not wish to introduce the young ladies to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am obliged to my hon. friend, but I think that after being in his department they can stand almost anything.

Mr. WILSON. Do I understand that only those messengers who have passed the civil service examination are entered in the regular list and have their salaries paid out of the salaries vote, but these others must be paid out of contingencies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Temporary clerks are paid out of contingency fund. The only persons in my department who have not civil service certificates are two messengers who have been there for several years.

Mr. WILSON. That applies to all departments ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot answer for all departments, but it applies to mine.

Department of Inland Revenue—salaries, $37,460.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I must congratulate the Minister of Inland Revenue. I think he is the only one of the ministers who gets along without violating the Civil Service Act. There is an increase of $2,000. Perhaps he will be good enough to explain that.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That increase is made up of the following items: Statutory increases, 5 first-class clerks at $50; the names are: J. F. Shaw, J. A. Doyon, T. Westman, Geo. Fowler, R. Quain; 5 second-class clerks at $50 each; the names are: L. E. Hudon, P. A. Hughes, A. McCullough, W. A. Halliday, R. E. Bonchette; 5 second-class juniors at $50, $250; L. G. Roy, B. Chevrier, E. M. Lawless, B. Hagerty, E. Charbonneau; 2 messengers, R. P. Yetts and Napoleon Potvin, one at $20 and the other at $30. In my estimates for next year I propose to ask parliament for two additional second-class juniors. For many years back we have been in the habit of employing what they call temporary clerks. I have two or three in the department who have received salaries under other heads, and I propose to ask for $1,200 more in order to place the salaries of these two second-class juniors at $600 a year, according to the Civil Service Act. In regard to contingencies, there is a decrease of $300; I suppose the hon. gentleman will not blame me for that.

Mr. BENNETT. Last year I asked the Minister of Inland Revenue a question with reference to the purchase of wood alcohol by his department. May I now ask the minister to explain in detail what is the principle of the purchase of this so-called article, wood alcohol.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Some five years ago a contract was entered into with the Standard Chemical Company for the supply of wood alcohol for the department. That contract is still running, and will expire, if I am not mistaken, in July next.

Mr. BENNETT. In order to aid the minister to give the desired information, I will place a few facts before him. In the township of Rama, which is situated in the county of Ontario, there is a concern owned by this Standard Chemical Company, and I find on reference to the Auditor General's Report last year that no less a sum than $22,605 worth of this article was purchased by the department from this company. I am not surprised at the statement made by the minister that a long contract was made with this company. Perhaps before the matter closes the minister will explain the nature of that contract. It is a contract of considerable importance in view of the large sums of money paid by the government to that company. Perhaps the minister knows that the owners of this concern are very prominent Liberals, and in a recent election in that riding the owners of this concern exerted themselves vigorously on behalf of the government candidate. Let me read for the benefit of the minister a statement made by one of the officials of this company, which appeared in the 'Globe' newspaper of March 3rd:

He desired to start his present business before the change of government. He wanted a little help, and went to Ottawa thinking that as an old Conservative he would have little difficulty in his lobbying. He found it impossible to even see several of the ministers on whom he called, and he came away quite disheartened. After the change of government he went down again. He had no difficulty in seeing the ministers, received a fair and business-like hearing, and he found that when the ministers were shown a reasonable proposition and one that was likely to be of benefit to the country, they would assist it. Assistance was promised him, and the result was the establishment of his business in five Canadian towns, and the expense of several millions of dollars. He did not know that the industry would have been started if there had not been a change of government. He thought the government were an honest government, and that the prosperity of the present time was largely due to them. Some manufacturers were complaining that they wanted a higher tariff. This, he thought, was something of a joke. The government would be wise to make no change until they saw some person losing money or going to smash.

Now this statement is made by one of the stockholders of this company, and it is quite plain that having, as he has, the contract with the government, on fair terms, his company are quite satisfied with the tariff. Now, what is the position ? One of the leading members of this company is Mr. Tudhope, the Liberal member in the local legislature for East Simcoe. As this gentleman, Mr. Peuchen, stated, he found it impossible to make terms with the former government for the manufacture of wood alcohol; but when he came down here, the other gentlemen associated with him being

good Liberals, he found no trouble whatever in making terms with the government for the production of this article. I find in the answer given by the minister last session, that he stated :

I understand that the price was fixed by the department. The department is entirely free to buy where it pleases.

Now, it is a most extraordinary state of affairs that here a number of gentlemen have applied to the former administration, and on the terms they were proposing were unable to make a contract, but with the new government they very easily made a contract. These good Liberals come down here and by reason of their influence—and a very powerful influence they no doubt had, which they exerted to the utmost—they are able to make a contract with the government without tender, without any public competition, practically fixing between themselves and the minister the price of this article; and if report is correct, the profits on this business are something enormous. What does the minister propose to do with Mr. Smith, and Mr. Jones, if they start a business ? Are they going to have competition with this company, or is this company to have a monopoly of the business ? It is one of those cases that we find going on all over the Dominion to-day. Here are a few favoured Liberals who come into the field, and without any tender, not in the open market at all, as should be the case when public money is being disbursed, these gentlemen are practically given their own price, and the result is that they secure an enormous sale of over $22,000 worth of their product last year to the department. What do they do in return ? Well, the figures of the last contest answer. In this neighbourhood, at the time of a general election, or at all events of a prior election, the powerful influence of this company went for nothing; but now since they are backed up and buttressed by this government, the result is that, with the aid of this bounty, or subsidy, or whatever you may call it, they succeed in increasing the Liberal vote in that vicinity by 100, in round numbers. Then the Postmaster General comes back and says it is a great triumph for a lower rate of protection. One of the greatest changes in the whole riding of North Ontario was made in this very district where a company of friends of the government are paid a handsome subsidy, and where pressure was brought—because there has been pressure brought—of course it is fair to the minister to state that at the time he was not the head of the department. But I think it is fair to the House and to the country to explain how it was possible that, without any competition, the government should give to a party of their friends a contract which enures to the benefit to the tune of over $22,000 in a single year. I think the matter is one for fair discussion and comment; and I ask the minister now to explain what is done with all this wood alcohol, and what is its selling price after it is purchased by the department ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If the hon. gentleman had thought proper to wait until we reached the item which concerns that article, I would have been in a better position to satisfy him with the information he desires to get. I have stated that a contract was made with the Rathbun Company and the Standard Chemical Company about five years ago by which the government was to buy from these firms the wood alcohol needed for the manufacture of methylated spirits. The price agreed upon, if I am not mistaken, was $1.40, with the condition that if the company could not supply the quantity required the department would be at liberty to buy the same article in the United States or elsewhere. The contract has been running since 1898 ; and I am surprised to hear to-day that the Standard Chemical Company, or some members of it, took an active part in the last election campaign. By-elections have taken place, and general elections have taken place since the contract was made, and these gentlemen who are said to have exerted great influence in that section of the country in the last election, do not seem to have exerted the same influence in elections in days gone by. I presume my hon. friend will not hold me responsible for any change of opinion that may have taken place in North Ontario, any more than I would hold him responsible for the persistence of opinion in the province of Quebec. But if my hon. friend desires to have more information with regard to that matter, I advise him to wait until we reach that item later on in the estimates, when I will be glad to give him all the information I have in the department. I may add that under this contract the department purchases every year from the above companies wood alcohol to the value of about $20,000. At the time that contract was made there was no other concern in Canada in a position to supply the government with wood alcohol, except the Rathbun Company at Deseronto, which, I understand, was afterwards merged with the Standard Chemical Company. That explains how it is that this contract was given to the combined companies.

Mr. BENNETT. Now that the minister has thrown a little light on the subject we understand why this company exerted their influence. Some two years ago, I understand, the company did not interfere in the same manner in which they did on this last occasion. According to the 'Globe,' the Postmaster General was present at that meeting, which was addressed by other members of the company, and perhaps the fact that the contract would expire next year might not be renewed on similar terms, was an inducement to that company to act

in the way they did, pitching into the fight and muzzling their men as they did on that occasion. Of course the minister is not aware of that. But the fact remains that here is the department making a contract with party friends, without public tender, without public competition at all, a contract for a five years' term; and it is a well-known fact in the neighbourhood that the undertaking has been a very profitable one to those gentlemen. And the fact that the term is about to expire, and that the company were looking for a renewal of the contract will probably explain why they put the screws on as they did in this last election, and brought about such a change of the vote in North Ontario. There was no change in any other district of the county to the same extent, and I think it is reasonable to conclude that the change was owing to the active influence of this company, bonused, or subsidized, or subventioned, or whatever you may term it, by the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How is the price ascertained ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I understand that the price agreed upon was exactly the same that we had to pay when we imported the article from Germany. There is almost a prohibitory duty on the same article imported from the United States, $2.50, I think. When the contract was made, that was the only concern in a position to supply wood alcohol.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do I understand that $1.40 is the price at which a similar article could be imported from Germany without paying the duty ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am informed that before the contract was awarded a contract was entered into with a Montreal firm who used to import the same article from France and Germany, and who sold it at $1.40. The same price which we pay to the Standard Chemical Company.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the intention of the government to ask for tenders at the expiration of this contract ? I think some notice should be given to the public so that other parties may have an opportunity of making offers for the supply of this article.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The department has not yet taken any action as respects that matter. I presume before the session closes we will ask for tenders, but the department has not yet concluded what course to adopt.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any correspondence with the company with respect to a renewal of that contract ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the manager of the company interviewed the government on that point ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, not to my knowledge.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is very odd that when one of the gentlemen, in fact, the very gentleman who made that speech was here in the city, in view of the fact that the contract is about to expire and that he must, of course, sooner or later, see the minister about it, he did not call upon the minister.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He called upon me.

Mr. BENNETT. So that the question of renewal went without discussion.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. He must have come down to report the good work he had done at the election.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He had to report to some other people perhaps.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it would be unfair to the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that he should have to shoulder this contract, because, when it was made, he was not the Minister of Inland Revenue. The gentleman who apparently took to himself the credit at this public meeting at Longford was the hon. Postmaster General who, according to the report of the Toronto 'Globe' :

> Recalled the interviews he had had with Mr. Peuchen in reference to the establishment of this industry and the promise of the government to encourage it by traffic regulations, and buy, after its establishment, part of the product of wood alcohol for the manufacture of methylated spirits. It was simply the duty of the government to give Mr. Peuchen a fair hearing. They desired no thanks for that, and any other gentleman with an equally good business scheme would be entitled to, and would, of course, receive as careful consideration from them. *

Does the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue echo these sentiments ? I presume he will, but in the first place, I want to know whether he is prepared to enter into a contract for the purchase of an article to the tune of $20,000 without competition. There was no competition when this contract was made, and yet the Postmaster General, with his usual modesty, at this public meeting at the works, took great credit to himself for having made the contract. I think it is fair for the committee to know, and I am going to ask the hon. minister for an answer, because I may not happen to be here when his estimates are taken up, as to whether the minister is pre-

pared to give a similar contract to this company for five years without any competition when the present contract expires ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I may say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) that I have waited, and I will wait two or three months till the expiration of the contract before doing any thing in the matter. I have been informed that some other people want to start a similar business in another part of the Dominion, and if there are other people engaged in the same line of business I will do what we have done in regard to the distillers—buy our supply according to the production of each of these concerns.

Mr. BENNETT. That will be a very encouraging reply to give to gentlemen who wish to engage in this business. It is quite as vague as the promises made by the government to the manufacturers of this country. The hon. minister states that he will wait until the contract expires and then pronounce his ultimatum as to whether there are to be tenders called for and competition invited in the purchase of this article. How does the hon. minister expect that any person else is going into the manufacture of this alcohol if he is not to know until the expiration of the contract what the minister's policy is ? Does not the hon. minister think that it is due to himself to state what his policy is, because, after all said and done, this $22,500 which is paid during the year to this company, is not the personal money of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. It is the money of the people of Canada. What does the hon. minister propose to do next year ? Is he going to buy this article from the company without any competition ? Would it not be better for him to say frankly, so that if any person else wishes to engage in the manufacture of wood alcohol he can at once invest in the necessary plant, that there will be competition in the purchase of this article ? Is the hon. minister prepared to go that far ? I have reason to believe there are other people who are anxious to engage in the sale of this article, but knowing the influence of these gentlemen who are behind this concern, they have reason to believe that if they had this article to sell they would not find a purchaser in the Inland Revenue Department, because the rule must prevail, as it has prevailed for the last five years, that the purchase of this article should be made from this company exclusively. Here we have the hon. Postmaster General stating that he had arranged with this concern, that they were to be encouraged and that their output was to be taken, or a part of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I challenge the statement.

Mr. BENNETT. I will simply read for the benefit of the Postmaster General, as he was not in before, the statement made at the meeting at Longford, where these works are situated, as reported in the 'Globe' of March 3rd :

> Sir William recalled the interviews he had had with Mr. Peuchen in reference to the establishment of this industry and the promise of the government to encourage it by traffic regulations, and buy, after its establishment, part of the product of wood alcohol for the manufacture of methylated spirits.

Nothing more definite could be said than that.

> It was simply the duty of the government to give Mr. Peuchen a fair hearing——

Mr. Peuchen did not care for the fair hearing ; what he wanted to get was a standing contract that would guarantee him for five years the privilege of selling this article to the government. It stands on a par with the arrangement made by the government with the American Bank Note Company—first making a contract and then establishing the concern. Before this industry was established he made that arrangement with them. The department is bound down under a contract without competition, to take wood alcohol to the extent of $22,500 a year, and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue goes farther ; he says that to-day he will not state publicly that he will purchase this article by open competition, but if there is another establishment doing business in Canada, he will see if he cannot do business with them. Surely it is unfair to use the public money in this manner, and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue owes it to himself to state that no more contracts for the purchase of wood alcohol will be made without open tender in competition.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite recollect the interview I had with the gentleman who was engaged in promoting the industry some years ago and at the meeting in question I narrated as accurately as I could remember the events of the occasion. I stated that this gentleman and Mr. Thomson called upon me in Ottawa as a minister, though the matter was not in my department, and told me that this was a very important industry, that it had scarcely an existence in Canada then, and that it was entirely suitable to Canadian conditions. They showed me that out of raw material which we have in such lavish quantities in Canada, valuable products could be obtained. I was convinced of the usefulness of the enterprise and stated to them that it being so suitable to Canada, the industry was deserving of all reasonable encouragement. As to my saying to them that we were going to take the output, I suppose that mistake arose on account of the reporter having to condense the statement. Mr. Peuchen and Mr. Thompson spoke and they may have given their views to the press.

They may have said how they had been aided by the government in bringing their industry into existence, and if they stated that they stated what was perfectly right, proper and justifiable. They felt very grateful to us that we had given an intelligent hearing to their application. Mr. Peuchen told us that he at one time was a Conservative, that he came to Ottawa during the regime of the Conservative party, that he endeavoured to lay his case before them, that he did not even get a courteous hearing; that in fact a hearing was refused him. He said he went away having lost all sympathy for the Conservative party because of the treatment extended to him on his attempt to submit to them an industry entitled to fair consideration. That is what Mr. Peuchen stated publicly.

Mr. COCHRANE. What has that got to do with it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He stated publicly that was the treatment accorded to the enterprise by the late government, and the very opposite treatment which was accorded by us is what has secured for us the good will of that enterprising concern that is now establishing these industries in Longford, Deseronto and Compton and perhaps other places, employing I do not know how many men and spending perhaps $150,000 or $200,000 a year amongst the people.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the nature of Mr. Peuchen's request?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not state that Mr. Peuchen made any request.

Mr. CLANCY. The Postmaster General said Mr. Peuchen had a hearing and that his request was granted. What was his request?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When Mr. Peuchen spoke to me on the subject he laid before me in a general way the advantage to Canada of an enterprise such as he proposed to embark in. As to the particular form of encouragement to be given him, I do not remember what it was, nor as a matter of fact did I ever have occasion so far as I recollect to interest myself in the matter after that interview. I was impressed with the idea that it was an important enterprise especially adapted to Canada, and I am of the opinion still; but it did not happen to be necessary for him I suppose to enlist my active services because I have no recollection of ever having interviewed any minister on his behalf in any respect whatever. I gave him what sympathetic encouragement I could and if he had desired any assistance from me at a later stage, I would be pleased within proper limits to have extended it to him. My connection with the matter began and ended I think with the interview which I have alluded to.

Mr. BENNETT. As the Postmaster General was not in the House a while ago, I will read to him what Mr. Peuchen stated at that meeting. Mr. Peuchen does state in effect that his proposition was not received favourably by the Conservative administration and I can readily believe that. Here was a company coming to the Conservative administration and asking to have what is practically a monopoly of the manufacture of wood alcohol in this Dominion. Mr. Peuchen says that he asked for this monopoly and he was refused it by the Conservative government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He does not say that. He says he could not get an interview. He never asked for a monopoly.

Mr. BENNETT. I will read what he stated.

> He desired to start his present business before the change of government. He wanted a little help and went to Ottawa, thinking that as an old Conservative he would have little difficulty in his 'lobbying.' He found it impossible to even see several of the ministers upon whom he called and he came away quite disheartened.

It is plain that he wanted a little assistance as he puts it, and he thought some lobbying would do it, but what he desired was to get a hard and fast contract with the Department of Inland Revenue at that time for the sale of his product at his own price, and he tells us quite frankly that he could not get it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That he could not get an interview.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister need not be so facetious about a person not being able to see a cabinet minister. Why there are times when some of the ministers of the present day won't see one another; we had an exhibition of that yesterday. I have no doubt whatever that Mr. Peuchen found it impossible to make the bargain with the Conservative ministers which he made with the present Liberal ministers, because the arrangement which he wanted then and has now received was a preposterous arrangement. Mr. Peuchen says:

> After the change of government he went down again. He had no difficulty in seeing the ministers, received a fair and businesslike hearing, and he found that when the ministers were shown a reasonable proposition, and one that was likely to be a benefit to the country, they would assist it. Assistance was promised him and the result was the establishment of his business.

According to the Minister of Inland Revenue the assistance to be given was that this company was given a contract for

the sale of their product. The Minister of Inland Revenue tells us that this Mr. Peuchen was here the other day and after Mr. Peuchen made quite a change in that constituency he comes down for his reward and the Minister of Inland Revenue tells us that his reward is to be that for the next five or ten years this company is to have a monopoly for the sale of this article. Does the Minister of Inland Revenue believe that in view of the approaching expiry of this contract, it is not a good business proposition to call at once for tenders for the sale of this alcohol. Is not that the proper way to conduct public business. The Minister of Inland Revenue knows well that it is, but apparently he is being held up by this company and has to give them the contract.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words on this wood alcohol. I am fairly well conversant with the prices which prevailed for this article prior to the present arrangement being made by the government. At one time the wholesale price of wood alcohol to the public was $2.25, but we are able to buy it now for $1.35. I may also say that the consumption of wood alcohol has increased possibly three times what it was before. The general public, at all events in the part of Canada I came from use wood alcohol in large quantities and this arrangement made by the government has reduced the price practically one-half to them. I think I am not going too far when I say that if the Minister of Inland Revenue was able to make arrangement whereby the price of wood alcohol was reduced by one-half, he is deserving of every commendation. So far as I am personally concerned, I have spent thousands of dollars in the purchase of wood spirits, and to-day I am able to buy for the same price nearly double the quantity that I bought formerly, and able to give the general public the benefit of this decreased price.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General said that when Mr. Peuchen came down here and introduced himself, there was no other industry of the kind in Canada. Now, I wish to contradict that statement right here and now. Wood alcohol has been made at Deseronto by the Rathbun Co. for years, and they supplied the late Conservative government with it. When the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Hon. Mr. Costigan) was Minister of Inland Revenue, I went with Capt. Carter time and again to the department to urge them to take larger quantities than they were doing, because they were then importing a certain quantity from Germany. The Rathbun Co. offered to supply it at the same price as the price in Germany without any duties added, and they claimed that they ought to have some protection on this article. The Rathbun Co. are making wood alcohol yet; and yet the hon. Postmaster General tries to make the people of this country believe that by his entering into this corrupt bargain with a Conservative in order to get him to support the Grit party, he is helping to establish a new industry, whereas the fact is that it is an old industry.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think I am correct in saying that until I heard Mr. Peuchen speak the other night, I was not aware that he had a contract with the government. What my hon. friend means by talking of my making a contract I do not know. I think he ought to explain, or not make such a statement. Mr. Peuchen made a contract with the government some years ago, but under what circumstances he did so I do not recollect. Certainly it was not made with me. I do not suppose there was anything wrong in the contract; I presume the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue can explain it. Nor did I say that the industry of wood alcohol had not before existed in Canada. I said that Mr. Peuchen pointed out to me the importance of the industry treating wood in the way they proposed to treat it. He produced some figures showing the extent of the industry in the United States and the great importance of such an industry in Canada; but whether or not it had a footing in Canada before, either in a sickly or a healthy condition, I am not aware. My impression is that it was proposed to put the industry on an extensive footing by the Peuchen and Thompson enterprise.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to call attention to one remark the hon. Postmaster General made that night, according to the statement that appeared in the 'Globe.' The statement is that the members of the government, and the hon. Postmaster General was one of them, promised assistance to this industry.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When was it?

Mr. BENNETT. I presume it was five years ago, when he came down here. That assistance was not by way of bounty, because there is no bounty payable for the production of this article. What was the assistance that was promised? According to the statement of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, without any public competition, without asking for tenders at all, a hard and fast bargain was entered into with this company to take a great part of its product. What has been the result? That under the arrangement made, this company has had an exclusive contract with the department; and the worst of it is that the Minister of Inland Revenue, in face of the fact that next year the department will, probably require $25,000 worth of this article, and in view of the fact that this contract is soon to expire, is not prepared to tell the House that he proposes to call for tenders for the supply of this article,

but he says that when the contract expires, he will then make up his mind what he will do. Surely he does not expect that other companies will go into the enterprise when he practically informs the House that this company will have the contract for all time to come.

Mr. HEYD. It appears that the government have entered into a contract whereby wood alcohol, which was formerly made in Germany, is now made in Canada. I do not think they should be condemned for that. According to the statement made by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), although wood alcohol is made in Deseronto, in order to induce the late government to buy it, the manufacturer had to get the whip of the Conservative party to intercede for him, and through his influence they bought some part of this man's product at the price they were paying to Germany. That was the condition of affairs apparently at the time the present government made a contract with a concern which established an industry in Canada for the purpose of converting wood by-products into alcohol. The result has been a reduction in the price to the community and the establishment of a new industry in the country; which is something for which the hon. gentlemen opposite ought to congratulate the government. What plan will ultimately be followed only time and circumstances can determine. But hon. gentlemen have no right to assume that a dishonest agreement will be entered into because the agreement that has been entered into has inured to the benefit of the people of Canada by reducing the price of wood alcohol and introducing a new industry into the country.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue what he does with this wood alcohol.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I find a very interesting item in the Auditor General's report bearing on this matter. It appears that the Minister of Inland Revenue is buying some $20,000 worth of wood alcohol from the Standard Chemical Company without any competition. I find that in 1896 we bought $19,000 worth of wood alcohol from the Rathbun Company without any competition; but there is this important difference between the two cases: at that time we paid $1.60 a gallon, while under the present arrangement we pay $1.40 a gallon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood the hon. gentleman from Burrard to state that the ordinary price in Canada now is $1.35 per gallon and that the price is now one half what it formerly was.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He referred to the methylated spirits, and not to wood alcohol pure, if I understood him rightly. I think he mentioned methylated spirits.

Mr. BENNETT.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He did not do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was discussing what I understood the hon. gentleman to have said. I would like to know what the total production of the company is and the cost.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We cannot ascertain what is the total production of the concern. I may say that when that contract was made, there were only two firms manufacturing that article—The Standard Chemical Company and the Rathbun Company. They both amalgamated, no doubt in order to secure the contract. The price given before was from $1.40 to $1.60. The contract was entered into five years ago. I do not care whether the parties were Liberal or Conservative. My impression is that Mr. Rathbun was a Conservative and so was Mr. Peuchen. The contract was given them because there were no other manufacturers of that article in the country. We could not get people to enter into the manufacture of alcohol for the sake of securing a contract of $1,500 or $2,000.

Mr. BENNETT. $22,000.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Would my hon. friend have a little patience? I have said that gentlemen have approached me and asked if I would give them the contract provided that they would engage in that business. I said no, but they might go into the manufacture of that article and I would do with them as I did with the distillers. I would give each manufacturer an order according to his production and buy from each at the current price.

Mr. OSLER. The objection raised is that this contract, which is about to expire in two months, is to be renewed with the same parties in order to prevent others from tendering.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. OSLER. The only fair way would be to advertise now for tenders, so that others might have the right to compete. Let me tell the hon. minister what perhaps he does not know, and what may explain why the present contractors are so anxious to have their contract renewed. A very large German firm is now investigating with a view of manufacturing wood alcohol by a new process, which has been accepted by the leading chemists in Germany and by which it could be manufactured at one-fifth its present cost. It is therefore only natural those people who have the contract to-day should be anxious to renew it for another five years. But it is not fair to the country that such a contract should be renewed. There is every reason why the government should advertise for tenders and let the public know two months in advance.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Inland Revenue if he has any data to show the price of wood alcohol in other countries ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, I could not say.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the hon. minister not know that the price which the government is paying is abnormally large ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It may be, but we have no choice.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did the Hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) make any pledge to the Standard Chemical Company that the contract would be renewed or did any other Minister of the Crown make any such pledge ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose we shall all have to rise one after another and give an answer. I have offered no pledge.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any change in the duty since this government came into power and about the time the contract was entered into ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. The tariff of 1896 on wood alcohol was $2.25, but this free trade government made it $2.40. We have now the secret of Mr. Peuchen coming down and interviewing the government. The government did not turn a deaf ear to his request. He got a contract and he also got security that the Germans would not be allowed to send any alcohol in at the same price. I think that the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Finance might have taken the House into their confidence an hour ago and given us the inner history of this contract.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman's explanation is very ingenious, but there is a little bit of an anachronism about it. The interview took place a few years ago and after the tariff of 1897. The tariff was revised in 1897, and I understand the Minister of Inland Revenue to say that that contract was for five years and has not yet expired. Therefore, it cannot date further back than 1898. Therefore, it cannot be earlier than 1898.

Mr. CLANCY. Quite so, but you are more generous than the hon. gentleman anticipated. First Mr. Peuchen got in advance of the tariff, and then he came a second time and got the sole contract.

Mr. BELL. As I understood it, the sale of methylated alcohol is entirely in the hands of the government. Now, what is the price at which the government sells ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. A dollar ten.

Mr. BELL. What is the proof strength ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Sixty-six or sixty-seven over proof.

Mr. BELL. Is it the same now as in 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is a little stronger.

Mr. BELL. What percentage of wood alcohol is added to the ethyl alcohol ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Twenty-five per cent.

Mr. BELL. Is that alcohol proof strength?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Sixty-five over proof.

Mr. BELL. Then it is sold at a dollar ten?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. A dollar ten for grade No. 1, and $1.40 for grade No. 2.

Mr. PORTER. The evil effects of the course which has been pursued in the department in dealing with this matter are very apparent from the discussion which has taken place. Wood alcohol, it has been stated—in fact it has been admitted by the Minister of Inland Revenue—was manufactured in Canada before the Standard Chemical Company obtained a contract from this government. It was manufactured, to my own personal knowledge in Deseronto, by the Rathbun Company. As Canadians with their money invested in an enterprise, they had a perfect right to be allowed at least opportunity of free competition with any who might come against them. But we find that this has not been allowed. The contract was made with the Standard Chemical Company, and the Rathbun Company were not given an opportunity of applying.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I beg the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Porter's) pardon. I stated only a moment ago that the contract was given to the Standard Chemical Company and the Rathbun Company, and that they amalgamated.

Mr. PORTER. What I say is that the contract was let without tenders being called for, and it was given to the Standard Chemical Company. Of course I accept what the hon. minister says. But notwithstanding that, the facts are that, after this contract was given by the government, the Rathbun Company leased their works and concern to the Standard Chemical Company. And why ? Because they were driven out of business by the action of the government in dealing in this matter. And the unfairness of the action of the government will become more apparent when I point out the fact that the lease which was taken from the Rathbun Company after the contract was given by this government does not expire until after the contract now ex-

isting between the Standard Chemical Company and this government expires. What position is the Rathbun Company in to-day to enter into competition with the Standard Company? The Rathbun Company are Canadians who have established themselves in this country. And are the Standard Company Canadians? They are importations from the United States to a large extent. This is not fair treatment, nor is it good principle for the government to go upon to give these contracts without open competition by advertising for tenders.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) is in error in saying that the personel are from the United States.

Mr. PORTER. I did not say entirely—they are largely from the United States.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know the whole personel of the company. The only two I know are Mr. Peuchen and Mr. Thompson, of Longford.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman is forgetting Mr. Tudhope.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know whether Mr. Tudhope is in it or not. But, even so, he is a good Canadian now. He has cast in his lot with us and has been here for years, and he rendered excellent service in North Ontario.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. It being six o'clock——

The PRIME MINISTER. It was understood with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that we would not sit to-night. Perhaps it would be well to let this item pass and adjourn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER. If hon. gentlemen opposite wish to sit to-night I have no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Carry out the agreement with the leader of the opposition, and let the House adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item has no relation to the subject we have been discussing. The Minister of Inland Revenue has stated that this question would come up in its proper order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. Another item will come up upon which the subject which the committee has been debating can be discussed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think that is perfectly right.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. PORTER.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Marine for the year ended 30th June, 1902.—Hon. Raymond Préfontaine.

On motion of the Prime Minister House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 20, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

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

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting that their Honours will unite with this House in the formation of a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of the printing of parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, namely: Messrs Bennett, Casgrain, Clarke, Davis, Holmes, Hughes (Victoria), Hyman, Johnston (Cape Breton), Johnston (Lambton), LaRivière, Lavergne, Loy, Maclean, McColl, Marcil (Bonaventure), Oliver, Parmelee, Préfontaine, Richardson, Scott, Sutherland (Oxford), Taylor, Thompson and Tisdale will act as members on the part of this House on the said joint committee on the printing of parliament.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

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

That a select committee composed of Messrs Borden (Halifax), Bourassa, Brock, Calvert, Casgrain, Clancy, Clark, Demers (St. John and Iberville), Russell, Fraser, Heyd, Hyman, Johnston (Lambton), Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Monk, Scott and Wade be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the library of parliament so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the library; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 21) to Amend and Consolidate the Law respecting Railways. He said: Mr. Speaker, I made a statement to the House a year ago, when I was introducing a Bill similar to this, which I think was a fairly comprehensive statement of the objects and purposes of the proposed legislation. Inasmuch as I would wish to confirm and be understood as repeating what I then said, I would refer hon. gentlemen who may desire to avail themselves of the reference, to Hansard of

last session, page 2431. I do not wish to extend my explanatory statement to any greater length than is necessary ; but there are some things which I shall perforce be compelled to repeat.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it would be as well for the hon. gentleman to make a fairly full statement. There are a good many new members in the House, and it may be a little difficult for all of us to refresh our memories in the way he suggests.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to convey to the House as complete a view of the general scope of this legislation as I can. The Bill is substantially the same as that which was introduced last session. There have been a few changes, but those changes, I think, are not material and do not essentially affect the main principles of the measure as introduced last year. I think the Bill has been simplified, it has been considerably condensed, and in its general reconstruction a good deal of thought has been given to it in order to perfect it in every possible way. The proposal is, as it then was, to abolish the existing Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and to substitute for that body a railway commission composed of members independent of the government, independent of parliament in a practical sense, though not in the broadest sense, and capable, as we think and hope they will be, by experience and ability, of making thoroughly effective the legislation we are now proposing to place on the statute book.

There are various kinds of railway commissions, as hon. members know. Commissions have been constituted in other countries, not possessing any controlling or executive power, but of a purely advisory character. Other commissions have been created, particularly in some of the colonial dependencies of the Crown, which have had under their management and control the government railways in those colonies. Commissions have also been established—and it is to this type that the one we are proposing to constitute will belong—not for the purpose of operating railways themselves, but for the purpose of exercising control over the operation of railways, in regard to rates, the manner in which the trains shall be equipped, the manner in which crossings shall take place, and generally the manner in which the public shall be protected in the use of the railways.

In constructing this Bill, we have naturally availed ourselves of the experience of those countries in which railway commissions of this kind have been established. In Great Britain a railway commission was established first as far back as 1873. Some material and important changes took place in the constitution of that commission, in the direction of enlarging and extending its powers, in 1888, and it practically exists to-day as it was then constituted. In preparing this Bill, we have availed ourselves of the experience of that railway commission. We have also turned our attention to the legislation which has been adopted in the various states of the union, as well as the general legislation of Congress. We have also, as the House knows, availed ourselves of the results of the inquiries which were made by a special commissioner appointed by us for the purpose, Mr. McLean, who made to the government two reports upon his inquiries in the United States and his investigation of the existing railway troubles in Canada. We have based some of the provisions of the Bill upon the results at which he arrived —we think correctly—in his study of these various problems, and we have sought generally to turn to useful account the best features of the legislation of Great Britain and the United States. It has been found in the mother country that the operation of the railway commission, though not removing all troubles, and though not a complete and effective remedy for all difficulties, has been on the whole fairly satisfactory. Mr. McLean points out that it has exercised a useful influence for the prevention of arbitrary exactions by railways, that it has been recognized as an unbiased arbiter in railway disputes, and that it has much improved the position of shippers. The defects generally recognized are defects which are incidental to the legislation and the lack of hearty co-operation on the part of the judiciary of the country. In the United States similar defects and others have been discovered, which he points out. He says that there political considerations play a great part in the choice of commissioners, even when they are not elective, and they are elective in a great many cases. He says the term for which the commissioners are appointed is too short ; in none of the states it it more than five years, while in many it is less. Another defect admitted by thoughtful men is that the salaries paid to the commissioners are too low, and in consequence it has not been found possible to secure men of the quality required, by training, experience and general fitness, for the successful operation of these commissions. He says—and this is a question which has attracted a great deal of attention in the United States, and has been discussed in a great many works treating of the subject—that frequent appeals and the enormous amount of litigation arises in connection with the working out of their scheme, been most detrimental to the successful operation of the measure. Litigation springs up on all sides and in respect of all questions. The judicial interpretations of the various clauses of the law and the judicial decisions in respect of the findings of the commission upon the question of facts, have been so conflicting that practically the powers of the commissioners are absolutely

nullified. In this connection, an eminent judge of the United States Supreme Court, Judge Harlan, says: 'The Inter-State Commission has been shorn by judicial interpretations of the authority to do anything of an effective character.' It has also been pointed out that the American legislation respecting the inter-state law was arrived at by a compromise between the transportation interests on the one hand and the producing interests on the other, and apparently there was no fixed aim in view in the establishment of these tribunals. One side probably contended that there was no need at all for such tribunals, and the other side insisted that it was imperative in the public interest that they should be established, and between the two a compromise was reached whereby, while these tribunals were established, they were not endowed with powers which all agree are imperatively necessary if they are to do effective work. But notwithstanding the defects admittedly existing under the system in force in the various states of the union and the United States as a whole, many men who have studied railway questions believe that these railway commissions have done much good. Mr. Blanchard, a well-known authority on railway matters, points out that the following good results have been achieved through this legislation:

1. It has secured more publicity of rates.
2. It has lessened open rate wars.
3. It has tended to equalize long and short haul rates.
4. It has exercised beneficial warning or police powers.

Meaning by that, that the provisions incorporated in the different railway bills imposing penalties for the omission to do or for the doing of certain acts has had a most salutary effect, by acting as a warning to companies that if they violated these conditions they might be made suffer the consequences.

5. It has silenced much unjust clamor against the railways.
6. It has been mutually educational.
7. It has been judiciously administered.
8. It has benefited the smaller shipper.
9. By obtaining a better classification it has afforded a more uniform basis for rate making.
10. Its statistical work has been of great value.
11. It has exercised important supervisory functions in regard to the application of automatic couplers and safety appliances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all these objects are aimed at in the present Bill, and in order that we may if possible successfully achieve them, in the face of difficulties which will constantly arise, we have strengthened the hands of the commission we are constituting. We are investing it with larger powers, we are giving it more executive authority, and we have in this respect perhaps gone beyond any legislation which has been passed in any other country up to the present day. The commission, under this Bill, will exercise all the powers which are now vested in the railway commission of the Privy Council. We propose to constitute a court to consist of three or five members. I confess to a personal preference for three, but I do not assume that my judgment is necessarily sounder than that of others, and I invite an expression of opinion from hon. members on both sides on this point when we come to discuss the subject in detail. Therefore we leave the number in blank for the present. It is proposed that the commission shall be constituted a court of record. The tenure of office is to be a term of ten years, and each member is eligible to re-appointment. We have fixed an age limit of 75 years, beyond which no person can remain a member of the board. The Bill which we submitted last year contained, and the present Bill, when printed, will be found to contain a clause providing that the members of the commission are only removable on an address of both Houses of parliament to the Governor General. This, on full consideration, we concluded to change, and although the Bill when it is distributed will contain such a clause, it is an oversight which will be remedied in committee. We propose that the members of the commission shall be removable in the same manner as the lieutenant governors of the provinces, namely, by the Governor General in Council, for cause.

We confer upon the majority of the board the power of deciding any question, but one member of the commission may make an order, providing the case or the matter is not one of a contentious character and is not opposed. We propose also that the meetings of the board may be migratory. The board may move from place to place, provided, however, that such meetings can only take place with the approval of the Minister of Railways for the time being.

We leave the salaries of the commission open for the present, and will make a proposal to the committee when we reach that stage in the consideration of the Bill.

I now come to an important feature of the Bill, the importance of which you will have recognized in view of what I said a moment ago as to the unsatisfactory experience in the United States by reason of the facilities for litigation on all sorts of questions under their system. We propose that the commission shall be the absolute judges of both law and fact, subject to two exceptions. The commission will be absolute judges as to the facts, only subject to appeal to the Governor General in Council. They will be absolute judges of the law, except when a question of jurisdiction arises, which of course it would be quite impossible to restrict in any way, but they may state a case to the Supreme Court in the event of any question of legal importance arising.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. At whose instance is the submission to be prepared, at the in-

stance of the litigants, or at that of the board ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would be prepared by the board—the board would submit the legal question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. minister does not understand the object of my hon. friend's (Hon. Mr. Haggart's) question. Will either litigant or both litigants have the right to have a case submitted, or will that be done only in the discretion of the board and on its own initiative ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the discretion of the board, just as it is in the discretion of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to-day ; we have made no change in that respect.

Following the clauses I have just referred to you will find a variety of sections, very much in the order in which they appear in the existing Railway Act, dealing, first, with the construction of railways. These clauses will be found between 176 and 205 ; and, except where, we think, they have been improved somewhat, are very much the same as the existing legislation. We have made the usual provision in this Bill for the inspection of railways, and have made similar provision, with immaterial amendments, as respects the operations of railways. We now come to the question of tolls, in respect of which there has been a material change. The provisions that we incorporate in this Bill with regard to the control, supervision and regulation of tolls are, in large measure, adapted from similar provisions in the English and American enactments on the subject, so far, of course as the provisions would be applicable to this country. We carefully provide against undue discrimination, undue preference and advantages of any kind. We have incorporated here provisions regarding the long and the short haul. We think we have adequately and completely protected shippers, and all those who use the railways, in the enjoyment of equal facilities. We have directed attention in the Bill to the question of through traffic, both within Canada and from Canada to and from other countries. We provide for a uniform freight classification. The powers we give to the board include power to alter the freight classifications, so that they may be not only uniform, but that they may be more equitable and just to the shipper. In framing the clauses with regard to tolls, we have exercised all possible care. The provisions have been drawn up after consultation with men who have had long practical experience with respect to railway tolls. And, while we have endeavoured in a proper way to protect the rights of the transportation companies, we have assumed absolute and complete control with regard to what their rates shall be.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is a very important statement, and this provision seems to be the principle one of the Bill. Does the Bill give the commissioners absolute power of determining and fixing tolls ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. Short of that, we do not see how the commission can be successfully worked. That is one of the things which has occasioned no end of trouble in the United States, and we think that in any other way it would be quite impossible to avoid the same experience in this country.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If there is no objection on the part of the hon. minister to the asking of questions at this stage, I would be glad if he would say whether this would apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the government railways ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The fixing of tolls, so far as relates to the Canadian Pacific Railway is subject, as the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) knows, to some limitation in a part of Canada, according to the generally accepted interpretation of the act under which that company was chartered. We presume we cannot interfere with their rates until they are paying a dividend up to ten per cent. In the other parts of Canada the Canadian Pacific would be subject to this law as all other railways. We have not provided that the government railways shall come under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission any more than they have come under the control of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. We leave the law exactly as we find it in that respect.

Mr. INGRAM. Then the government railways may do as they like about rates ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The government railways have always been able to do that, in the sense which, I suppose, the hon. gentleman means. Of course, the government railways cannot do as they like ; they must do as the people or the government likes.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, in the matter of rates, how is the uniformity to be secured, if the government railways are not under control ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have always had uniformity on the government railways.

Mr. INGRAM. But not uniform with other lines.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not possible to secure absolute uniformity on all railways. In fact it is not possible to secure uniformity on any one very extensive railway, because its freight is carried over different parts of the system under varying conditions. You do not have uniformity on the Canadian Pacific, and never can have, though the Can-

adian Pacific were clearly subject to the operation of the law throughout its entire system.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. minister tell us why the government railways should not be under the control of the commission just the same as other railways ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am willing to discuss that question when we reach the clause under which it arises. I would have precisely the same reason for continuing the law as parliament had for enacting it in that form and for continuing it when the law was revised in 1888. The reasons are cogent and, I think will be so regarded by the committee when the subject comes to be discussed in detail.

Mr. McCREARY. I would like to ask how this provision will affect a case in which a province, for a consideration, has made a bargain with certain railways for the control of their rates ? Would this Railway Commission supersede the legislation of the province ? What powers would the commission have in such a case, for instance, as the bargain made by the province of Manitoba last year with the Canadian Northern Railway with regard to the control of rates ? Would the commission have the power to override that legislation or vary it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) is asking me to express an opinion on a question which would require more thought than I could give it at this moment as I am standing on my feet. Probably it would be wiser to call for professional opinion to see what these agreements are, and ascertain the facts, before expressing any very decided view upon the question. I think perhaps I can afford my hon. friend some information which will be of use to him even in this connection. This board constituted by parliament would of course have to be advised as to any legal obstacles that may arise in respect of the exercise of its powers in any given case ; and if it should transpire that there were existing agreements such as my hon. friend points out, which would make it illegal for them to make regulations affecting tolls contrary to the terms of any such agreement, they would not exercise their power. They have the widest possible power to arrange and to apply their schedules to any portion of any railway, or any particular portion of any particular district, and not apply them to any other portion of that district. So I think any difficulties of that kind can be overcome easily, and it would not militate against the general efficiency of the Bill if a difficulty did arise such as my hon. friend has pointed out.

We provide for the greatest possible publicity in the matter of tariffs. I think it will be found when sections of the Bill come to be investigated, that every reasonable means has been provided whereby the public can be made acquainted with the rates they will be called upon to pay for transportation, speaking generally, on any of the railroads of the country. Of course, we know there are two great divisions of railway tariffs, freight tariffs and passenger tariffs. We divide freight tariffs into three classes, the standard, the special, and what we call the competitive. As the law stands at present, the schedules of tariffs emanate from the companies. The law provides that a by-law of a railway company must be passed setting forth the tariff which it proposes to get authority to impose upon its traffic, and the Governor in Council may either approve of that by-law, in which case it goes into operation, or he may refuse approval, and withhold assent until such time as a by-law is submitted to him containing a tariff of tolls which he can approve. After all is said and done, the tariff which is thus settled and approved is a maximum tariff ; it is not a tariff to be imposed by the railway upon its traffic ordinarily, because in practice it is always in excess of the tariff rates which are charged. That system will cease to be in operation when this Bill becomes law. The companies will propose their tariff, the board may say : We will not approve of that tariff, but we will approve of such and such a tariff, and they may prescribe what that tariff shall be. We have given it that power; and that tariff, as I have said, will be a standard; that is to say, the general tariff in operation upon such railway or portion of such railway as the board shall determine. Neither more nor less than the rate so fixed shall be charged, unless or except there has been submitted and approved one of the other two classes of tariffs, a special or a competitive. Conditions may exist, the carriage of certain classes of goods may be called for, such as coal, lumber or grain, in regard to which it is the custom of railways, and that custom will continue, to make special tariffs, and if these tariffs commend themselves to the board they will go into operation. Competitive freight tariffs deal with reduced charges for any class of the general freight classification between points which the board may deem it advisable that such competitive tariff shall apply, but shall not be subject to the clauses respecting the long and short haul. Special and competitive tariffs may be amended at any time, or may be supplemented at any time, by the railway companies, and tolls for these specified commodities or between any points——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. By the commission ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under special conditions, cir-

cumstances or emergencies, that tariff may be changed, but it is not to continue in operation one moment longer than is necessary, and the board shall have power to disallow it. Nobody, I apprehend, wants to hamper the great railway interests of the country; we do not want to do that; and we know there are constantly ocassions arising when offers of particular merchandise are made with which railway companies have to deal at once, and will have no time to prepare and submit a tariff for the consideration and approval of the board. The companies are to have power to make such a tariff and to apply it in particular instances, immediately advising the board of what they have done, when the board may approve or disallow such tariff.

Mr. BARKER. What will occur supposing they disapprove of what has been done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What has been done cannot be undone. We make this provision to avoid uncertainty on the part of shippers. It is also provided that they shall have three days' notice of any reduction of rates and ten days' notice of any increase of rates. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have stated fully the respects in which we have introduced changes regarding the control of rates. We now pass on to the other provisions in the Bill which are not of so much interest, and which are almost in all respects identical with the clauses of the General Railway Act.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Centre Toronto). May I ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, before he passes on, whether he is giving this commission control of the granting of charters to railways, or whether its recommendation will be submitted to the Railway Committee to be acted upon by the Railway Committee, and also may I ask the hon. minister if this commission is to have control of canals as well? I listened carefully to what the hon. minister has said, but I have not heard him say anything about canals. Canals may become the rivals of railways. Another very important means of carrying trade at the present time and which is growing all the time are tramways. Will the commission have control of freight and passenger tramways operated by electricity or otherwise, and are these powers included in the Bill? Some of our railways are part rail and part canal, or part waterways and part steamship carriage; would this commission have the same control over all these means of carriage that you are giving it over railways, or are you reserving these for the control of another commission, or to that of the Privy Council?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Brock) has asked me several question and I will try to answer them in the order in which he has asked them. He has first asked whether any provision is being introduced in this Bill giving power to the board to control the granting of charters. I may say to him that we have made no such provision. Later on, before I resume my seat, I intend to call the attention of the House to that question and to another, and cognate question, that might be discussed and considered while this Bill is going through. This provision and the other one that I shall mention later will be provisions of a very drastic character, and I did not feel like pressing upon my colleagues in council the inclusion of these two clauses in the present Bill; and yet they are railway questions of importance and I thought it would be very fitting at all events that the attention of the committee, when they were considering the Bill, should be brought to them, that they might become subjects of discussion; and it might be that such an opinion would be evoked from the committee that clauses embodying the sense of the committee on these subjects could be included in the Bill. I have drafted a couple of clauses relating to these matters, and later on I will call the attention of the committee to them. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) asked me another question as to whether this legislation included tramways. I may say that we did not have it in mind to include control over tramways in preparing this Bill. There is another question which I am afraid has escaped me for the moment.

Mr. BARKER. The question as to part rail and part water routes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In regard to the question of the control of canals by the board, we have not suggested that. There does not seem to me very much analogy between the subject of railways and that of canals, not so much as to make it desirable that the commission should be invested with any duty in respect to canals.

Mr. COWAN. May I ask the hon. minister whether it is the intention to bring the operations of express companies under the control of the commission? For instance, in shipping carloads from the fruit districts, over a railway, would the commission be empowered to exercise control over the rates charged by the express companies?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) will find abundant power to regulate rates as respects express shipments of all kinds. If he thinks these provisions are wanting in any respect we will be very glad to hear from him on the subject.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. minister allow me to ask him whether there will be any appeal from the decision of the commission? I was not here and I did not hear any reference to that point.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte)

was not here when I mentioned that there is an appeal provided for in the Bill from and against any and all decisions of the board to the Governor in Council. That tribunal was thought to be the most useful to which to make an appeal for many obvious reasons. There is an appeal now to the Governor in Council from the Railway Committee. It is perhaps just as well that I should say that in the few years I have been connected with the Railway Committee that power has only been availed of on one occasion, and it is to be hoped that it will not be found very frequently necessary to appeal from the decisions of this board. Perhaps I might as well refer to the other subject just at this moment which I had in my mind and which relates somewhat to the question which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) asked. I had in my mind two questions which we have not undertaken to deal with in this Bill, one as to the exercise of control over the granting of new charters or the location of new railways. That power has been conferred by the legislatures of some of the states—one or two, at least, to my knowledge—but I think it has been rather in the form of an advisory authority. The duty is cast upon the commission to advise the state legislatures in respect of any applications for the construction of new railways, and in other instances the power has been given to the commission to grant or withhold, even after the charter has been granted, a certificate which is called a certificate of public necessity, or something of that kind. without which certificate the company chartered to build the railway cannot proceed with its work. It will appear, of course, upon the surface, that the object of such legislation is to prevent the unnecessary duplication of railways, to prevent their running, perhaps, too close to one another, or running parallel with each other, when the public interest will be best served by there being either no other railway or by its being located elsewhere, at some convenient or sufficient distance from the existing railway.

Mr. INGRAM. Then why should the charter holders, having a time limit in which to commence and complete the railway, be interfered with in that way ? That would affect the time limit to commence and complete the line of railway after it had been chartered. Parliament grants the right to construct a railway and fixes a time limit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is much to be said in favour of the proposition, and I am not going to say that there is not a good deal to be said against it. I was merely pointing out, with the view of inviting discussion later upon this subject, that this was one of the powers which have been conferred upon railway commissions in other places but which it is not proposed in the present Bill shall be conferred upon this commission.

Another direction in which legislation has taken place elsewhere is in giving railway commissions power to exercise a very careful supervision and control over the excessive issue of stock and bonds by railway companies. There seems to me, speaking individually only, to be very much in a proposal of that kind to commend itself to parliament. We know perfectly well that in the experience of the past few years, at least, although companies which have charters from parliament and are authorized to issue very large quantities of stock, very rarely indeed has any of the actual money been put into stock or has gone into the construction of these roads. The stock is given, I suppose, perhaps, to enrich the bonds, or distributed as favours among friends or used otherwise than as a means of raising the capital to put into the undertaking, and it seems that it is very desirable, if parliament thinks it well to proceed with this Bill, to consider whether or not there might not be some tribunal, and if so why not the railway commission, to look into, watch carefully and supervise the expenditure upon these railway undertakings, so as to be able to restrict the undue and excessive issue of their bonds or shares of capital stock. These bonds, this stock distributed among the public, received as a gift or bought at perhaps a low rate to-day and sold at a little higher rate to-morrow, as the prospect of the railway may improve financially, get into the hands of the holders at an enhanced price and they become a legitimate charge upon the traffic of the railway, and become sometimes a burden upon such traffic and an unnecessary burden, it seems to me. It is my own opinion that we whould be acting in conformity with public opinion if we turned our eyes in the direction of legislation of that kind.

I have endeavoured to state as fully as I could, without being unduly tedious, the general scope and in some respects the particular details of this Bill. It has been framed in an honest endeavour to put before parliament a Bill which should be effective in its operation. If the country desires, as I believe it does, that there should be a tribunal constituted for the purpose of exercising a large measure of control over the railways of the country, I think we would fail in our duty in responding to that demand if we did not give to the tribunal we are creating, ample power to enable them to carry out the purpose for which they are created. When you come to read some of these clauses it may seem that the powers that are given—if they are pressed to extremity of their literal meaning ; if an interpretation is going to be given to them by the board right up to the limit which their language would bear—it might seem that you are giving to the Railway Commission power which would enable them to crush the railways or to do serious injury to the business in-

terests of the country. While that may be so, it must be borne in mind that you must give in the language that you employ, larger powers than you intend to have exercised in order that you may insure a sufficient measure of power to the body which you are investing with these responsibilities. It is because of this, that it is of the first importance when we come to constitute the tribunal itself; when we come to determine upon the qualifications which are necessary in order that the measure generally may be successfully worked out; that we shall exercise extreme care in making these selections. It would not be possible for me, and it would not be perhaps becoming for me at this stage, before parliament says there shall be such a tribunal constituted, to undertake to state in any definite way just what the ideas of the government are as to the personnel of the board itself. We are fully conscious that it will be necessary that there should be represented on that board a man of large legal experience who has had some knowledge of the trend and bearing of railway questions, who has followed railway legislation generally. There should be a man who should have technical knowledge of the working of railways and railway tariffs also upon the board. This is very important. It is regarded as very important in the United States, and after the long experience they have had in that country I presume their judgment may be taken as fairly sound. Outside of these two qualifications I apprehend that a wide latitude might be exercised by the government in its choice. I have noticed recently in the public press that some opinions have been attributed to me with regard to what the constitution of the board ought to be and what ought to be the avocations of the men who are appointed on it. I must say that I have been quite misunderstood in these reports. If any person has had any conversation with me in respect to the subject I have not gone any further than to state in the most general way anything with regard to the technical and legal training required. Beyond that, I think the general business interests of the country should be represented; and chiefly and prominently among these must always come the interests of the great farming community of Canada; an industry which in its importance far surpasses that of any other industry; far surpasses the manufacturing and commercial interests great as they are and great as they will continue to be. But while that is the case it is at the same time absolutely true that the farming interests and the manufacturing and industrial and general commercial interests are a common interest after all. A man, no matter what his particular occupation might be who had a business experience might well be taken to be qualified to fill a place upon this board provided that he has a sound judgment and a calm and independent mind. In considering this, bearing in mind that it is the strength and pressure of the public opinion which has been aroused by what the farmers of the country have felt to be their particular grievance; having regard to the enormous extent of these interests not only in eastern Canada, but growing with such tremendous rapidity in our great west, I am satisfied that I speak with the approval of all my colleagues when I say, that the selection which we will make to occupy a place on this board, particularly in respect to the business interests of this country which are connected with transportation, will be such a selection as will commend itself heartily to the approval of the farming community, and will insure, as far as possible, the promotion and protection of their interests.

Mr. BROCK. I notice that the hon. minister has not stated that the commission is to have any power to deal with labour difficulties and strikes which affect railways very materially. Is it intended that these are to be dealt with in the compulsory arbitration Bill which I understand is to be introduced?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not incorporated any provisions of that kind in this Bill. There would be difficulty in doing so. I can point out one, which however I do not consider to be by any means the most considerable. You are constituting a commission which will impose very onerous and responsible duties on the gentlemen who compose that tribunal. They will have no sinecure, I can assure you. The duties they will have to discharge will be multifarious, and I think, at all events in the inception, whatever it may be found possible to do later, it would not be wise to hamper the action of the commission by attaching to it such duties as the hon. gentleman alludes to. Then there is another reason. It has not been found practicable so far, under the conflict which exists between provincial and federal legislation, to do very much, if anything, in the direction of compulsory arbitration; and if you are to rely, as I think you will have to rely, almost entirely upon the friendly intervention of a conciliatory board, for the solution of these labour difficulties, it would not be well to ask the commission to assume duties of that character. Such a board should always have upon it a direct representative of the labour elements themselves; if they are to have confidence in its decisions, they must have some choice in the composition of the board. Another reason, and perhaps the conclusive one, is that my hon. friend the Minister of Labour has a Bill which he proposes to submit to parliament this session touching that very question.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if he has made provision in the Bill to give

the commissioners power to deal with all questions relative to water which is necessarily carried beneath the railways ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Will they have power also to deal with railway crossings in towns and villages, and all matters of that kind ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Will they have power to deal with the long and short hauls ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask one question. I did not care to interrupt the hon. minister as he was proceeding with his speech. He spoke of appeals to the Governor in Council on some questions of fact.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On all questions of fact. All orders of any kind made by the board may be appealed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it to be in the nature of an appeal pure and simple or in the nature of a re-hearing ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I take it that would be very much as the Governor in Council himself would determine. The Governor in Council under this Bill would have complete and absolute jurisdiction to revise any order or decision of the board. We have hitherto had, I think, only one instance in which an appeal was carried to the Governor in Council, and in that instance we forwarded from the Railway Committee of the Privy Council the shorthand notes, which contained a statement of everything that had been said, the arguments addressed to the committee and the evidence taken ; and I think some of the gentlemen wished to supplement that evidence, and they were permitted to do so. The same thing would be done in the case of an appeal from a decision of this board.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should have thought there would be a necessity for some specific provision in the Bill with regard to that. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman one more question. Apparently the power to control rates does not extend to the Canadian Pacific Railway, at least to a very considerable portion of the system of that company. Under the circumstances referred to by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), the same thing might be said of the Canadian Northern, which stands in very much the same position as the portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway referred to by the hon. minister. Then, there is the Intercolonial Railway as well. So that we have three great railways in Canada as to which there will be no control of rates by this commission ; and will not the fact that there is no control over the rates on these three railways hamper the commission very much in its dealing with the rates on other railways ? I do not profess to have any great practical knowledge of railway matters ; but it occurred to me that the control of rates would not be nearly so effective under these circumstances as it might otherwise be, because how will this commission be able to control the rates effectively on one railway when it has no power whatever to deal with the rates on another and a competing railway ? It seems to me, with due regard to what the hon. minister may say on the subject, that will be a great handicap on the commission in regard to the control of rates, which, as the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals says, is one of the most important features of the Bill. However, I do not propose to discuss the Bill at this stage, and I merely make this suggestion for the purpose of asking the hon. minister to direct his attention to that particular point when he comes to move the second reading.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, my hon. friend would not, I am sure, anticipate that any conflict is likely to arise with the decisions of the commission in respect of rates, because I have never heard any one allege that the rates charged on the Intercolonial Railway are of such a character that they would have to be reduced in order to conform to the rates prevailing on other lines.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, we are making this Bill for the future, are we not, as well as the past ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and I think the experience of the past affords very good ground for inferring what will be our experience in the future. I would say, in regard to the condition pointed to in the first instance by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), I understand that the nature of the agreement between the Canadian Northern and the Manitoba government is this : The Canadian Northen binds itself not to impose a higher rate than the specific rate mentioned in that agreement in respect of its traffic which, of course, so far as the jurisdiction of the Manitoba legislature is concerned, would be limited to the province of Manitoba. The exercise of the powers of this commission are not therefore likely to bring it into conflict with any contract made between the provincial government and that railway. While the hon. gentleman was speaking, the thought presented itself to my mind that the only question that would arise would be as to whether or not the Canadian Northern was imposing too high a rate. Well, there could be nothing in this

contract which would entitle that company to claim that a reduction in rates was beyond the jurisdiction of the railway commission or this parliament and that they could therefore not properly be asked to submit to the jurisdiction of the railway commission. The railway commission might cut down its rates and the Manitoba government could not complain in that case, though it might complain if the rates were put up. I do not think therefore that the case is one of practical difficulty.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to discuss this Bill fully at its present stage. Last session, I heard the hon. gentleman explain the Bill he then introduced, but a good many of its provisions have escaped my memory and I am not as well prepared as I might be to discuss the subject. However, I shall look into the matter and be fully posted on the second reading of the Bill. But what strikes me first in the appointment of the commission is the question as to what powers we can give it. The hon. gentleman has told us that in the United States certain powers were given the commissioners, but that it has been found impossible to get their decisions carried out by legal enactments. That is no doubt perfectly true to a considerable extent. No doubt the work of the commission in the United States has become simply of an educational character, but in that respect it has had a great deal of influence on railway companies, because when the railway commissioners draw the attention of the public to anomalies in the charges of railway companies to differences in rates at different points and to other abuses which the state and inter-state commissions were intended to prevent, the very publicity given to these abuses has the effect of bringing about their correction. That is, after all, the strongest power which the commissioners have in the United States. The hon. gentleman says that in his Bill he has vested the commissioners with greater power than is given similar bodies in Great Britain and other countries. I cannot speak with authority on that point, but it seems to me that the shortest possible way of settling the question would be for the hon. gentleman to state to what railways this Bill will apply. It is not intended to apply to the Intercolonial Railway and it cannot apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Nor will it apply to these railways which the hon. gentleman mentions in the province of Manitoba, nor can it apply to any railway which has a local charter. There is also another series of railways to which it will not apply. It cannot affect any railway which obtained its charter before a certain date—I forget the year now—before the Railway Act was amended, because these railways were given their charters under the condition that their rates could not be interfered with until 15 per cent was being earned on their capital stock. If that be the case, this Bill can apply to very few railways in the country. I may be wrong in my contention that the railway commission will have no power over those railways which are solely under the jurisdiction of the local governments and receive their charters from these governments; but I think that I am right. In order to bring such railways under this Bill, we would have to declare that they are works for the advantage of Canada. If I am right, I would ask why should we appoint such a commission? Why spend so much money for the purpose of fixing and controlling rates over a few railways that would come under its jurisdiction? We cannot interfere with the Canadian Pacific Railway charter because that company has an express contract with this country, and it would be an act of confiscation to alter that contract without compensation. It is true that we may pass a Bill giving us the right to exercise that power, but that is not what I understand the hon. gentleman proposes to do. If I understand him rightly, he proposes only to give this commission jurisdiction where he can do so without interferring with any vested rights. The Canadian Pacific Railway have an understanding with this country, under which their rates are fixed and they contend that we cannot alter those rates so long as the condition of that contract is not accomplished, which provides that until the company earn a certain percentage on their capital per year, their rates cannot be interfered with. That is their contention, and I am inclined to think that they are right. I think that every railroad which received its charter prior to a certain date has a moral right, nay more, a legal right, has a virtual contract of this country which we are in honour bound to carry out, and any act of ours in contravention of that right, any act of ours which will interfere with the rates they have a right to charge, would be an act of confiscation.

There are many ways in which perhaps a commission might be of use. It might be useful in settling those difficulties which come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The hon. gentleman proposes that the proceedings before the commission shall be the same as those before the courts and shall carry costs. I suppose these costs will be imposed according to some schedule drawn up by the commission, and similar to schedules in other courts of law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What then did the hon. gentleman mean when he said that costs would apply?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We propose that the same system shall continue that now obtains in the

Railway Committee, namely that the costs be left to the discretion of the commission. The fact that we are constituting this commission a court of record, is not tantamount to setting up a judicial tribunal in the ordinary sense. We are simply giving authority to the decrees which they may pass.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand that the power to allow costs will be the same as that now held by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood that the object was, in view of the ease with which questions might be brought before that tribunal, to allow this power of mulcting a party in costs to prevent bringing what are called litigious actions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we have only given costs in two cases in the last six or seven years.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I presided over that committee for a number of years, and never allowed costs in any case.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have allowed only fifty dollars or so in one or two cases.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No matter who these commissioners under this new law may be, I do not think the commission will be any more responsible or intelligent or better able to deal with the questions coming before it than is the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. There is one change made in this Bill with which I quite agree. Commissioners were to hold office the same tenure as judges and to be removable only on an address to both Houses of parliament. The hon. gentleman now intends to give the Governor in Council power to remove these gentlemen.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. For cause.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Of course. But no officer has ever been removed by the present government, except 'for cause,' according to the Minister of Railways and Canals and others. But the 'cause' may be very slight in some cases. But I believe in the power of removal, and I think this is an improvement in the Bill. As I have said, there are a good many things in which the commissioners might exercise power. One is as to the issue of stock and bonds. Of course, they cannot prevent that issue, because the company is given the power in its charters. But they can exercise a supervisory and educational power, as is done by the commissioners in the United States. Of course, if an issue were illegal, it would be bad and void. But they can inform the public of any excessive exercise of the power of issuing stock or bonds. As I have said, it is not my intention to discuss the Bill in full. We shall have an opportunity on the second reading and when the Bill is in committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) whether, if a charter were granted with a provision that the use of the bonding powers shall be subject to the approval of the commission, the commission would not be able to control such powers ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Certainly they would. They can do that now—they can alter any charter or cancel any contract. Their power is supreme in these things, the only condition being that it shall be done specifically, otherwise the interpretation would go against them in the courts. Of course, if, as my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) says, it were embodied in an Act of parliament, that would be sufficient. But how could you embody it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To whom do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) to refer when he says 'they' have the power to do these things now ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I mean the parliament of Canada. It has absolute power to control. We have the power of eminent domain, and can even take a man's property without giving him any consideration in return. Of course, that is never done, but still the power is vested in us.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In whom ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I mean in the parliament of Canada, in the people of Canada, in the Dominion of Canada. When I say 'we' I am speaking in that sense. When I said 'they' had the power, I referred to hon. gentlemen opposite as representing the majority and exercising the power of legislation and government.

Mr. INGRAM. I may have misunderstood the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in his explanation and in some of the answers given to questions that have been asked. We know perfectly well that one of the chief reasons why the people have demanded this commission is the exorbitant character of the rates charged by certain railways. In answer to a question as to the long and short haul, the hon. minister has stated that this commission will have the power to remedy grievances with respect to exorbitant rates. But, in answer to a question by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) the hon. minister was not clear as to whether this commission would have the right to interfere as to the rates on certain local railways. How, then, can they effectively remedy grievances with respect to rates ? We had every reason to hope that this new Bill would cover not only railways but tramways as well. There is a strong belief throughout the country that a large number of tramways will be con-

structed to accommodate the farming community and to serve as feeders for the trunk lines. But this Bill does not give the commission power to deal with the rates on the tramways. Next we find the hon. minister stating that, though this parliament is the highest in the Dominion, and clearly has the right to grant charters to railway companies, yet, even after parliament has granted such a charter, this commission may take the company by the throat and say: You shall not construct that railway until we furnish you with a certificate authorizing you to do so. I for one, as a member of this House, would not feel like so stultifying myself in matters of that kind. Parliament should retain the right to grant or refuse charters, but, once the charter has been granted on the condition that the railway shall be commenced within a certain time and finished within a certain time, the company should be free from interference with regard to that matter by any of the parties whatever. This and other objections, I think, will fairly be raised to this Bill as I find it now. I have not read the Bill, but have only listened to the explanations of the hon. gentleman, and consequently I am not in a position intelligently to discuss it at this stage, but I hope at a later date to have something more to say about it. In the meantime I may say to the hon. gentleman that he has his hands full in promoting a Bill of that character in this parliament. He will find a great many serious objections to it, and a great many differences of opinion. So far as I am concerned, however, I should be glad to assist the hon. gentleman in any way that I can, though my assistance may not be worth much, in making this a workable Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House go into Committee on Tuesday next to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Tuesday next, to consider the following proposed resolution :That it is expedient to amend the 32nd chapter 63-64 Vic., "An Act respecting and restricting Chinese immigration," by providing :

1st. That a tax of $500 shall be imposed on every person of Chinese origin entering Canada.

2nd. That the person in command of, or in charge of, any vessel or vehicle, bringing Chinese immigrants into Canada shall be personally liable to His Majesty, for the payment of the said tax, with respect to any such immigrant carried by such vessel or vehicle.

Motion agreed to.

THE MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION TO THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance a question; and in order to make my question plain I will quote from the government organ in the city of Ottawa, the 'Free Press.' I notice a report in that paper that a deputation of manufacturers waited upon the government and asked for higher protection. I will quote a short paragraph :—

The Prime Minister promised full consideration of their request. He advised them, however, that they allow their proposed tariff schedule to be made public. Mr. Fielding informed them that any other course would injure their case. He had letters from many manufacturers warning him against the request of the association, and urging that the tariff be left as it stands at present.

I ask the Minister of Finance if he has any objection to lay those letters on the table that he received from manufacturers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In the first place, I desire to point out to my hon. friend that the only organ which the government has in the city of Ottawa is that valuable publication known as the 'Canada Gazette.' For whatever appears in that quarter we are willing to be held responsible. In regard to the other matter, there were some of the papers referred to which I will be pleased at a later stage, or perhaps at an early date, to lay on the Table of the House. The report is not exactly in line with what I said. I said I was aware that a number of letters had been written, some of which I had seen in the hands of members of parliament, taking exception to the proposed action, or what was supposed to be the intended action of the Manufacturers' Association. I stated that I also had some communication myself adverse to what was understood to be the proposals of the Manufacturers' Association. Some of those papers that are not of a confidential character I shall be glad to bring down at once.

Mr. INGRAM. In the words of the hon. gentleman, why are some of them confidential ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have received a great many representations from different parts of the country on the tariff question, from time to time, which have been offered and received in confidence. Where the representations relate to the material facts of a man's private business, it might be very inconvenient to have such things made public. In many such cases we have received information in confidence and have kept it accordingly. But where a proposal is made to impose a particular rate of duty on a given article, I think that is not a matter that should be received in confidence, and that we should be free to make it public. That is the view I expressed to the Manufacturers' Association.

SUPPLY—CANADIAN CATTLE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

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

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Before you leave the Chair, I wish to give notice that I will move on Tuesday next, or on the first day thereafter when the House is moved into Committee of Supply, the following amendment :—

That in the opinion of this House there is no justification for the application of the Diseases of Animals Act of Great Britain to Canadian cattle.

That Canadian cattle at the time of the passing of said Act and ever since have been free from all contagious diseases.

This House is of opinion that the application of the said Act to Canadian cattle has an injurious effect upon the cattle trade of this country.

This House regrets that the representatives of Canada at the colonial conference utterly failed to obtain any redress or promise of redress for this grievance.

This House further regrets that this government has not succeeded by more vigorous protests, or by other effective steps, in finding means to obtain the removal of the existing unjust restrictions on the sale of Canadian cattle in Great Britain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I would suggest to my hon. friend, though that is a question for him to consider, whether it would be wise to move that as an amendment to Supply. The whole subject is likely to come up, and by bringing it up in the form of an amendment to Supply, unless he has some special purpose in view, he restricts the discussion and obliges us to confine ourselves to that particular form. If that is his purpose, I cannot object. But if the object is to broaden the whole question, he can find another form of bringing it up. Still, if he proposes to put it as an amendment to Supply, I cannot object to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman forgets that last year this very course was adopted, and the government acquiesced in the proposed amendment. I do not know if my hon. friend has any special purpose in view further than that which the hon. gentleman had in view who made a similar motion last year. He is adopting exactly the same course as was adopted last by an hon. gentleman opposite.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But my hon. friend forgets that when the motion came from this side of the House, possibly the hon. gentleman who moved it was more likely to accept an amendment to his amendment. But, if an hon. gentleman moves a similar amendment on the other side of the House, I am not sure that he would be so ready to accept any kindly advice we might give him. However, that is for my hon. friends opposite to consider.

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

Department of the Interior—Salaries, including E. Deville at $2,800, W. F. King at $2,500 and Otto J. Klotz at $2,300, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $119,029.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) is not able to be present. He is arranging to go to England, and he asked me to take his estimates for him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose he is going to England notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be good enough to give us some detailed explanation why this provision is necessary in this item ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The increase is $3,332.50, and it is made up by the balance of the increases and reductions. The total increases are as follows :

Increases :—			
Statutory increases	56 x $50 00	equals	$2,800 00
	1 x 37 50	"	37 50
	3 x 25 00	"	75 00
	2 x 10 00	"	20 00
			$2,932 50
Promotion of Robert Dunlop, from $900 to 2nd class at $1,100 per annum....			200 00
Promotion of Messrs. F. C. Capreol, H. Sherwood, G. W. Paterson and F. W. C. Cuming to 2nd class from $1,000 to $1,100 per annum....			400 00
Additional required in the case of Mr. McIsaac, who was transferred from the Auditor General's office on the 1st July, 1902, $650 per annum and only $600 was provided....			50 00
Additional junior 2nd class clerk.....			600 00
Increase to Messrs King and Klotz, $150 each in addition to statutory increment, and E. Deville, surveyor general, $200.....			500 00
			4,682 50
Decreases :—			
Difference between salary of Mr. J. P. Dunne, promoted to 2nd class at $1,100 and salary of Mr. H. E. Hume, $1,400 superannuated....			300 00
Difference between salary of S. J. Willoughby promoted to 2nd class at $1,100 and Mr. W. S. Gliddon, promoted to 1st class, $1,400....			300 00
Difference between salary of late Mrs. Ridley, $900, and appointment of J. G. Mitts, $600....			300 00
Difference between $1,000 salary paid late Mr. L'Etoile and J. W. Gibson appointed at $600....			400 00
Difference between salary of Mr. A. T. McNeill, resigned, $650, and appointment of Mr. Munroe at $600....			50 00
			$1,350 00
		Increases.....	$4,682 50
		Decreases.....	1,350 00
		Net increase.....	$3,332 50

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand in what respect the Civil Service Act is repealed, or why it should be repealed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am informed that in the case of Messrs. King and Klotz the maximum salary is $2,400, and they are being allowed $150 in excess of the maximum. Mr. King is connected

with the new observatory and has an important addition to his labours which are of a very responsible and technical character. Mr. Klotz has been employed in connection with the Alaskan boundary, and the hon. Minister of the Interior thinks his services should be recognized accordingly.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the country is very fortunate in being able to retain such distinguished men as I know Mr. King and Mr. Klotz to be in their profession, and it seems a little peculiar that the advances in salary to these gentlemen are so small in comparison with the very large increases that were made in the salaries of two other officers, unimportant as compared with them. I think one of the gentlemen to whom I refer is a chief clerk, and another a registration clerk, and they had $400 added to their salaries a session or two ago. No doubt their duties were increased by the administration of the Yukon, but theirs are largely clerical duties and it is satisfactory after all to find that men who have scientific training and who are so able and prominent in their professions as Mr. King and Mr. Klotz are to receive some recognition, though, I must say, in proportion to the recognition given the other gentlemen, they have not been fully rewarded even yet.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would my hon. friend (Sir Wm. Mulock) be good enough to tell me if J. D. Bollard, who is mentioned as receiving $850 is the gentleman who is in Paris now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is not the same person.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. May I ask where this gentleman is located ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the immigration office in Ottawa.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is not the Civil Service Act amended so that eminent gentlemen such as those mentioned can be retained in the service without requiring the repeal of the provisions of the Act ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say why the Act is not amended. I suppose if the Act in time is found not to be sufficient to meet any situation that may arise, and if that becomes quite clear, the House will be possessed of the information and will amend it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That has been quite clear for the last six years, ever since I have been in the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are only a few cases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Only a few cases ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In comparison with the whole Civil Service list.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does seem a most absurd thing to keep that Act on the statute-book and to repeal it piecemeal each year in the estimates.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Special merit has to be taken into consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might be done occasionally in a very exceptional case of special merit perhaps.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why is it that the hon. gentleman changes the theoretical organization of the department ? It does not seem as if he requires any more of a staff for the purpose of accomplishing the work, but he wants five more second-class clerks and one more first-class clerk. The hon. minister ought to maintain his theoretical organization approved of by council, and under no circumstances, unless of the gravest and most serious character, change it. And why he has changed it by adding five second-class clerks and one first-class clerk to his staff I do not know.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There may be a different number of clerks in the different classes but there is only one additional clerk in the total number.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I know that perfectly well. What I complain of is that the theoretical organization of the department has been changed and there ought to be some grave reason for doing that. There are less in the third class, five more in the second class and one more in the first class. There ought to be some reason for that change other than favouritism.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. All these changes have been made on account of length of service, increased duties and efficiency. The hon. gentleman will not stand in the way of promotion for merit.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes I do. The country requires a certain staff for a certain organization and because a clerk is efficient and has attended to his duties is no reason why there should be a larger organization than is absolutely necessary to carry on the business of the country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there are a number of young men as junior second class clerks, getting small salaries, and if they are promoted to a higher rank because of merit, surely my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) would not object to that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I insist that the first duty of the government is to see that the organization necessary for carrying on a department should not be increased. That is all the organization that is required for the efficiency of the department, and the government are not justified in unnecessarily increasing the organization even if it be for the purpose of increasing the salaries of deserving clerks.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expression 'increasing the organization' would convey that the number of clerks has been increased, but as the hon. gentleman knows there is only one additional clerk. It is not to be expected that a number of meritorious young men are always to stay at the same salary. Surely if the minister sees that some of these young men who have made excellent clerks are at small salaries for a number of years he ought be able to promote them.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I wish to ask when was Mr. Bollard appointed in the department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was appointed in 1884.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has he been in the department since ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Was he not sent to the Yukon for some time ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am informed that he never was sent to the Yukon.

Mr. CLANCY. Are there any statutory increases included in this increased vote ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am informed that in every case where a clerk was eligible for the statutory increase it has been granted to him.

Mr. CLANCY. Are we to understand that the Postmaster General and his friends have receded from the position they took at one time, viz., that no statutory increases should be given, or are these increases given under the system adopted by this present government on recommendations made by the favourites of the department ? When the government took office they set their face against statutory increases except as a matter of grace on the part of the minister for the time being. Has the Postmaster General abandoned that policy and will the civil servants in future receive their statutory increase under the Civil Service Act, as they did in the past ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In all these cases the services of the clerks were such as to entitle them to these increases. The labourer is worthy of his hire and is being paid accordingly. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) will not object to our taking advantage of this privilege in the law to ask parliament for this vote.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has given a beautiful explanation. I asked him if he had abandoned the policy of refusing to give statutory increases unless it suited the sweet will of the minister, and he evaded that question. Now let me ask him again : Has the government abandoned the system they found in operation when they came into power and which was that unless there was some substantial reason why a civil servant should not receive his statutory increase he was entitled to it by law.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We propose to give an increase to those who are deserving of it. If my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) can show that these men are not entitled to their increase we will be glad to hear from him about it.

Mr. CLANCY. It is scarcely worthy of a minister of the Crown to give such an answer as that. The minister is bound to give this committee all reasonable information, and he has not the right to ask a member on either side of the House to show cause why a civil servant was or was not entitled to an increase. I was going to say that the hon. minister was 'dodging' the question, but although that might be substantially true it may not be parliamentary. I trust the Postmaster General will give all reasonable information to this committee as he is bound to do.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what more I can say. The government are proposing to give these increases to the officers named because they deserve them. There is the statute and there are the officers, and we are exercising the privilege which the statute confers upon us.

Mr. CLANCY. We have obtained that much information from the hon. gentleman —there is a statute. The hon. gentleman disregarded the statute in the past. I would like to ask on whose recommendation these increases were made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. All these increases are based upon the recommendation of the deputy minister.

Mr. CLANCY. Have those who have been advanced passed the civil service examination in every case ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, all those referred to.

Mr. CLANCY. When were these recommendations made ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some time last December, a short time before the deputy minister went away. He went into the case with the minister, and made the recommendations.

Department of Indian Affairs, $66,610.

Mr. INGRAM. Who are the chief clerks in the Indian Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are four chief clerks : John D. McLean secretary, at $2,400 ; D. C. Scott, accountant, at $2,100 ; S. Stewart, assistant secretary, at $1,950 ; R. Rimmer, law clerk, at $2,050.

Mr. INGRAM. Have there been any changes in the chief clerks in this department for some time back ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The last change was the appointment of Mr. Rimmer in 1898.

Mr. INGRAM. Did he get the maximum salary then, or did he start at a lower salary and receive increases ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Rimmer was appointed in 1898 at a salary of $2,000 a year. Since then he has had one increase only, of $50.

Mr. INGRAM. Is he entitled to an increase the same as the others ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The maximum, as the hon. gentleman knows, is $2,400.

Mr. INGRAM. There must be some reason why he has not received the annual increase since his appointment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not a case of a man entering the service as a junior and spending several years before reaching his present position. He got $2,000 at the time of his appointment, and I am informed that the minister thought he should remain at that salary for a short time until it would be wise to recommend an increase.

Mr. INGRAM. Then I understand that this gentleman was appointed in 1898 and was paid $2,000, which he was not entitled to. Is that the general rule followed in all departments ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no rule on the subject. He was appointed a chief clerk and law officer, a more or less technical position, at $2,000. There is no question of being entitled until parliament votes the money. Since his apointment he was recommended for one increase which made his salary $2,050, and he is now recommended for another.

Mr. INGRAM. The point I want to get at is if these increases are to be given by a sliding scale, who has a right to recommend them from year to year ? There surely ought to be some principle governing these cases.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the increase should be based either on merit or take place automatically. I think the view of this government is that there should be an exercise of judgment on the part of the minister in the case of high-priced officers. In the case of low-priced officers, I think, expressing my own opinion, that the increase should be given automatically, unless a man disqualifies himself from receiving it. You can hardly compare the case of a law clerk with the case of a secretary performing a different class of work altogether. Each case should be judged on its own merits.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many different departments are under the charge of the Minister of the Interior ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Department of Indian Affairs, the Department of the Interior and the Geological Survey.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has that system been found to work well ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So far as I can see, it has been most satisfactory for the last six years. I cannot speak as to before that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) was not so careful as to his speaking in former years. If the system of having three departments under one cabinet minister works so well, might I ask the Postmaster General, or my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when we may expect that reform of which we heard a good deal before 1896—the period concerning which the hon. Postmaster General is so unwilling to speak—the reduction of the number of cabinet minister from 14 to 7. We can all remember how in those days a gentleman very prominent on the other side, now Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), advocated that policy. and perhaps I had better address myself to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce unless my right hon. friend would like to deal with the question himself.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I never expressed such an opinion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce will observe that he is repudiated by his leader.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). My right hon. colleague has merely said that he never expressed that opinion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Which is tantamount to a repudiation of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is your inference.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is perhaps in return for the somewhat taunting speech which the Minister of Trade and Commerce made last year, in which he recalled to the right hon. gentleman the fact that he had made a very strong free trade speech in Winnipeg. The Minister of Trade and Commerce will remember how he turned round to the leader of the government and said that the words he had used at Winnipeg were very excellent words at the time and would be very excellent now. We on this side rather felt for the leader of the government on that occasion. But since

the right hon. gentleman who leads the government will not take this matter up, perhaps his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce will. My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce belongs to a cabinet which has fourteen members drawing salaries and I do not know how many without portfolio. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was strongly of the opinion in the olden days before 1896, that seven cabinet ministers being enough for the United States should be quite enough for Canada. It would be interesting to know whether or not he is still of that opinion, and if not when and why did he change it. We have it from the Postmaster General, that this system of having three departments under the one minister works excellently well. Why not take the department of Trade and Commerce and Customs and Inland Revenue and place them all under the control of the Minister of Customs ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And Public Works also ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from St. Mary's Division (Mr. Tarte) has always a valuable suggestion to offer. Why not throw in the Department of Public Works ? This would give my hon. friend the Minister of Customs a somewhat wider scope for the splendid energies he is wont to exhibit on all occasions. I offer this suggestion particularly for the approval of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who no doubt will take this occasion to urge on his leader and colleagues the advisability of the change. If seven ministers were sufficient for Canada six or seven years ago. they ought to be now, just as they are in the United States.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman has not quoted me correctly. As a mere matter of personal opinion, I do not object to state that I have not altered my opinion which I have expressed several times to the effect—not that I think we should follow the American system—but that I greatly prefer the English system. Speaking academically, of course, I would rather have the number of cabinet ministers reduced and have a very much larger number of junior officials similar to the under secretaries of state. Theoretically considered, I think that that is a far better system than the one we have fallen into. It is scarcely worth while at this time of day to recall the reasons which compelled us to inaugurate the present system at the time of confederation. They were political rather than reasons of business. My experience has confirmed me in the view that if we were free to act—which unfortunately we were not—it would have been better for all of us if we had a number of under secretaries and a more moderate number of cabinet ministers. That is my individual opinion and the hon. gentleman is welcome to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I suppose this is only one of the many instances in which the Minister of Trade and Commerce is suffering, and suffering in silence, from the fact that the ideas he so loudly and strenuously advocated when in opposition have not been adopted by his colleagues with whom he is compelled nevertheless to co-operate. There are many other things, I dare say, on which, if we could induce the Minister of Trade and Commerce to unbosom himself, he could similarly enlighten us, but we have not gained much information on the question as to whether the present number of cabinet ministers is to be increased or decreased. All we know is that a very prominent gentleman in the cabinet is convinced that the cabinet is too large, and that we have more ministers than the country requires. But he dare not venture to urge that the number should be reduced even to the extent of one. It seems to me that the right hon. the first minister should take the House into his confidence and tell us to what extent, if any, he sympathizes with the views of his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That hon. gentleman has been frank. He tells us that he still holds the view that there are too many ministers of the Crown, and the country is interested in knowing from the first minister whether, despite the views of his colleagues, he is not only not going to reduce the number of cabinet ministers but on the contrary proposes to increase them. If we are to place any credence in the well authenticated rumours which were used in order to encourage the hearts of the faithful in the west and to serve election purposes, another portfolio is to be created—that of the Minister of Mines. At one time, the Minister of Mines was to be taken from the province of British Columbia, but lately, during the Yukon election, the country was informed that the government candidate in that election, if successful, was to be chosen for that position. I think that the right hon. gentleman, who, I am glad to see in his place ought to satisfy the legitimate curiosity of the public on this question. He ought to let the country know whether he proposes to reduce the number of his colleagues or whether he proposes to add to that number by appointing a Minister of Mines.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I should think that, by this time, having been for some time in public life, my hon. friend (Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) would cease to attach much importance to rumours. For my part, I am a little older than he is, and I have ceased to care what rumours may be. I do not think that parliament should care much or lose time in seeking to ascertain whether any given rumour is true or is not true. Governments have their own way of acting, and that is by official method ; and, so long as

no official action is taken by the government there is nothing to find fault with. But I see that my hon. friend, not having anything serious to criticise in the action of the government, wishes to criticise in advance. He wishes to know whether we intend to appoint a new minister, and, in case that may be done at any time, he indulges in criticism in advance. So far, nothing has been done in the way of increasing the cabinet, it seems to me he is simply borrowing trouble in worrying over the matter. I would suggest to him that he should not allow his sleep to be disturbed by matters of that kind. It will be time enough to worry when the government presents any such proposition. But, so long as they do not do so, I cannot see why he should criticise.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All this sounds very pretty, Mr. Chairman. But, of course, there is nothing in it. The Prime Minister, with the support which the country seems to be blindly giving him of late, can afford to be jaunty and light-hearted about these things, and to tell us that the people have no right to be curious. But it is not so long ago that such questions as I have referred to were made to do duty in the interest of the Reform party, so called. Take for instance the case of my old colleague, Col. Prior, formerly one of the members of this House from Victoria, B.C. He happened to join the Conservative administration and to hold the position of Commissioner of Inland Revenue, a subordinate position in the administration but not in the council. And the party which the right hon. gentleman then led made a great deal of capital out of the implied slight to the province of British Columbia—that it had been so long denied representation in the cabinet, and at last its representative had been given a position in the government but denied a place in the cabinet. From that time on, the right hon. gentleman's representatives in British Columbia have been assuring the people there that it is only because of the Chinese immigration question, that it is only because the right hon. gentleman is so engrossed with this, that or the other question of, perhaps, great importance, that he has not been able to carry out his heart's desire, which, his lieutenants assure the faithful in that part of the country, is to have British Columbia represented in the cabinet. So, these are not altogether rumours, but are statements which do duty and make votes for the right hon. gentleman. This is the time to air the rumour, if the right hon. gentleman will allow me to refer to it as such, and have it either punctured or confirmed. Let us know whether these people who pretend to speak with authority have the slightest reason for that pretense, or whether they have been simply pleasantly spoken to by the right hon. gentleman, as I have been. Shall we tell them, when they assure us that the province is to be directly represented in the cabinet, and that Senator Templeman's position without portfolio is an earnest of the intention of that government that soon there will be a member sitting at the head of a department, that there is nothing in it—that it is only rumour ? Or shall we say the same when we are told that the member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) is to be the happy man ? I dare say it is embarrassing to the right hon. gentleman to be asked to take the House into his confidence. It may be very inopportune for him to explain the situation of the government now. But, surely, speaking as one of the committee on the country's business to the head of the government, I have the right to ask, and to press the right hon. gentleman to say whether there is anything in the statements that have been made and largely circulated throughout the country ; or whether they are, as he has suggested, mere rumours. If he wishes to convey the idea that these matters have been the subject of rumour and nothing more, that is an answer to the question I have put. And, if that be so, then are hon. gentlemen opposite prepared to make good their profession of reducing the number of ministers instead of increasing them ? If, on the other hand, they have been seriously considering the appointment of a Minister of Mines, whether in the person of a representative from British Columbia or of the representative from the Yukon, it is clear that they intend to depart in this particular, as they have in so many others, from their past professions.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has at all improved his position. I must say that I decline to recognize any rumours whatever.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They are only rumours then ?

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend quotes any word of mine or of any of my colleagues, I am ready to answer. friend quotes any word of mine or of any thing to say as to where they originated or on what authority they were circulated, I decline to be bound by them or even to answer any questions with regard to them. If, for instance, Senator Templeman has said anything on the subject, or if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) can trace anything I said, his question will be a proper one. But life is too short for one to hold himself responsible for what appears in newspapers about one. I do not think that when the hon. gentleman was in the government he held himself responsible for what appeared about him in the newspapers or for rumours of any kind. The hon. gentleman spoke of a wish of my heart not being realized. I must say that that has happened more than once—I have failed to

realize things that I had very much at heart. And this may be one of those things—I do not say it is not. The hon. gentleman has not made out a case, and if he wishes to draw me in this way, I am sorry to say he is hardly likely to succeed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not always hold himself bound even by the statement of his colleagues. I referred him to a statement of his present colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and he refused absolutely to be bound by it—repudiated it at the very outset, and left my poor unfortunate friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to struggle with the matter as best he might. I think I am justified in saying one thing on behalf of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He has struggled with the situation, as best he could, from 1896 down to the present hour, seeking to have the number of his colleagues reduced to seven, but not at all desirous of having the reduction commence with the Department of Trade and Commerce. But he will not stand any further additions to the cabinet. I want to say that distinctly on behalf of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He has made up his mind on that point—the cabinet has grown as far as he will stand. If the Prime Minister attempts to add to the members of the cabinet, I am sure the Minister of Trade and Commerce will strike. I think I have the right to say this in justice to my right hon. friend (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) because he does not appear to be inclined to say it for himself.

Now, the Minister of Trade and Commerce says that he would be glad indeed to see the cabinet reduced to the number of seven, if we were free to reduce it. When did we lose our freedom in that regard ? I think my right hon. friend the Prime Minister boasted of our glorious freedom in England, and gave up for that boast our chances of preferential trade with England in 1897. We have that glorious freedom, at least, have we not ? Let me direct the attention of my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the fact that we can reduce the number of departments at any time, we are perfectly free in that regard. We have just as much freedom now as we had when he made that pronouncement in 1895. In what respect has our condition changed with regard to freedom ? I do not quite follow the observations of the hon. gentleman ; perhaps he will make the situation clearer to the House than it is at present. But coming back to what the Postmaster General said a moment ago, we are in this position, that a gentleman occupying the position of cabinet minister and acting as Minister of the Interior, tells us that the system of working three very important departments together, requiring a great deal of labour and attention to details, answers perfectly well, and is in the best interests of the country. Well, does not this declaration made by one of the right hon. gentleman's most important colleagues, justify us in asking whether the government has any idea of carrying out a system of that kind. My right hon. friend seems to think that he is not obliged to give any answer to this question because the word rumour has been mentioned. Let us dismiss the rumour altogether. I think, however, there was something more than a rumour, because these allegations were made on public platforms by gentlemen speaking in the interests of the Liberal party in a recent election. However, let us dismiss the question of rumour. Here we have a declaration made by a gentleman who now holds an important position in the Liberal party and in this government, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a declaration never repudiated, so far as I am aware, by my right hon. friend. Then we have the declaration of the Postmaster General that the system under which the pledge of the Minister of Trade and Commerce might be carried out answers excellently well in the interests of the country. My right hon. friend thinks he gets rid of all that by saying that there is nothing more than a rumour. Now, let me ask why it is that a policy which the Minister of Trade and Commerce pledged himself to the people of this country years ago to carry out, if I remember his words correctly, and which his colleague says now would be in the best interests of the country, is not carried out by this government. I think my right hon. friend ought to treat this matter more seriously than by dismissing it on the ground that is a mere rumour.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce can well take care of himself, as perhaps the hon. gentleman opposite will find if he persists in his attempt to draw him out. Let me relate as a warning to the hon. gentleman a story told by the late Hon. Mr. Huntingdon in this House, under somewhat similar circumstances, for the benefit of an hon. gentleman opposite him. A little boy received a present of a jack knife, and, with it he tried to carve his name upon the hind quarters of a mule. Some time after the doctor had tried to put his nose into shape and reduce the swelling of his eyes, the little boy said to his father : 'Pa, do you think I will ever look as nice as before ?' 'No,' said his father, 'but you will be a darn sight wiser.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my right hon. friend feels obliged to compare the Minister of Trade and Commerce to a mule, that is his own affair. He says the Minister of Trade and Commerce is well able to take care of himself. I entirely agree with that, and I believe he is also able to take care of

a good many persons who are nearly related to him. I do not know but that the same observation could be applied to the leader of the government of this country. Now, we have had a very interesting discussion with regard to this matter, I do not know whether my right hon. friend feels pleased with it or not. He has not seen fit to make a declaration of the policy of his government with regard to it, but he has seen fit to treat a great question of this kind in a flippant manner instead of giving such an answer as might be expected from the leader of the government. Does my right hon. friend think that this flippant way of dealing with a matter declared to be of so much importance by one of his own colleagues, is really what the country expects of him ? Does he think that by telling some stale story he will get rid of public responsibility in this regard ? I do not think that his method of dealing with a matter of this kind is consistent either with public interest or with the dignified position which he holds. The Postmaster General has made a very important statement here to-day. He says that the system of working three great departments under one minister of the Crown answers very well indeed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not lay down any general proposition. The hon. gentleman asked whether the combination of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Indian Affairs and the Geological Survey under one minister had worked satisfactorily. I said that so far as I knew it worked satisfactorily last year. I did not say that other departments could be grouped together. There are departments and departments.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have this to say to the hon. gentleman, who I am sorry to say has not as good temper as he might have, that I thought the whole discussion was in the nature of banter. But if he wants to have an answer from the government on this great question of policy as to what ought to be the constitution of the cabinet, I think he will agree with me that the present occasion is not well suited to a discussion of that kind where we are only discussing the estimates of the Department of the Interior. If he desires, however, to ascertain the views of the government with relation to the constitution of the cabinet, which might be a very proper and important question to discuss, if he will give us proper notice we will be glad to gratify him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad to find that the right hon. gentleman is willing to deal with this matter in a fairer tone. It may be that some notice should be given to the government, and I am willing to accept that suggestion. In view of what he has said, I will take a further opportunity during the session, after proper notice, of asking the right hon. gentleman to state his policy on this question.

Mr. SPROULE. I should imagine that the Prime Minister had been reading very carefully the Gamey debate in the local House, for I notice that that little story of his has been given down there. I thought that the late Joseph Rymal had patented that story, but since he has died, I suppose the Prime Minister thought there could be no objection to him using it after it had been used in Toronto. But, what I rose more particularly to draw attention to was the fact that the right hon. leader of the House speaks of not being held accountable for rumour. The present government have surely something more than rumour to work upon ; they have the resolution which was moved in this House and supported by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce at the time when it was proposed to establish the Commissioner of Customs and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, which, they said, was increasing the number of the departments and they thought it their duty to protest strenuously against it. Then, we have the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and his colleagues enlarging these two commissionerships into full fledged ministerial departments and he took one of them himself. That was much more than rumour and not only that but they made it retroactive so as to enable themselves to collect a salary for the year which was past and gone. That was not rumour. That was dealing with facts which took place in this House and therefore is ample justification for referring to the matter and especially in view of the fact that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has occupied the position ever since and must have assented to it before Council or otherwise it could not have come before the House notwithstanding the views he held in regard to it before he became a cabinet minister in the present government.

Mr. HACKETT. Before you declare that item carried, Mr. Chairman, if we are discussing the question of cabinet ministers, I want to say one word for the province of Prince Edward Island. Almost since the time of confederation, we have had a member of the cabinet representing that province. A short time ago, when Sir Louis Davies was removed from this House to a higher position, a gentleman contested the constituency which he had represented in his stead. A good deal has been said here about rumour. The right hon. leader of the government has said that he cannot be held accountable for rumour. I can assure him that I attended meetings during the contest and it was held up to the electors of West Queen's that if they elected the gentleman who now represents that riding he would be a cabinet minister. There is

no province that requires more to be represented by a cabinet minister that Prince Edward Island owing to its isolated position, and owing to the fact that we are shut out for a long time in the year from communication with the mainland. There is no province that has a greater right or is more deserving to be represented in the cabinet than the province of Prince Edward Island. We have suffered this year for the want of representation in the cabinet and we are likely to suffer longer. I see that the hon. member for West Queen's (Mr. Farquharson) sitting now at the left of the right hon. leader of the government, he has not yet been appointed to the cabinet, and I would urge upon the right hon. gentleman that if he wishes to do justice to the province of Prince Edward Island he should see that hon. gentleman is elevated to the proud position of a member of the cabinet, the promise of which induced many electors to vote for him.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at six o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 23, 1903.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the year ended December, 1902. —Hon. Sir Frederick Borden.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Jas. H. Ross, Esq., member for the electoral district of Yukon, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Mr. Scott.

SUPREME COURT.—AMENDMENTS.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the object of the Bill which I am now introducing is to amend the Supreme Court Act so as to give that court exclusive jurisdiction in federal matters, such as is vested in the supreme court of the United States.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DAMAGES FROM FIRES CAUSED BY RAILWAYS.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, this Bill is the same as that introduced by me last session.

Mr. HACKETT.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LOAN COMPANIES.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 24) to extend the power of loan companies. He said: The object is to give to some existing loan companies, incorporated under an early Act, similar privileges to those incorporated under a later and more generous Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

WHEAT SHIPMENTS FROM PORT HURON AND FORT WILLIAM, &c.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

How many bushels of wheat were shipped from Port Arthur and Fort William during the season of navigation of 1902, and the destination of same (by water to other lake ports) from said ports?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). In reply I beg to say:

Wheat shipped by vessels and destination of same during season of navigation, April 11th, to December 5th, 1902, from the ports of Fort William and Port Arthur.

	Canadian Vessels.	Foreign U.S. Vessels.	Totals.
Owen Sound	1,308,160.10		1,308,160.10
Midland	8,316,972.30		8,316,972.30
Parry Sound	3,515,760.20		3,515,760.20
Pt. Edward	192,904.10		192,904.10
Meaford	1,009,332.30		1,009,332.30
Goderich	2,759,484.40		2,759,484.40
Kingston	4,985,176.50		4,985,176.50
	22,087,791.10		22,087,791.10
Buffalo	636,558.50	11,256,928.10	11,893,487.00
Pt. Huron	827,293.20	869,945.20	1,697,238.40
Total bush.	23,551,643.20	12,126,873.30	35,678,516.50

On account of the elevator at Port Edward being burned, the elevator at Port Huron was used for the 1,697,238.40 bushels, which eventually came back to Canada, so that the real shipment to United States was only 11,893,487 bushels, and the total to Canadian ports would be 23,785,029.50 bushels.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The hon. gentleman asked last week for the total receipts at the various ports. I was not able to give the receipts at Sarnia, but on subsequent inquiry I find that they amounted to 3,884,391 bushels during the season of navigation of 1902. I would also state that in the answer I then gave with reference to the port of Goderich, there was an error. The receipts were given as 2,226,660 bushels. They said 3,226,660.

JUDGE MYERS.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

Was the Minister of Justice correctly reported in 'Hansard' of February 21, 1902, when in answer to a question as to when a successor to Judge Prendergast would be appointed, he replied 'in the immediate future ?'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the statement contained in 'Hansard' with respect to the appointment of Mr. Myers who was appointed the 3rd of January, 1893. I am informed that he was at the time a member of the local legislature for the electoral division of Minnedosa, province of Manitoba.

FREE RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin)—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

Is it the intention of the government to introduce a system of free rural mail delivery in any part of the Dominion during the present year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). In the absence of the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) I may inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson) that the matter referred to in his question is under the consideration of the government.

CONTRACT FOR 25,000 TONS STEEL RAILS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. To whom was the contract for 25,000 tons steel rails, to be delivered in June, 1903, given?
2. At what prices ?
3. Who were the other tenderers ?
4. What were their prices ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The contract for these rails has been awarded to a Glasgow firm and the contract itself has been sent forward for execution, but has not yet been received. Until the contract itself has come back executed, it would not be in accordance with the custom in these matters to allow the names of other tenderers to transpire. I should be very glad to inform the hon. gentleman who has made the inquiry as soon as we receive the contract executed, so that he may repeat the question.

LEGISLATION RESPECTING PRIVATE BANKERS.

Mr. McGOWAN asked :

Is it the intention of the government to introduce any legislation at the present session regarding private bankers, so that the transactions of such bankers may be made more public than at present, and enable depositors to ascertain their financial strength ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It is not in contemplation to introduce any legislation of the character mentioned in the question. Persons who call themselves private bankers stand in the same relation to the public as any other business persons.

COST OF THE CENSUS.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

How much has been paid to date in connection with taking the census of 1901 ? What further sum will be required to complete the census of 1901 ? Has the expenditure in connection with that service been completed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In answer to the latter part of the question, I would inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy), that the expenditure has not been completed. The remainder of the question is covered by a motion before the House, in response to which the information will be promptly brought down.

RESIGNATION OF THE WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Morin—asks (translation) :

1. Has Dr. Duchesneau, Warden of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, given in his resignation ?
2. If so, has the government accepted it ?
3. If not, has the Minister of Justice, or any one belonging to the Department of Justice, had any interview or correspondence with the warden of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary on the subject of his resignation ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. H. M. Carroll). (Translation.) The answer to the first and second questions is : No. As to the third question, I would say that there has been no official correspondence or interview on the matter.

PAYMENTS TO P. D. TYERMAN.

Mr. TAYLOR (South Leeds)—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Has P. D. Tyerman received any sums of money from the government, or from any department of the government, during the past five years ?
2. If so, what sum or sums has he received during each of the said years, and from what department or departments, in each instance ?
3. For what service or services were the said respective sums paid to the said P. D. Tyerman in each instance ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). With respect to the Department of Agriculture, the answer to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Taylor's) questions are as follows :

1. Yes.
2. 1901-02, $619, from the Department of Agriculture, 1902-03, $883, from the Department of Agriculture.
3. For professional services and expenses incurred in connection with the small-pox outbreak in the territories.

The following answers have been received from the Department of the Interior:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. The following amounts were paid P. D. Tyerman during the past five years through the Department of the Interior:

Year.	Service.	Amount
1899-1900.	Professional services inspecting and treating Doukhobors and other immigrants including expenses and medical supplies.....	$ 57 00
1900-1901.	Professional services attending diphtheria cases at Schwitzburg, &c., expenses and medical supplies.....	$ 430 00
1901-1902.	Professional services inspecting and treating immigrants, expenses, drugs, &c.....	$ 270 80
	Total..	$ 757 80

The answers received from the Department of Indian Affairs are as follows:

1. Dr. Tyerman has received sums of money from the Department of Indian Affairs during the past four years.

2. The following sums were received by him:

Fiscal Year.	Amount.	Agency.
1898-1899.....	$ 211 50	Carleton.
1898-1899.....	554 70	Duck Lake.
1899-1900.....	427 00	Carlton.
1900-1901.....	1,610 45	Duck Lake.
1900-1901.....	305 54	Carlton.
1900-1901.....	871 57	Duck Lake.
1901-1902.....	1,027 00	Carlton.
1901-1902.....	473 00	Duck Lake.
	5,480 76	

No payments were made previous to 1898-99.

3. The sums were paid him for medical attendance upon the Indians of the Carleton and Duck Lake agencies, North-west Territories.

ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT.

Mr. PUTTEE asked:

1. On what date was the contract signed for the construction of locks on the Red river, at St. Andrews, Manitoba?

2. What is the time specified in the contract for completion of the work?

3. What is the total amount of consideration of the contract?

4. What percentage can be advanced to the contractor on accepted work?

5. How much has so far been advanced and paid?

6. Is there now any possibility of the contractor completing the work within the specified time? If not, what action is to be taken to ensure speedy completion?

7. Has application been made on the part of the contractor for change or waiver of specifications, as regards material to be used, the schedule of wages to be paid, extension of time, or other material clauses?

8. Have any changes been agreed to? If so, what are they?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland):

1. 18th July, 1900.
2. 19th July, 1903.
3. $469,000.00.
4. 90 per cent.
5. $28,045.00.
6. The contractor has until the 18th July, 1903, to execute his work.
7. Yes, as regards material through a largely signed petition.
8. No.

PRINTING OF ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Morin—asked:

1. Who is the person, or who are the persons, in charge of and responsible for the printing of the electoral lists?

2. In the case of errors of addition or of omission of the names of electors on the electoral lists at the King's Printer's, who is the one to be held responsible for such errors?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The King's Printer prints the lists as received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. If any errors occur in the printing, the King's Printer is the responsible officer.

MR. HARRISON, INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES —RESIGNATION.

Mr. WILMOT asked:

Did Mr. Harrison, a Dominion Inspector of Fisheries, resign that office previous to becoming a candidate for the New Brunswick Assembly?

If so, has he been reappointed, and at what time?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). Mr. Harrison resigned his office as inspector of fisheries on the 16th February, 1903. He has not been reappointed.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, or applications, relating to or concerning the grant or concession to A. N. C. Tredgold, or to the Hydraulic Mining Syndicate, either separately or associated with A. N. C. Tredgold, of claims, rights or privileges, on Bonanza, Bear, and Hunker Creeks, or their tributaries, or elsewhere in the Yukon.—(Mr. Bell).

(Translation.) Copies of all correspondence, letters, documents, etc., relating to the difficulties in regard to the Indian Reserve of Doncaster, in the county of Terrebonne.—(Mr. Desjardins).

(Translation.) Copies of all correspondence, letters, and documents relating to the request made to the federal government in connection with the building of a post office in the town of Terrebonne, county of Terrebonne.—(Mr. Desjardins).

(Translation.) Copies of all correspondence, letters, documents, specifications, plans concerning the deepening of the river Jésus, from the end of the Isle to the end of the Pacific Bridge, on the said river, so as to allow the passage of vessels drawing five feet of water.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

(Translation.) A statement giving,—

1. The names of all the immigration agents employed by the government in foreign countries.
2. The names of the countries wherein each of such agents does his work.
3. The place of residence of each one of such agents.
4. The salary paid to each one of them.
5. The travelling expenses paid by each one of them.
6. The office expenses and other expenses made or incurred by each one of such agents during the last year of his employment.—(Mr. Bourassa).

W. W. FITZGERALD—HOMESTEAD AND PRE-EMPTION.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the government, or any member of the government, and W. W. Fitzgerald, of Grenfell, Assa., or any one in his behalf, regarding his homestead and pre-emption, which were cancelled.

He said : I am not familiar with the facts in this case, and, therefore do not propose to say anything about it. I only desire to get the correspondence so as to satisfy Mr. Fitzgerald that everything was regular, as he seems to think it was not. I have made inquiries in the department, and so far as I know, everything was done regularly. Mr. Fitzgerald wishes to get the correspondence, and therefore I make the motion.

Motion agreed to.

COST OF TAKING THE CENSUS.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Sproule—moved :

For a return showing the total cost of the taking of the census for 1871, 1881 and 1891. Also, the amount paid on account of the taking of the census for 1901, up to March 1, 1903.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I move in amendment that the following words be added :

Also a statement showing the nature of the information given in the census of 1891 and in that of 1901, and the mode of remuneration of the enumerators on each occasion.

Mr. J. CLANCY (Bothwell). I desire to avail myself of this motion to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to what seems to be a growing evil in this House, namely, that when we ask a short question the information answering which it is within the capacity of a clerk to prepare within ten or fifteen minutes, we are told on this side of the House that we must wait for a return ; and when the motion is put upon the paper to bring down that return, though it would probably not involve a great deal of time, the hon. gentleman rises in his place and proposes an amendment that involves considerable work, thereby delaying the information which the House is entitled to. I just desire to say to the hon. gentleman that I do not think he is treating this side of the House fairly. I can understand that there are many cases where questions may be asked upon both sides of the House in relation to which a return would better give all the information required, but that involves a great deal more work. But I want to say to the hon. gentleman that the question asked by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and the one subsequently asked by myself, do not involve much work. If the hon. gentleman expects to get along with the work of this House—and we on this side desire to aid him in every possible way—I can tell him that he is not pursuing the right course in order to accomplish that object. I repeat that the hon. gentleman's refusal to give the answer from his seat in the House rather than oblige members on this side to ask for a return, which may turn out to be quite a lengthy one, is unfair, and is narrowing the rights and privileges of the opposition of this House. I hope the hon. gentleman will reconsider his position, and that he will give me the information that I have asked, specially in view of his amendment just made to the motion of my hon. friend from Leeds, which adds a great deal of work to the original motion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The point of the hon. gentleman's remarks is that this amendment is going to cause considerable delay. If it should so prove, my hon. friend's position will be justified ; but if the information is promptly brought down, I do not suppose he attaches much importance to the form in which it is brought down. I can promise the hon. gentleman that there will be no unreasonable delay.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to say what day that return will be brought down ? The reason I ask is because the information is important, and we should have it at once.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot fix a day, but I will promise the hon. gentleman the return will be prompt.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I would just remind the hon. gentleman that it is necessary the return should be prompt, because there are items in the estimates which we wish to discuss with those figures be-

fore us. Therefore the Minister of Finance will see the importance of furnishing to the House the statement at the earliest possible moment. His amendment, of course, will necessitate a great deal of delay.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Practically no estimates touching this subject will be proceeded with until the information is brought down.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

LEGISLATION RESPECTING TELEPHONE COMPANIES.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the leader of the House whether it is the intention of the government to introduce a general telephone Act this session, as was promised last session.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would ask the hon. gentleman to give notice of this question.

EXPROPRIATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 8) to amend the Expropriation Act (the Minister of Justice) read the second time and House went into Committee thereon.

On section 1.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to be a new principle to introduce into the expropriation power, under the general power of eminent domain, which is given the government to exercise. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will explain whether there is authority in any other country to exercise this power to the limited extent that is proposed now. The government have the power to take property where it is essential in the interest of the community upon giving a fair remuneration for it, but, I have never heard of the power being given to exercise the right of expropriation for a limited period. There may be some other countries which exercise this right and there may be a precedent in England for it but I have never heard of such legislation before.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Mr. Chairman, I am not aware that there is such leglislation in England, but a Bill similar to this was introduced into this House a few years ago and passed. It was rejected in the Senate because the Bill made the law applicable to cases then pending in the courts, and of course, that was a departure from the general principle which the Senate could not sanction, and as a result the Bill was withdrawn. There is nothing, in my judgment at all events, more natural than that the government should have the right to take a property for a limited period of time, if the uses for which the government want the property are sufficient to justify them in exercising a limited control over it. Take the construction of a public work in the vicinity of a quarry, for instance; we want to build a lock on a canal, why should it be incumbent upon the government to expropriate the quarry and to retain it for all time to come when in all probability we only require to use the quarry for one or two years? Why should the government not have the right, if they are willing to pay for it, to take the property for any limited time the government desire, to use it for that time and after the expiration of that time to allow it to revert back to its owner? It seems to me it is a very wise principle in legislation not to encumber the government with the property after it becomes useless and after they have used it for a certain period of time. I want my hon. friends to understand that the object of the Bill is to enable the government to acquire the use of property for a limited period of time, that is to exercise the right of expropriation for a limited period, at the expiration of that time the property to revert to its owner, the government paying for the damage the man may have suffered during the time that the government had used it. There is nothing unjust or unfair in that proposition as it appears to me.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must see at once what is involved in that? How is it possible when you make the expropriation, to know the user of it that you intend?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. You are obliged to state the time for which you require it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How are you going to be able to say whether you are going to take ten yards of stone from a quarry or a million yards of stone at the time of the expropriation?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. You are obliged to do that in expropriating permanently. When you are going to expropriate permanently you know the property you are going to expropriate and the judge assesses the value of the property. The elementary principle is to determine the quantity of stone you are going to take. I have had experience with cases of this kind.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman entirely misunderstands my argument on the question. When you expropriate for the use of the government and exercise the government's right of eminent domain you know the value of the property.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. How do you know?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It can be determined by arbitration. The right of eminent domain should not be exercised except it is in the interest of the Crown and the people at large. You know the value of a pro-

perty; it is possible to determine it, but how is it possible to determine beforehand what the user would be of a quarry which the government is going to take for a limited period. We will, for instance, require the use of a property for two or three years and the government only intend to take so many yards of stone out of it. To exercise the right of expropriation you want to know how many yards of stone you will take out of it or what the user will be. It is impossible to know this at the time of expropriation. I doubt very much the power of this government to exercise this power to a limited extent. It may be that as you can exercise the power to the fullest extent and can expropriate absolutely, you also have the lesser power of taking possession of the property for a year or two, but, the anomaly occurs that it must be impossible to tell the user what the government intend to make of a property for a short time when expropriating it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has suggested no serious difficulty in the working out of the provisions of this Bill. I agree with him that at present the government has no power to expropriate any limited interest in property and that is the reason why the government is seeking power from parliament which has the right to confer that power. If we find it necessary in the carrying out of any public work to acquire an interest in property for a limited term of years, or a limited interest in any sense, we are asking parliament to allow us to do that, in the public interest.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why should the public be benefited at the expense of private individuals ? Why should my property which is expropriated for a limited time be ruined and then that the government should have power to throw it back on my hands ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman evidently objects to the principle of expropriation altogether.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, I do not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is as unjust to take a man's property from him altogether as to take it for a limited term.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is a difference. If you take a piece of my property for all time to come the arbitrators can settle what that property is worth, but no arbitrators could settle the value of a property that the government was only going to take for a limited time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) evidently does not believe that there can be any equitable expropriation of private property for public uses, or else he would not suggest that objection. I say that it is just as much of an outrage to take a man's property altogether as it is to take it in part. Suppose a public work is going on and that you want to place the necessary plant on private property during the two or three years that the work is going on. You can judge how long you may want to use that property and you will be careful to expropriate it for such a time, or if you do not expropriate it for a sufficient length of time you would have to expropriate it later on for a further term. You are bound to compensate the owner of that property for any damage he will suffer, and if he is compensated to that extent what has he to complain of ? Why can it not be as easily estimated what damages the owner of a property will suffer if you take it for two years as if you take it for ever ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is exactly the point.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Suppose you want to take a dwelling house for ten years, is there no way of ascertaining the just amount the owner should receive for that period.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no trouble at all in a case of that kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then there is no trouble at all in any case. Now in the case of a quarry—suppose there is a quarry right alongside a public work and that it would be in the public interest to expropriate only a part of that quarry ; assume that that quarry is equipped with all the necessary plant for its working ; assume that the government wants to expropriate one quarter or one half, what difficulty would there be in the way of estimating the value of that part of the property which the government wanted to expropriate. Surely the owner would be paid full compensation to cover any injury he would suffer. Unless this committee can be convinced that no method can be devised by which a property owner can have just and reasonable compensation for the limited interest you are taking in his property then there can be no objection to this Bill.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you are dealing with a quarry that has already been opened. There is a difference between the expropriation of such a quarry and the expropriation of a quarry that has not been opened.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the difference ?

Mr. COCHRANE. The difference is that when a quarry is opened there is no damage other than for the material you take out of it, but if you expropriate land on which to open a quarry and you pay perhaps for only one fifth of it, you will destroy it for all time to come for any other purpose because it might be that no one else would want to use that quarry but the government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has answered his own objection. If it were found impossible to estimate fairly the amount of damages that would be done to a quarry that is not opened, then the owner can claim from the tribunal all the compensation he could possibly suffer, and unless the government is able to bring evidence to show that he does not suffer full damages they would have to pay the bill ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of your Bill then ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The government would take a portion of that quarry sufficient to give it enough stone to suit their purpose, and it would have to pay for it. There is no danger that any one who has his property taken is not going to get all the compensation he is entitled to ; the danger is the other way.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister says that if the property owner does not know what user the government is going to take of the expropriated property, he can ask the fullest damages possible. Why not take the whole property, then ? The owner should receive payment for all the value put upon the property. The trouble of an expropriation for a short time is the difficulty of knowing the damage or the value of the user.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is for the court to determine.

Hon. Mr HAGGART. Suppose a property is covered with timber, and it is necessary for the government to take the timber off the land for two or three years.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. You cannot do that under the Expropriation Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, you can. It is an absolute expropriation of the property for the term for which it is taken, to cut timber or to do anything else with it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Timber is not real estate once it is cut.

Hon. Mr HAGGART. It is real estate when it is growing on the land. The stone in the quarry is also part of the real estate. The minister sees the absurdity of the proposition in regard to timber, but he says the Act does not apply to that. Why does it not apply to that just as well as to the stone in the quarry or to the soil ? The application is the same. If the property is expropriated for a term of two or three or five years, it is as absolute an expropriation as an expropriation forever. How is the party whose land is expropriated to know whether the government is going to use the whole of the quarry or only a portion of it ? He can only know the amount he is entitled to when the government abandons it. No legislature in the world has ever before made provision for the partial exercise of the right of eminent domain. I never heard of it either in the United States or Great Britain. There is only one way to exercise the right of eminent domain or of taking the property of an individual for the purposes of the Crown, and that is to take it absolutely and pay for it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not know that it is necessary to discuss with my hon. friend the question of the partial exercise of the power of eminent domain ; but I want to point out that when it is desired to expropriate property for the purpose of public utility, the first thing a government has to do is to give a notice containing a description of the property and having attached to it a plan of the property which it is intended to expropriate. At the same time, it is necessary for the government to deposit the amount of money which is considered to be the fair value of the property taken. If you want, for instance, to expropriate a quarry which has not been opened, the first thing necessary is to ascertain the quantity of material contained in the quarry, otherwise it is impossible for the government to estimate or the court to determine how much the compensation should be. Before the amount to be paid by way of compensation can be determined, it is necessary to ascertain the extent to which the government is going to benefit and the extent to which the individual is going to be prejudiced. If the government wants a part of the quarry—one half or one third or one fourth—it is as easy for the government to determine what the value of that portion is, as it is to determine the value of the whole. I put it to the common sense of the House whether it would be right for the government in case they want to use a quarry for the purpose of extracting 100 or 200 cubic yards of stone rom it, to be obliged to expropriate the whole quarry in perpetuity, and after they have extracted what they require, to have the property lie useless on their hands ? Is it not more fair and equitable for the government to say, we want that quantity of stone, for that we are prepared to pay, and after we have paid for that, then the property reverts to the orginal owner. To what extent is the original owner prejudiced ? From his quarry so much stone has been taken, he has been paid for the quantity so taken, he has been paid for damage caused by the expropriation. He has not suffered any loss, and the property remains on his hands. Is that not more fair and equitable than to require the government to expropriate the whole property ?

Mr. SPROULE. Could not the government dispose of the quarry ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In what way could the government, under these

conditions, dispose of a quarry to benefit the public ?

Mr. COCHRANE. What good would the property be to the owner after it had been destroyed for all time to come ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If it is destroyed for all time to come, he gets the full value of it.

Mr. COCHRANE. You do not know what damage you do till you are through with it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If you do not, you cannot expropriate. It is for the government to make out their case.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the government required a few cords of stone, and upon the basis of that the compensation was fixed ; but it turned out that they required three or four times that amount.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They would have to pay for it.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the arrangement be according to a schedule of prices ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. My hon. friend must bear in mind that when the government or anybody representing the government enter on a man's property for the purpose of expropriating it, it is incumbent on the government to determine the limits of the property they require. They are looked upon as trespassers and the courts require them to describe the property they wish to take, they cannot go an inch beyond that description. If the government expropriate 300 or 400 yards of stone, when that quantity is exhausted they are obliged to leave the property or give a new notice of expropriation, because the expropriation is always held to be for the benefit of the party from whom it is expropriated.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. By the wording of the hon. gentleman's Bill, he may expropriate a limited estate in the property of any individual. He may expropriate a property for sufficient length of time to take 300 of 400 cubic yards of stone out of it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The limit would have to be described in the notice for expropriation. In that notice you must inform the court what you intend to take, and are bound strictly by its terms. There is no rule more firmly established than that you cannot go one inch beyond the limit of your notice.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is as to boundary but not as to the estate.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have the right to occupy during a given term, and during that occupation you take out a certain quantity of stone.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not under the power of eminent domain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are changing the law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are establishing the principle of absolutely expropriating for a limited term and for a limited purpose. You are to have absolute property only for the purpose of taking out a certain quantity of stone.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let me give a case which has actually occurred. In connection with a public work, it is necessary to put a guy on an adjoining property, and that guy is only required for the purpose of a derrick or putting up a pier. Why should you be obliged to take that piece of property for all time when you only required it for two or three months and it was absolutely useless to you afterwards ? Let me put another case, and one that has occurred within my knowledge. You have a quarry some distance away from the construction you are building, as in the case of the Quebec bridge. To get to that quarry you have to pass over two or three pieces of property. You only want the right of way while you are constructing your bridge, after your bridge is finished, the right of passage is absolutely valuless. But under the law you have to expropriate those pieces of property for all time. Would it not be fair that you should simply pay the owners for the use of their property during the time you required it and then hand it back to them. Is it fair that you should have to buy that property for all time ? It seems to me that the fairness of the rule asked for is quite evident.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg to differ from the hon. gentleman. I could understand his argument with reference to an easement, for instance, for the purpose of building a dam, or some other public work, but that case is provided for in most of the local acts of the local legislature.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In some cases it is.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We have not got it with us in Quebec.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The fair way when a government wants a property even temporarily, is to buy it out, and then resell it when no longer required. In what different position would the government be at the end of the term, if it held the property, than that in which the owner would be when the property reverted to him? I could understand the argument with reference to easement but cannot understand it with reference to real estate. When you exercise the power of expropriation, you should, exercise it absolutely. After you have no use for the property, it is just as valuable to you as to its former owner. Let it be sold

and recoup yourselves in that way just as the former owner would have to do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot understand why my hon. friend should say that the only fair way is to take the whole property. Fair to whom ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. To all parties.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Fair to the owners whose property you are taking ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What constitutes fairness ? Is it not fair to give a man all that the user of his property is worth ? Can there be anything fairer than to pay a man all he can reasonably ask ? If you want your neighbour to allow you the privilege of using a piece of his ground for a short time. Would it not be fair that he should say : 'Pay me for the time I have it and I will give it to you.' Would it not be equally fair for the government to say : 'Give me the use of your property for a certain time and whatever is fair I will pay.' The amount of compensation is determined and the government pay for it. Is there any unfairness in that ? It simplifies procedure, saves public money, does not take anything out of the pockets of anybody and justice is done all around.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is an excessive power which the government exercises—that power of expropriating property for public purposes and the owner is not bound to part with his property to the public except on certain conditions. One of these is that it must be required for the use of the public generally, and the conditions under which he may be compelled to give up what is his are very limited in most countries which enjoy a constitution. Unfortunately they are not so limited under the constitution we have in this country and the constitution of Great Britain. That power of expropriation is one which comes down to us from the Roman law, and is never exercised except in its absolute sense of taking the property and paying for it in full. There has never been any such thing known as a partial expropriation, or taking a man's property for the part of the time and then returning it to him. When you want to use his property, take it and pay for it, and when you no longer require it, it is just as valuable to you as to the man from whom you took it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman then objects to the principle of expropriation ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not, but I say that the principle of expropriation is only justified in extreme cases. The exercise of that right was very limited under the Roman law. It is also limited in the United States and in every country in the world except here and Great Britain. It is supposed to be exercised only in one manner and only for the use of the public and in the public interest. A property may be expropriated but only on condition that the owner shall have a fair consideration and that it should be expropriated in a fair manner and absolutely taken and paid for in full. But we are here extending the power of expropriation by providing that property may be expropriated for a month or six weeks or even only a few days in order that you may run a tramway through it to some quarry ; but if you want to do that you should buy the property absolutely and pay the owner for it.

Mr. WRIGHT. According to the last argument if the government were to build a railway through a man's farm the government would not only have to buy that portion traversed by the railway but the entire farm.

Mr. BROCK. I think the government are endeavouring to legislate in a way that is going to give them and all future governments a great deal of trouble. The hon. minister speaks of expropriating a quarry. Surely he must know what a quarry means. Very often they expropriate land in which there is a good quarry. But it is only made valuable by being opened up. Would the government buy it, open it up and so make it valuable, and then, having paid a considerable sum for it give it back to the previous owner at a valuation ? This would open the door to an amount of corruption in connection with property of that kind that the government probably does not foresee. It is easy to work the surface of a quarry; but if an enormous quantity of stone were wanted, they would have to go very deep. How are you going to have the value calculated ? I suppose the owner of a quarry, like any other owner, owns to the centre of the earth. How, then, are you going to get at the value ? It seems to me that, if the government are going to open up and put quarries into working shape and then get rid of them, the legal department of the government will be kept busy. I cannot understand the reason of the proposition. Cannot the government buy stone as an ordinary contractor buys it ? Why do they wish the power of expropriation—unless it be that they have their eyes on some quarries they wish to buy. It seems to me it is no argument in favour of this expropriation proposal to say that stone is necessary for the building of a bridge or something of that kind. There are any quantity of quarries from which the hon. minister can get the material under contract at competitive prices, and so buy his stone a great deal cheaper than any government can get it by proceeding in the manner here proposed. I

say this is a method which will cause a great deal of trouble to the government and loss to the public. If the government take powers of this kind, how can they refuse to incorporated companies the same power ? I do not know where the thing is going to end, but I can see that it will lead to great difficulties before it is ended. The government had better let the matter drop where it is, and buy their stone as the private companies do that are buying stone and building important works on the most economical principles.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is evidently the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Brock's) opinion that the government ought to allow itself to be held up by anybody who happens to have a quarry in the vicinity of a public works. That is the principle that has prevailed up to the present time, but we cannot sanction it any longer.

Mr. BROCK. I think they will hold the government up just as much under this power of expropriation. Is there only one quarry in the country ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There may be only one in the vicinity of a public work.

Mr. BROCK. Why, their name is legion. You can get stone laid down at public works cheaper than the government can get it by this expropriation method.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose this is limited to government expropriations—it does not extend to railway companies.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is an amendment to the Expropriation Act, but that Act is sometimes made applicable to railway companies also.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is what I thought. So, you give this power not only to the government but to the railway companies ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, only to the government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) understood me perfectly. This Expropriation Act is applicable, in the first instance, to public works. If you incorporate a railway company or a company to carry on any other public enterprise, you may make the Expropriation Act applicable to that company. Parliament may grant that power or it may not—it is for parliament to exercise its discretion in that matter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But does that power extend to railways which have charters at the present moment ? Some of them, or all of them, have the right——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under the Railway Act—

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They have the right to exercise this power of expropriation just as the government have. Will this extention of the power of expropriation apply to those railway companies that already have charters ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely it must. To make applicable to them the Expropriation Act is to make applicable to them not only that Act but any amendments to it.

Mr. CLANCY. I am at a loss to understand how the Minister of Justice can reconcile his own arguments on this subject of the expropriation of a quarry. Let us suppose a case : Suppose the hon. gentleman owns a quarry contiguous to the site of a proposed public work. Suppose that that quarry has no value except as a source of supply of stone for that public work. The government would naturally say : We only want a portion of the stone, and so we will expropriate a quarter of the quarry. But, the value of the whole quarry is in what is taken for that public work. How, then, will the damages be fixed ? Would the government take all that is valuable in the quarry, pay for only a portion of the value, and leave the valueless part in the hands of the owner ? Is the hon. minister prepared to say that that would be a fair proceeding ? The hon. minister, as I understand him, says he would return the quarry to the owner because it is of no value. But it is of no more value to the owner than it is to the public. The only object in expropriating a quarry under such circumstances is to benefit the public by securing stone cheaper than it could otherwise be secured. But why should the individual owner yield a right he possesses merely because of the accident of the location of a public work ? If the government expropriate a quarry, they ought to pay every cent it is worth to place stone there from the nearest rival quarry, no matter what the distance may be. The value in the property belongs to the individual and not to the country, and, if the public take the property they should pay full value for it. Then, I do not see that the Bill provides for any prospective profits, but merely for damages. I shall not argue that point because I am not a lawyer. But I do not see just what the effect of that clause would be. The only actual damage that the owner could claim would be that sustained through the taking of a quantity of stone from his quarry, leaving out of account the whole value of the quarry under the Expropriation Act. I cannot see how the hon. minister can reconcile the exercise of such a power with the fact that the government will have taken the whole value of the property.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think I should have to leave the court to assess the damage. That is entirely beyond our jurisdiction.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) any case in mind by which we might judge more definitely of the effect of this clause ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I mentioned a moment ago the case of Stewart and the Queen, the case of a quarry, from which it was necessary to take a certain quantity of stone. Nothwithstanding that we only took a small part of the stone of the quarry, the government was obliged to purchase the whole quarry, and it now remains absolutely useless, so far as the government is concerned, as a public work. There is the other case, where a public work was separated to some extent by a strip of land from the quarry, and it was necessary in order to get it to pass over a man's property by a tramway. This work at the outset would last perhaps a year and a half, but in order to pass the tramway over this property and get to the quarry, it was necessary so the courts decided, to expropriate this narrow strip of about seven feet. Surely this property, once the public work was completed, became absolutely valueless to any one save the owner of the property. But you cannot expropriate the right of passage over the property ; it is necessary to expropriate the property itself. That is a second case. Then there is the third case I mentioned a moment ago, of a guy that was used in connection with the construction of one of the piers of a bridge. It was necessary to put up a guy in the vicinity of the pier. My recollection is that the piece of property upon which this guy was put was not required for more than five or six weeks. But in order to put up that guy it was necessary to expropriate the property itself for all time, and once expropriated, and once the guy was removed, the land was absolutely valueless for the purpose of the public work. Now, was it reasonable that the government should be obliged, under these circumstances, to take that property for the mere purpose of putting up a guy ? Was it necessary to take that property for all time ? Was it not fair to the individual, as well as to the public, that he should be paid for his property for the time during which it was in use, and after it reverted to him in the condition in which it was before, was it not right that he should take the property back again, when he had suffered no damage whatever except the right of user that was vested in the government for a limited period, as I have stated.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understand it, if this Bill becomes law it will in ordinary course apply equally to private railway companies as well as to the Crown. There is usually a provision that some of these clauses should be made applicable to a private company ; that is not an unusual provision. Does not the Bill make the provisions of that Act applicable to private railway companies ?

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, I think not.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My recollection is that there are expropriation clauses applicable to private companies.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think the Railway Act contains a provision for expropriation.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman means that this should be confined to cases where public works are going on ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understand it, this is a principle that is now being introduced for the first time into the legislation of any country. It is not found in the English legislation.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When the hon. gentleman says it is being introduced for the first time in any country, he is wrong, if he goes back to the Roman law.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have not gone back to the Roman law. But I say, speaking subject to correction, that this is a unique piece of legislation. The hon. gentleman points out that it is confined to the government expropriation, it is not contemplated that this power should be given to private corporations. His argument is based on the idea that the Crown might well have this law, but it is not proposed to give the same privilege to private corporations. Now, the fact that no such provision has existed hitherto, does it not suggest that hitherto this has not been considered a reasonable right to vest in any body, whether in a government or a private corporation ? The hon. gentleman sees the distinction between a railway company as such, and the government as such. The fact that there has been no such provision hitherto, and that there is no such provision in the English law, seems to me to indicate that it has not been considered fair and reasonable. In other words, if the government or any public body proposed to take my property, they should not take it for a day or two, there should not be a mere chaffering about a few pence, but the property should change owners, and the arrangement should be completed once for all. They should either take my property wholly, or leave it alone. That seems to be the principle, at any rate, on which we have gone hitherto. Without having given it much consideration, it seems to me a very extraordinary power. The hon. gentleman admits that it is not a power that should be given generally to public bodies. The one body that could best afford to pay for the whole thing seems to be the one that is most concerned. I think it is well worthy of consideration whether we should go that far.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman will remember that this Bill was considered a year ago and passed by the House, but when it reached the Senate it was rejected, because it was found there that the Bill was applicable to a case that was then pending, the case of Stewart. Now, it is as we go along and acquire experience that we discover the difficulties that exist in our legislation, and it is the practical experience of these difficulties which makes it necessary now and then to amend our legislation. Perhaps the hon. gentleman was not present when I mentioned a moment ago several cases calling for this legislation. Take, for instance, a public work being constructed in the neighbourhood of a quarry, which is separated from the public work by a strip of land in the possession of a private individual. That strip of land is not needed in any manner, near or remote, for the purpose of a public work ; but in order to reach the quarry from which the public work is separated by this strip of land, it is necessary to construct a tramway. The tramway is constructed from the quarry to the public work crossing, over this strip of land. Probably this strip of land may not be required for more than a few months ; in the case in question, I think it was required for a little over a week. Now, a man, to get to his quarry, is obliged to expropriate that propriety, to buy it and take it for all time, and when he has ceased to have any use for his tramway, the property is of no value to anybody except to the man from whom it has been taken, a strip of land seven feet wide.

Mr. CLANCY. Why does the hon. gentleman confine his Bill to that class of cases ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not confining my Bill to any particular class of cases ; but there are hundreds of these cases. Now, I will put this case to the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). Surely, under these circumstances, it is eminently unfair that the government should be obliged to pay for that property, after allowing to the person who owns that little strip of land, not only the value of his property, but the resulting damage which he may claim as having suffered because of his property being cut in two, for instance, as in the case in question. He says, one piece of my property is cut off from the other, and you have damaged my property by so much. After a time the property returns to him, but it is of no value to any one but himself. If the government sought to dispose of it, no one would buy it. The piece of land in question is about an acre and a quarter in length and a few feet wide. Take the other case I mentioned, where you are erecting a pier, or a lock of a canal. It is necessary to erect a derrick ; in order to put up the derrick you have to place a guy, and you have to put that guy beyond the property you require for the purpose of the public work. You have to go on to an adjoining property belonging to an individual, and you cannot go there unless you take that property, or except you treat with the owner individually. We know that frequently people may be somewhat cantankerous and that when the government are building a work in a locality their property is looked upon by some of them as a sort of gold mine to them, and they say that if we make any use of it at all we must expropriate it absolutely. Surely, that is not fair. It should be within the option of the government to say : We want that property for five, six, seven or eight months, we will pay you fairly for the use of it for the time during which we use it as the Act provides.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no very strongly pronounced views on this question, but this occurs to me and I submit it to the hon. Minister of Justice, that the cases mentioned by him must after all be exceptional in which the government cannot make a fair arrangement for the temporary use of property. Take the case of railway construction by the government and by private companies—there are very few of these cases that the hon. gentleman will be able to cite as having given rise to the necessity for this legislation and I think it is not a safe principle to legislate for exceptional cases. If I remember my hon. friend's argument, it is this : Why should not the government be in a position to make such an arrangement as this ? Why should they be fastened down with a property in fee when they only wish it for a short time ? That argument seems to apply not merely to cases of the government but to those of railway corporations, and yet, I understand, that the hon. gentleman spoke as if this privilege should be confined to the government only.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The answer is perfectly obvious. The intention is to amend the Expropriation Act. We have to have some system in our legislation. If at any time in connection with the incorporation of a company it is found desirable to give that company the powers that the government have those powers can be incorporated in the Bill for the incorporation of the company. Then, there is the power exercised by parliament in respect to a particular corporation and exercised in the light of the conditions under which the incorporation exists. The discretion is vested in parliament and that discretion is only exercised after having a full knowledge of the facts concerning the corporation which shall exercise these powers.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That argument is fair and reasonable as it stands and yet I understand the hon. gentleman carefully guards his words by saying

that the government have submitted this legislation from the government point of view in regard to public works and in no way commits itself to the principle that this would be a proper power with which to vest railway corporations generally.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That will be for parliament to decide. We have not reached that case yet.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But if the hon. gentleman is not able to say that this principle equally affects these private, or quasi public works the illustrations which he gave with so much unction to show the reasonableness of this proposal from the government point of view seem to be rather diminished in force when he will not say that he will take the same ground in regard to public works in the hands of private companies. The hon. gentleman will see that this is a very extraordinary power to give the government. He mentions one particular case in which the government had experienced some trouble and difficulty and in which the people have possibly suffered some extraordinary expense. I do not think the hon. gentleman is able to make any other reference than that of the Stewart case to which he refers as a ground for the adoption of legislation a parallel for which is not found on the statute-book of any country.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will realize that there is a vast difference between conferring powers of this description on a private corporation and giving them to the government, because, after all, it is to be presumed that the government will exercise greater discretion in using powers of this sort, than a private corporation might. The government after all are subject to the control of parliament, and if an injustice is committed they would have to account for it, while in the case of a private company there might be a more arbitrary exercise of this power than that which would take place under the government. In so far as a private individual is concerned where is the difference in principle between expropriating a property for the purposes of public utility in its entirety and expropriating for a limited period, provided the individual whose property is being expropriated receives notice, because then he is in a position to say that the compensation which the government offer is adequate or it is not adequate, and if it is not adequate he goes to court and then he stands in absolutely the same position as the government. When he goes to court the court determines as to whether the government have offered an adequate compensation for the limited right of expropriation. It is a mere matter of the court determining the extent to which the property has depreciated, the extent to which he is going to suffer damages and the court will give him compensation which will be determined so far as he is concerned according to the same rule and on the same principle as if the government were expropriating permanently.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is it not a fact that private railway companies have these temporary powers now ? I find in an Act passed last session that railway companies may go on land temporarily, pay rental for it for a number of years, or take for all time just as they wish. It seems to me that this Bill is taking a somewhat similar power for the government. Surely the government are entitled to that power if private corporations have it at the present moment.

Mr. GOURLEY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice if there is any precedent for this Act in imperial legislation ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not that I am aware of now.

Mr. GOURLEY. Well then I am opposed to it, on the ground that in England, which is a thickly settled country, this question must have arisen a thousand times. These very same difficulties that the hon. Minister of Justice has pointed out, must have been experienced there. There must have been a thousand hardships of a similar kind in a thickly settled country like England, and if they have not considered it expedient in a country like that to give these limited expropriation powers I do not think that we should adopt this legislation. I agree with all that the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has said. I have listened to the debate with an open mind and I have come to the conclusion that if they have no limited powers of expropriation in England there ought to be no limited powers here ; because the question must have arisen a thousand times. The more the debate goes on, the more I am convinced that limited expropriation is unjust. There is no court that can assess damages caused by limited expropriation. The court can assess damages, for absolute expropriation, because it is simply a question ultimately of the value of the land, but, sir, if you enter upon a territory under the powers of limited expropriation, no court can assess the value of the land. Take the case the hon. Minister of Justice has put ; he wants to enter upon my land and put a guy upon that to connect with his works. He wants to exercise that right, for a number of years, and he says he should have the right to expropriate my land for the purpose for six years. Supposing I have a chance to sell that property six months afterwards at what I consider a very advantageous price, I am debarred of the sale because the government has the use of the property for six years. It is the most extraordinary and unjust principle that I ever heard propounded.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If the government took it for all time to come what would be the difference ?

Mr. GOURLEY. That is all right ; because the court has said what the proper value of the property is for all time, and I have the money in my pocket. That is just and right, but, if the government enter upon a property for a limited number of years the owner cannot sell it during the term of that occupation. Suppose the value of land goes up, that the land becomes very desirable a year or two after this guy is placed upon my property, and I can sell it, I am debarred from so doing. When he takes his guy away six years after, the land has fallen in value, and I am injured very seriously by the Crown, and there is no remedy for me. I thought at first that this might be a fair proposition, but since listening to the discussion, I am convinced that it is a most unjust measure. Speaking as a lawyer, I speak to lawyers on the other side, and say, that if there is no precedent for this legislation in England, which is a thickly settled country and where these hardships must have arisen thousands of times in a more aggravated form than here, then I say that we should not pass such legislation. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice, that he should not address this House, which is largely composed of lawyers, with this argument as to hardship. Every judge, I have heard, in a court of law, who introduced the doctrine of hardship in order to get over the just principles of the common law, has made a spectacle of himself every time. Whenever a judge gets weak and wants to avoid the law and the evidence, he commences to talk about hardship, and then he makes a law for himself, and it takes us years to get it right. I hope that the lawyers of this House will therefore see, that when the Minister of Justice comes here and talks 'hardship,' they should vote down the Bill at once.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) if there are any foolish judges in the province of Nova Scotia ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not want to be asked that question ; but I will say that we have very foolish decisions given at times whenever a judge attempts to avoid the sound principles of the common law, by saying that this is a peculiar case of hardship in which he must not be governed by the principles of law, but by the rule of thumb.

Mr. SPROULE. The dangerous thing in this Bill would be the extension of it beyond the right of the Crown. If this amendment be in future incorporated in private Bills it will tend to harass the private individual more and more, and place him at the mercy of corporations who, for little or nothing, want to use his property for a limited period of time. If the right was absolutely confined to the Crown, it would not be so dangerous, but if it is extended to private corporations, it may become very objectionable indeed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This amendment is applicable exclusively to the Expropriation Act and the Expropriation Act has exclusive reference to public works.

Mr. CLANCY. Did I understand the Minister of Justice to say that the Bill applied exclusively to public works ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. So far as the individual property owner is concerned, what is the essential difference between giving that power to railway corporations and exercising it by the government ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The power given to the government is assumed to be exercised with greater regard for the rights of individuals than if it were vested in a corporation.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the Minister of Justice think that it is a good principle to lay down ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes If parliament wishes to extend the powers conferred on the government by the Expropriation Act to private individuals, parliament may do so, but for the time being parliament has vested that right exclusively in the government. I understood the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) to say that last year an Act was passed conferring this power on private corporations.

Mr. MACLEAN. You passed an amendment to the Railway Act under which private corporations have got these powers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is only for the purpose of making an approach to a quarry.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is the very case which is cited here, and I say that in that amendment of last session we have given this power already to private companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Act of last year is only of a very limited nature, although I am not prepared to say that it might not go further. The Minister of Justice is now asking parliament to confer upon the government this added privilege in the prosecution of public works. It is but a very moderate extension of the right of eminent domain, and it is limited to the power in respect to which this right originated. My hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) surprised me a little, because he is a very right minded gentleman when he allows his mind to have fair play. He said that because in England they had not passed legislation precisely like this, therefore we should not pass it here. Well, they have something to learn

from us occasionally in England. We do not restrict our legislation here to the legislation passed in the old country. We are trying in the colonies to make experiments in the way of legislation, and our experiments are daily commending themselves to members of the imperial parliament. I am at a loss to understand why the hon. gentleman should tie his hands in this particular instance, because the imperial parliament has not moved in this direction first. He says that this question must have arisen in numberless cases, and if it had arisen, the necessity of it would have impressed itself on the public mind there, and they would have had something of this kind drafted in the interests of the country. But the conditions in England are not at all similar to the conditions here. The government of England is not building railways or canals or bridges or public works, as we are. The government are doing here many things which are done by private enterprise in England, and in that country circumstances will not arise to call for legislation such as this. I think my hon. friend will, on a moment's reflection, see that he is going to hamper himself very materially in respect to advanced legislation in Canada, and that he has somewhat hastily declared himself as opposed to this Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The condition is limited exactly as I argued it to be in the first place. I understood the Minister of Justice to state that the government have the power of expropriating lands for a specific purpose, and abandoning them afterwards. There is no such provision in the Bill. There are only two ways in which the limited expropriation can be exercised; you may take the land for a limited time only, but not for any specific purpose, and you have the fee simple of the land for the time you take it; or, you may exercise the power of expropriating a limited estate for all time, not for a term of years. I asked the hon. gentleman if he could amalgamate the two, so as to make a limited estate for a limited time? He told me no, you must take the land for a limited time, or you must take a limited estate. The time for taking the land is limited, but where you exercise the power of taking the limited estate, it is not limited. Then, I contend that under the clause, you have no power for finding out the amount you have to pay the individual when you take the property for only four or five years. If my contention is right, when you want to expropriate a person's land for any purpose, what possible means has the court of knowing the value of the user for four or five years during which you are in possession of it?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This Bill was drafted by a very competent draughtsman, for the purpose of meeting the very case which my hon. friend has put, and I leave it to any lawyer in the House to say whether it does meet it or not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All I can say is that the language of the clause will not convey the meaning which the hon. gentleman says it does, to a person with an ordinary English education. I contend that, according to the ordinary interpretation of language, the limited interest or estate does not apply to the land that is expropriated for a limited time.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will state the case which I intend to cover by these words. The government give notice of their intention to expropriate a piece of property, say for a rifle range; and after they have given notice, with a plan of the property attached, they discover that the property, or the full extent of the property covered by the notice is not required. Then they must give notice of their intention to abandon expropriation proceedings, or that, instead of taking the quantity originally described, they intend to take a smaller portion, or that, instead of taking the property in its entirety, they intend to take a limited interest in the estate.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Suppose that before the abandonment takes place the original owner has the opportunity of selling his property at a great advance but is prevented by these expropriation proceedings, I do not see any provision which would entitle him to compensation for the loss of that opportunity.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At first blush I would be disposed to say that the owner would undoubtedly have the right to compensation. Suppose the government gives notice of its intention to expropriate, and pending the expropriation proceedings, the owner has an opportunity to dispose of his property but is prevented from doing so by this notice of expropriation. The government then find that they do not require the property and give notice of their intention to abandon the expropriation proceedings. I should say that they cannot do so without compensating the owner for the damage done him by causing him to lose the opportunity of selling. But we might leave that clause over for the purpose of further discussion.

Mr. LENNOX. Take clause 2, it reads:

2. Whenever, from time to time, or at any time before the compensation money has been actually paid, any parcel of land taken for a public work, or any portion of any such parcel, is found to be unnecessary for the purposes of such public work, or if it is found that a more limited estate or interest therein only is required.

This is put in the alternative. Might not both conditions apply?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The clause has to be considered according to the law as we have it now, which merely provides for the expropriation for all purposes. That

paragraph with reference to limited estate is intended to apply to the Act as amended by the previous section we have just passed.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. These sections 2 and 3 read together would meet the difficulty suggested by my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), but I am willing to consider the matter and put the difficulty suggested before the draughtsman, who is more familiar with the details of the Bill.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am quite content with that.

Sections 2 and 3 allowed to stand.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That seems perfectly reasonable. It is intended to give the government the right to remedy by some new work any damages that may have been caused. For instance, in the construction of a canal, you may separate the highway from some residence in the vicinity, but you may also remedy that by constructing a bridge. In assessing the damages, the construction of this bridge would have to be taken into consideration.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister gave an instance of using a piece of property for the purpose of erecting a guy. That would give you the right of entry and you might take down the fences, &c. Who has to put them up ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would be a matter for compensation which would be determined by the court.

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That section is probably the most far reaching of all those in the Bill. I would like to have it stand over until we come to consider section 2. It cuts out the right of the individual to take damages against the Crown.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have an open mind on the subject and want to have the whole matter thoroughly discussed.

Progress reported.

YUKON TERRITORY ACT.

Bill (No. 9) to amend the Yukon Territory Act (The Minister of Justice) read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). My hon. friend is aware that jurors must be, of course, in the North-west Territories as elsewhere, British subjects. But the majority of the inhabitants in certain portions of the North-west Territories are not British subjects. Under the application of the North-west Territories Act, the same individual is called upon to perform the duty of juror three, four and five times. The intention is, under this Bill, to give the Yukon Territory Council power to make an ordinance regulating the selection of jurors in such a way, while adhering to the rule to have only British subjects as jurors, a man cannot be called upon to serve out of his turn.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You do not intend to give them power to make an ordinance that foreigners may serve ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course not. The fact is that doubt has arisen as to the right of the Yukon Council to pass such an ordinance, and this is merely to confer such a right upon them to make the matter clear.

Bill reported ; read the third time, and passed.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Bill (No. 10) to amend the Act relating to the custody of juvenile offenders in New Brunswick (The Minister of Justice), was read the second time, and House went into Committee on the Bill.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Under the law as we have it now, it is competent for the Governor General to order a boy who is confined in the Dorchester penitentiary to be removed to the Boy's Industrial Home. But it is not within the jurisdiction of the Governor General to have a boy who is confined within the Industrial Home removed to the penitentiary. The object of this Bill is to give that power, on the recommendation of the Attorney General of New Brunswick.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the Governor General, under this Bill, have the power to order the transfer of the boy for any different term from that for which he was originally sentenced ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No—the same.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This clause seems to read peculiarly. It gives the Governor General power to order the removal of 'any boy who is imprisoned in the Boy's Industrial Home under sentence for an offence within the law of Canada, and for a term of years for which he might have been sentenced' and so on—not for the term he was sentenced, but 'might have been sentenced.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Governor General clearly can not do that. Once a sentence is passed it is beyond the power of the Governor General to increase

it. If there is any doubt as to the wording of the clause, I will have it looked into.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Of course, parliament can give power. It might be that a boy had been sentenced for the minimum term provided for his offence, but, apparently under this, it would be possible for the Governor General to order his removal, not for the term of his actual sentence, the minimum, but for the term for which he might have been sentenced, the maximum.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think that could be, but we will make it clear, if necessary. If my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will read the whole section, he will see that it authorizes the Governor General :

> On the application of the Attorney General of the province of New Brunswick, cause any boy who is imprisoned in the Boys' Industrial Home under sentence for an offence within the law of Canada and for a term of years for which he might have been sentenced to imprisonment in a penitentiary, to be transferred to the Dorchester penitentiary for the remainder of his term of imprisonment.

If a boy is sentenced for less than two years, under the law he cannot be moved to the penitentiary. But if his sentence is one which would have justified the sending of him to the penitentiary he can be transferred from the Industrial School to the penitentiary for the remainder of his term.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That quite meets my point.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A boy may have been sentenced to the Industrial Home for a period of five or six years, but, probably, the judge would never have thought of sending him to the penitentiary for such a long term. Why should the government take power to transfer him to the penitentiary for a term for which the judge would not have sent him there ? I do not think that is right.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is the law which exists with respect to boys in the Industrial Home in Nova Scotia. And in New Brunswick boys may be transferred from the penitentiary to the Industrial Home. Suppose that a boy is in penitentiary, and it is found that, instead of being benefited he is being contaminated by contact with criminals. It is surely well that he should be removed to the Industrial Home, and the Governor General, on the application of the Attorney General of the province, may order that removal. But, take the other case. A boy is in the Industrial Home, having been there for a period of time for which he might have been sent to the penitentiary. But it is discovered that he is a boy of such a character that, instead of benefiting, he is contaminating the others. Is it not equally right, for the sake of the others, that such a boy should be removed to the penitentiary ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are giving him a new punishment without a new trial.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is merely a different place of punishment.

Bill reported ; read the third time, and passed.

IMMORAL ENTERTAINMENTS.

Bill (No. 12) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892 (The Minister of Justice), read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). This Bill has been prepared and introduced at the suggestion of those who are responsible for the municipal administration of some of our great cities. It appears that in some of our larger cities there are performances now being given which have a demoralizing effect on the youth of the community, and under the law as it stands, it is not possible to reach them. The object of this Bill is to reach such performances as I have alluded to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the meaning of ' indecent and immoral ?' These words might bear a different interpretation in the minds of different people. Some persons may look upon a thing as indecent where others do not. The punishment is very severe. It gives extraordinary powers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have provided that the powers are to be exercised in the discretion of the magistrate. This matter has to come before the courts, and the definition of indecent or immoral must necessarily depend to some extent on the mind of the individual who is called upon to judge the case. I know a good many sections of the Criminal Code in which those words are used, but there is no definition of them, because every man knows what is indecent, and every man ought to know what is immoral.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is just the trouble. We know that at the present time there is a large class of the community who think that all modern novels and all modern plays are, to use the language of this Bill, indecent and immoral. For myself, I do not hesitate to say that I think these persons hold very extreme views. Merely because there are events in a play, or in a book, that are such as would not be taught in a Sunday school, but which are meant to illustrate the condition of society through the ages, is not a sufficient reason

for suppressing them. There are a great many people, and their opinions are entitled to weight, perhaps a majority of well meaning people, who, in my opinion, go to extremes in this matter. They see all sorts of things which they think ought not to be permitted. In some of the eastern cities, I believe there are people who paste over certain portions of placards which they consider immoral, but which in other centres, in England for instance, are considered legitimate. Reputable and high class actresses have had their likenesses placarded over with these slips, on the ground that such likenesses are indecent. Well, there are judges and judges, juries and juries; and one cannot tell what view may be taken in any district. It seems to me that the tendency of this Bill is to drive us back, in some districts, to a state of puritanism for which there is no reason under the sun. To me this seems at the moment a short cut, and a very dangerous cut, to reach a right end. Of course, the object that underlies this Bill must commend itself to every member of the House. We do not want immoral plays before the public, and we do not want indecent plays. But I venture to suggest that there will be a difficulty in the administration of that law, whether it is in the hands of a judge or a jury, and it will possibly keep away some of the very best talent that every one ought to want to see in the Dominion. I fear it will have the effect, in some centres of Canada, and according to the view that may be taken by the counsel who will advise as to the prosecution, of keeping out of the country what would really be a benefit to that very class that the promoters of such legislation as this have in view. No one wants to keep out a high class actor. Yet we must remember that in all the best plays of the present day there is perhaps in a strict application of the word, something that might have an indecent tendency. There are references in books, as there are in conversation and in newspapers, revealing modern society which might be called indecent. In what I am saying I am giving my own experience, that some of the very best citizens in this country, in order to reform society all at once, press upon parliament legislation that is too extreme, and is calculated in the end only to frustrate the good objects they have in view. I desire to caution the committee in this respect. While this clause is going through—no doubt it is framed all right—I hope hon. gentlemen will have an opportunity of considering just how far it will go. We do not want to drive out of the country the best talent who are now producing modern plays that might come under the category mentioned in this clause, in the minds of some persons.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I quite appreciate what my hon. friend says, and the danger that would result from a too close construction of the words 'immoral and indecent.' My hon. friend must bear in mind the law which we have on the statute-book. By reading section 179 of the Criminal Code you will find that every one is guilty of an indictable offence who

> Publicly sells or exposes for public sale, or to public view, any obscene book or other printed or written matter, or any picture, photograph, model or other object, tending to corrupt morals.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a strong term. We do not want obscenity, whether produced by talent or not. I think that is a far stronger word, and is less susceptible to misunderstanding than these words 'indecent or immoral.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If I understand my hon. friend, he would not have any objection to substituting the word 'obscene' for 'indecent or immoral.'

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, I think it would then be a safe piece of legislation.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the hon. Minister of Justice wishes to devote his energy to the amendment of the Criminal Code surely there are other ways in which he can direct his attention to it with profit to the public. If there is anything that the public require to be protested against, and the Criminal Code appears to be the only thing that will protect them, it is some kind of legislation for dealing with the encroachments of great companies like the coal combine. There is something being done against the public that calls for a cure and the only cure is the Criminal Code. Look at the effect in this country of the great coal strike in the United States. Combinations were formed between our coal dealers and the railway companies, especially the railway companies of our own country, to the injury of the Canadian people, creating a coal famine in this country when no coal famine really existed. If the hon. Minister of Justice wishes to tackle something that ought to be tackled he should put something in the Criminal Code that will put a stop to such enormous evils as this. I intend later on to bring this subject to his attention and I would say to him now that instead of taking up our time with these trivial matters he should place something before us dealing with the question to which I have alluded.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) will remember that this question does not bear on the question under discussion.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think I am quite within the discussion in saying that the hon. Minister of Justice instead of taking up our time with consideration of immoral plays

might better give the House an opportunity of discussing some of these great evils.

The PRIME MINISTER. Bring in a motion to that effect.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have no objection to this Bill if the hon. gentleman thinks it is necessary, but I hope he will deal with the coal combine and put a clause in the Criminal Code that will stop such practices as I believe those connected with it have indulged in.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) considers it a trivial matter to deal with an indecent or obscene play.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is the other trivial?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We will see in its time. I beg to move:

That the words 'indecent, or immoral,' be struck out and that the word 'obscene be inserted in lieu thereof.

Motion agreed to.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved:

That the words 'indecent or immoral' be struck out and that the word 'obscene' be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Chairman, I do not see why you strike out the word 'immoral' because there is a difference between 'obscene' and 'immoral.' The play might be immoral and yet not obscene.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is the language of the code and it is better to keep to that language.

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Department of Customs—Salaries, including R. R. Farrow at $2,150, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $45,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). I ask leave to strike out all the words after 'salaries' in the item. There has been a mistake in the preparation of the items and the accountant's salary of $2,150 has not been included so that I will have to bring in a supplementary estimate for his salary.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to make some observations on the frequency with which the words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' occur in these estimates. I find that out of twenty-five items these words appear in eighteen. Now, the Civil Service Act was passed for the good purpose of regulating the qualifications of those who enter the service, and providing that they should have a fair remuneration which would be increased from year to year. I can understand that in the application of such a law there necessarily would be some rare exception. But these exceptions are growing greater and greater every year until in fact the exceptions have now become the rule. Surely it would be more creditable to the government to repeal the Civil Service Act completely or to amend it, rather than they should go on constantly violating it. It has become almost a scandal that there are so many flagrant violations of this Act by the government.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would point out to the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) that there are thirty-four officers included in this item, and the words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' would only apply to Mr. Farrow, the accountant.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that, but we are entitled to some better explanation from the government. Year after year we get some flippant answer when we inquire about this. until it has come to be that the Civil Service Act is almost entirely disregarded by the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not agree with the hon. gentleman that there is any abuse existing. We believe that the Civil Service Act serves a good purpose, but there are exceptional cases that can only be dealt with in an exceptional manner. The hon. gentleman says that out of twenty-five items, in eighteen of them these words occur. That may be correct, but let me point out that in the Department of Militia there are thirty-three officials and the words only apply to one out of that number. Is there any abuse in that? In the Department of the Secretary of State there are twenty-six officials and the words apply to one official only. In the Department of Printing and Stationery there are twenty-seven officials and only one exception made, while in the Department of the Interior there are ninety-six officials and only two exceptions made. The hon. gentleman will see that there are not numerous exceptions, and even if there should be these words in connection with the items of every department of the government it would not follow that there was an abuse. It should only mean, and I hope it does only mean, that in one or two exceptional cases in a department these words are put in for reasons which of course must be explained to the House. I do not think there is any abuse: I do not think there is any reason to repeal

the Civil Service Act. In ninety-five per cent of the cases the general rules of the Act remain, and it is only to a small number in proportion to the total number of civil servants to which these words apply.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Finance will admit that these words occur ten times more frequently in the estimates now than they did formerly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think so.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not made a precise count but I believe I am within the mark when I say so. If the civil service could be managed formerly within the four corners of the Act, why are the exceptions so numerous now? Look at every department of the government in these estimates and you will see that some civil servant gets an increase "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act." That certainly leaves the impression that either the Act place, it was intended to prevent him getting outside of the Act more and more every year. All the conditions were considered when the Act was passed. It started the civil servant at a fair salary, gave him a reasonable increase from year to year until he reached the maximum of his class, and then provided for promotion. Every thing reasonable is provided in the law and the constant violation of it is without excuse. The Act, in the first place, was intended to provide that the qualification of the civil servant should be such as to ensure his being a good and useful officer. In the second place, it was intended to prevent him getting salaries from two or three sources, because it had been found in many cases that the salary voted in the estimates was no indication of the whole amount an officer was paid. To prevent abuse in this respect the Act provided that his whole salary must be shown in the vote; and where a rare exception occurred, as in the case of a civil servant who, from technical knowledge or special qualifications, would be required to do some work outside of the department to which he belonged, then something additional might be paid to him by saying 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act;' but these exceptions were intended to be very few. Now they are becoming very many, and a great abuse is growing up, showing that the Act is not fulfilling the expectations of the House, and the government should either amend it or repeal it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As my hon. friend has referred to the Department of Justice, I may state that I had in my department Mr. Blackadar, clerk of records, who received the maximum of his class, $1,400. The minimum salary of a junior second-class clerk is $600, but by paying $800 I can get all the duties performed for which Mr. Blackadar was paid $1,400. All that my hon. friend points out is perfectly true, but providing the House is informed of what we are doing and the House exercises control over it, no very great harm can come to the service.

Mr. SPROULE. I need not remind the hon. gentleman of what occurred in the Department of Militia. The man who became a defaulter was brought in without having the qualifications which the Act called for, and we know what the result has been, though I do not attribute it exactly to the Act. But it shows the necessity of keeping within the Act, and if it is necessary to depart from it in special cases, let us provide for them by amendment to the Act and not by constantly setting it aside.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I notice that there is to be a new assistant commissioner, a new chief clerk, and two more junior clerks. Who is to be the new assistant commissioner, what is the necessity for his appointment, and what is the necessity for another chief clerk?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The increase in the item now under discussion is $3,310, which will be increased to $5,460 when I bring down the supplementary vote for Mr. Farrow's salary. Of this increase, $2,800 is for the assistant commissioner. I think it will be apparent to hon. gentlemen why this appointment is made if they consider how greatly the work of the department has increased. In years gone by we had an assistant commissioner, who I think was Mr. Watters. After he left, the office was not continued, but I have felt that it was only due to the proper working of the department and in the public interest that we should have an assistant commissioner. The chief clerk referred to is Mr. Bremner, who gets the statutory increase of $50. Then, the hon. gentleman asks about the eight first-class clerks. One of these, Mr. Watson, it is proposed to raise from a second class clerkship to a first class.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What salary is he receiving now?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. $1,400. He will receive $1,800. He has shown special aptitude in taking supervision of the statistical department, which, as the hon. gentleman knows, was a comparatively small branch of the service in the city of Ottawa, but which has become large owing to the work which was previously done at the ports being now done at headquarters. This has enabled us to get out our trade reports monthly. Then, Mr. Morin, a first-class clerk, is to be promoted to a chief clerkship, but as his salary is at the maximum, $1,800, it will remain the same.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is Mr. Watson the senior clerk?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman state what clerks he goes over that are his seniors ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Watson goes to $1,400. He has $1,150 now. There is another clerk getting $1,150, two getting $1,200, one $1,250, three getting $1,400 and one $1,350. If you go by promotion, of course there are gentlemen getting larger salaries than he, but he is recognized as having peculiar fitness for the position. He has taken charge in a larger measure of that department, and it does not seem right that a gentleman who is really supervising those who are getting higher salaries should not have a salary somewhat befitting the position.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the Act allow you, where a party is not at the maximum of his class, to put him in another class where there is a vacancy ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think so.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has not told us yet who is to be the assistant commissioner.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have a gentleman in my mind whom I thought of recommending to my colleagues. He is at present in the service.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is he a chief clerk ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, his name is Mr. Bain.

Mr. CLANCY. The Minister of Customs has told the committee that the necessity arises from the increase in the work, but that is no explanation. The volume of the work may greatly increase without creating any necessity for an office of that kind. The increase is simply in clerical work which any clerk of ordinary capacity can do. Unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to show that the character of the work has been changed and that the change necessitates the appointment of an officer of that kind, he is without any excuse for fastening another officer on the public service. It would be much better to increase the salaries of those already engaged and who are doing clerical work. The position of commissioner is one of pure supervision, and his responsibility is very considerable. The commissioner or deputy head must be a man of ability and training and should be well paid. But the hon. gentleman now proposes to fasten another officer on the department on the plea that when Mr. Watters was there, there were two commissioners, or rather a commissioner and an assistant commissioner. But in the days when the hon. gentleman was filled with economy, he told the House that he had dispensed with an assistant commissioner because such an officer was not needed. Now, however, he says that an assistant commissioner is necessary because the volume of work has increased. But I do not think that excuse can be accepted. An increase in the mere volume of the work would not necessitate the appointment of an assistant commissioner, but only an increase in the character of the work to be done by ordinary clerks.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I should be very glad indeed to give the details concerning the work if I could, but I would ask the committee to consider whether, on the face of it, they cannot see that when the business has increased to the extent it has, we must expect to get a little additional help. We have not increased the staff very much. I must give my predecessors the credit which I gave them when criticising their administration from the opposition benches. It was generally recognized that the department was economically managed both by Sir Mackenzie Bowell and by Mr. Wallace who succeeded him, and when we consider that the trade in six months now is equal to what it was in the twelve months when we took office, when we consider that the number of entries has nearly doubled, and that there are more ports, and a larger transit trade and more business altogether, I think the House will agree with me that the commissioner ought to be in the position of occasionally being able to leave his office and visit the principal ports and keep in touch with what is being done. If I had the hon. gentleman in my department and could show him the increase in the work, I think he would be satisfied.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman gives us as one reason that there has been a large increase in the number of entries and in the volume of business. But surely he does not pretend to say that the commissioner makes a single entry or touches a pen in connection with that part of the work to which the hon. minister refers. The hon. gentleman might just as well ask for an increase in his own salary because of the increased work in his department. The cases are precisely parallel. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thinks he should have an increase or not, but I can say that there is no more reason for the appointment of an assistant commissioner than there would be for increasing the hon. gentleman's salary. The increased volume of business does not entail on the minister more work than he had to attend to when he first took office, although I will admit his responsibility must have increased. I admit the responsibility; but the work to be done by reason of the increased business in the department is, 99 per cent, I venture to say, a class of work that could be done by any efficient clerk. The hon. gentleman knows the growing tendency under our sys-

tem—and I am not going to impute the blame to this government any more than to any former government—to fasten upon the public service men who have no sound claim to the positions to which they are appointed. No man has any claim in himself to be employed in the public service—the public interest is the only ground on which such appointments should be made. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, is quite convinced that he has a very worthy gentleman, whom he wishes to place there. During the time I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I have never once attacked the salary received by an official. My belief is that Canada must first secure good service, and Canada has no more right to demand good service at less than its worth than any individual employer has. Therefore, we are bound to give fair remuneration to the men who are absolutely necessary. But we only minimize the chances of proper advance on the part of the men of merit, if we chuck into the service men who are not needed, I venture the opinion that the hon. minister has not made out a case to justify the change he proposes.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). I do not think there is any class of people in the Dominion that are so poorly paid as the officials in the departments of the government. We speak of the prosperity of the Dominion, but we are apt to forget that prosperity increases the expense of living, so that this prosperity has not been of much advantage to these officials. I think it very desirable that the Minister of Customs should be able to leave his office oftener than he does to visit the principal ports of the country and see how the work is conducted there. And if the minister himself cannot always make those visits I think the commissioner of customs should be sent around from time to time to examine the different ports. When I was collector of customs, a position I occupied for fourteen years till my friends opposite thought it not in their interests that I should be there any longer, the Minister of Customs, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, used to visit our port and spend days and days there. I speak with some knowledge when I say it is very desirable that either the Minister of Customs or his commissioner should visit the most important ports and see how the work of the department in those ports is carried on. The men who grow up in the different departments of the public service have their minds run into one groove, so that they become unfit for any other positions than those they occupy. They have not the slightest hope of ever being profited by anything until Providence shall take them away to a better country.

Mr. BELL. What are the initials of the Mr. Watson whom the hon. minister proposes to raise ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. His name is John Archibald Watson. He was appointed in the summer of 1891.

Mr. BELL. Was he appointed as a second class clerk ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He is in the second class clerk list.

Mr. BELL. Was he originally ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think he has been in the second class ever since I came into the department.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When the hon. minister, in presenting his estimates, has to announce an important change like this—I am not saying he is not perfectly justified in making it—altering the theoretical organization of his department, he ought to be prepared to give the reasons for the change. I notice, from the statement the hon. gentleman gives us, that the gentleman whom he intends to appoint assistant commissioner—though he may be deserving of the position—only entered the service in 1896. He is now, I think, a first class clerk receiving a salary of $1,500 a year with an allowance as private secretary. The hon. minister must consider the demoralization of the whole staff when he takes a man, who only entered the service in 1896, appoints him a first class clerk and then promotes him over the heads of even the chief clerks and makes him assistant commissioner. There must be some strong reason given to justify such a course. We want something more than the mere bald statement that there is an increase in the work of the department. The hon. gentleman should, as I have said, be ready to give us reasons for this change in the theoretical organization of his department and he should be able also to tell us what are the special qualifications of this gentleman who is to be thus put over the heads of others and appointed assistant commissioner.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has mentioned one point which removes an objection by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). That hon. gentleman seemed to think we were bringing a new man into the service. That is not the case—this is the promotion of a man who has been six or seven years in the service.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not raise that objection and did not inquire as to that point. I objected to the nature of the hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Paterson's) explanation, whomever it might apply to.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) spoke of our wishing to bring some one into the service. But it seems I was wrong as to what the hon. gentleman said. I have already explained that I wished to ease the

work upon the commissioner so that he may have liberty to leave his office and visit the principal ports, and, when he is in the office I wish him to have an assistant whom he may consult. It is desirable, also, to have one who can take the commissioner's place when he is absent. At present, a chief clerk must be called in to fill the place. As to promoting a man over the heads of others the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has administered a department and he knows that it is quite possible that a man may be found who, though not so long in the service as others, has developed a perculiar fitness to fill a certain position. And, when he found such a man, I am sure he did not hesitate to give him the position. The gentleman I have mentioned, who is to receive this appointment if the House pass the salary and my colleagues approve, is not excelled by any one in the service in his grasp of the business or otherwise better fitted for the position. I think that any one who knows him will agree as to his qualifications. And, reverting to the question of promotion over the heads of others, the hon. gentleman must remember that the commissioner of customs, of whom I desire to speak in the highest terms and whom I regard as one of the most faithful officers in the service, was not in the civil service at all, but came from outside and was appointed at the very head of the department. I am bound to say that experience has justified the selection of that gentleman. The work has been well done indeed. The work that that commissioner renders is greater than hon. gentlemen opposite, not acquainted with it as they are expected to be, have any idea of. Now with reference to the remark of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) who complains that the commissioner has not more work. He seems to think that he sits in his office and that all he has to do is to say to a certain clerk, Do this, and to another one, do that. Why, these clerks have to consult with him in reference to the business, correspondence has to be conducted, and letters written. And though he does not do merely clerical work himself, he has to be consulted with regard to it, and any one who visits his office, I venture to say, will find that he is a very busy man. Therefore, I desire an assistant commissioner, in order to relieve him somewhat of his too onerous duties, and who will take his place when it is necessary for him, in the public interest, to visit some of the larger ports and transshipping points, as I think he should do much oftener. I need not say more. I think if the hon. gentleman was administering the department he would be of the same mind as myself. I need not go into further details. I state the broad fact that the work has increased to such an extent that help is needed, and I am asking for a first-class clerk. The hon. gentleman complains that he is to be put over the heads of others. I grant you that this Mr. Watson we propose to raise is going over some others; but in the judgment of the commissioner and of myself he has special aptitude for the position he is filling at present, greater than some others that are there, and for that reason I am asking the committee to grant an additional salary so that he may take his rank as a first-class clerk. It seems only fair and right, since he is in a position like that, supervising other first-class clerks, that he should not be paid a salary inferior to that which they get.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we should have some other items of information before this vote is passed. I see that the Civil Service Act provides that

> The Governor in Council shall from time to time determine the number of officers, chief clerks, clerks, messengers and other employes that are required for the working of the several departments in each division of the civil service.

They should determine that from time to time. Have the Governor in Council determined that in that department another chief clerk is necessary? Because, if not, it is done in violation of the Act.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, and there will have to be an amendment to the Customs Act passed in the House before this office is created, and it will come, of course, by consent of the government.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me you are starting at the wrong end of the business. You first vote the salary, and then you go to the Governor in Council to set you right. According to my understanding of the law, the Governor in Council first have to consider whether the work there necessitates an additional chief clerk. And the Act provides that after that is done the salary for the additional chief clerk can be voted.

> All appointments to the civil service shall be during pleasure, and no person shall be appointed or promoted to any place below that of a deputy head unless he has passed the requisite examination and served the probationary term hereinafter mentioned.

I notice that in most of these cases there is no satisfactory evidence that they have served their probationary term in one class to entitle them to be moved into another, and it requires an Order in Council to move them in violation of the Civil Service Act.

> A first-class clerkship shall only be created by Order in Council.

That Order in Council has not passed, and we are providing a salary for a chief clerkship before we know that one is needed, before the Governor in Council have exercised their judgment as to whether one is needed or not. It seems to me the hon. gentleman is going to work entirely in the wrong way.

A chief clerkship in any department shall only be created by Order in Council, passed after the deputy head has reported that such an officer is necessary for the proper performance of the public business in the department, stating the reasons on which he has arrived at that conclusion.

Then the concurrence of the head of the department is required. Then it is provided that a first-class clerkship should only be created by Order in Council, and a second-class clerkship also by Order in Council. But in every one of these instances the first or theoretical part, as the hon. member for Lanark says, must be determined by Order in Council according as the need of the service requires these additional clerks; and that is done after careful examination, and after recommendation by the head of the branch, sanctioned by the Deputy Minister and by the minister himself. But here the first thing we do is to vote the salary upon the statement of the minister that the work is increasing there. I think his course is radically wrong.

The salary of a clerk on appointment or promotion to any class shall begin at the minimum of such class.

In nearly every instance we are violating that provision of the Act. They do not commence at the minimum, and they start the salary above the minimum. In other respects also we are violating the Act, because we take clerks from one class and promote them to another before they have reached the maximum of that class.

No salary shall be paid to any member of the civil service whose appointment or promotion, or whose increase of salary after the first day of July, 1882, has not been made in the manner provided in the Civil Service Act in force at the time of such appointment, promotion or increase.

In every one of these instances we are violating the law, in other words, we are voting these sums outside the Act entirely, we do so saying 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' Therefore I say I was justified in taking strong exception to the abuse that has crept into the departments.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But you must have the provision made before the Order in Council is formally passed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, you cannot appoint a person to that position with a salary unless the House has sanctioned the grant.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister is entirely wrong. His first duty is to change the theoretical organization of his department on recommendation of the deputy head, and get an Order in Council, assigning reasons for it. Then there is a reason for parliament voting the salary. You cannot appoint a party to a position until the salary is voted, or at least if you do appoint him, you cannot pay him the salary until it is voted. The first duty of the minister is to get his deputy head to concur with him as to the necessity of a change in the theoretical organization of his department, then get the approbation of his colleagues in council, and the sanction of the Governor. When he has got that, he comes here and asks us to vote the salary. Then when the minister says that the deputy head did not pass the examination——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That he was appointed to the position without examination, or without passing through the lower grades.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, not examination.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, he was appointed to the position without passing through any lower grade to the deputy head of the department and the hon. minister knows that the Civil Service Act does not apply to the deputy head at all.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not apply to the deputy head.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And there are several other offices that are exempted and the hon. minister must remember—it was stated again and again—the reasons why. There must be some offices in the country at the disposal of the government of the day as a reward for political services and as a reward to men of ability in the House for services to their country. Among them are the deputy headships of the departments, the postmasterships in the different towns and cities and the collectorships of customs in the different towns and cities. The justification that he has given is no justification at all because the reason does not apply in this case. He does not come to the House and tell us that he has the approval of the Governor in Council for a change in the theoretical organization of the department as the Civil Service Act requires. He should be prepared with all these reasons to give to the Committee and particularly to tell why it is that the theoretical organization of his department is changed and whether it is changed with the approbation of the deputy head of the department.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. When the hon. gentleman says that I have not the sanction of the Governor in Council for this act he is mistaken. Council agreed to this; it would not have been in the estimates if they had not agreed to it. It is the salary that is being asked for. This officer cannot be appointed until the salary is provided for and he cannot be appointed until an Order in Council has passed appointing him; but, I am asking meanwhile

whether the committee will sanction the payment of a salary to a person to be appointed to the office who must be appointed, of course, by the Governor in Council, and who will be.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister is trying to impose upon the Committee and upon me. He says that he has the sanction of the Governor in Council for the estimates brought down and therefore that he has his sanction for the change in the theoretical organization of his department. But, the Civil Service Act requires that the deputy head of the department shall approve of the theoretical organization and that there shall be an Order in Council passed approving of it. Does the hon. minister say that anything of that kind is done and does he say that because he has the consent of the Governor in Council to the bringing down of his estimates and presenting them before the House he has the approval of the Governor in Council for this appointment ?

Contingencies, including $1,750, which may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $10,355.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to the fact that the contingencies are to be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. I understood the hon. minister to say that the whole of the contingencies are intended to be paid in that manner.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I did not express any opinion. My hon. friends must explain that for themselves I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I understood that the hon. minister said, when I mentioned contingencies, that it was not intended to apply to the Civil Service Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I certainly did not say anything of the kind. If I said that I was mistaken.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well then I mistook what the hon. minister said, but he must see that the vote for contingencies applies to everything under that head and that the Civil Service Act does not apply.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, the explanation is this : There is an amount voted for contingencies and in that amount is included $1,750.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why do you not put it so in your estimates ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think it is so stated.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not at all ; it is nothing of the kind. Put it plainly.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know how the hon. gentleman would word it. Contingencies, including $1,750, which may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is a comma after $1,750.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is only the $1,750 to which the Act does not apply.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the comma is struck out that is the way it reads.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Strike out the comma and it may be so. Contingencies, $1,750, which may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act—if that does not apply to the whole of the contingencies I know nothing about the English language or construction of it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is not intended.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well then, put it in the form in which it is intended.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. $1,750 is the amount out of the contingencies that may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well then, change it so as to make it clear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Strike out the comma ; strike out the comma.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, strike out the comma. I have explained before that the way in which this $1,750 came into the estimates was that a first-class clerk who had been drawing $1,750 a year became ill. He took a trip for his health, I think, to the North-west and, unfortunately, on his way, he died. Between the passing of the original and supplementary estimates this took place. When we came to the supplementaries I dropped the vote for a first-class clerk of $1,750 and took a vote for that amount, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. I then got two men for the $1,750 that the one man had got before and the money is being used in that way. It has passed now for two or three years in that way.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Let me suggest this amendment : Contingencies, of which $1,750 may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I accept that ; perhaps it is better.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister did not explain who these two second-class clerks were. Have they been taken out of those who have been temporary clerks in the department ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The two second-class clerks are in the service now,

Mr. Schofield, who has been there for six years is getting $600 a year and Wm. Wall, who has been in the department for five years is getting $550. The first of these was paid out of the Board of Customs vote—that is the outside vote. The salary of the other has been paid out of contingencies, the item under consideration now. Instead of one being paid out of the Board of Customs vote and the other out of contingencies they become second-class clerks and their salaries are provided for in another item.

Mr. CLANCY. I see that the contingencies stand at the same amount notwithstanding that this clerk was paid out of contingencies formerly.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I leave the contingencies at the same amount because I am afraid we will have to use the extra amount. But, the total, as the hon. gentleman will see, of the advance for the department of contingencies and salaries combined is $5,460. I beg to move that this item be amended so as to read: 'Contingencies of which $1,750 may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.'

Item as amended, agreed to.

Department of Public Works—Salaries, $47,550.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The small increase was on the recommendation of the deputy; there is no change in the staff, and notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. CLANCY. Was there no change in the personnel of the staff?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None whatever; it is going along in peace and harmony.

Department of Railways and Canals—Salaries, including J. W. Pugsley at $1,800, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $45,950; contingencies, $8,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of this increase?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The net increase in the vote this year over last year is $800. That is made out in this way: We have allowed the usual statutory increases, which amount to $750. We have increased Mr. Pugsley's salary $100 and we have promoted Mr. Little, Mr. Bell, and Mr. Wright—Mr. Little from a second class clerk to a first class clerk. Mr. Little was appointed in the service in 1881 as a third class clerk; promoted to a second class clerk in 1900. He has been performing the duties in the accountant's branch previously done by the assistant accountant. He is a faithful and industrious officer and we have promoted him to the first class. We have promoted Mr. Bell from a junior second class to a second class clerk, and we have promoted Mr. J. P. Wright from a junior second class clerk to a second class clerk. These three cases involve an increase over the salaries which they now receive of $550. We make provisions for two junior second class clerks which will add $1,200. The total increase caused by the staututory increase and by the additions to the salaries and promotions which I have mentioned will total $2,600. We have one first class clerk less whose salary was $1,800, leaving a net result of $800 as an addition to the appropriation.

Mr. SPROULE. Had these clerks reached the maximum of their class in each case before you promoted them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. When did Mr. Pugsley come into the service and why do you have to say 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act'?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Pugsley entered the service in 1880; he was appointed third class clerk in 1883; he became a second class clerk in 1890; he was promoted first class clerk in 1896; he has been clerk of the Committee of the Privy Council since February, 1896. The increase will make his salary $1,800.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the minister looks at the estimates he will see that he is voting the same number of first class clerks as there were last year. There must be some mistake if you have one first class clerk less now. Your estimates are wrongly printed as presented to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are only asking for the amount of money that we require.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister states that Mr. Pugsley is promoted to be a first-class clerk; yet there were ten last year and there are only ten now. So that one seems to have disappeared.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are only ten now including Mr. Pugsley.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister stated very definitely a little while ago that he had dropped one first-class clerk—in other words, that he had one less now than he had last year. I ask the minister to tell us definitely how many he had last year and how many he has this year.

Mr. SPROULE. Which one did you drop?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell you. My memorandum does not show.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the minister is making some additional junior clerkships and one additional first-class clerkship. Did he first get the consent of council to this increase, as the Act provides?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the Governor in Council undoubtedly assented to the appropriation being asked for the increase. That is all that has been done.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the hon. minister is doing in his department what has been done in the Customs Department—commencing at the wrong end. The Act provides that the Governor in Council shall first determine how many clerks are required for each department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They determined on that when they agreed to the estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not complying with the Act at all. They must first provide for the number in the different classes; and after that the salaries are voted, when they are recommended by the head of the department. But it appears this has not been done in the department of the Minister of Railways nor in the department of the Minister of Customs, and I presume that the same practice has been followed throughout the various departments. Therefore the Civil Service Act has been entirely ignored by the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend's remarks are based upon a misconception. His argument is that you must first create the clerkship before you come to the House for a vote. My hon. friend is mistaken. The Civil Service Act distinctly declares the reverse. Section 15 provides that a chief clerkship in any department shall only be created by Order in Council passed after the report of the deputy, after the concurrence of the head of the department in such report, and after the salary has been voted by parliament. These various conditions must first be complied with before the Governor in Council creates an additional clerkship. The same rule is carried down to a first-class clerkship. Section 17 provides that a first-class clerkship can only be created by an Order in Council passed on a report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the department, setting forth the reasons for creating the office, and after the salary has been voted by parliament. The same condition applies to a second-class clerkship. In each of these cases before the Governor in Council can grant an additional clerkship, parliament must first have provided the money. The first step is to get the appropriation from parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the provision of the Act to which I refer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I take this from the Act as published in the civil service list, dated 1902, and which contains all the amendments.

Mr. SPROULE. I refer to section 6:

> The Governor in Council shall, from time to time determine the number of officers, chief clerks, clerks, messengers and other employees required for the working of the several departments in each division of the civil service.

What I complain of is that the Governor in Council have not brought their judgment to bear on this at all. The minister at the head of the department has simply found it necessary to put on another man, and asks us to provide for the salary before the Governor in Council have decided whether the requirements of the work call for another man.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Governor in Council can only consider the matter after parliament has voted the money. It can do nothing with regard to creating offices until the appropriation is voted.

Mr. SPROULE. How can you determine how much money you want before determining what number of clerks you require? You must do that before asking us to vote the money.

Mr. LENNOX. The House is entitled to have the opinion of the Cabinet before any proposition is submitted to it to change the organization of any department. We are entitled to have first the recommendation to the minister at the head of the department made by the deputy head. That recommendation ought to be on record. Then the matter should be brought before the Governor in Council and considered, and it is only on the approval of the Governor in Council that the minister at the head of the department has a right to ask parliament to vote the money. This is not a mere matter of form. We are entitled to have the guarantee and pledge of the Governor in Council that the necessity exists for the change. More than that, until the Governor in Council has determined that there is a necessity for an increase, the minister at the head of the department cannot estimate what amount of money he will require. It is a very serious neglect of the primary conditions upon which we are called upon to vote the estimates that, not in one department alone, but in all the departments, this very important provision of the Civil Service Act is ignored.

Mr. SPROULE. What I said is further substantiated by the subsection 2 of section 6:

> If the number of employees then attached to any department in either division is greater than the number allowed to the department as herein provided, the Governor in Council shall name the persons to fill the several offices; and the remainder shall be supernumerary clerks without being eligible for increase of salary, of that class respectively in which they rank, and shall so remain until promoted in the manner herein provided or until severed from the service.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Assuming the hon. gentleman to be right in his interpretation of the Civil Service Act, it would have no application to the present case. Taking it for granted that before the change of government, such subjects had been dealt with precisely as the hon. gentleman says they should have been, the number of employees authorized by the Governor in Council was 28. After I came into the department two vacancies occurred, and these were not filled, so that we have had but 26 permanent employees in the department instead of 28. Therefore, according to the interpretation of the hon. gentleman, since the Governor in Council decided that 28 permanent clerks were necessary for the proper organization of the department, and since there are now only 26 there, we have the right to ask for the appointment of the other two, without again going before the Governor in Council.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You do not increase the junior second-class clerks by one ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I promote and leave a junior second-class clerkship vacant.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have one less second-class clerk and the same number of first-class clerks. And the junior second-class clerks are the same number as before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will have two new appointments of junior second-class clerks to make according to the deputy minister's statement.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister assumes that once the Governor in Council has exercised his judgment as to what the number ought to be, the department meets all requirements by providing either a fewer or a larger number in the future.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not proposing to go beyond the number.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says that so long as he keeps below the number that is all that is necessary. But the Act provides that the Governor in Council—not the department—shall determine from time to time, and the Governor in Council has not been consulted from the first. The hon. minister does not think it is necessary for the Governor in Council to exercise his judgment so long as he keeps below the number which the Governor in Council authorizes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not interpret the Act as the hon. gentleman does. I think that the view stated by the Minister of Finance is the correct one. But, without assuming that all these performances would have to be gone through with any ordinary case it is not necessary in the present case, for the reason that, what they may reasonably have for the purposes of work of the department will not be exceeded by the votes I am now asking for.

Mr. SPROULE. Was this department changed in any way of late years—was any additional work put upon it or any work taken away ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No division of the work, but the work has grown greatly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister seems to think it necessary that the number of clerks stated in the written brief he has presented should be appointed. But he must get the consent of His Excellency and state it in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He has.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The estimates placed upon the Table do not show that. We have no information that His Excellency has given his consent. Here is the statement showing that there were ten first-class clerks last year, and he wants ten ; there were five second-class clerks last year and he estimates for six this year ; there were six junior second-class clerks last year and he wants six this year. The hon. gentleman will find this in the details at page 20 of the estimates. The department has furnished wrong information to the Finance Department and they have got the consent of His Excellency which is not in accordance with the requirements of the Act. The hon. minister must get it corrected.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am satisfied with the amount stated in the estimates—I do not want any more.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. minister quite sure that the statement he gave, which shows that one first-class clerk is dropped, is quite correct ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My statement shows that, as compared with last year there is $1,800 which is not required this year, and, therefore, we do not carry it over to the 1903-4 estimate.

Mr. HEYD. Why is it not required ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not understand. But I am not asking for it.

Mr. CLANCY. Who is the first-class clerk who is dropped.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot find that we have dropped any. We have just as many as we had last year.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. minister will look at page 20 of the estimates he will see that there is an increase of $50 for chief clerk, recording staff, and another increase of $50 for chief clerk, correspondence, and $50 for chief clerk, law clerk. Then, in the estimates for second class clerks there is an increase of $1,150. These a total increase of $1,300. Then, in the case of junior second-class clerks there is a decrease of $500. By deducting the decrease from the increase, we get the difference of $800 provided for in the estimates, without any change in the chief clerk. If the civil service list gives anything like a correct account, then, Mr. Pugsley was a first-class clerk last year and was now raised from the second-class.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was a first-class clerk last year.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. minister said he had been raised. If the hon. gentleman will examine the estimates he will see that of first-class clerks there are four at $1,800, two at $1,600, three at $1,550 and one at $1,400.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Four at $1,800, one at $1,650, two at $1,550, and one at $1,500.

Mr. CLANCY. According to the item there does not appear to be any at $1,650. But according to the civil service list—I would refer the minister to page 168—Mr. Pugsley seems to have received $1,650. The figures do not seem to be correctly given in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Pugsley is put down in my memorandum as having received last year $1,650. There were four who received $1,650. There were four who received $1,800 according to this statement.

Mr. LENNOX. Including J. W. Pugsley.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, he got $1,650 last year. Two clerks, Mr. Chubbuck and Mr. Ross, received $1,550; and three, Messrs. Devlin and Payne and another Mr. Ross, received $1,550.

Mr. CLANCY. The estimates show three at $1,550, instead of two.

Mr. LENNOX. And four at $1,800, including J. W. Pugsley.

Mr. CLANCY. It would be well for the hon. minister to send the figures back and have them corrected. It is clear he has not been handed an accurate statement.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister must correct his estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I really have no correction to make. I want $45,950 on account of salaries, exactly as stated in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When we vote an amount en bloc, it is understood that it is to be appropriated in the manner indicated in the details given in the estimates. But the hon. minister wants it voted and himself left free to apply it according to his memorandum. The House will not do anything of the kind. It should be spent according to the details in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I quite agree with that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Let the minister take it back and have it corrected.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not discovered anything to be corrected. I will read them over. In the estimate there is $6,000 for the deputy minister and the chief engineer; in my estimate it is $6,000. In the estimate there is $2,400 for the secretary of the department; it is the same in my memorandum. In the memorandum Mr. Maynard gets $2,150; the same in the estimates. In my memorandum the law clerk gets $2,100; the same in the estimates. Then the chief clerk of correspondence, Mr. Dickenson, gets $1,850; so in the estimates. Then there are four first-class clerks getting $1,800 each; there are two who get $1,600 each; three who get $1,550 each; one who gets $1,400. These amounts make $16,450, exactly what I find in the estimates. Then you come to the second-class clerks. One gets $1,400, according to my memorandum; one gets $1,350, one $1,250, one $1,150 and two $1,100 each. Now these amounts sum up $7,350, as shown in the estimates. Then of junior clerks, there are two at $950, one at $800, one at $750, three at $600 each——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Only two here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Add up those amounts, and I think you will find they are correct.

Mr. BENNETT. There are two in the printed book.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because one of these is made a second-class clerk who was junior last year. I find I did make a mistake. There are only two at $600. I was including the allowance for the private secretary. That makes the sum $4,650, as shown in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister is correct now, but his statement to the House before was incorrect and misleading.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have been making the same statement all along.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister said there was one second-class clerk less. There

is the same number this year as last year. He stated also that there were two more junior second-class clerks. There is exactly the same number this year as before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we are one short, and we are promoting.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman shows the House that the whole increase amounted to $2,600, and that there was one first-class clerk dropped who was getting $1,800, which left a difference of $800. That was the hon. gentleman's first statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And that is correct.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not correct. The increases are only $1,300 actually, and the decreases are $500, which leaves $800 net increase.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You cannot figure that out. I quite understand that the hon. gentleman is disposed to be jocular. But the amount is to-day as I stated, $800 more than the appropriation of last year. The way that is ascertained is as follows: $750 for statutory increases; $100 increase for Mr. Pugsley, who gets $50 increase and $100, which brings him up to $1,800. There are three promotions amounting to $550, Little, Ball and Wright; two junior second-class clerks to be new appointments, $600 each, amounting to $1,200. The summing up shows an increase of $2,600. As I said before, less a first-class clerkship appropriation not used, $1,800, leaving a net increase of $800. That is the memorandum which I have.

Department of Marine and Fisheries, $79,050—Salaries, including R. E. Tyrwhitt at $950, and L. Bance at $1,400, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $67,050.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine), I may say that the increase is made up of forty statutory increases at $50 each. In regard to Mr. Tyrwhitt, when I was at the head of the department, I sent him to take charge of the hydrographic survey of the North-west, a post of increased responsibility and expense. I allowed him an increase of $100 a year, but when the matter came before the Auditor General, he took exception to it as not being a legal payment according to the Civil Service Act. So we are asking the House this year to vote him the increase that was voted last year, to make his salary $900 for the coming year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister will make the amendment the same here as in the other cases, so as to remove all doubts as to the salary being excepted from the Civil Service Act.

Contingencies, including L. Charbonneau at $500, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $12,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that there is an increase in contingencies.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year there was a vacancy in the department requiring the appointment of a messenger. I asked the House to give me a vote so that I could secure an active, intelligent man as a messenger. The vote was granted but the Auditor General would not pay the salary because the name of the person appointed was not in the vote, so that the messenger, L. Charbonneau, has been appointed and paid by Order in Council.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How long has he been in the service?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About one year. The balance of the increase is owing to the increase in the telegraph service, an additional amount of $3,500 being placed in the estimates. In other years we have been obliged to apply for a supplementary vote. We shall not want a supplementary vote this year, as this amount is provided for in these estimates.

Public buildings, Ottawa—Astronomical Observatory, $45,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. minister be kind enough to tell me how that matter stands now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Chairman, I may say that the work is going along fairly well, perhaps, not as fast as we would like, but the foundation is completed and a great deal of material is on the ground ready to make good progress during the coming season.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is the building located?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the experimental farm.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether the plans are the same as those that were prepared when I was in office?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Just the same.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. May I ask also who the contractor is?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Viau.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What is the amount of the contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Seventy-four thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine dollars.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When is the work going to be completed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract calls for the completion of the work on 25th June, 1904.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of the money that was voted last year has been spent and what advancement has been made in the work ? I see there was a vote of $15,000 last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During the first six months of this year there has been paid $3,387.45. The estimate of the architect is that about $13,000 will be spent between now and the 30th of June next.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The minister is asking only the amount that he thinks will be spent during the year, and next year he will come down for another sum of money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Correct.

Mr. SPROULE. Was this work let by contract to the lowest tenderer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let by contract to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SPROULE. And it is to be finished in 1904 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. June, 1904.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. minister to say that it will cost about $74,000. Does that include equipment ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Including equipment it will cost $93,400.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the object to transfer the observatory from Toronto down here, or is this to be an additional one ?

Mr. CLARE. If the work calls for $74,999 and is to be completed on the 25th June next, why is not the whole amount placed in the estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is on the 25th June, 1904.

Mr. SPROULE. I was asking the hon. minister if it was intended to do away with the observatory at Toronto.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think this interferes at all with the observatory at Toronto. This is under the direction of the Interior Department and it has been in existence in Ottawa for a great many years. There will, of course, be a great improvement in the service, in the building, accommodation and equipment. But, it does not interfere with the observatory at Toronto. The observatory at Toronto, I think, is in connection with the Marine Deparment and it serves a different purpose altogether.

Mr. CLARE. As the estimates we are now passing are for the year ending June, 1904, why not put the whole amount in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand my hon. friend's point now. The foundation of this work is completed and the chief architect estimates that this $45,000 is all the contractor will earn during the time for which we take this vote. The building is not expected to be completed until next season, though the contract requires it to be completed on the 25th June. The chief architect estimates that the contractor cannot earn more than $45,000 in the coming year. That means that he cannot complete the work within the time specified.

Mr. CLANCY. It means that the contract will not be completed on the 25th June, 1904 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. minister give any information as to what astronomer is to be in charge and whether there is any person supervising the work who is possessed of the technical knowledge necessary to provide a suitable structure for the purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not connected with the Public Works Department, but as I happen to know, I do not object to giving the information. Mr. King is a gentleman that I believe the House has a great deal of confidence in and he is at the head of this work. There is no contemplated change in the staff, so far as my information goes. The staff is perfectly satisfactory and from the reports I have seen it has received a great deal of praise from some of the older countries that spend a great many thousand dollars on this service.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the Mr. King who has been surveying the international boundary between Canada and Alaska ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Who is the clerk of works for that building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. P. Canty is his name.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know him very well.

Ottawa—Branch of Royal Mint, $50,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. minister explain how that matter stands ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid it is standing still. It was decided by the department under my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte), to place the building on the government property near the Printing Bureau. The Militia Department which has control of that property raised some objections, and I believe that information was received from the authorities in England, that in building a mint for the reception of minting plant you require to have a very solid and exceedingly level surface. Therefore some difficulty was found, outside of the objection of the Militia De-

partment, towards occupying the site chosen. That has occasioned delay. I hope that delay will not be much longer. I think that on the same property, probably on the other side, we will be able to find ground enough to carry out the plan prepared by the department when my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was minister. The same plan is in every way satisfactory if we had a suitable site. I hope to have a report to-day, but at all events I will have it in a short time and I think the chief architect will report that we can have a level site on the other side.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Do I understand that it will be the same site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, on the other side.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When I left office these objections had not been raised.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think so.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Why, it is on solid rock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In order to get a level surface, there would be a good deal of cutting down necessary and much expense would have to be gone to, and it would not give an opportunity for driving around as laid down in the plan. When I went to the department I found that nothing had been done and I asked for a report. So far as I can say at present, if the other site is found satisfactory, it will be adopted.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I cannot understand where that other site is. I may say at once that when I left office no objection of the kind had been raised The bottom is rock and there can be no possible objection on the ground of solidity.

Mr. BENNETT. There has been an earthquake since.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Minister of Finance and myself had agreed as to the site and I cannot for the life of me discover why the English authorities, who had approved of the plan when I left office, raised the objection since. I would like to have some more knowledge as to the nature of these objections because I cannot understand them at all. Indeed I do not know where the present site can be and perhaps it is only fair to ask that the item should stand until we have more information about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is three years since this vote was first taken and when I went into the department I endeavoured to have the work go ahead. The country and parliament is committed to it and I believe it is an important work in the interest of the country. Of course if the House wishes to renew this vote I shall submit the plan.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The reason why the work did not go on so rapidly as it will perhaps go on now, is that the Minister of Finance asked me to delay until he returned from England. That is the reason why the contract was not awarded but as to the site it was decided upon when I left office. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr Sutherland) does not accuse me of losing time. The plans were prepared, they had to be sent to England to be approved of, and the Minister of Finance asked me before his last trip to England not to give the contract before he came back.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There seems to be a contradiction in the statement by the minister. First the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was told that there had been a change in the site, and it would now appear that there has been no change in the site.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is correct in what he says. He had commenced proceedings with the view of building the mint on Nepean Point, close to the Printing Bureau, and he had gone so far as to call for tenders. He was good enough to make a delay until I could return from England, and on or about that time objections were made by the Militia Department, and perhaps from other sources as to the suitability of the site, and it was proposed to look for a new site. I am aware of the site which my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has in his mind, but as it includes some private land, perhaps we would not be wise in indicating at present where that land is until it is under option. I do not think any business man would think it wise to announce that we were going to buy a certain piece of property until we had that property under option.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When I left office the government had chosen a site on government ground. I want to emphasize that fact. Of course if the minister tells me that he has good ground for asking that the item should go through I will make no more objection.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Might I ask the Minister of Militia and Defence what are his objections to the site in question. Of course, if it is against the public interest, I do not wish him to answer.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have no objection to say that after the plans were matured it was found that very much more ground would be required for the buildings than was at first supposed, and that it might interfere with the use of that ground for military purposes in future. If for instance there should ever be a military depot at Ottawa it might be a convenient site for such a building. I had a careful report made upon the matter by

the then General Officer Commanding and I addressed a letter to the Minister of Finance suggesting that there should be delay until the whole question could be considered.

Mr. BIRKETT. This being the third time that this vote has been placed in the estimates for a royal mint at Ottawa, it seems to me that I should now ask the Minister of Public Works, if the government intends building the mint this year. If I am correctly informed the Minister of Finance is not in favour of building a mint because he says that the mint will be an absolute loss to Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BIRKETT. The Minister of Finance is reported as having so stated. I wonder if I am correct or not in that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I wonder if my hon. friend will give me the source of his information.

Mr. BIRKETT. Yes I will.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the earlier stages there was some debate about the advisability of our having a mint but for several years it has been the policy of both sides of the House that a mint should be built.

Mr. BIRKETT. Well, I will read it. On the 15th of May, 1899, Mr. Fielding made a speech in the House of Commons against the establishment of a mint in Canada. His speech will be found in 'Hansard' for 1899, pages 3112 and 3113. Mr. Fielding said :

> I am well within the mark when I say that a well equipped mint would turn out in one month all the copper and silver coins required in Canada in the whole year so that we would have an establishment with one month's work, and eleven months' idleness.
>
> Were we to adopt this policy we would lose a considerable part of the profit we are now enjoying—that is the profit out of the coinage.
>
> Were we to convert all our gold into coin we would find that we had no use for it.
>
> There is no profit in the minting of gold.
>
> Not only is there no profit, but there would be absolute loss.
>
> It would be a waste of money to have a Canadian mint.

In the face of that, I think it is my duty, as one of the representatives of the city of Ottawa, to ask the Minister of Public Works if it is the intention of the government to establish a mint in Ottawa or merely to keep this vote dangling before the eyes of the electors from year to year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When the hon. gentleman stated that he had been informed by somebody that the Minister of Finance had opposed this mint vote, he was mistaken, because he had not been informed, but was reading from an old debate dealing with the question of a mint under entirely different conditions from those which exist to-day. We are not proposing to establish a mint in the manner which was then under debate, but a branch of the royal mint of England, which will mint not only the coinage of Canada, but also the sovereign of the British Empire from Canadian gold, an entirely different proposition. So that my hon. friend is reading from an old story, under conditions which have vastly changed, and his zeal on behalf of his constituents has certainly not been so great as it ought to be when he is giving a turn to my remarks entirely unwarranted by the experience of the past three years.

Mr. BIRKETT. I am certainly indebted to the hon. Minister of Finance for the information he has given; but I did not misquote him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say the hon. gentleman did.

Mr. BIRKETT. My information is correct. The statement was made by the hon. gentleman, and he never contradicted it. If there was no profit in minting gold three years ago, where do you expect to get the profit now ? I merely want to know, on behalf of my constituents, whether it is the intention of the government to establish this mint or not, or whether they intend to keep this $50,000 vote dangling before the electors until the next election comes around?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman says he did not misquote me. I do not accuse him of misquoting me. He is reading from a newspaper report of what occurred three years ago.

Mr. BIRKETT. No, I am reading from 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, it is not my practice to delve into those old records unless I have some special reason; but my recollection is that I stated then that if we could arrange to establish a branch of the royal mint, and not simply a mint for Canadian currency, that might be worth while. When he says he is obliged to me for the information I have given, he need not thank me, because I did not give him any information that has not been before the House for a long time, and if the hon. gentleman has not discovered it until now, he is not as wide-awake a representative of the city of Ottawa as I had supposed he was.

Mr. BIRKETT. I have had it in my possession for three years, so that I am not so slow after all.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the very fact that the item has been voted for three years is a very good reason for the hon. member for Ottawa asking the question he has, especially in view of the information which we have now that the government has not even selected the site for the mint. I wish to ask what is the estimated cost of this mint.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A very full estimate has been made. It is

estimated that it will cost at least $275,000, or perhaps, when fully equipped, about $300,000. I may say to my hon. friend the member for Ottawa that since this policy was decided upon, no member of the government has had the slightest intention of delaying the work of putting up the building. So far as the Finance Minister is concerned, during the few weeks that I have been in the department, he has bothered me with regard to it, both in writing and personally, on several occasions. I am making every possible effort to have the work commenced, and I hope, if this vote meets the approval of the House, that when the supplementary estimates for the coming year are brought down, I shall be able to give full information as to the site, and as to what additional amount will be required in order to enable us to go on with the building during the year 1903-4. By that time we ought to be able to advertise for tenders and to know exactly when we can go on with the work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Finance has given a curious excuse for his change of opinion. Three years ago he held exactly the opinion stated by the hon. member for Ottawa. He has had the item in the estimates for three years, so that it must have been only this year that he has received the consent of the imperial authorities to establish a branch of the royal mint. Why did he ask for a vote two years ago, without having that consent, and when he held the opinion that the mint was entirely useless ? It is only this year, as I understand, that he has received the authority of the imperial authorities, to do what he proposes to do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who said that ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood that you said it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say anything of the sort.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister, in answering the objections of my hon. friend from Ottawa, stated that when he made his statement three years ago he had a different opinion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I did not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And that because of the authority he has received from the imperial authorities, another state of affairs exists. When was it he got the authority ? Was it last year, or the year before ? It could not have been the year before, because it was then proposed not to build this mint in the city of Ottawa, but in Vancouver or somewhere else in British Columbia, for the purpose of minting the gold mined in the Yukon and keeping it in our own country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has the unhappy faculty of understanding a great many things that nobody says. I certainly did not say any of the things the hon. gentleman attributes to me. As to when the authority of the imperial government was obtained, when the Act of this parliament was passed to establish a mint, it was distinctly stated that it was to be established in Ottawa; it was never proposed to put it anywhere else. The whole matter was threshed out in this House at that time, and the Act passed two years ago was to establish not a purely Canadian mint, but a branch of the royal mint.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that it was claimed during the election contest in the Yukon that if a supporter of the government were sent here, there would be a chance of having the mint established at Dawson. It was also stated in British Columbia when I was out there that it was desirable to have a mint at Vancouver, therefore it was necessary that the government should be supported in that quarter. Down here in Ottawa, I presume the same thing was dangled before the people so as to show them it was very desirable the government should be sustained. Why, the party opposite have been making use of this question in various localities. Certainly some one has been deceiving the people, and the fact that we have been voting the money three or four sessions and not spending any part of it gives colour to the belief that the whole thing is kept open for political purposes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not see how any one could pretend that the site for this building was to be elsewhere than in Ottawa. The grant was taken for a mint at Ottawa. The Act was passed for the establishment of a government mint at Ottawa, and no member of the government has ever proposed that it should be anywhere else than in Ottawa. All this political scheming exists only in the imagination of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. The fact that you are not spending the grant is sufficient to give rise to the suspicion that you are using this item as a bait for political support.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Suspicion ever haunts the guilty mind.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It took some time for the plans to be got ready as that kind of work is new here. After the plans were prepared they had to be sent to England, and we wrote, I do not know how many times, to get these plans back before we could get them. In England they do not do things so quickly as my hon. friend would like to see them done here. We lost a great deal of time before we could get the plans back. Tenders were asked for, but my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who was going to England, thought it was better that

he should consult personally with the imperial authorities before anything further was done, and that was why the contract was not awarded. I may be mistaken, but I am afraid that the choice of a new site will require the making of new plans. The plans were prepared for the site at Nepean Point, and no objection was then raised to that site. There was some talk about that piece of land being required for military purposes but we got over that difficulty, and tenders were called for.

Mr. CASGRAIN. When were tenders called for ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. About five months ago.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Had an agreement between the imperial authorities and the Canadian government been arrived at then ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, we had full authority then, but the Minister of Finance was anxious to see the imperial authorities again. The arrangement for the site however was final, because I called for tenders and I am afraid that if a new site be chosen new plans will have to be prepared.

Mr. BIRKETT. In connection with this item, there is another item of $200,000 which was formerly voted for the new geological museum at Ottawa. It was twice voted by this House but I do not see it in the estimates this session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in the estimates. In 1901 we passed the Act, entitled an Act respecting the Ottawa Branch of the Royal Mint. That Act, it is provided, may be cited as "The Ottawa Mint Act, 1901." How in the face of that anybody can say that the government at any time entertained the idea of putting the mint anywhere else, is something I cannot understand.

Mr. CLANCY. In view of the statement made by the ex-Minister of Public Works, that the consent of the imperial authorities had been obtained and tenders called for, why did the Minister of Finance ask for further delay until he could see the imperial authorities.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was calling for tenders during my absence and I suggested that the contract should not be awarded until my return. I desired to consult the imperial authorities—not to obtain their consent, because that had been given—but about some matters of detail. I asked my hon. friend to be good enough to hold over the tenders until my return and he was kind enough to do so.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the hon. gentleman raise any question with reference to the foundation not being good, because the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Sutherland) lays special stress upon the fact that the building would require a very solid foundation, thereby implying that the site already selected was not sufficiently solid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. I may have said that the building required a solid foundation but the site referred to by my hon. friend is perfectly solid. It required however to be levelled and the surroundings levelled.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If I understand the objection, it was that the ground was not broad enough. As to that I am not prepared to say anything except that when I left office the ground had been found sufficiently large. Of course this is a very important building, and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works have a perfect right to choose a better site if one is to be found.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is it possible for the hon. Minister of Public Works to tell us what proportion of land belonging to individuals and what proportion belonging to the government will be taken for this site.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give that at present.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And how many thousand feet more would be required.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall get that information.

Mr. BIRKETT. I see an item of $50,000 for the Victoria Museum, but surely that is not intended to replace the geological museum ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will reach that in a moment.

Mr. BIRKETT. I asked why the $200,000 which was twice voted for the geological museum was dropped. Two years ago I was given to understand that plans had been prepared for a building which was to cost $1,000,000. Has the Department of Public Works any plans for this museum, for which $200,000 was voted two years ago ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When were the $200,000 voted ?

Mr. BIRKETT. In 1901-2, for a new geological museum at Ottawa, and that was estimated as one-fifth of the total cost.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That amount was voted, but when we found that it could not be spent we simply reduced it. There was no use voting a large amount in the estimates when it could not be spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were only $50,000 voted in 1901.

Mr. BIRKETT. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. My present colleague (Mr. Belcourt) told me distinctly that he had the plan of this building at home in his own residence and the building was to cost $1,000,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. When was that ?

Mr. BIRKETT. 20th October, 1900. Are those plans still in the possession of the government ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. When was that ?

Mr. BIRKETT. In 1900—on the 29th of October. I want to know if these plans are still in the possession of the government?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, I am not able either to affirm or to dispute the reports heard by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Birkett) outside. But there is one point upon which I have information. He stated that there was an item of $200,000 for this purpose in the estimates of 1901. I have those estimates before me, and I find this item :

Victoria Memorial Museum, $50,000.

I will send the volume over to the hon. member (Mr. Birkett) and from it he will see that he is mistaken.

Mr. MACLEAN. Sufficient has come out in this debate with regard to buying more land, to justify us in calling upon the government to lay before the country a plan for acquiring land in Ottawa for the purposes of government on a comprehensive scale. Every now and again a proposition is brought up to buy land here or to rent it there for the purposes of the government. The time has come when a large block of land should be acquired in Ottawa for government purposes. That land could be acquired for a reasonable price. It ought to be got now ; the government should cease this tinkering way of acquiring land here or there at heavy prices and against the public interest. There is opportunity for jobbery in every such deal.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the minister if it is the government's intention to locate this mint according to the plans now in the possession of the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information from the chief architect is that the plans are quite satisfactory. They have been approved by the British government. And I am perfectly frank in stating that, when I get this vote, if then my colleagues approve, the work will be gone on with as soon as possible.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has the whole site or only part of the site been bought ? Of course, if I am indiscreet in asking that question, I shall not press it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and the House will see that it would be indiscreet of me—holding the views I do, and intending, as I do, to ask council and this House to endorse any action we may take—to answer that question now. I agree with my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) that it is in the public interest that these important national buildings should be erected. If my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Birkett) objects to their being erected here, I know other places that would be glad to have them. In my humble opinion they ought to be at the capital. I agree with my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) and what he proposes I hope to do at an early date—to make a report showing the best locations for these buildings and to purchase land which will be sufficient for years to come.

Mr. BROCK. The impression made upon the mind of the ordinary business man, I should think, would be that we might call a halt in this matter of a mint. It has been before us a great many years. We had expressions of opinion from very high authority, even so high as the Minister of Finance, that a mint in this country is not needed, and is, in some respects, undesirable. It would certainly cost an enormous amount of money. For the life of me, I cannot understand what advantage Canada is to get from it. I think we should get far more advantage out of the proposal of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) of buying a large block of land at one transaction upon which buildings could be erected suitable for the purpose of government, the whole to be carried out according to some comprehensive plan. The great objection I have, not only as a member of this House, but as a business man, is to the cheese-paring way with which this thing has been gone about, not only during the last six or seven years, but during the last twenty or thirty years. When this magnificent building was put up—then was the time to have acquired an immense amount of property ; it would have been very valuable to the country now. But, having missed that opportunity, we should not go on making the same mistake year after year. I would suggest the Minister of Public Works to call a halt in this very matter we are discussing, and let us see if we cannot work it in with the larger scheme to the advantage of the country. I do not believe the business men of Canada have got into their minds what advantage a mint is going to be to the country. We have done and are doing a good deal for glory ; let us do something for profit and for business reasons. The city of Ottawa is of great importance we all acknowledge. But, if we are to have a mint there are other business centres in this country. This is business, not politics. There is the city of Montreal, very near us, and the city of Toronto, not very far away. Then we have Vancouver in the west, which has the advantage of being much nearer the gold producing country than Ottawa is. As to making money, we know that large amounts are being made here, and many people in the city of Ottawa are becoming enormously

wealthy. If a little daylight is let in, I think we may find that we are getting too many money making institutions in the city of Ottawa. Let the government take the country into their confidence in this matter. We find that the site looked upon as good not five months ago is now regarded as inadequate. How will the whole question be regarded ten years from now? The government should take this matter seriously, and not go about it as if they were speculators on the stock exchange. Surely it must be a serious matter, seeing that it has occupied attention for three years. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Birkett) who is a good business man, does not understand what you are trying to do. Is it politics or business? I think the time has come when we should stop driving at politics and settle down to business. The government do not seem to regard these matters seriously. The Minister of Finance particularly, in his jaunty fashion, plays battle dore and shuttle cock with these questions. But he cannot do it all the time. The country is waking up, and I think we shall wake up the government and compel them to treat public affairs seriously and not answer, as the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did the other day when he was asked a plain business question, with a ridiculous comical story. The government are being watched from one end of the country to the other. Let them turn their eyes to the west, and they will see their friends in power in the province of Ontario being arraigned before the people. These things cannot be turned aside with a jaunty sneer. This matter of erecting a mint in Ottawa may be treated by the government as a small matter, but the country cannot be humbugged about it all the time. The Minister of Finance may meet a committee in this city and, with his cleverness, appear to turn them down. But the only effect is to send emissaries throughout the country who feel that they have not been fairly treated. And I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the time is coming when there will be a change.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BROCK. The very laugh, the very sneer I hear from the other side emphasizes what I say. Hon. gentlemen opposite know it. There is not a man coming from a constituency in Ontario who does not know this, and there is not one of their supporters from Ontario who does not tell them of it. They are trying to withstand a movement that has been helped on by the action of the late Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) who honestly tried to voice what is the real feeling of the country and what would be best in the interest of the country. The Minister of Finance, I claim, is turning this thing down, and he is turning it down to the detriment of his friends and the party to which he belongs. I am not here to make an excuse for the hon. gentlemen opposite, I will be glad to see them turned down. Now, Sir, I submit that a matter of this kind, although it appears to be small, is really of great importance, as showing the trend of opinion in this country. It is significant that a matter can be brought up here year after year for three years, and that the whole country can be misled, moreover, that the very city in which this building is supposed to be built can be misled. I think we are justified in concluding that the government have not been honest in this matter, and that they are now endeavouring to hoodwink the people of this country in connection with this mint.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I must defend what I have done in the past. I think I am on fair ground in saying that the government, while I was a member of it, did not purposely lose any time. As I said, the plans had to be prepared here first, and then they had to be approved on the other side. That took time. But tenders were asked for before I left, and were received, and if there had been no change in the site the work would be going on now.

Mr. BROCK. The change of the minister was the principal thing.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Now it may be well that the committee should realize thoroughly what that royal mint means. We have been discussing it in the past. I, for one, would have been glad to have a Canadian mint, but after discussion it was found that perhaps that would not be practicable. It was resolved to have a branch of the royal mint, which means of course that the superior officers of the institution will not be Canadians but Englishmen, the imperial government will appoint them. Practically this institution would not be under our care and control.

Mr. BROCK. Do the imperial government pay anything towards it?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No.

Mr. BROCK. Oh, Canada pays the bill.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. On that question as on all others, my motto is Canada for the Canadians. But I fully realize that it would not be practicable or possible to have a purely Canadian mint. The idea of the Minister of Finance was to have a royal mint so that we might work for the imperial government. But on the other hand, we would have to pay for the institution though it would not be under our care and charge. That is about the size of it, and it is just as well that we should look the matter straight in the face. The government have decided on that policy, and I am equally responsible for it. But as the government have not moved in the matter, it is just as well perhaps that we pause over

the position as we find it to-day. I must give the Minister of Finance this credit, that he has always been anxious for the work to proceed, and it is not his fault if the work has not progressed more rapidly. We pushed the plans in England as quickly as we could. Of course if we are obliged to buy a new site, it will cost a large amount of money. Land is not given free in this capital of ours. If the original site has been condemned—well, later on when the proper time comes, I shall desire to know the reasons why it has been condemned. I went carefully over the ground again and again with the chief architect, as well as with other able men, and we thought that the site was a very proper one indeed, otherwise I would not have consented to it.

Mr. BIRKETT. The Minister of Public Works made one or two remarks which I think are a little unkind, and he attributed opinions to me which I do not hold. He said that the member for Ottawa (Mr. Birkett) did not wish to have the mint built in this city, that there were plenty of other places anxious to get it. Now the member for Ottawa did not say one word against putting up any building in Ottawa, but he did ask why the building had been abandoned, and why, after this vote had been repeatedly taken, nothing was done. Surely I would be the last man in this House to say a word against one dollar being spent in Ottawa. I want to see all the money possible spent in this city, and I do not like to have any one insinuate that I am not anxious to see that building go on. The fact is that I see no reason why it has not been gone on with. The vote was taken three years ago, the plans are prepared, the site chosen is excellent. I do not see why the site should be changed, and in my opinion there is no reason for any change.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course I only spoke in a jocular manner. The hon. gentleman referred to the vote of $200,000, he was mistaken in that, for I looked back three years and found the same vote, $50,000. I myself am in favour of building the mint in Ottawa, and sincerely desire to see the work go on as quickly as possible. There is no intention on the part of the government of delaying it any longer than is necessary.

Mr. BIRKETT. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Could the minister say whether a proclamation has been issued by the imperial authorities establishing a branch of the royal mint in Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say as to the issue of the proclamation, but arrangements have been made between the imperial and Canadian governments for the establishment of a royal mint. Whether the proclamation has been actually issued I do not remember at the moment; but I am clear in stating that all the arrangements have been made between the two governments to authorize the establishment of a mint at Ottawa, in accordance with the Act passed unanimously by this House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Act was predicated upon proclamation issued by the imperial authorities and published in the Canadian 'Gazette,' establishing a branch of the royal mint at Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think that would prevent our going ahead. I am not sure the proclamation has been issued, I almost think it has not, but it would be issued the moment the mint has been established and put in operation. However, there is no misunderstanding, there is perfect agreement between the imperial and the Canadian governments, and the correspondence on the subject was brought down at a previous session.

Mr. MACLEAN. When does the hon. gentleman think this mint will be established and in running order ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Public Works can best answer that.

Mr. MACLEAN. I mean the other arrangements after the building is erected.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Just as soon as the building can be erected.

Mr. LENNOX. Instead of regretting the delay that has occurred, I think it is rather fortunate that delay has occurred. I think a good deal could be said about this, and a great deal of thinking could be done about it. Now, we have had a great deal of discussion as to the question of the necessary public buildings at Ottawa and as to the sites for them and it surely does occur to the government, as it has occurred to many hon. members, that we do not want one public building in one part of the city and another public building in another part and thus have them distributed around through the city of Ottawa. There ought to be some definite and complete plan as to where the public buildings which are likely to be required in the next half century will be located. Now, we are met with the difficulty at the present time that there is no site for this building, and that because—and it may be a very good reason—it is contemplated by the government that they may have to purchase some private property, it is not expedient at the present time to take the committee into their confidence and tell them where that site is to be. That, I can understand is perfectly reasonable, but, at the same time, I think it is probably a good reason why this item should not be pressed at the present time. I do not think—and in this I differ from a great many hon.

members who have spoken—that there is any great urgency in regard to this matter. If I understand the hon. Minister of Public Works aright, he suggested, during an early part of the discussion, that probably he would have a report from his chief engineer to-morrow. Was I right ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, within a few days.

Mr. LENNOX. I thought he said to-morrow; however, within a few days. I know I cannot prevail very far upon the government and probably as a new member my views are not entitled to any great weight, but I would suggest that in view of the fact that we are liable to have this report in a few days and as there is no great urgency in passing this item at the present time, it be allowed to stand over, if it meets with the concurrence of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and that we take it up again when we have more information than we have at the present time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let me say that I must insist upon pressing this vote if we are to make any progress at all. This matter has been before the House for three years at least, and I think it was unanimously admitted by both sides of the House that it was in the interests of the country that this work should go on. Perhaps, unexpected circumstances have arisen to create some delay, but it is better to have some delay than to make a mistake. If the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) understood the conditions at all he would see that this building should under no circumstances be put in a situation near the other buildings used for parliamentary or public purposes. You would not want a factory with a wall around it like a gaol placed in the beautiful park around this building for instance. We should have our geological museum and such other national buildings as we require near each other if we could get a plot of land under reasonable conditions that would answer for some years. At the same time, no one would think of establishing this manufacturing industry on the same ground as that occupied by the class of buildings to which I have referred.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It must be isolated.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that when the supplementary estimates are brought down, I shall be prepared with full information upon this subject.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On this subject ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On this subject.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the money is voted it is to be expended on a building in Ottawa ?

Mr. LENNOX.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. It is stated that this amount has been voted three times without any objection. The hon. gentleman must know that he is asking this vote under entirely different conditions from those that formerly prevailed. It was voted the last time on the express condition that the site which had been selected was to cost nothing. Now the hon. gentleman comes down and asks for this vote without being prepared to tell the Committee, and the Committee has not insisted on knowing, what the building would cost, but, surely, the hon. gentleman will not expect the Committee to vote a sum of money blindly when it can be delayed for a few days and when the Committee does not know how much will be involved in securing a suitable site, information on which point may change the minds of the Committee entirely as to whether we should undertake that work or not. I understand that work to be one more of national pride than of absolute utility or necessity for Canada. The first impulse that seized the House was that we should have a Canadian mint, not because we absolutely needed it but from a sense of national pride. We have been forced to abandon that position and to take another position. Now, so far as the benefits accruing to Canada from the standpoint of dollars and cents are concerned, we have not even from the hon. Minister of Finance any encouragement to hope that our position will be materially changed. We are told that if we had a Canadian mint it would not be in operation for more than one month in the year, but what assurance have we, when we are taking another mint upon ourselves and investing so large a sum of money—and it is a British mint, not a Canadian mint, separately as was understood in the first instance—of the necessity that has arisen under which we should give the hon. gentleman this vote until we see the question somewhat worked out ? I think the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is quite proper in suggesting that Canada can live without a branch of the imperial mint for another year. Now, the question is that if there is one established in Canada, will it be in Ottawa ? That seems to be a settled question, and I think the hon. gentleman can well afford to allow that vote to stand. We do not know what complications will arise in connection with the new site that may change the mind of parliament entirely, because the hon. gentleman is asking the vote under new conditions.

Mr. LENNOX. Just a word, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. minister in regard to my not appreciating the point that this building, possibly being surrounded by a wall, or probably surrounded to some extent by a substantial iron railing, or paling, should not be in close association with the buildings here. I quite apprehend that

point, but the point I wish to make clear is that there should be some relation of the public buildings, one to the other, that it is not desirable that we should have certain public buildings here and the mint in an entirely different part of the city, unconnected as a matter of view, even, with the present location. I have too much of an eye for architectural beauty and the fitness of things to desire to see it even in the place where it was proposed, at one time, to erect a statue to our late sovereign the Queen—at the entrance to the public buildings here. I do not propose that it should be upon this plot of ground at all, but I do consider that when we were discussing the question before that it was pretty well understood a site had been fixed upon, and that while it was an isolated site in every way appearing to be suitable, was well within the view of the public buildings we have here and was to form part of a group of buildings proposed to be erected at a considerable cost. I say again, and I say it much more urgently than before, that I think it is not only the courtesy we should expect from the hon. minister that he should allow the matter to stand over, but it is the right of the representatives of the people, having regard to the changed conditions that have arisen, to ask that this item shall not be pressed at the present time. Let me be as distinct and definite as possible. I want to say here that having regard to the changed conditions I shall feel it to be my duty, at all events, to protest in the most vigorous way by vote, or otherwise, against this matter being pressed whilst the people's representatives are not in a position to know where the building is to be placed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not discussing, or we should not be discussing, to-night, the wisdom or unwisdom of establishing a Canadian mint. After several years of discussion on this subject the parliament of Canada came to the conclusion unanimously that it was a wise measure to have ; not a Canadian mint as was originally proposed, but a branch of the royal mint. I stated to my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Birkett) that if he had read that interesting speech of 1899 carefully he would have observed that at the very time at which I dissented from the motion then made respecting the establishment of a purely Canadian mint—in that very speech I suggested that if an arrangement could be made with Her Majesty's government for establishing a branch of the royal mint, that would give larger employment than a purely Canadian mint, that would probably be a very desirable arrangement. That arrangement which I then suggested was afterwards carried out. This was fully understood when parliament unanimously adopted that Act, and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was one of its most cordial supporters. Therefore, we are not discussing to-day the wisdom of establishing a branch of the royal mint in Canada. I admit it was to some extent a matter of national pride, but national pride is not less to-day than it was two years ago. If we are open to complaint at all it is not because we have adopted the policy of building a branch of the royal mint, but because there has been some delay. I see no reason in the world why we should not proceed with this vote so that if there has been delay in the past there shall not be delay in the future. We have unanimously adopted the policy of having a mint, my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) voted in support of it and he must not go back upon himself. I want him to be consistent. I want him to stand to his guns ; he supported the royal mint here only a few years ago for national and imperial reasons, and I do not want him to be less national and less imperial than at that time. I think I am correct in stating that when the proposal was made to establish a mint the question of the site was not then considered essential.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes it was.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will not contradict my hon. friend, because he may have looked it up and I have not ; we can see about that later. I do not think the question of site was at first considered essential, but it came up later. Without stating now where the site is to be, I am quite satisfied that the cost of the land will not materially change the situation. I can not go further than that. I can assure my hon. friend who has raised a doubt on that point, that from what I know as to the progress that has been made in getting a site, the cost of that site will not be a reason for changing our policy respecting the mint.

Mr. BROCK. I stand up Mr. Chairman, again to justify myself. The Finance Minister has charged that when this mint was proposed I strongly favoured it. I strongly favour everything still that tends to imperial interests as well as Canadian interests, but even suppose I have changed my opinions in regard to this matter I can say as the Prime Minister said the other day that I have been green in my youth and that I have a right to change my opinion. But let me say, Sir, that I have not changed my opinion. I agree with the opinion of the Bank of Montreal, that it is a bad business, that it will be a losing business, that there is no profit in it, and if I led the majority of this House to carry me with it I simply did what the Finance Minister did himself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let us stand together then.

Mr. BROCK. I contend that the establishment of a mint in this country will redound to the financial loss of this country, and if that be the case, it is not beneath the dignity of the Minister of Finance to recede from his mistake when he finds he has made one.

I do not see why I should drag Canada into a serious loss of $100,000 a year merely for the sake of national pride. We can distribute our national pride much more profitably in another direction. We can assist our great empire to which we belong much more liberally than we are doing at present, we can spend our money much more profitably than by spending it on a mint which the Finance Minister is going to take to his own particular glory instead of the national glory of this country. So far as my opinion goes, now I advise the members of this House to move very slowly in this matter. It is not merely the expenditure on the building that we have to consider.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much will it cost a year ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Act of Parliament provides for an annual expenditure of $75,000.

Mr. BROCK. But the Minister of Finance told us that he was making a profit by having the silver coined in England instead of here, and to that $75,000 you must add the loss which we incur in that regard. But you forget the patronage there is in connection with such a department. Why bless your heart they can keep Ottawa solidly Reform for years to come with the patronage they will have.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BROCK. I would ask the members of this House to be very careful about adopting the financial schemes of the Finance Minister. He will allow his financial ability to be directed in any way that will keep him where he is. This country knows it ; we have all recognized it. It has been impressed upon me personally ; it has been impressed on this side of the House and I think the members on the other side of the House are impressed too. Therefore, I would ask gentlemen who have an interest in this country, and I think we all have, I would ask them to vote down this scheme even supposing we go back on our record. We have the advantage of the opinion of the First Minister that it is justifiable under certain circumstances to go back upon our record. I am not ashamed of changing my opinions if I change them in the right direction, and the right direction at the present time is to sit upon an expenditure of this kind. We are floating upon the crest of that wave of prosperity which the Finance Minister spoke of some years ago. He knows as well as any man in this House, and the sensible level headed business men of this country are warning him every day that we are approaching a time when things will not be as prosperous. We are not only putting up a mint now, but we are putting up a building in which we are going to carry on a very losing business. There is no need for it at all ; there is not a bit of glory in it ; we are perfectly satisfied with our present currency and the manner in which our coinage is at present turned out. Gentlemen I ask you to oppose this Canadian mint in every possible way, and I do ask the Finance Minister to have the grace, once in his life, to acknowledge that he has been possibly wrong and to let this thing drop.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection to admit that I may be possibly wrong sometimes.

Mr. BROCK. And you are wrong now.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have to disagree from the hon. member (Mr. Brock) with regard to this expenditure. He objects to it because the expenditure may be directed in such a way as to keep the present government in power for many years. Thank goodness, the application of the money is not in their hands at all. It has to be paid direct to the Lord Commissioners of the Treasury in England.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What becomes of the patronage story ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is the patronage part of my hon. friend's argument that I object to.

Mr. BROCK. They will fix that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Even the officers are to be appointed by the imperial authorities. The Act provides for an annual expenditure of $75,000 to be paid into the hands of the Lord Commissioners of the Treasury in order to meet the salaries and contingencies of that department. My hon. friend (Mr. Brock) need have no fear that it will be expended so as to injure any political party. I am with the hon. gentleman opposite that the mint should be erected in Ottawa. But I do not know that it will be a great success financially, or that a large amount of money will accrue to the country because of it. I heard the objection of Mr. Clouston, of the Bank of Montreal, as to the establishment of the mint, but I think it was predicated on the establishment of a Canadian mint. Under the new circumstances, I do not know whether there will be a profit or a loss ; but I think there will be no great loss of money, after all, in the establishment of this institution, as we have the assurance of the hon. Minister of Public Works that it will be built in Ottawa, and that after the building is completed the expenditure, in the shape of patronage, in the appointments to the different offices in the mint, will be in hands that will not exert a corrupt influence on the electors of Ottawa.

Mr. BROCK. Notwithstanding all that has been said, I beg to move that the item be struck out. In doing that, we shall be on the safe side for Canada, at any rate.

Amendment negatived : Yeas, 6 ; nays, 47.

Victoria Memorial Museum, $50,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote, as the House knows. My own personal view is to recommend council to purchase a block of land that will be sufficient; and before I ask for any money to go on with this building, that will be reported to the House.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In other words, no site has been chosen as yet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I want to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the necessity of a new press gallery in this chamber. The press gallery is crowded, and the press boys would like to have some more accommodation. If my hon. friend will kindly give his attention to my request, I shall be very much obliged indeed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that in view of the improvement which was made last year, giving so much satisfaction to members of the House, I think it will be proper to ask for a supplementary estimate to continue that improvement on the other side, and I will ask the architect to report what accommodation can be given to the press gallery.

Mr. LOGAN. I think it is the unanimous opinion of the members of this House that the construction of a national museum is of the very greatest importance at the present time. I am not so much concerned about the construction of a mint; but so far as the geological museum is concerned, it seems to me that we are flirting with calamity to allow the precious records of this country to be kept in an old building which is liable at any moment to be swept away by fire, and I think the minister cannot act too quickly in securing a site and going on with the construction of a new building.

Mr. SPROULE. I am entirely opposed to the principle of voting a large amount of money year after year without knowing when it is to be used or whether it is to be used at all. It is a very unsound and pernicious principle, and I respectfully submit that the ministers ought to be prepared to give the House more information than they do as to whether the money is intended to be used or not. If it is not to be used we should not be asked to vote it, and if it is, then they ought to be in a position to give us some particulars about it. The hon. gentleman says the site is not yet selected. Is it intended that any portion of the vote shall be expended during the present year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I approve in a general way of the remarks of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). In regard to this particular vote, I believe the desire of the great majority of the members of this House has been expressed by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan), that some provision should be made for such a building as he has spoken of. Before we proceed with the work, I will bring the fullest possible information before the House, and I hope to give the full cost.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There were two or three sites in view when I left office. If I may be allowed, I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should not be cheeseparing in this matter. This is a very important building, and it should be located on a site that would do credit to this country. A few thousand dollars more or less for the purchase of a site for such a building should not be considered for a moment. I had first contemplated locating the building in the Major Hill Park, over the pond there; but on reflection, and after having consulted some of my colleagues, I made up my mind that that would not do. I had another site in view, a very fine site indeed, and one which I thought would not be too expensive. It would not be in the public interest to say where it is.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would it be convenient to the buildings?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In all the big capitals of the world the public buildings are not together. It is out of the question to suppose that we can locate all our buildings in the same locality. It seems to me that a building of this kind should have an ornamental site, and I do not think the House will object to the purchase of a fine site, even if the price is a little high.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to be understood as opposing the expenditure. I am opposing the principle of asking the House to spend money without knowing what we are committing ourselves to. The hon. minister says that if we vote this item he will give us the information later. But, if we should object afterwards to vote any more money, we will be met with the statement that we had committed ourselves to this expenditure long ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My intention is to bring down all the details, and we will let the item stand.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 24, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of George D. Grant, Esquire, for the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Ontario.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Eastern Townships Bank.—Mr. McIntosh.

Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—Hon. Mr. Costigan.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 30) to incorporate the Federal Oil Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 31) to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough) moved :

That the public accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and the report of the Auditor General volume 1 and 2 for the same year, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on public accounts.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY — SIR WILLIAM MULOCK'S SPEECH.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at the head of the government to a despatch in the morning 'Citizen' of to-day, purporting to give a report of a speech by Sir William Mulock at the banquet of the Young Men's Liberal Club in Toronto. The report reads, in part :

The event of to-night's banquet of the Young Liberal's Club was the speech of Sir Wm. Mulock pleading the justification of a bonus to the Grand Trunk Pacific or any line of railway projected to unite eastern and western Canada, running through the, as yet, unsettled 1,000 miles in northern Ontario. Any railway which traversed this unprofitable country was entitled to public aid, for it would be helping to build up Canada nationally by providing an all-Canadian route for the output of the western provinces. The fact that a line from Winnipeg to Quebec would be so much shorter than to Boston or any other Atlantic port was emphasized and the need of dealing with this question before trade settled down into an American chanel was pointed out. The incapacity of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian Northern Railway to handle even the present output was noted and the need to provide transportation facilities to keep pace with the advancing tide of immigration was taken as an axiom.

Evidently the government have some policy on this subject, as emphasized in the speech from the Throne. I wish to know from the right hon. gentleman what is the policy of the government—or is he prepared to state it at present ?—with reference to the transportation question and the assistance to be given to the Grand Trunk Railway or any other enterprise proposing to open up the north-west. I wish to know whether a part of that scheme is to build a road from Quebec to connect with the new line in the north-west.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have not seen the report which my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) refers to. Perhaps I had better wait until Sir William Mulock returns, when he can speak for himself. I do not know whether he has been accurately reported or not. As to the general question of the policy of the government, when the government has framed a policy it will be its duty to bring it down to parliament at once. But upon the general question of transportation, I think that it is of pressing need that we should have more means of communication between the east and the west.

Mr. SPROULE. If you were to apply the same principle as you did in the case of the ex-Minister of Public Works, he ought to get out.

SUPPLY—EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

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

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou) moved in amendment :

That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following substituted :

That in the opinion of this House there is no justification for the application of the Diseases of Animals Act of Great Britain to Canadian cattle.

That Canadian cattle at the time of the passing of said Act and ever since have been free from all contagious diseases.

This House is of opinion that the application of the said Act to Canadian cattle has an injurious effect upon the cattle trade of this country.

This House regrets that the representatives of Canada at the colonial conference utterly failed to obtain any redress or promise of redress for this grievance.

This House further regrets that this government has not succeeded by more vigorous protests, or by other effective steps, in finding means to obtain the removal of the existing unjust restrictions on the sale of Canadian cattle in Great Britain.

He said: It will be, Mr. Speaker, in the recollection of hon. members that this matter was dealt with at the last session of this legislature by a motion made at the same stage of the proceedings, as the present. It has since engaged a great deal of attention among the agriculturists of the mother country and quite recently it was brought to the notice of the imperial parliament by an amendment to the address. Last session this House unanimously passed a resolution proposed by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and the hope was then expressed that this proceeding would strengthen the hands of our representatives at the colonial conference and enable them to secure some relaxation of the regulations which are so injurious to the cattle trade of this country. No doubt the history of this question is familiar to every one, but it may nevertheless be well to recapitulate it. Canadian cattle were admitted to the markets of the mother country until 1892, under the careful supervision of the British Board of Agriculture. In 1892, owing to the suspicion that disease existed in one animal, which formed part of a cargo of Canadian cattle, the regulations were changed, Canadian cattle were required to be slaughtered at the port of entry, the ports to which Canadian cattle were admitted were limited to six in number, and all imported Canadian cattle had to be slaughtered within ten days from their arrival.

At the time when this suspected case of contagious pleuro-pneumonia was reported and declared to be that particular disease by the veterinary authorities of the Board of Agriculture, it was maintained by the authorities on this side and by some very eminent veterinary authorities in the mother country that the animal suspected of pleuro-pneumonia was infected only by the common catarrhal pneumonia, which is not at all contagious or dangerous. That view was presented to the British authorities by the Canadian government, and various arguments were urged to show that the cattle of Canada were healthy and that really no cause existed for excluding them from the inland markets of the mother country. Lately the arable farmers of Scotland, who are intensely interested in this matter, have been agitating very strongly for the repeal of the obnoxious legislation. They quote the authority of the gentleman who purchased the animal suspected of being diseased. He bought the cow in question in October, 1892, and shortly afterwards all the cattle upon two of his farms, on which this animal had been from time to time, were slaughtered by order of the British authorities. But in not one of these animals so slaughtered was any trace of disease found. Furthermore a general order was passed requiring the slaughter of all the animals in the cargo of which that cow formed part, and in no case did any of these animals show any trace of pleuro-pneumonia. Nor was the slightest trace of the disease found in any of the animals with which the one suspected had come in contact. Prof. Williams, who is perhaps the most eminent authority in Great Britain on these matters, did not agree with the government experts. He held, and so did Mr. Clark, veterinary surgeon of the Perthshire county council, that there was no pleuro-pneumonia in existence among the animals imported and that none of the animals which had come in contact with the supposed diseased animal had given any evidence of the existence of pleuro-pneumonia. Furthermore I see, on the authority of the farmers who waited on Mr. Hanbury, president of the Board of Agriculture, that a portion of the lung of the suspected animal had been removed and is still in existence at Edinburgh, in the custody of the veterinary authorities there, which is in itself sufficient evidence to show that it was a mistaken diagnosis which led to the exclusion of Canadian cattle. Mr. Clark also says, speaking of disease among Canadian cattle:

I never met with a case of contagious or infectious disease in one single instance and this including that most prevalent disease, tuberculosis.

Now, Sir, the cattle of the mother country are not as free from disease as those of Canada. The statistics given as to the condition of the cattle slaughtered at Glasgow show that among 46,784 animals home bred cattle slaughtered at Glasgow, under inspection of the veterinary authorities, tuberculosis existed in 6,332 cases, making an average of 13·53 per cent of infected or diseased animals. At the same time among 49,881 Canadian and United States cattle which were slaughtered, there were found no cases of pleuro-pneumonia and but 66 cases of tubercular disease, or only 13-100 of 1 per cent. In addition to this corroborative and accumulative evidence showing that the cattle of Canada are and have been perfectly healthy, Mr. Hanbury, president of the Board of Agriculture, himself admits that there is no disease existing among Canadian cattle. On the 9th of October, 1901, when receiving a delegation of agriculturists, in Edinburgh, he made the statement that in his opinion there was no disease in Canada. And on February 27th of this year, he declared in the House of Commons that he had admitted for months past that Canada was free from disease, but nevertheless he was convinced that if the people of Great Britain were to keep out disease, the Act of 1896 must be maintained in all its completeness. Mr. Hanbury in a variety of ways and at a variety of times has tried

to justify the position taken by the British government and persists in declaring that his government will not relax the regulations excluding Canadian cattle from the mother country. The importance of this matter to the Scotch farmers is so great that a very strong agitation is being carried on by them to have these regulations relaxed. They have met Mr. Hanbury in large numbers, and have urged upon him the fact that they are being injured in their business by the embargo laid upon Canadian store cattle. The main point in Mr. Hanbury's reply to that delegation was that in this matter he, as a member of the Board of Agriculture, and the Board of Agriculture as representing the government, had no power to make any change, or to do anything for the agriculturists of Scotland. He says that they are acting under the terms and carrying out the provisions of an Act of the imperial parliament which they cannot repeal. He further says that he doubts very much if the government of Great Britain to-day is strong enough to effect the repeal of the Act. Substantially, what he has said to the agriculturists who are interested in this matter is that if they wish to have these regulations altered, or the regulations which they consider injurious cancelled, it is necessary for them to bring pressure to bear upon the government of Great Britain through the parliament of Great Britain ; and they have invited the co-operation of their fellow subjects in Canada in this work. It is largely upon that ground, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is now being brought to the notice of this House. It is important to Canada that we should have this trade, apparently, because the exports of Canadian cattle to Great Britain have in the past been very extensive.

I have already mentioned the fact that the interruption that occurred to the traffic came in 1892. I will read to the House the figures representing the value and extent of the trade from the year 1892 to 1901, these being the years in which I find these figures tabulated in the Year-book, a volume which is accessible to all the members of the House. It was in 1892 that the difficulty about this trade began.

Year.	Head of cattle exported.	Value.
1892....	101,426	$7,481,613
1893....	99,904	7,402,208
1894....	80,531	6,316,373
1895....	85,863	6,797,615
1896....	97,042	6,816,361
1897....	120,063	6,454,313
1898....	122,106	7,403,990
1899....	115,476	7,129,430
1900....	115,056	7,579,080
1901....	119,050	8,028,476

Now it is evident that this is a large and important branch of exports for the people of Canada, and anything that tends to diminish the price at which these cattle sell in the mother country, means exactly that much of a loss to the shippers from this side of the Atlantic. These cattle that are taken across to Great Britain are practically of two classes. First of all, there are those that are not fully fattened or ready for the butcher, which are called store cattle ; the other class are those in which the farmers of eastern and south-eastern Scotland are so largely interested, and for which they are pleading at this time to have fully admitted into the markets of the country. Probably during the later years of this measure, shippers from this side have sent over more fully matured and ripened cattle, and have thereby in a measure avoided the loss that would occur by having their cattle slaughtered at the point of debarkation. However, a circumstance that affects all the cattle going from this side of the Atlantic, is that in crossing the Atlantic they are liable to more or less rough usage from the bad weather, and are liable to arrive in the ports of the mother country greatly injured ; and it being necessary to slaughter them within ten days from the time of their arrival, they are frequently slaughtered and placed upon the market in such a condition that it is impossible to realize for them anything like the value which they possess if the purchasers, farmers and others on the other side, were permitted to buy them and put them upon grass, or feed them otherwise for a month or two during which they could recover condition, and would command a much higher price in the meat markets of the mother country.

The arguments that have been advanced by Mr. Hanbury, with whom the people and the government of this country have had to deal with reference to this matter, have been somewhat various. They were mentioned in the discussion which took place last year ; and at that time the hon. the Minister of Agriculture spoke of one of Mr. Hanbury's arguments as positively preventing the consent of the British government to the course proposed, that is, that the treaties in existence between Great Britain and other countries would absolutely prevent Great Britain from giving better terms to Canada, without at the same time admitting all other countries to share in the same benefits under the provisions existing in most of the treaties requiring the mother country to give to all countries included in the treaties the better terms which she gives to any one country. The Minister of Agriculture thought last year that the plea of Mr. Hanbury that the government was prevented by the better terms clause in the treaties from making this concession to Canada, had been abandoned by Mr. Hanbury. Still, I find that in his arguments advanced to the agriculturists of Scotland, dealing with this question, in October, 1902, he again recites the very same reasons why the cattle of this country could not be admitted into the mother country, because if that was done, it would be necessary to admit the cattle of all other countries as well.

Now it is generally supposed that the plea which has been made that these cattle were shut out of Great Britain because disease existed in this country, has been abandoned. It has generally been supposed that was not the real reason which existed in the mind of Mr. Hanbury and which led him to persist in excluding Canadian cattle. It has been rather suspected that it was a measure of protection, that by excluding Canadian cattle on this plea he practically secures an advantage in the markets of the mother country for the breeders and feeders of the mother country. In reference to that matter, the experience of the feeders, those men who have arable farms in Scotland and buy store cattle and fatten them upon their own farms, shows that they do not agree with Mr. Hanbury. They seem to think they are being injured to quite as great an extent as the people of Canada by reason of the fact that they are prevented from buying store cattle from this country to feed upon their own farms. Latterly, I see that Mr. Hanbury, in speaking on this matter, practically maintains that if Canadian cattle are to be admitted into Great Britain, it is going to prejudice the position of the breeders of store cattle in Great Britain.

Now, if the mother country chooses frankly to adopt that as a measure of protection, I do not feel that we as a people who are disposed to shape our legislation so as to give our own producers an advantage in the market, would be in a very good position to find fault with them. But that is not the ground upon which Mr. Hanbury based his case in the speech delivered by him in the Imperial House of Commons on the 27th of February last. From first to last he cast an aspersion upon the cattle of Canada, contending that if they were not now diseased they are liable to be diseased at any moment, and that it is imperative, if the people of Great Britain are going to preserve their herds from disease, that they must shut out the cattle of Canada. While Mr. Hanbury has abandoned the plea that Canadian cattle are diseased we still find him appealing to the British House of Commons against the admission of Canadian cattle on the ground that it is impossible for English cattle to be kept free from disease if Canadian cattle are admitted. That seems a most absurd proposal by Mr. Hanbury, because the figures I have cited show, that whereas the cattle of Great Britain are largely diseased; whereas they are admitting thousands of store cattle from Ireland a large percentage of which are diseased, on the other hand the cattle of Canada are absolutely free from disease. You will find in the reports of our Department of Agriculture, that Dr. McEachran our inspector reports on the cattle sent from Canada to England year after year, that no contagious disease exists among them. On two occasions Dr. McEachran reports that probably in no other country in the world is there such complete absence of disease amongst cattle as there is in Canada. In face of that condition of affairs; in face of the fact that cattle in Great Britain do show tuberculous disease; in face of the fact that the cattle imported from Ireland are, on the evidence of these Scotch farmers, not healthy or vigorous or profitable; in face of all that, Mr. Hanbury appeals to the British House of Commons to support the legislation now in existence, and he maintains that it is impossible to keep cattle disease out of Great Britain unless they debar Canadian cattle. It would be just as reasonable to argue that the clear pure water of a spring going into a river which was more or less polluted, would pollute that river, as to maintain that the admission of one hundred thousand healthy Canadian cattle to mix with the more or less diseased cattle in Great Britain was going to introduce disease amongst British herds. It is perfectly clear that the ground upon which so far the government of Great Britain, as represented by Mr. Hanbury, have rested their case to keep our cattle at a disadvantage and to inflict a loss upon our shippers, is absolutely without foundation. Mr. Hanbury made the statement in the course of his speech: That it is impossible to know whether there is disease or not in the countries whence these cattle have been sent to Great Britain. That statement is entirely at variance with the condition of affairs in Canada where the most careful inspection is made of every animal shipped, and where successive governments have asked the government of Great Britain to send their own veterinary inspector to Canada to satisfy themselves in the most absolute manner that no disease existed, if they are not content with the report of the Canadian inspector. In face of all these facts it seems to me that we in this House of Commons should express our entire dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs. I find amongst these Scotch farmers a very general disposition to represent the case of Canada as one which deserves special consideration. Several of them referred to the great sacrifices made by Canada for the empire; to the manner in which Canada has shown herself disposed to come to the assistance of the mother country and not to spare either blood or treasure in rendering that assistance. These men of our race in the motherland seem to think that it is only fair that Canada should receive some special consideration, or at least should not be unjustly discriminated against in this manner. In the light of this, and in view of the fact that we have an unassailable and impregnable case it seems to me that if there is an unanimous expression from this parliament that this obnoxious restriction should be removed, the government of Canada ought to be in a position to press this matter very forcibly upon the government of the mother country. Last year this House passed a resolution similar to this, and one hope expressed at that time was that the gentlemen representing Canada at the colo-

nial conference would be enabled to gain something for the benefit of our country in regard to this matter. It was thought that when Canada gave that concession in tariff matters known as the British preference, that if we were going to make concessions to the manufacturers of the motherland, the government of Great Britain might be asked to make a concession to the agriculturists of Canada in conection with our cattle export trade. That was not done. I find that at the colonial conference this matter was referred to, but apparently received very little attention, and so far as we can learn it was relegated for settlement to Mr. Hanbury, the president of the Board of Trade; the very gentleman who told the Scotch farmers in Edinburgh that he had no power to deal with this question and that any action taken in connection with it must be with the sanction of Great Britain supported by the House of Commons. At page 41 of the report of the proceedings of the colonial conference this reference is made:

> The representatives of Canada desired to bring before the conference the clauses of the law under which live cattle imported into this country from Canada are required to be slaughtered at the port of landing. It was considered, however, that the matter was not of sufficient general interest to be dealt with by the conference and arrangements were made for a discussion privately with the president of the Board of Agriculture.

Thus the matter was referred to that same Mr. Hanbury, who, at that time and more recently still, has said that it was utterly impossible to grant this request. No report, so far as I know, has come to this House as to what may have occurred in the course of the referred discussion which was to have taken place between the representatives of Canada and the President of the Board of Agriculture, and probably it will be to our advantage now to learn from the members of the government, to what extent this matter was discussed with Mr. Hanbury, and what the result of the discussion was. If I had known more exactly, before the notice of this motion was given, what had transpired at the colonial conference on this subject, it would probably have been better that a motion had been made for a report of the conference or what took place between the Canadian representatives and Mr. Hanbury. That information we may have from the members of the government present. On this explanation of the position in which the question stands at present, the attitude of Mr. Hanbury and the attitude of the government of Great Britain, so far as we can know from public information, I will rest the case at this point, simply moving the motion of which I have given notice.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the time and the circumstances are at present favourable for the discussion of this question; and if my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) feels it his duty to press this amendment, I shall have to ask the House to reject it, for two reasons. The first reason is that the method and manner and terms of the resolution unmistakably mark it as a vote of non-confidence in the government. We accept it as such, and we ask those who are supporters of the government in the House to join us in taking that view. The second reason is that a motion passed this House within the last few days calling for the papers on this subject. My hon. friend, without waiting for the production of those papers, endeavours to precipitate a discussion to-day. I think, until those papers are brought down, the House is not in a position intelligently to discuss it. When they are brought down, if it be found that the government have not in every respect pressed this matter on the attention of the imperial authorities, then there may be need of some further action in the House. But, until that motion has been responded to, as it will be at an early day, by the production of the papers, I submit that the time is not favourable for a discussion of this question.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has given the very briefest, and it seems to me, the flimsiest reasons why this question should not be discussed to-day. What are they? First, that the time and the circumstances are not appropriate, because of the absence of the papers. If we were living in an age of the world when we had not the public press, which dishes up everything fresh on our tables in the morning, that might be regarded as a sufficient reason; but, in view of the fact that we are so well informed with regard to what takes place, not only on the continent of America, but in the mother country, it cannot be said that we are without sufficient information to enable us to deal with this question. Therefore the present time cannot be inappropriate. Then, the hon. minister regards this motion as one of non-confidence; but when a similar motion was proposed by one of his own friends at the last session of parliament, it was considered quite appropriate then. If it was appropriate then, how can it be inappropriate now, when moved in exactly similar circumstances? If the government accepted the motion then, without regarding it as a motion of want of confidence, they can accept this motion to-day. They have not the opportunity of putting up one of their own friends for the purpose of defending the government for delay; but the hon. minister calls on his friends simply to vote down the motion as one of want of confidence. It seems to me that is about the very worst excuse the government could offer. The hon. Minister of Finance has not applied himself to the subject at all, but just calls upon his silent majority—I will not call it as his friends used to do

on this side of the House, the brute majority—to vote it down. Now, this is a very important question, one in which the great agricultural class of our country especially have a great and direct interest. It is of sufficient importance to engage the most careful attention and the most active services of the government and their friends, whether they are at home or abroad. The history of the matter has been very well given by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell). In 1892, it was said that two head of cattle reached England affected with pleuro-pneumonia. One was taken over on the 'Monkseton' and the other on the 'Huronian.' The result was that the embargo was put on, and in 1896 a Bill introduced and passed prohibiting the importation of Canadian cattle into England or Scotland, unless they were slaughtered at the port of debarkation within ten days after their arrival. The embargo was put on for the purpose of keeping out disease and maintaining the sanitary condition of cattle in that country. It was claimed in Canada, as well as in Scotland, that there were no justifiable reasons for putting on the embargo, as there were grave doubts whether the cases in question were cases of pleuro-pneumonia or not. Professor Williamson, of Edinburgh, one of the greatest authorities on the subject in the world, declared most positively and emphatically, after careful examination, that they were not cases of pleuro-pneumonia. At that time, the government of the day in Canada were attacked most fiercely for having failed to get that embargo raised. The contention of the opposition at that time was that it had been put on owing to the laxity of the Canadian government regarding the enforcement of the quarantine regulations between Canada and the United States. I remember very distinctly that the hon. Postmaster General (Sir Wm. Mulock) for a whole afternoon in this House arraigned the government in a most voluminous way, going over the whole history of the case; and several other hon. gentlemen opposite joined him in the most energetic and sarcastic fashion.

It was claimed that this great injustice was due to the failure of the late government to do its duty. Afterwards in 1896 a law was passed by the British parliament preventing the importation of Canadian cattle. Before that year there was only an Order in Council, but that Order in Council was afterwards converted into an Act of parliament. The government opposite came into office in 1896. Have these hon. gentlemen shown themselves sincere in the charges they made in 1892, that this embargo of our cattle was due to the lax quarantine regulations which were then in force between this country and the United States. Had they been sincere, they would have endeavoured to make these regulations more stringent and prevent the possibility of any disease being imported from the United States or elsewhere and thus be in a position to appeal with greater force to the mother country to remove the embargo. Did they do that? No, Mr. Speaker, they did exactly the reverse. And in what little they did, they have been entirely unsuccessful. It is true that at intermittent intervals they have written to Mr. Hanbury, president of the Board of Agriculture of England, asking that the embargo be taken off, and the invariable answer they have received is that their request will not be complied with. The plea given for this refusal is that the British government desire to keep the herds of English cattle free from disease, but we have at last the admission from Mr. Hanbury himself that he does not believe contagious disease exists among Canadian herds, so that the only plausible excuse for putting on the embargo and maintaining it has really no existence, according to Mr. Hanbury himself. Why then is the embargo kept on? Judging by the information we have, we can only come to one conclusion, and that is that this embargo is simply a measure of protection for the English and Scotch farmers who desire a better market for their own cattle, and is not intended to prevent the importation of disease at all. We are justified in coming to that conclusion by the reply given by the president of the Board of Agriculture to a deputation which waited on him in Edinburgh in 1902. He said that the Order in Council had been converted into a solemn statute passed unanimously by the House of Commons, but that the statute was passed at a time when a most vigorous agitation was kept up which led to the conclusion that there was real danger to the herds of Britain in the importation of Canadian cattle and when that agitation was not met by the vigorous opposition that might have been expected. He then went on to say:

> Therefore although Canada may be free at the present moment—and I honestly admit that I think it is—I told the Canadian minister so myself, and I am perfectly willing to repeat it to this deputation—I think the United States are also free; these are the two countries sending in their animals for slaughter, and no country which was not supposed to be free from disease would be allowed to do that. There is another reason in addition to disease, though connected with disease, which I am bound to say weighs with me, and it is this. Given the fact that, although a country may be free from disease, you can never guarantee the continuance of that freedom from disease, what would happen if the importation of store cattle, say from the two countries free from disease at the present moment—Canada and the United States—were to be allowed? The first thing that would happen undoubtedly would be that the price of English stores would naturally fall to the price of the stores sent over from Canada and the United States.

Therefore the real object of Mr. Hanbury was to protect the English and Scotch farmer and not to keep out disease. What

effort has the present government made to have this embargo removed ? So far they have made very little effort indeed. True, from time to time, they have written some letters. From time to time the Minister of Agriculture has made some slight representations to Mr. Hanbury, but all they have done has resulted in nothing. We have very strong evidence that contagious disease does not exist in Canada among our cattle. We have the evidence of veterinary surgeons who have been making reports from time to time, ever since 1892, to the government of this country that no contagious disease of any nature dangerous to cattle exists in Canada. We have the evidence disclosed by the slaughter of every animal of the herds of Canadian cattle, over 1,000,000 in all, in England and Scotland since 1892. In no one instance was there any trace of contagious disease. We are therefore right in assuming that there is no danger to be feared from the importation of Canadian cattle in the mother country. We have the evidence of Mr. Hanbury himself who declared that he does not believe that the disease exists in Canada at present, nevertheless we have not yet had any relaxation of this embargo. When the present government took office they declared that the embargo was imposed because of the carelessness of their predecessors in not strictly enforcing the quarantine regulations between us and the United States. But what was the first thing done by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) ? The first thing he did was to relax those regulations. He did the very thing which he and his friends declared most emphatically should not be done. They had declared that instead of relaxing we should make these regulations more stringent and enforce them more strictly, yet no sooner did they take office than they did the very reverse. Will that convince the Canadian farmer that this government have his interests at heart ?

Before 1892 we had the present Minister of Agriculture declaring that anyhow the British market did not amount to very much, and I am bound to believe that he entertains the same opinion still, if we are to judge him and his friends by the half-hearted methods they have made to relieve this country of the embargo.

But who are aiding us in our efforts to get it removed ? Mr. Hanbury has stated that 95 per cent of the British people were opposed to it. In answer to that I point to the fact that petitions were presented to the British government, signed by people representing no less than 8,000,000 consumers and feeders and handlers of these cattle, who are interested in having this embargo removed. We have also an ally in the Scotch farmers and feeders who are using every effort to convince the British government that their policy in this respect is a mistaken one and they ask us to help them. They say to us : Our interests are identical in this matter; make a greater effort in your country and we will in ours, in order to force conviction upon the British parliament that no necessity exists for this embargo and that it will be eminently in the interests, not only of the Canadian people but of the Scotch farmers and the Scotch and English butchers and the British consumer, to have this embargo raised. We have able allies; they are willingly joining us, they are energetically joining us, and they wish us to make a greater effort.

A short time ago we had the colonial conference, and the Prime Minister was there with many of his friends. I think the Minister of Finance was there, and the Minister of Agriculture also. One of the important subjects discussed was the trade relations between us and the mother country. And what representations did these hon. gentlemen make there with regard to this important question that showed a desire on their part to get the embargo raised ? I do not know that either the Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture broached the subject at all. So far as the papers informed us, we have no means of knowing that they said a word regarding it. Is that an evidence of their being alive to the interests of the Canadian farmers ? Here was a splendid opportunity to make such representations—and to back them up with facts that were within their reach—as might have enabled them to secure the raising of this embargo. But, so far as we know they did nothing. They treated the matter—I was going to say with silent contempt, but perhaps that would be going too far.

On another question, I wish to say a word. Why is not the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) here to enlighten us on this question ? I have noticed a fashion which has obtained of late years in this House, which, I think, ought to be put a stop to as soon and as completely as possible. Whenever a session of parliament commences, two or three or more ministers at the head of important departments, who ought to be here to answer questions put to them, absent themselves. Our Minister of Agriculture is in Japan, I believe. Last session he was away somewhere else. I do not know what he may be doing. He may have gone upon a very important mission. But I think he could have taken some other time of the year to go rather than during a session of parliament. It is currently hinted, whether true or not, that ministers are conveniently absent to avoid troublesome questions which might be brought to the attention of parliament in which their departments and the government are vitally interested.

If that be the reason, we had better know it, and we had better change the system at once. It is a matter of great importance that, during the session of parliament, min-

isters should be here to answer questions put to them. At present, two important ministers are absent. The other is the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton). It may be true that he is away on an important mission; but it seems to me that, either some abler man might have been sent in his place, or he might have chosen some other time to go, and take pains to attend during the session. We ought to break up this custom of ministers being absent when parliament is in session. They should be here to give us the information necessary to enable us to discuss intelligently questions which are brought before the House. But, when we ask questions, we are told: In the absence of the minister, the information cannot be given, but it will be given when the minister comes back. But by the time the minister gets back the session is over, and the opportunity to bring out the information for the benefit of the public is gone. For the reasons I have given, I think I am justified in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). And I hold that the government should not put forward the pretext that this is a want of confidence motion. They could accept it if they liked. But this plea is only a pretext on the part of the government. When they have no other way of bringing their supporters solidly together they call upon them to vote the motion down on the ground that it is a want of confidence motion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). This motion may be a want of confidence motion in the government; but what we have seen here to-day is certainly an exhibition of want of confidence on the part of the government in themselves. They are not prepared to justify their record in this matter and I do not believe they can do so, for their record is one of utter lack of vigour. They have said that they are in favour of an imperial preference. But, if we, as a country, expect preferential treatment from the motherland, we must ask for it. If we are to sing the song of imperialism, as we have heard it sung in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite, that song must be honest, it must be genuine. And hon. gentlemen opposite have not been genuine in their expression of imperial sentiment. They go to the colonial conference, being called there to discuss imperial questions and imperial trade; and when they reach there they declare that they have not a single suggestion to make. If they desire to attain anything, certainly that is not the way to attain it. If the government go there to discuss questions in which their country's interests are concerned, there must be some vigour in their presentation of their case. Is there any evidence of vigour in the statement of the case presented at that conference by hon. gentlemen opposite? On the contrary they went there with nothing whatever to say. The people of Great Britain, if they are to give us a preference, expect us to ask for it and to make out a case. If we say we are imperialists and that we are prepared to feed the empire—and I believe Canada is prepared to feed the empire—we must say so; and, not only that, but we must say that we are willing to assume our responsibilities with respect to the maintenance of the integrity of the empire. I do not agree with the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), who says that, in some ways we are British, but we must not say it—certainly we must not express it vigorously. We are British and our wish is to build up the empire and to trade with other portions of the empire. But when you say you wish to trade with the empire, you must also say that you are prepared to take part in vindicating the integrity of the empire.

But hon. gentlemen opposite have not taken that position; on the contrary, as was pointed out the other day and was stated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) who has just sat down, they had not a thing to suggest at the imperial conference. I believe that a vote of thanks was the only proposal they had to make. What can the farmers of Canada expect to accomplish, if they send representatives to discuss matters in that fashion. As a party, hon. gentlemen opposite have never tried to promote the trade relations that might have been promoted. They profess to be free traders, and yet their energies, whether in opposition or in power, have been devoted to extending our trade relations with the protectionist United States. Of all people, hon. gentlemen opposite, the professed free traders, should have done all they could to build up trade relations with the mother country. But they have seen no salvation except in closer trade relations with the United States, a country antagonistic to us, a country that is trying to get into the British market ahead of us. Is it any wonder that when a proposal of this kind is brought forward, their only course is, not an attempt to justify their record but to plead: This is a vote of want of confidence in us. I hope to see the trade relations between Canada and the mother country largely extended. I believe that extension is coming. But, if it is to come, it can only be through our presenting a fair case and saying to the empire: Give us a preference in trade, and we will do our share in maintaining the integrity of the empire. That has never been said by hon. gentlemen opposite. But the people of Great Britain expect us to say it. What was the burden of the discussion in England yesterday? It was that the colonies should be prepared to do their share toward the defence of the empire. That is the sentiment that is ringing through England to-day. I am sure that the British public are prepared to give up some of their free trade ideas if they can find that the colonies are prepared to join them in some kind of trade relations involving an inter-

imperial preference. It is to be had, it can be worked out, but it must be worked out vigorously, and by men who have confidence in the measure. Not only have we heard the confession made by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) the other day, but we have heard the Prime Minister say in this House that he did not think it was worth while to go into the question of the inclusion of Newfoundland because of the troublesome French shore question. Sir, statesmanship does not consist in avoiding questions because they are troublesome, statesmanship implies that you must approach a question with a vigorous determination to overcome difficulties, then you will accomplish something. But all the satisfaction we get to-day over this question is that we are told it is a vote of want of confidence in the government. Wait till the papers come down, and something will be done, sooner or later.

I know that the sentiment of the people of this country is that the empire must have inter-imperial trade between its different portions, concessions must be made by one portion in favour of another. Not only that, but the different members of the empire must be prepared to do something one for the other, and when we go to London in that frame of mind, when we say that we are of the empire and wish to trade with the empire, that we as Canadians can feed the empire, then I believe we will make great progress in attaining the end we have in view. As I said before, the people of the empire are beginning to realize more and more that the empire is a unit, and it must be independent of the outside world for its food supply. I believe the empire can be independent, and that she can rely on the colonies, and above all she can rely on Canada for her food supply, her animal food as well as the cereals she may require. She will ultimately look to this country for that supply, but she will never do so until the representatives of this country go to London with a clear policy and say to the mother country: We expect something from you; we give you something, and we want something in return. One of the weakest confessions that was ever made was that trade preference which we have discussed so much in this House. Its weakness consisted in the fact that while you give something you say you do not want anything in return. I say the Canadian farmer does want something in return. He believes that if he gives he must get, on equal terms. When hon. gentlemen adopt that policy and show that they are in earnest in promoting trade within the empire, when they say to the home government: You are shutting out our cattle to-day, and we ask you to take down the bars, especially as there is no reason for keeping the bars up, then I believe we will get something. But until there is a vigour in our policy, until it has a Canadian ring and spirit in it, and also an imperial ring and spirit in it, we shall make no headway. I believe I speak for the Canadian farmers in saying that they are convinced this government have been negligent all through in dealing with these matters.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). I was in hopes some member of the government would explain the position in which we stand in reference to this question, and would tell us whether proper efforts have been made with the British government to show them that there is really no necessity for alarm in allowing the importation of Canadian cattle, because there is absolutely no disease in Canada among our cattle. That is well understood, then why should the British government refuse to admit our cattle? I think if this government would put the question in a proper shape, and tell them most emphatically that the people of Canada are unanimous, the British government would reconsider their action. Mr. Hanbury, of course, represents the farmers of that country, and before the views of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) are carried out he must make an effort to change the government of Great Britain. He must go and talk to the British parliament the way he is talking to us. He must tell them that the people of Canada are willing to pull down the bars and let everything that is manufactured in England come into Canada, the same as we are asking them to let all our products go into England. Then I think he will have some grounds for making a convincing argument and not before. I think this government ought to be most emphatic in representing to the British government that there is no disease among Canadian cattle. I think we have a right to hear from the government as to whether they have been active in making such representations, whether it is possible for them to change Mr. Hanbury's decision. There is no doubt that there will be a change in the British government pretty soon, because in every election that takes place in England nowadays the government are losing, for the reason, in my opinion, that they have adopted a high protective policy in placing a duty on flour and wheat. Mark you, there will soon be a change of government in England. As a farmer, I think we should show the British people that we want to trade with them, that we want to feed them, and feed them cheaply.

I have been across the Atlantic with Canadian cattle that I raised myself, and I know there is a loss of from $10 to $15 on the price of those cattle on account of the necessity of slaughtering them in British ports. These cattle sometimes, as they go off the ship where they have been fed, deteriorate in price probably to the extent of $10 or $12 on board ship. If these cattle could be bought by grazers and fed, we would lose not more than two or three dollars, but as it is we lose from $10 to $15. I think the farmers of Canada ought not to send cattle there that are not thoroughly finish-

ed, and these cattle ought not to depreciate unless they go off their feed on board ship. Our farmers should not send stockers, we do not want to send stockers, we want to finish our cattle, and then if we have to kill them on their arrival on the other side, there is not so much depreciation. I do not think that our farmers will be satisfied unless this government makes a strong effort to induce Mr. Hanbury to remove the embargo. They have seen Mr. Hanbury, they know him well enough, and if they would use upon him some of the persuasive eloquence they use at home, I think they could convince him that we are entitled to have our cattle admitted freely.

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN (Montmorency). I desire to offer a few observations on this question which has been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell). It seems to me the government has dealt with this important question in a very high-handed manner. Here is a resolution which certainly interests the whole of Canada. We heard this question discussed year after year when the party which is now on the opposite benches occupied the government side of the House. The opposition of that day contended that the reason why this embargo had not been removed, was the supineness of the government of the day. We all know that the people of Canada were asked to condemn the government because they did not make greater efforts to induce the imperial authorities to relieve us from this embargo. Now, Sir, we are told that we should wait, that the papers have been moved for, and that they will soon be before the House. Well, if I mistake not, the papers on this important question were moved for some time last week, and unless they are very voluminous they should already be before the House so that we might discuss this question with connaissance de cause, knowing all the details, knowing what the representatives of the government did at the time of the imperial conference, and what they have done since. This question has been before the British public for a long time, it is before the British public to-day, and it seems to me it is the duty of the government to bring down these papers to the House as soon as possible. Unless these papers are so voluminous that they could not be copied in time they should have been brought down a day or two after they were asked for and the government is at fault there. What are the two points upon which my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) rests his argument and his condemnation of the government upon this question ? He says, first :

This House regrets that the representatives of Canada at the colonial conference utterly failed to obtain any redress or promise of redress for this grievance.

I have before me the blue-book brought down in the imperial House which contains the deliberations of the colonial premiers and I find upon this question simply this :—

The representatives of Canada desired to bring before the conference the question of the law under which live cattle imported into this country from Canada are required to be slaughtered at the port of landing. It was considered, however——

I want to call the attention of the House to this :—

—that the matter was not of sufficient general interest to be dealt with by the conference and arrangements were made for discussion privately with the president of the Board of Agriculture.

That was a question of grave importance for Canada. It had been a question of such grave importance in the opinion of the party now in power when they were on this side of the House that they called condemnation down upon the Conservative government for not securing the removal of this embargo on Canadian cattle. Turning to the preceding page I find :—

In addition to the commercial matters, of which previous notice had been given, two subjects were brought forward by the metric system of weights and measures, and the question of the postal charges on newspapers and periodicals.

I take it that the question of the embargo on Canadian cattle was of far greater importance than the adoption of the metric system or the question of the adoption of a reduced rate of postage on newspapers. But the gentlemen who represented this country before the imperial conference devoted their time to the consideration of this resolution which was passed.

That it is advisable to adopt the metric system of weights and measures for use within the empire, and the Prime Ministers urge the governments represented at this conference to give consideration to the question of its early adoption.

I fail to see why this other question of the embargo on Canadian cattle was not just as important as the question of introducing the metric system into Canada. It is very well theoretically to introduce the metric system into Canada ; it may be an important subject to those great men coming from all parts of the empire to deliberate upon, but what our representatives who were sent over had to do was to represent the interests of Canada and they should have impressed upon the other gentlemen who were there—their colleagues in this imperial conference—that for us, in Canada, this was a more important question than the introduction of the metric system, or the introduction of a system by which British newspapers would come in at a smaller rate than they come in at now. I realize that these two questions, the question of the metric system and the introduction of British newspapers at a lower rate of postage, are important subjects, but where was the right

hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when this other question came up? Surely, with his persuasive eloquence, which we all admire so much he could have brought these other gentlemen if he had tried very hard to look upon this question as one of the gravest subjects which could be brought before the imperial conference. Of course, at that time these gentlemen, and particularly those who represented the British government at the imperial conference, said to themselves: Why should we disturb our minds over this question? It is only a question of trade between Canada and the empire. We know that the Canadians upon this point will give us everything we want without asking anything in return. That is what they thought in their own minds. They simply said: We will refuse this as we have before refused a preference in trade matters because these gentlemen from Canada will say nothing, they will go home contented and tell the people that they obtained the metric system and a reduction of postage on newspapers and the people of Canada will swallow all this and say: What a good government we have and what splendid representatives we had at the imperial conference! But, there is something more. The motion goes on to say:

This House further regrets that this government has not succeeded by more vigorous protests, or by other effective steps, in finding means to obtain the removal of the existing unjust restrictions on the sale of Canadian cattle in Great Britain.

It seems to me that it is due to the members of this House that we should have some other reply from the government than simply: Wait until the papers are brought down! I say, with all due deference to the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), that it looks as if he were not in a position to tell the House what steps the government has taken in this matter. It looks as if he were not in a position to defend the course which has been taken. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is now away and I emphasize what my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said a short time ago that it is unfortunate that two hon. ministers who are charged with the administration of two of the most important departments in the government should be absent at this very time. Why was it so absolutely necessary that the hon. Minister of Agriculture should go to Japan just when this House was going to open, when the public knew and when the members of this House and when the government knew that most important questions relating to his department would be brought before the House and that the only reply we will be able to get—and in this I am not speaking at all in any spirit of hostility to the hon. Minister of Finance—will be that the hon. Minister of Finance will get up and say: You will have to wait until the hon. Minister of Agriculture gets back, or until certain papers are brought down. This is not the answer which we should expect from the government; it is not the answer which we have a right to have from the members of the government on this important question. They know what these papers contain, or they should know, they know what efforts have been made, if efforts have been made, by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in the direction of relieving us from this embargo. They must have deliberated upon this question in Council, it cannot be a secret, it is a matter of national importance to us all and we call upon them here to say what they have done. We call upon them to get up and frankly state to the House that they have taken such and such measures that they have communicated with the imperial authorities within a very short time, that they have done something at all events to relieve us of this just cause of complaint. It looks as if the hon. Minister of Finance did not know what has been done, or that nothing has been done at all by the government. Well, it is time for this House to know what has been done, it is time for the farmers of this country, for the cattle dealers to know if this government have really done anything in the direction which is indicated by the motion. If they have not done anything I say this House stands in judgment upon them and that they should be condemned by the House, because, when they were in opposition, they condemned us time and time again for not doing what they said we should do and if they have been following in our tracks they should call down upon themselves the same condemnation which they so many times directed against us.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have just a word of answer to give to the very reasonable request made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) a moment ago. He says that the government should give an answer as to the efforts that were made when we were in England during last summer to remove the grievance of which he complains and which is now before the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) has called the attention of the House to what took place at the conference. The matter was brought up by the Canadian ministers at the conference. The hon. member for West Elgin will find in the blue-book which has been brought down by the British government the proceedings in this respect. As my hon. friend knows the discussion was not given out but a simple summary of what took place and that he will find at page 41.

The representatives of Canada desired to bring before the conference the question of the law under which live cattle imported into this country from Canada are required to be slaughtered at the port of landing. It was considered, however, that the matter was not of sufficient general interest to be dealt with at the con-

ference and arrangements were made for its discussion privately with the president of the Board of Agriculture.

My hon. friend has just stated that the matter seemed to have been treated with some levity. That is not a fair inference to draw. The reason why it was not taken up at the conference was that it was a matter which interested Canada alone, and that is the difference between it and the question of the metric system or the question of the postage on newspapers, both of which interested all the colonies of the empire, whereas the question of the cattle embargo interested only Canada. As a result of our representations the extract which I have read shows that the matter was considered by the conference, but was not taken up, and it was determined then and there that it should be discussed between the representatives of Canada and the Board of Agriculture. This was done. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) was not in England then, but the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) who takes a deep interest in agriculture was deputed by myself and my colleagues to discuss the matter with Mr. Hanbury and the Board of Agriculture. A few days ago this question was brought before the House on a motion for the papers by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). These papers will be produced not later than this week. I hope that before next Monday they will be on the Table of the House, and then the House will be in a position to determine whether or not we have fulfilled our duty. Until the House has been placed in possession of that information it seems to me that it is not fair to ask that this motion should pass. My hon. friend (Mr. Bell) was appealed to when he gave notice of this motion, not to bring it in as an amendment to Supply because in such a form we could not amend it. The hon. gentleman has thought fit to pursue another course, and he is quite within his right. The delay in bringing down these papers has not been unreasonable; we are only in the second week of the session; we shall have these papers within a few days, and it certainly would have been more in accord with the rules of fairness and justice if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) had given a reasonable delay for the papers to be brought down. However, without waiting to know what has been done; what are the efforts that have been made and what has passed between the representatives of Canada and the British Board of Agriculture, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) asked the House to vote that the representatives of Canada at the colonial conference have utterly failed to obtain any redress, or attempted to obtain a redress for these grievances. That we might have been censurable for having failed to try to do a thing would perhaps be reasonable, but to blame us for having failed after we did try is not in accordance with the rules of fair-play. The words of the amendment are:

This House further regrets that this government has not succeeded by more vigorous protests, or by other effective steps, in finding means to obtain the removal of the existing unjust restrictions on the sale of Canadian cattle in Great Britain.

If when the papers are brought down the House is not satisfied with the efforts which we made, perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) might have occasion to renew his motion, but in the absence of these papers and without the House knowing what has been done, it is not to be expected that the House should pass such a motion as this. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has told us that this is not a motion of want of confidence, but if it is not such a motion, what is it? There are some motions which may not in terms imply want of confidence, and not this government but other governments, have accepted them when moved as this motion has been. But here it is stated in so many words that we are censurable, and to adopt that would be like turning the other cheek to be smitten. We have no option in the matter. It is a motion of want of confidence for not having obtained what it is said we might have obtained.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He appears to be more anxious to condemn the government than to get our cattle into Great Britain.

The PRIME MINISTER. I agree with my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) that hon. gentlemen opposite appear more anxious to condemn the government than to have the embargo removed from our cattle. Some reference has been made to the fact that my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is not in his seat. I agree that as a rule ministers ought to be in their place in parliament—members ought to be in their places in parliament and ministers still more so. But there are reasons sometimes why even members cannot be present here—I do not wish to be personal and I make allusion to no one in particular. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture is in Japan on a good errand. We have sent exhibits to the exhibition which was opened there recently. We hope that we may be able to develop our trade with Japan and we thought it of the greatest importance to have the government of Canada represented so that we may get our share of the trade which is growing between the Orient and the Occident. That is the reason why the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat to-day. The Minister of Agriculture will be back at an early date. I hope the session will not last until the snow is again white on the hills, but at all events, long before prorogation, the Minister of Agriculture will be in his seat to answer all questions that may be put to him. I hope he shall bring us the good news from Japan that he has profitably occupied his time, and the result of his trip will be fruitful of good to this Dominion.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). The Minister of Finance has called upon his followers to vote down this amendment in the most summary manner possible, and bear in mind that it is an amendment which affects the interests of a very large portion of the people of this country. It is strange that even to this day we have not had the papers with reference to the colonial conference laid on the Table. Immediately that the British parliament met the papers were laid on the Table there, and were it not for that, this Canadian parliament would to-day be in absolute ignorance of what took place. There is no excuse for that. We know, thanks to the papers being laid before the imperial parliament, that this question of our cattle was at the colonial conference relegated to a conference between the Canadian representatives and the president of the Board of Agriculture. Surely those papers ought to be brought down and laid on the Table of the House. This House would have no knowledge that anything of the kind occurred between those gentlemen and the President of the Board of Agriculture, if we had not got hold of the papers which were laid before the Imperial House of Commons. We know that there has been a conference on the subject, and why are the papers not brought down ? The right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Finance tell us to wait for a week or two. We have waited. On the first day of this session a notice was put on the paper by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and a motion was carried on the Monday following, I think, for those papers. But without that motion, or any motion, the first duty of the government was to inform the House of the proceedings of the imperial conference and to bring down the papers and lay them on the Table. Why has there been no effort made by the representatives of Canada, after all that Canada has done for the empire to bring pressure to bear on the people of England, through the imperial government and the House of Commons, to have this embargo removed ? Mr. Hanbury has stated incidentally in the House of Commons that the embargo is really for the purpose of protecting the growers of store cattle in Great Britain from the importation of cheap cattle from Canada. What has been the result of this imperial conference, which afforded the most glorious opportunity the people of Canada and of the different colonies had of making some arrangement with the people of Great Britain, either in the form of preferential trade or in the form of a removal of the embargo of cattle going into the country ? The only things accomplished were on the subject of measures and the subject of postage on newspapers going to England. There is another thing which the government have forgotten to bring down. The member who laid the papers on the Table of the House of Commons in England, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, stated that he would have been glad to publish the whole of the proceedings of the colonial conference, but that the views expressed by the colonial premiers were omitted, in deference to the opinions of some of the gentlemen concerned. Were those the opinions of our premier ? What was it that was omitted from the proceedings of the conference as published, which would have been willingly published by the imperial authorities but for the request of the colonial premiers that it should not be published ? We have a right to a statement from our representatives at that conference, as to what they proposed, if they proposed anything, outside of what was laid before the imperial parliament. At any rate, we had a right to the bare papers which were laid before that body. The right hon. premier and the hon. Minister of Finance object to the mode in which my hon. friend from Pictou has proceeded. Is it not the same mode in which their own friends proceeded a year ago, when a motion in almost the same terms was moved by the hon. member for Labelle, and adopted by the government as the expression of their opinion on this subject ? Here is that motion:

> That evidence having been furnished to the British authorities, proving that there is no justification for the application of the Diseases of Animals Act (Great Britain) to the cattle of Canada, this House regrets that the provisions of this Act continue to be applied to Canadian cattle, thereby preventing the sale of Canadian animals in Great Britain on fair terms, and injuring the cattle trade of Canada in all foreign markets. That this House hopes the government of Canada will avail itself of the opportunity afforded by the approaching imperial conference in London to urge upon the British government the removal of this unjust restriction on the sale of Canadian cattle in Great Britain.

This motion was accepted by the government as a correct expression of their views in the matter, and was agreed to unanimously by this House for the purpose of strengthening their hands. The present motion is brought forward for the same purpose—to strengthen the hands of the government and to inform the people of England that the people of Canada, by the voice of their parliament, are unanimous in the position they take on the subject. For these reasons I think the hon. Minister of Finance has adopted a very high-handed method of dealing with the motion of my hon. friend from Pictou.

Hon. J. ISRAEL TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker, we have an undoubted right, I think, to complain of the way in which we have been treated and are being treated to-day by the imperial authorities. The imperial authorities know well that Canadian cattle are not diseased ; there cannot be any doubt as to that ; and still they brand our cattle before the world as being diseased. We all feel that this is not fair.

There are in all parts of the world, people who are afraid to call things by their right name. In England they want to protect their farmers ; this cannot be denied ; and still they want to call themselves free-traders. If they want to protect British cattle they should say it in so many words, instead of branding Canadian cattle as diseased, when they know that our cattle are perfectly sound. I have only one word to say on this question. I believe that every government in Canada is bound to do what they can on questions of this kind, and I verily believe that this government has done everything it could. It has not succeeded any more than its predecessors did ; no government in the same circumstances could succeed. There is one lesson which perhaps the Canadian people should learn ; there is one leaf from the British book which they could read with advantage. John Bull, when his interests are at stake, can take care of himself. We should do the same thing. When our own interests are at stake, we should take care of our own interests. I have nothing more to say. I believe my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) has done well to call the attention of the House to this question. On the other hand, I do not know whether the feeling of the House is not in the direction of not voting for this motion. The papers have been called for ; there has not been any delay, after all ; we have been here only for a few days. When the papers are down, if they show that the government have not done what they should, it will be time for us to act. This question is one of great importance, and if my hon. friend's motion be defeated, as no doubt it will be, that might have a bad effect. We voted unanimously last year, and I will be perfectly prepared to vote again for an address such as was called for in the motion of the hon member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). That motion was not one of censure at all. If a motion should be presented asking for an address or a protest to the imperial parliament, I should be disposed to support it, but this is a motion of censure, and made before the papers asked for have come down. I think that after having drawn the attention of the House to this matter, my hon. friend would be consulting the judgment of parliament and be within parliamentary propriety in asking leave to withdraw his motion.

Mr. JOHN SHERRITT (North Middlesex). I would like, Mr. Speaker, to offer a few remarks on this question, which interests every farmer and cattle raiser in the Dominion. I do not think there is any question before the House of more vital importance to our people generally. A good deal of agitation has taken place throughout the Dominion with reference to many matters, which sink into insignificance compared to this question of slaughter of Canadian cattle at British ports of entry after they have been there but a few days. I am a farmer myself and know something of the losses sustained in having to ship cattle hundreds of miles by rail and then put them on board steamers for the old country, where they are apt to land in a very bad condition, and where they must be placed on the market within ten days after their arrival. It seems to me that it would not be out of place, from the standpoint of a farmer, if this government would arrange to have our cattle allowed to remain another ten days before being slaughtered. I know from personal knowledge of the business that if they were allowed to remain at the port of entry an additional ten days, that would mean millions of dollars to the people of this country. The cattle arrive in a condition which is not the most favourable. They arrive feeble after having been knocked about on the ocean trip and not fit to go on the market, and besides the present regulations place the butchers of the old country in a position to round up the market. If there is a large amount of cattle landed, all these butchers have to do is to wait until the ten days are up and then they can get our cattle for whatever price they have a mind to offer. I think that a great mistake was made by the people in this country in the past. By shipping stockers I think we made a great abuse of the privilege we formerly enjoyed, by shipping a great many thin cattle which it would have been a great deal more profitable for us to feed at home. There must be something wrong about the business when we ship the cattle and then send over feed to fatten them. The House will agree with me that it would be an advantage to Canadian farmers to be placed in such a position that they would not be so liable to be rounded up on the British market and forced to sell at any price offered. I would suggest therefore that we should endeavour to get an extension of ten days added to the time our cattle are allowed to remain on the market before being slaughtered or sold. I am not here to censure the government. They may have done the best they could, but the result has not been satisfactory. If there ever was a time in the history of this country when our representatives should feel independent, or at least when they should feel that they have a right to ask and to expect, if not favours, at least what they are entitled to, it is now. When we consider what we have done in South Africa, when we consider that the blood of our sons is filtering in the sands of South Africa, we should feel that we are in a position to-day to ask for at least that which is to some extent our right. A few days ago I was in Montreal, and I noticed that a great many United States cattle were there which had been shipped from New York, and which were being fed in our cattle yards, previous to being exported to the old country. When we find our American cattle feeding in our yards in Toronto and

Montreal, I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether they do not think that we are endangering our chances of getting a better arrangement with the mother country. Should there be any disease in the United States, we are exposing ourselves to the danger of having that disease communicated to our own cattle. We buy our stockers out of the same yards where American cattle are allowed to be fed and we put these stockers on our farms, so that if there is any disease in the American cattle we are running every risk of having that disease communicated to our own cattle. It seems to me that a reform is urgently called for in this matter, and I would urge it upon the consideration of the government and at the same time impress upon them the necessity of making the most strenuous efforts to have the embargo raised, or at least have the time in which our cattle are allowed to remain in the ports of entry, before being slaughtered, extended.

Mr. HENRY CARGILL (East Bruce). As a farmer and representing a farming constituency, I feel bound, Mr. Speaker, to give whatever aid I can to have the injustice to which the Canadian cattle trade is being subjected in the English market, removed. I do not think there is any subject which can engage the attention of this House that is of more importance to our agricultural community. Volumes of evidence have been produced by the speakers who have preceded me, and further evidence can be produced to show that our Canadian cattle are free from disease. I do not think that the freedom of our cattle from disease is really disputed by any one. Whatever reason may be assigned by the British government for excluding our cattle from the British market or placing an embargo upon them, there can be no doubt that the real reason is the desire to protect the British farmer. I regret exceedingly that the rules laid down for the guidance of this House preclude a vote being taken on a resolution of this kind, and any time should be opportune for discussing such an important resolution. I think it is to be regretted that under our rules an important resolution such as this cannot be introduced and freely discussed on any occasion, and I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, the advisability of considering some amendment to these rules which would enable us in this House to discuss a resolution of this character without having it side-tracked by the government. I think that on a question such as this both sides should be unanimous. It is very important that we should adopt some rule which would allow free discussion and a free vote, irrespective of party politics, on a question of this kind, on any occasion when a member of this House thinks fit to bring it up.

My hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. McGowan) says that the embargo placed on Canadian cattle entails a loss of $15 per head upon the cattle exported to the British market. This being the case, there is an almost incalculable loss suffered by the farming community identified with this interest. My opinion is that it is not in the interest of the Canadian farmer to export stock cattle. I know that the farmers in this country who have succeeded are the farmers who have finished their cattle and exported them ready for slaughter. The government should allow this resolution to pass unanimously, for such a movement, at this particular time, would have a very salutary effect upon the imperial parliament. I trust the Prime Minister and his colleagues will take this matter into their serious consideration. If they do not allow this motion to pass, I trust that, when the papers are brought down, a motion will be framed and passed unanimously by this House expressing the desire of the Canadian people to have this embargo upon their cattle removed.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I would like to appeal to the good sense of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) and suggest to him the wisdom of withdrawing his motion at this time. After the correspondence is brought down, which we are promised will be in a few days, we can judge what the efforts of the government have been for the removal of this embargo, and perhaps it may be possible to prepare a resolution upon which both sides of the House can agree, to be presented to the British government. It seems to me that that would be the best way of dealing with this subject. The importance of the matter, of course, is well known to both sides of the House. If we are to succeed, we are most likely to do so by uniting. In all fairness to the government and to himself and to the purpose he has in view, it would be better for my hon. friend from Pictou not to press the motion at this time.

Mr. JOHN McGOWAN (Centre Wellington). I think all will agree that this is one of the most important questions that has been brought before the House for some time. I regret that the matter has been brought forward in the way it has been. I would prefer that it had come before the House in a form which the government would accept. I recognize that there is more or less a vote of censure upon the government in this motion. I would suggest that my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) leave it open until the papers promised us have been brought down. Then, if it is found that the government have been derelict in their duty, I would certainly join him in censuring them. But until the papers are before us, I would much prefer that it should not be made a party question. Speaking for the province of Ontario and, I believe for the whole country, I venture to say that it is most important that there should be unanimous expression of opinion upon this question.

Mr. NATHANIEL BOYD (Macdonald). The question under discussion, is, possibly, of more interest to the people of Manitoba and the North-west than to those of any other part of Canada. Next to their grain crop, this cattle trade is the most important to them. I brought this matter to the attention of the House last session. And I must say I was rather amused, this afternoon, at the regret expressed because the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) was not here. Last session, when the discussion on my motion relating to the question took place, it was shown by the correspondence that had passed between the Minister of Agriculture and the clerk of the legislature of Manitoba that the minister did not know what was going on about it. He sent a telegram to the clerk of the legislature saying that he did not understand that a certain regulation passed by the imperial government was in existence. In other words, he said he did not understand that the imperial authorities were adding to the protection they had been giving to their cattle growers for some time past. It was shown by the correspondence I read in the House that the call for tenders for the beef for the imperial army contained a clause distinctly stating that the beef must be British-grown, showing that they had adopted a species of protection of the most intense character. And our Minister of Agriculture was not aware of it. So, as to his being in Japan, he might as well be in Gibraltar or anywhere else for all he knows of the question, or for all the good he could do us by being here. There are two points with respect to this matter that I would like to emphasize. The hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) mentioned one particularly when he made reference to the imperial government saying that there was disease amongst our cattle. That, Sir, we deny. And we find fault with the imperial authorities because they decry the health of our cattle and so interfere with our trade. It was the duty of our representatives when in England to deny that with no uncertain sound. It would not have detracted from their dignity if, even in advance of the papers being brought down, they had told us in what emphatic manner they had repudiated this assertion on the part of the British authorities. The other point is that we wish to show that the British people are protecting their farmers and to draw this to the attention of our free traders in this House—and they are getting fewer every year; the government is passing them up to the Senate.

Now, Sir, those are the points I wish to bring out. There is no disease amongst our cattle, we repudiate it, and we wish to say to the people of Great Britain that we are well aware of what they are doing. They are protecting their farmers and others who are raising cattle in the British isles. Those are the points we wish to bring out. When my hon friend from Wellington (Mr. McGowan) tries to make the question as easy as possible for the government, let me tell him and others that were not in this House some years ago when the Postmaster General and his friends rang the changes against the government of that day, and found fault with them in season and out of season for not doing what it was pretended they should have done, finding fault with them for doing just what this government is doing now and in my opinion, doing it much better than the present government. I think it ill becomes the Minister of Finance to take such a decided objection to the motion of my hon. friend from Pictou, and to say that it was a clear want of confidence in the government. Now the hon. member for North Middlesex (Mr. Sherritt) brought out an important point, and that was the great loss to our Canadian producers from the fact of their having to kill these cattle ten days after they are landed in the old country. That is really where the great loss to the producers of Canadian cattle comes in. I think the least this government should have done to impress upon the imperial authorities, and to impress upon Mr. Hanbury, because he is the gentleman who apparently takes the most decided stand against our request, that there is no disease amongst our cattle. I do not think the government have done what they should have done, and they have not done what they claimed our friends should have done when we were on the other side.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I merely rise to protest against the way in which the Minister of Finance, by a mere wave of his hand, puts this question aside and tells his followers that they must support him because it is a motion of want of confidence. Motions made on going into Supply, the hon. gentleman knows, are more or less motions of want of confidence. The reasons the hon. gentleman gave are very extraordinary, they are of such a kind as Mr. Hanbury will take notice of, and will not encourage him to grant our request. They will in fact furnish him with weapons to resist our demand, because he will be able to say that so little notice was taken of the matter in the Canadian parliament that the question was put aside until the correspondence came down. I venture to predict that the correspondence will disclose one thing very clearly, namely, the weakness of the Canadian representatives at the colonial conference. We were told by the First Minister that the reason this question was put aside was that they did not consider it of sufficient importance to be taken up by the colonial conference, because it was a matter affecting Canada alone. Why, the right hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that one of the weapons used by Mr. Hanbury is that if Canadian cattle were admitted, the cattle of all other countries would have to be admitted on the same terms. Now in what position do we find ourselves ? It has been pointed out by my

hon. friend from Pictou, and by other gentlemen in this debate, that the question was put aside because it was not thought of sufficient importance to be taken up. Who suggested that it was not of sufficient importance ? Certainly it could not have been the Canadian delegates. It was a most natural suggestion to come from a government who has taken so arbitrary a position, and it was the duty of our Canadian delegates to protest against taking any such position. The people of Canada will regard that as a complete abandonment of our position. What was the proposition that followed ? That a better way of attaining the object would be to have a conference with Mr. Hanbury, the gentleman who had set his face against reason, against argument, against fact in his determination to exclude Canadian cattle. I say the period is past when we in Canada should feel called upon to convince the British government that there is no reason why Canadian cattle should be excluded ; the period has now arrived when the people of Canada should enter a protest against the arbitrary position taken by the British government. Mr. Hanbury is pleased to say that possibly there may be disease in Canadian herds in the future. Now there can be no more absurd position for a gentleman occupying his right rank to take as a pretext for excluding Canadian cattle. Mr. Hanbury and every other intelligent man knows that Canadian herds are free from disease, and have been for years. Now it has been pointed out by several gentlemen on this side of the House that Mr. Hanbury is adopting this course as a measure of protection to the cattle raisers of the United Kingdom. He declares himself that to admit Canadian cattle would be to destroy largely the interest of cattle growers in a portion of the United Kingdom. That is plain.

Now let us remember that the Canadian representatives at the colonial conference were prepared to abandon a question that seems to me to overshadow all others. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they think there is a single gentleman in this House who will contend for a moment that the question of the metric system, important as it is in itself, or the question of reduced postage upon newspapers between Canada and Great Britain, are questions that, both together, can be weighed against this question affecting the raisers of cattle in Canada. Why, the idea is absurd. We were told on a former occasion by the Minister of Customs, with a tear in his voice, that we had touched the hearts of the British people, that while we had not a legal preference we had still better preference in the hearts of the people of Great Britain ; and he instanced the case under discussion to-day and declared from his place in this House what a weapon that preference would be with which to go to the British public and ask for the removal of that unfair restriction. As I said at the beginning, I merely rose to protest against the attitude of the Minister of Finance, who has given a most trivial reason for setting this question aside, namely, that the papers were not brought down. Surely those papers have been in the departments for a long time. They must be in the Department of Agriculture, or at least in some other departments where they are easily procurable. The hon. gentleman should have laid these papers on the table before this time. He did not have to get the consent of the imperial authorities before he could do so. He might well have anticipated the anxiety of the people of this country on this great question, and have been prepared to treat it on its merits rather than to take shelter behind a pretense that this motion was a want of confidence.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). For a number of years, up to a period four or five years ago, I used to bring this question up annually. When I was in England in 1897 I discussed the matter with a number of prominent people there, and I found that they would not under any consideration entertain a proposition to allow Canadian cattle to enter on any better terms than they were giving us. In other words, it was a straight policy of protection to the British farmer as against Canadian and American cattle. I pointed out at that time that they could protect the farmers to a much better extent than by shutting out our cattle. If they examine the freight rates from almost any part of Ireland, from almost any part of Scotland and from even the midland districts of England from the large centres they will find that the freight rates on cattle to the central markets of Great Britain are almost as much as they are from parts of the United States of America to the British islands and that by looking into the regulation of their own freight rates they may protect their own farmers to a much greater extent than any injury that would accrue from allowing our cattle in. It has been said by a very eminent English statesman within recent times that British diplomacy —all diplomacy in fact—consists of personal influence, personal intrigue and personal unscrupulousness. I refer to Sir Edward Monson, British Ambassador at Paris. I have to say, here, that as a Canadian I do not intend, so far as I am concerned, that Great Britain shall be allowed to blacken the character of Canadian cattle by saying that tuberculosis and other diseases exist in this country merely in order to carry out their usual policy of intrigue. Let them come out and declare that they are going to protect their own farmers and it would be fair to our people if they do so. I want to point out to the Britisher that, when he taxes Canadians he should put us in all respects on an equal footing with Russians, Germans, Frenchmen, and the nations of Europe. Canada does not cost the people of Great Britain one dollar in taxes, while these

European nations impose a heavy tax on the people of Great Britain. I demand that we shall receive better treatment from Great Britain or that we shall find out the reason why. We believe that we should have better treatment in regard to our cattle, and that we should have better treatment in the markets of Great Britain. I do not see why the government cannot accept this resolution. It declares that this House regrets that no conclusion was arrived at on this subject. Surely the ministers, or some of them, regret that no conclusion was arrived at. I must correct my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) in stating that these gentlemen crossed the water and brought nothing home with them. My hon. friend forgets that two or three of them came home with those titles that they formerly spoke of as tin-pot titles. One thing the conference has accomplished, at all events, is that it has enabled some of these hon. gentlemen to get some of their old tin-pot titles. I trust the ministers will take this into their serious consideration and that if they do not arrive at the conclusion to vote for the resolution upon the present occasion, at an early date they will take such steps as will result in impressing upon the British government that Canadians realize that they have done about as much as they intend to for the old land until the statesmen of England are prepared to treat us better than they treat the Russian, the German, the Hottentot and the citizen of every other nation in the world.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the discussion of this question for a great many years in this House and I am bound to say that this discussion, in so far as it has been taken part in by hon. gentlemen on the government benches to-day, has differed from any that I have ever heard in this House before. In defence of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), I must say, in his absence, that he was more frank when this question was discussed in this House last year than hon. gentlemen have been on this occasion. Now, Sir, the people of Canada believe this is a very serious question and one which should be seriously considered by both parties in this country, whether Conservative or Liberal. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, last year, when he was asked to produce the papers in connection with the embargo in the motion presented by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) said that the correspondence was very slight, that there was very little correspondence to produce, but that at a later period he would bring it down. But, what did he say in the meantime ?—that he had been in the old country, that he had discussed the question with the British Minister of Agriculture, that he had been in Edinburgh, that he had discussed the question with a large number of people living in that locality and that the British Minister of Agriculture did not dispute the statement of the hon. gentleman when he said that Canadian cattle were not diseased. The answer that Mr. Hanbury gave on that occasion was something like this:

> Hon. Mr. Hanbury said that while he was quite ready to admit that Canadian cattle were perfectly healthy. . . . disease might break out among them at any moment and in such a case the reimposition of the old embargo would be a difficult matter as it would cause greater disturbance in the trade and make the condition of affairs worse than if a settled policy were followed.

That was the statement that Mr. Hanbury made on that occasion. What followed ? He said in Edinburgh that:

> So long as he remained Minister of Agriculture he would neither make nor advise any change in the law.

The ministers representing the Canadian government in England have been at the conference. The right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated that this matter was not of sufficient importance for the conference to deal with. If that is true, if the conference viewed it in that light, surely the ministers from Canada had an opportunity of discussing this question with the British Minister of Agriculture, or with the English government. If the government had made it a point that an important question of this kind should be discussed with the British Minister of Agriculture, or with other gentlemen representing the English government, and then, if they had discovered that the English government were not prepared to amend the law, that they were not prepared to admit Canadian cattle, what would be the use of wasting time discussing the removal of the embargo from Canadian cattle in Great Britain? If that is a settled policy of Great Britain on this question, it is simply a waste of time to discuss it here. Let our ministers be frank with us and say to the House that the British government are not prepared to change the law and that it is useless to look for the removal of the embargo on Canadian cattle. Has Canada anything in her possession that would be of advantage to Great Britain ? Is there anything by which Canada can enter into some arrangement with Great Britain and by which Canadians can have the advantage of sending their cattle to Great Britain ? If this could be done, I think it would be a long step in the right direction, but to pursue the course we are pursuing now is simply a useless waste of time in my judgment, and nothing will be accomplished.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, as I come from a part of the country where thousands of dollars are invested in the cattle industry, I thought it would not be out of place to make a few remarks on this question although I cannot hope to add anything of an original character to the debate. We had a resolution during the last

session introduced by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) which was intended, as he stated, to strengthen the hands of the government in the endeavour at the inter-imperial conference to bring pressure to bear upon the imperial government in order to have this embargo removed, and as far as we can learn from the public press and from the other documents at our disposal nothing transpired at the conference to show that the government took those steps that we Canadians expected they would take as our representatives. They seem to have screened themselves to-day behind the plea: Wait until the papers are brought down and then you will see whether anything in our actions should merit your condemnation or not. There would be no impropriety in the members of the government, who had this conference with Mr. Hanbury, explaining at least the gist of what arguments were brought to bear on him, and then we would be in a better position to know whether to condemn the government or not. Since the resolution was passed in the House last session, Mr. Henderson, of Scotland, the representative of the Canadian Cattle Importation Association, has been in Canada, and he has spoken before our Boards of Trade and other bodies who are interested in having this embargo removed. Mr. Henderson has urged that strong resolutions should be addressed by the Canadian parliament to the imperial parliament, and he has stated his own opinion that it is useless further to approach Mr. Hanbury after the remarks that gentleman has made on the question.

The Prime Minister read to-day from an imperial document, a statement that the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) was delegated by the Canadian government to interview Mr. Hanbury. If there is any member of this government who could fill this mission with least grace it is the Postmaster General, because as the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has shown he was the member of the Liberal party who from this side of the House condemned the Conservative government for relaxing the quarantine regulations between the United States and Canada which was alleged to be the reason why the embargo was levied in the first place; and he is now a member of a government who did away with the ninety days quarantine thus allowing the free intermixture of the cattle of the United States with the cattle of Canada. Mr. Hanbury now admits that there is no disease among our Canadian cattle, but he says it would not be advisable to remove the embargo because it would injure the trade in Irish cattle. Evidently he has an eye more to Irish votes than he has to doing justice to Canadian cattle, and in that respect Mr. Hanbury is probably playing the politician rather than the statesman. Mr. Hanbury has ventured the opinion that Canada is not a loser, because we can fatten our cattle and get more per head for them than if the embargo were removed, but I take it that our Canadian people are better judges as to whether we are losers or gainers, and if you consult practical cattle exporters such as the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), Gordon and Ironsides and others, they will tell you that we are heavy losers by reason of this embargo. At the present time our cattle are admitted only at the port of Glasgow in Scotland, at three or four ports in England, and at no port at all in Ireland. They have to be slaughtered within ten days after landing, and as the hon. member for North Middlesex (Mr. Sherritt) has pointed out, the beef deteriorates on the passage across, and having to be sold merely to local butchers without competition, only the lowest price can be obtained. If other ports were opened and this embargo removed, not only the local butchers but the butchers from all over Great Britain would be present to purchase our cattle and competition being keener the prices would be better. I believe also that no cold storage facilities are provided at the ports of entry, which is a further loss to us. Mr. Henderson who is a practical man has estimated, notwithstanding Mr. Hanbury to the contrary, that there is a loss on our cattle of from $10 to $15 per head because of this embargo. It has been pointed out to-day that one million Canadian cattle have gone to England since the embargo, and at the lowest estimate of $10 per head that means a loss of $10,000,000 to Canada. In his interview with the Winnipeg Board of Trade, Mr. Henderson stated that 8,000,000 consumers in England were in favour of the removal of the embargo and that they were supported in this by a large section of the British press, and by a large number of the members of the House of Commons. I will not say that the abolition of the quarantine between Canada and the United States is a bar to the removal of the embargo on our cattle in England, but if there be a suspicion in the minds of the English people that there is disease amongst United States cattle, our quarantine regulations would have to be more stringent than they are at present in order that the British embargo might be removed. It has been stated by the Prime Minister that John Bull never mixes up sentiment with business. I quite agree. The embargo on our cattle is an evidence of it. He has in profound words of wisdom in trade matters said: That business is business, and sentiment is sentiment, and business is no more sentiment than sentiment is business. John Bull looks out for No. 1, and he thinks all the more of any son of his who does the same thing. I do not think we are standing in our own light either commercially or sentimentally when we inform the British government that so far as Canada is concerned we are granting a preference of 33⅓ per cent on imports from England, and that she should grant a preference,

or rather do us justice in removing the stigma which is now placed on Canadian cattle by condemning them before the whole world as diseased. We do not ask any preference for our cattle over the cattle of any other country which is free from disease. We are told in England that they cannot remove this embargo from Canadian cattle without removing it from American cattle as well, and we might as well say that Canada should have a fiscal policy universal to the whole world and should not give a preference of 33⅓ per cent on British goods. In view of the fact that we have already granted Great Britain a preference, it is natural for us to expect that our cattle should be admitted to the British market when they show a clear bill of health. It has been proven beyond peradventure that there is not any disease among Canadian cattle, and now that Mr. Hanbury has been forced to admit that no disease exists, why should not the embargo be taken off unless it be retained as a system of protection—unless Mr. Hanbury is practising protection while he is preaching free trade exactly as our government is doing in Canada. We are therefore only calling upon the Canadian government to do their duty when we ask them to show stronger reasons why we should not pass this motion condemning them. I think, Sir, that they could without any impropriety tell us what took place between the Postmaster General and Mr. Hanbury, notwithstanding the fact that the papers are not yet on the Table of the House.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince, P.E.I.) This question is of great importance to the farmers of Canada, and as I am a farmer myself, I take a great interest in it. A great deal has been said with regard to the sentiment in Great Britain towards Canada and the loyalty and patriotism of the people of Canada. We are all proud of what Canada has done in connection with the trouble in South Africa ; and after our young men have shed their blood on the veldt of South Africa in upholding the British flag, and after Canada has granted a preference in her markets to the products of Great Britain, the government of Great Britain should at least show a preference to our cattle in their markets over those of foreigners. Instead of that, they have been insisting on protection to the farmers of England against the farmers of Canada, and at the same time, as my hon. friend says, blackening the character of the products of Canada. If we are going to have a united empire all round the globe, then the people of all parts of the empire should be treated in the same way. Some hon. gentleman has stated that Mr. Hanbury wishes to protect the Irish cattle. Sir, the Irish people have done no more for Great Britain than the people of Canada, and there is no more reason why the cattle of Ireland should be protected than the cattle of Canada. Why is that embargo not removed at this time ? A year ago we were told that we should have a short session because the premier of Canada and the local premiers were going to England to have a great colonial conference for the purpose of advancing the interests of Canada. For that reason we made the session short. The premier has said this evening that the session may be so long a one that the snow may whiten the ground before it comes to an end. If it does, it will be because a large amount of government work was left over from last session to allow these gentlemen to go to England to take part in that conference. What have they accomplished ? Somebody says they were looking after tin-pot titles. I do not know that they have brought many back. The premier of Prince Edward Island went to attend that conference, and it was stated in the government organ of that day that he would come back as Sir Arthur Peters. He did not, however. He came back as plain Mr. Arthur Peters.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HACKETT. Before recess, Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out the importance of this question. We know in general that stock raising is the principal part of the farming industry, and that in order to effectively promote that industry we should have the right of entry on the English market, the same as British subjects all over the United Kingdom. Since recess there has been placed in my hands the Montreal 'Star' in which there appears the following dispatch :

London, March 24.

The statement of the Secretary of War, Rt. Hon. St. John Broderick, in the House in reply to Mr. Alfred Davies, shows that the War office still excludes Canadian beef from the army contracts.

That, I consider, a very unfair policy. Why should Canadian beef be excluded ? The people of Canada are just as loyal to the British flag as those of the United Kingdom, and while we are willing to shed our blood for the British flag, the British people should at least give a preference to Canadian beef over beef from the Western States. I would ask that this resolution moved by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) should be adopted by the government without division. Our Canadian farmers are the mainstay of the Dominion. They are the men who provide the bread and beef for the people of Canada and who also ship a large surplus to other countries. They therefore should be looked upon as the first people to be protected by the government of this country. I see by the Year-book of

1901 that the value of our exports to Great Britain amounted to $8,000,000. Well, if we were allowed equal privileges with the people of Ireland and Scotland, if our cattle were admitted into the markets of Great Britain without being subjected to this embargo, our exports would amount to $1,000,000 more in the year. That is something worth contending for, and I trust that the government will see the importance of adopting this motion and allow it to be adopted unanimously.

Before recess I said a few words about the trip made to England by our ministers to attend the coronation festivities. Their expenses were paid by the Canadian people and our people were entitled to expect some results. We supposed that when the Prime Minister of Canada and the premier of each of our provinces attended the conference of premiers of the whole empire at London, they would bring back some tangible result. But, Sir, they came back with nothing. The only thing they accomplished was the passing of some resolution with regard to weights and measures, but not one single thing in favour of the Canadian people did they accomplish. There was one result, however, from the trip which was worth noting. During their absence, the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who was alive and active to the interests of the Canadian people, was advocating what should be done to promote our wealth and our prosperity, but when these gentlemen returned to Canada the right hon. the First Minister asked the Minister of Public Works to resign. Why did he ask him to resign ? Simply because the ex-minister was advocating the interests of the Canadian people. We are told by the hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches that they cannot reply to the motion of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) because the Minister of Agriculture has gone to Japan. Is that a reason which we ought to accept ? Why should ministers of the Crown, who are paid to reply to questions of this kind, be unable to reply because one of their number happens to be in Japan ? I say that the gentleman who is at the head of so important a department as that of Agriculture should be here to answer the questions put to him by the representatives of the people, and when he is not here he is derelict in his duty. I trust the government will allow the motion of the gentleman for Pictou to pass without a vote because it affects the interests of a large part of the population of Canada. Should this matter come up in the imperial parliament what would they say ? They would say : You divided on this question in Canada which shows that you have different opinions concerning it. This is not a motion of want of confidence, Mr. Speaker, but a motion in the interests of the Canadian farmer, and I trust the government will take that into consideration and allow it to pass without calling for a vote.

Mr. HACKETT

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see that the right hon. the leader of the government is not here, but in his absence I would make a suggestion to his hon. colleague the Minister of Finance. The opposition desire to get the unanimous opinion of the House on the important matter brought up by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell). But as the Finance Minister has declared that he will call upon his friends to vote down the motion and as he has promised to have the papers laid on the Table in two or three days, I would suggest to my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) that he should withdraw his motion in order that he may have an opportunity, when the papers come down, of renewing it should they not be in accordance with his opinion. We do not want to prejudice the matter at all, it is not a question of private politics, we have no desire to make political capital out of it, our only desire is to have this embargo removed, and therefore with the consent of the government I would suggest that my hon. friend, if the government will consent, should withdraw his motion, reserving the right to renew it on another occasion when the papers are before the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The government can have no objection to the hon. gentleman withdrawing his motion.

Mr. SPROULE. On the understanding that the hon. gentleman will not be estopped from dealing with the same subject on another occasion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Whatever is open to the hon. gentleman within the rules of the House, he is free to do. I am not aware of anything which would prevent his bringing the matter up again. But that is a matter that will have to be governed by the rules of the House.

Mr. BELL. The leader of the House in his place to-day stated that he thought these papers would be laid upon the Table in the course of this week. In that case, if the government will—as I have no doubt they will—use diligence in giving us these papers at an early day, as I would much prefer that the resolution would be prepared that would be unanimously supported, I would ask leave with the consent of my seconder that I withdraw my motion.

Amendment withdrawn.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to ask what is the earliest day when we could expect the Redistribution Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The Bill is in a very advanced stage. I would not like to fix a definite date for its introduction, but I can promise that it will be introduced very shortly.

LEGISLATION RESPECTING TELEPHONE COMPANIES.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Before the motion for Committee of Supply is put, I would ask the Minister of Justice if it is the intention of the government to introduce a general telephone law this session ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) asked that question before, the leader of the House suggested that there should be a formal notice. The Prime Minister is absent at the moment, but if the hon. gentleman will put a notice on the paper it will be a reminder, and an answer will be given.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think this is sufficient notice, and the next time the Committee of Supply is moved for I shall press for an answer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman cannot get an answer if we have not one ready for him.

VACANCY IN ST. JAMES DIVISION.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention and that of the House to a matter of very great importance to the city of Montreal. I refer to the vacancy in St. James division. We have had the announcement in the speech from the Throne that very important matters in connection with the transportation question and other matters of interest to the city of Montreal are to be brought up this session. I think it extremely desirable that this important division of the city of Montreal should be represented without delay in this House, as its interest in these questions is so great. You, Mr. Speaker, have, no doubt, issued your warrant, and an election can be had there in time enough to have here from St. James division a representative who will be able to sit and deliberate upon these important questions. Besides, the division having been represented as it has been for the past two sessions, and in view of other circumstances to which I need not refer, it is but right and proper that an election should be had there without delay and the division represented. I do not think it should be necessary to insist at length upon the urgency of this matter. I live in the division and have a vote there, and I know that the electors of the division are extremely anxious to be represented in the present session. I would ask the government if it is the intention to have an election there without delay.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is, no doubt, aware that there has been a special finding in that case, and a report that there was a general system of bribery in the election. Under these circumstances, the question arises whether the warrant should be issued direct by the Speaker, or whether it should not be taken cognizance of by the House itself. There are several precedents on the subject, and we must consider them.

Mr. MONK. I was not aware that there was such a report.

Mr. SPEAKER. As my name was brought into the discussion, I may inform the hon. member (Mr. Monk) that I was prevented from issuing my warrant because a report was made that a general system of corruption had prevailed in the election. Section 48, chapter 9, of the Revised Statutes seemed to cover the case and to prevent my issuing my warrant.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is it the intention of the Minister of Justice to bring it before the attention of the House ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is a matter to be considered by the House, not by the Department of Justice.

Mr. MACLEAN. When will it be brought before the House ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At the proper time.

THE BUDGET.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see by a report in the Toronto 'Globe' that it is likely that the budget speech will be made on Thursday next. Is there any intention on the part of the Finance Minister to——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The report is not correct. An announcement will be made, as usual, a couple of days in advance.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE—LORD ROSEBERY'S SPEECH.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not know that this is the best time for bringing up a matter to which I wish to refer, but I think I shall be in order in doing so. I notice in yesterday's paper a cable despatch, part of which reads as follows :

> The Earl of Rosebery will to-morrow move in the House of Lords : 'That this House expresses its approval of the establishment of a council of national defence and earnestly hopes that the first efforts of such a council will be directed to the adjustment of national armaments, to the naval, military and financial conditions of the empire.' Lord Rosebery will then probably make an announcement upon the question of colonial contributions, probably urging that it is necessary for the colonies to send members to the House of Commons, and reform the Lords as the necessary preliminary.

Has the Minister of Finance any information he can give us as to any correspondence going on between the government here and the colonial office regarding this question ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no information, I am afraid, that I can give my hon. friend. I need hardly remind him that Lord Rosebery is not in the imperial government. He speaks from the opposition side. Whatever views he may have, he would hardly open official correspondence with the government of the Dominion. However, I am hardly in a position to give the hon. gentleman any information upon the subject.

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

Public works, chargeable to income—public buildings, Nova Scotia—Halifax, new public buildings, $60,000.

Mr. MONK. Would the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) have any objection to leaving this item over until my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) returns ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. Mr. Sutherland). I have no objection, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) desires it. But I do not think this is a debatable item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not a new item, but it is to provide for the continuation of the work upon a building begun a year ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building is under contract, and $60,000 is what the architect estimates will be spent during the coming year. This is in addition to $50,000 already voted. All particulars and details with regard to the building have already been given. Besides, if desired, there will be another opportunity to discuss the matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think the hon. member for Halifax would wish to have it kept over.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Generally, what is the explanation of the item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a public building at Halifax, the contract for which was let on the 30th June last.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the building for —a post office ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Customs house and general offices.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect of the department has made a careful estimate, and he thinks that $60,000 is all that can be expended on this building.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $250,000 is the amount of the contract. The total amount expended to the 31st of December was $43,874. That includes the site.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. CLANCY. When does the contract call for the completion of the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the 15th of September, 1904. Of course the balance we are asking for will be for the fittings, &c. The contract is given to the lowest tenderer, M. E. Keefe, of Halifax.

Quarantine station, Lawlor's Island, $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for repairs.

Public buildings, New Brunswick—Richibucto, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This building is under contract for $9,716. The contract was made on the 15th of November, 1902, and the building is to be completed by January, 1904. The balance is required for heating, boilers, fittings, &c. The total cost is estimated by the architect at $15,000. It is a general public building for post office, custom house, &c.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the statement of the Minister of Public Works last year as to the probable cost of this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not got that information. I will be pleased to look it up and bring it down. The total cost estimated by the architect, including everything, is $15,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There seems to have been a vote of $5,000 last year. What was the promise made to the House as to the probable expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say what statement was made last year. I will make a memorandum and find out, if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. CLANCY. Who is the contractor in this case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. James Reid, Sydney, N.S. He was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. CLANCY. Has there been any change in the plans with regard to that building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that no change has been made in the plans and specifications as they were first send out.

St. John, immigration building, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for the foundation, and to make some alterations required in the St. John immigration building. Representations were made by the city, by the steamship companies and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that there was not room enough to accommodate immigrants landing at St. John, and it is necessary to

make these improvements for their accommodation. I may explain that we are putting a third story on the present building, and increasing the fire protection. The third story is estimated to cost $10,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the total amount expended on those buildings ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount previously expended was $35,517. It is a pretty large building.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you expend the money voted last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister give us an idea of the probable number of immigrants that will land there ? I thought they usually came by Halifax.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not got a summary of the number that have arrived. But we had communications from the Immigration Department that it was necessary to increase the accommodation for second-class passengers. The Elder-Dempster Steamship Company expect to land at St. John 2,000 immigrants per week for the season of 1903. The Allan Steamship Company, whose boats arrive on the same day as the Elder-Dempster line, also expect to bring large numbers of immigrants.

Mr. SPROULE. The present year ends on the 30th of June.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That means for the present season. They were urging that this work should be done early this season. We have also communications from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company urging improvements.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The present building is a great deal too small. A few weeks before I left office, I went down there and saw myself that the size of the building ought to be increased. It was built too small at first.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am sure that we are obliged to the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) for the information he gives us, and which it is almost impossible to get from the Minister of Public Works. It is a good thing that the hon. gentleman is in the House, because otherwise we would be pretty much in the dark as to what is going on in that department.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not mean to convey any new information, but as I was Minister of Public Works when that increase was decided upon, I thought it would be no harm for me to tell what has come to my personal knowledge.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is what I said. We are thankful to the hon. gentleman, and the House is pleased that we have him here to give us information that we cannot get from other sources.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have been only a short time in the department, and I am pleased indeed to get any information from the ex-Minister of Public Works, or any other member that is able to give it. I am most anxious to give all the information provided for me by the officials of the department.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The House is well aware that the Minister is new in the position, and he is no doubt doing his best. Are these immigrants expected to remain long at these seaports ? Do they not push right through, and should not facilities be afforded for expediting their departure from the seaports ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a certain delay at these landing ports. I have satisfied myself from the information given to me by the steamship companies and the railway companies, as well as by the immigration agent responsible for the report which he makes to the department, that this increased accommodation is really necessary. I may say to the committee that when we consider the number of people arriving and likely to arrive during the present season we will see that they can hardly be properly accommodated even when the increased provision that we propose is made. There are on the way now on one of the Allan ships 1,800 immigrants who will arrive at St. John, and the Elder Dempster Company inform us that they will be bringing about 2,000 immigrants a week. Therefore, the accommodation which we propose to provide will scarcely provide for the large numbers which are coming, and I am informed that it is really necessary.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood from the hon. minister that the total cost of the improvements would be $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The balance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, the total amount of the improvements will be $22,000, $10,000 last year and $12,000 this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

St. John quarantine station—water service, drainage, heating, &c., $8,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. minister be kind enough to tell us what steps have been taken in reference to this water service ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote of $8,000 is to provide fresh water to the quarantine stations on Partridge Island. It is necessary to carry the water main across the channel from the city to the different quarantine buildings. The estimate has been made by the chief architect.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount required ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is estimated to cost $24,000. I have all the items here if the hon. gentleman requires them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It seems an enormous sum for drainage and the connection of the water works with these buildings.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it has been a costly work, but I think the committee will agree with me when I say that it is very necessary that these unfortunate people who are quarantined there, some ill and some not, should be supplied with drinking water.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the quarantine station on Partridge Island ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the distance over which we have to carry this pipe to connect with the quarantine station ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The main is 5,400 feet long to be carried from the city across the channel.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he will ask for tenders, or whether he intends carrying out the work himself with his own officers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that an arrangement has been made with the city of St. John to do that part within the city and the balance will be done under contract let by tender.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to ask the hon. minister what part he intends doing himself ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About three-quarters of the expenditure will be for work done by the department under tender and contract.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What kind of work does my hon. friend want to make a contract for—the laying of the pipe across the harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Let me draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the enormous expenditure for a purpose of that kind. Twenty-four thousand dollars would furnish a small town in Ontario with a water works system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I am informed by the deputy minister that every effort has been made to procure water in other ways. Tests were made for artesian wells and it has been found that this is the only system by which they can get a plentiful supply.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will there be an extra charge for the water in addition to the cost of these works ?

Mr. SPROULE. Is the city of St. John paying any part of this expenditure or do we pay it all ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think there is any reason why the city should be called upon to pay for any part of the work. It is entirely for the benefit of the quarantine station.

Mr. SPROULE. We get the water from the city water works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any understanding as to a permanent arrangement and as to what charge shall be made for water by the city ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we will pay $252 per annum.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that for a length of time or for one year only ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is by the year for the present; there is no fixed time.

Mr. MONK. Did I understand the hon. Minister of Public Works to say that the installation of a water service and a drainage system at the quarantine station in St. John was going to cost $24,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I think, under the circumstances, the committee is entitled to some more details. It seems an immense sum to pay to supply the quarantine station with fresh water and a system of drainage. Even $5,000 would do a great deal but $24,000 entitles the committee to some details as to how that sum is going to be expended. We are absolutely in the dark as to the details of the expenditure, and it appears such a large item that I think we ought to go into the details.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I do not know that there is any other information that can be desired which can be given by the department. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) wants a detailed statement of every item as estimated by the architect I will be very pleased to bring it down and give it to him. I have not these details here, but in a general way I have given the fullest possible explanation and all the information that is in my possession.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has given no explanation at all. In view of the largeness of the item, $24,000 for providing the quarantine station with fresh water and a system of drainage, I would like to know

how much of this is going to be spent in plumbing, for instance? If there is to be a pumping station to pump the fresh water how much of this sum goes for that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The water will be taken from the city water works, so that there is no pumping station required.

Mr. MONK. I never heard of such an amount as $24,000 to provide such an establishment as this with water and heating and drainage. What sum is to be applied under each of these heads?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building, is already heated, but a pipe 5,400 feet long has been laid from the city of St. John, through the channel to the island, and the excavation is very expensive. A careful estimate of the cost of the work has been made by the chief architect, and he says it cannot be done for less than this sum. Last session $17,000 was voted but that was found insufficient, and it was deemed better to wait until enough money was voted before going on with the work.

Mr. MONK. I must say that we find very great difficulty here in getting proper details in connection with large items of expenditure. No school board, no municipal council, not to speak of an individual, would say that the amount here asked to vote for this purpose, is at all within a reasonable limit. We had better postpone this vote until we get those details which any ordinary administrative body would be entitled to. I have no desire to delay the business of the House, but I do say that this item should not pass until we get sufficient information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree that the fullest possible detailed information should be given on every vote, but I think the information given with regard to this vote is full and sufficient. It is most inconvenient to allow these items to stand, and I will suggest to the hon. gentleman that if he is not satisfied, then at a later stage I will bring down the detailed statement made by the chief architect, if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I cannot agree to that proposition, because on many occasions we have been told that detailed information would be brought down afterwards, and for one reason or another we have never seen it. Here we are asked to vote $25,000 under the heading of water service, drainage, and heating, for a quarantine station, and I am in the judgment of the House when I say that this appears at first sight to be an exorbitant sum to ask for such a purpose. The minister cannot tell us how much of this money goes for water service, how much for drainage and how much for heating. Surely, with his deputy minister at his elbow, he ought to be able to give information on that point. I am again in the judgment of the Committee when I say that we have not had a single satisfactory explanation to enable us to pass this vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I also am in the judgment of the Committee when I say that it has never been customary in this House to ask for the number of nails and the number of feet of lumber which enter into the calculation of the architect. I think I have given the fullest possible explanation in a general way, and I have proposed to the hon. gentleman that if he is not satisfied I will bring down the detailed information later. Why, it would take tons of paper if we were to bring down full details in connection with every departmental item, such as this.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What information has been given already?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell me what information he would like?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I asked the minister to distinguish between the cost of water service, the cost of the drainage, and the cost of the heating, and he was unable to do so. The minister tells us that it is unusual to ask for such information. I have not been in this House so long as he, but my parliamentary experience extends from 1886, and I can say that not only is it usual but that it is the rule to ask and to obtain such detailed information. While the Hon. Mr. Tarte was Minister of Public Works, when these details were asked for they were always given and given cheerfully. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) knew everything that was connected with his department, and the same rule should be followed now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The same rule is being followed. I think my hon. friend gave every detail at that time, and I do not think it could be expected that that should be given over and over again, especially when I have promised to bring down full details of the estimate made by the architect for the work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When I left the department the position was this. The department had tried to dig artesian wells, and a great deal of money had been spent without getting water, although the experts had told us that we could get water easily. Then it was suggested that a system of surface water could be arranged for. I went down during the month of August, and it was not very difficult for me to make up my mind that that suggestion had no sense whatever. The only practicable means of getting water for a quarantine station is to lay a pipe across the bay, a distance of 5,000 or 6,000 feet at least, to connect with the city of St. John water system. It is a very rocky place.

Mr. CASGRAIN. How much would that cost ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It would cost $20,000 or $25,000 at least.

Mr. MONK. Then we are not voting enough.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Of course, I have not the details. I had Mr. Shewen, our chief engineer, make a complete report on the matter. When I left the department that report had not been received. It is very important that we should have water at the quarantine station, and I am very much surprised and sorry that we have not sooner provided the accommodation that we should have there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). One would infer, from the hon. gentleman's remarks, that it was proposed to bury the pipe in the rock. Surely that is not the intention. It might rest on the bottom of the bay.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When my hon. friend who has just spoken rose, I was about to rise for the purpose of making a statement of the facts so far as I know them, and they entirely correspond with the statement made by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). The problem of obtaining a water supply for Partridge Island has been a very serious one indeed, and has given to all who have been interested in the matter a great deal of anxiety and concern. I am personally acquainted with the efforts that were made in the direction stated by the ex-Minister of Public Works, which efforts failed. Partridge Island is simply a rock where no water has been found or is likely to be found.

Mr. MONK. What is the distance from the city.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About a mile across the west channel of the harbour.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. About 5,000 feet.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The water supply is obtained from the western or Carleton side of the harbour, in connection with the public supply, and I do not believe it will be possible to secure such supply in any other way than that now proposed by the Department of Public Works. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) spoke as if this were a very large expenditure to be made in an unimportant locality.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He rather spoke of the place as not being of special consequence. Of course, if it were in the city of St. John, my hon. friend would at once admit that any reasonable expenditure for any proper purpose would be justified ; but he spoke of the work on this island as if it were not a matter of great importance. I can assure him that a quarantine station at that point is an absolute necessity. Hundreds and even thousands of people are brought into the harbour of St. John, largely immigrants, for the west, and it is of the most vital consequence to the health of the people of Canada that proper precautions be taken there, and that a thoroughly equipped station be established there. What has been done has not been done without much consideration on the part of all who were interested in the matter. I think that the sum named in this estimate is a very moderate and reasonable sum, if it is found to be sufficient to cover the actual outlay. I do not wish to speak on that point, however, because I have no special knowledge to qualify me to do so ; but I am sure that my hon. friends who criticised this item rather severely——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, I am glad to hear that they did not, because I think it will be found, on a searching investigation, that there is no vote asked for in these estimates which is more justifiable or necessary than the one now under discussion.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has spent some time in eloquently answering a charge which was not made. No one questioned the probable necessity or utility of this work; there was no criticism, so far as I know, on that point at all. The point of criticism, as the hon. minister well knows, was that the hon. Minister of Public Works was unable to give any information. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) stated specifically the items on which he asked for information, namely, the water service, the drainage service and the heating, and I am sure that my hon. friend will agree that the committee should be put in possession of this information. The hon. Minister of Public Works is pleased to say that he will bring down the information after we have passed the item, and if it is not found to be satisfactory he will consent to a rehearing of the case. Surely my hon. friend would not propose a course of that kind in this House. Where would it end ? He knows that we could not do that kind of thing. He knows that without the consent of the House the case could not be heard again. If the hon. gentleman would give us the information, we would be under no necessity of putting these questions to him. I am going to take the liberty of asking again what is the cost of the heating and the nature of the heating, what is the cost of the drainage service and the character of that drainage, what is the cost of the water service, whether there is a contract with the city of St. John and what is the nature of that con-

tract, how long is that contract to continue and what sum is to be paid. Those are very reasonable questions and it is no severe criticism to ask the Minister of Public Works for the information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thought that I had answered the most important of the questions the hon. gentleman put, but I find that the department are a little short in some of the details we should have with regard to this expenditure. The item is somewhat misleading. This $12,000, I understand, was for the purpose of putting in a water pipe under an arrangement with the city. The pipe has to be extended down to tide water, and we agreed to pay two-thirds of the cost on the report of the engineer, our share being some $4,000 out of $6,000. I would prefer having the item stand until I can have an opportunity of sending to the department for further details.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Before the hon. minister leaves St. John harbour, I would take the liberty of drawing his attention to another point. I understand that the Public Works Department is charged with the care of the historical landmarks of the country. At the mouth of the River St. John is old Fort Latour, built in the very early days of the settlement of North America by the Huguenots, and one of the most interesting landmarks of the country. I would suggest to the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways that an appropriation should be made to keep that old fort in a state of preservation. I am sure that the descendants of the old Huguenots, who were the first French colonists in that portion of British North America, will be greatly pleased if the government should do so.

Mr. SPROULE. To how much water is the quarantine station entitled for this $200 a year ? Is any arrangement made for the use of this water for protection against fire ? If the city have the right to sell this water at a high price, we should not pay such a large share of the cost of laying down the main. The city is getting a good return for its disbursements and we ought to know what we are getting for ours.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that I have not the report from the engineer in charge at St. John, and would ask that the item be allowed to stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Dominion buildings, $3,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Was that expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is the usual vote for general repairs and the full amount was expended.

Dominion public buildings, maritime provinces, renewals, repairs, &c., $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the same vote asked for a number of years.

Mr. MONK. That is not sufficient explanation. We are entitled to know every year how the money is to be expended. If we put a new furnace last year in a building, we require to know what we are going to do to that building this year and should have a statement showing how that $12,000 are to be expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a general vote for repairs to public buildings throughout the province. It would be quite impossible to tell just what repairs would be required for the coming year, for unforeseen conditions will arise. We can only account for the money that was voted in previous years, and my hon. friend knows that that is given in the fullest detail in the Auditor General's Report. I can give the hon. gentleman the details of expenditure for the past year.

Mr. MONK. I do not require that, so far as I am concerned. But I would like to know how this sum of $12,000 is divided.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that, if the annual vote were too large or too small, the minister would have to explain why he asked for so much, or would be obliged to ask for an increase. For the past year, for instance, I have a list here of repairs running from 75 cents to $800, and applying to twenty or thirty public buildings throughout the province, and amounting in all to about $7,000. That left a balance of $5,000 unexpended. The deputy minister informs me that this $12,000 is about the usual amount required from year to year for the maintenance of the different buildings throughout the province.

Mr. INGRAM. Do these repairs cover furniture ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we have a separate vote for that. This is only for repairs to the buildings themselves.

Public Works—chargeable to income, public buildings, Quebec—Dominion public buildings—renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $12,000.

Mr. MONK. Would the hon. minister tell us how this is divided ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a pretty long list, but I will give my hon. friend the expenditure so far this year, which amounts to $11,988.

Mr. MONK. What I wished to know is not how this money was expended last year, but how this estimate is made up—what amount is allotted to the different parts of the province. A board of school commissioners, for instance, will provide a certain

amount for repairs at each school. What I want to know, in two words is what is the hon. minister's basis of calculation in making up his estimate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimates are not made up in the way suggested by the hon. gentleman. They are made up on the basis of a number of years' experience. Showing what is likely to be required for the repairs of the public buildings in the province. Owing to special causes, much more may be required in one place than in another. For instance, we spent in the Aylmer public building this year, $166 ; in Hochelaga, $404 and in Drummondville, only $8. The committee will easily see that the necessity for repairs arises from causes which cannot be foreseen. The method of the department in the past has been to get the vote which experience has shown to be necessary.

Mr. MONK. If that is the system adopted, I believe this is the only administration throughout the country, the only public body where such a system is followed. The hon. gentleman thinks what has been spent in the past is a guide for what he shall ask in the future. He tells us we have spent $166 on the Aylmer building. I suppose he counts on the same amount next year. Does the hon. minister mean to say that, before this item is made up those in charge of the different buildings are not required to send in an estimate of the repairs that will be necessary ? I venture to say there is not a board of school commissioners, nor municipal body throughout the country where such a plan is not adopted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman says he has had great experience in school and municipal bodies—

Mr. MONK. I did not say that, but I was speaking of what everybody knows to be their method.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I have had experience in both, and I take issue with the hon. gentleman. Every one can understand that there are certain unforeseen contingencies which involve expense and which must be provided for. In the case of the department, if any repairs are required at the first of the fiscal year, no doubt, reports will have reached the department from the officers in charge of the different buildings. But, suppose a roof leaks, or a pipe bursts, or a door breaks, we cannot know of these things in advance of preparing the estimates. The estimate is made up, I think, in the only business way for places of this kind. We do not expend the money unless it is required. In some cases balances are left over, while, in other cases there is an over expenditure which must be justified and a vote given to cover the amount.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. LENNOX. I entirely disagree with the statement of the hon. minister as to the mode usually adopted by public bodies. Of course, there must be a certain amount provided to cover unforeseen contingencies. But, that we are to be guided entirely by the past, is certainly not a correct system. As has been said, it surely would be expected that the department would ascertain from the parties in charge of the respective buildings what sum each of them would require. A very strange condition of things otherwise would arise. The government is not entitled, as I understand it, to expend the public money unless it is voted by parliament. Unless the information is collected on which to base a careful estimate, we are not in a position to take a fair, business view of what is required within the time the estimates cover.

It may arise that the estimate may be too large, it may just as well arise that it may be too small. Suppose that some of these buildings require extensive repairs, more than have been required for several years, that a large building in some part of the province of Quebec requires reroofing, involving an expenditure of several thousand dollars of this appropriation. Is it a business principle that the department is to close its eyes to this necessary information, and come down here without the first glimmering of knowledge as to what is required in that behalf ? It may well happen that a building which has been used as a public building of the Dominion may be abandoned, or that the repairs have been so extensive that no others may be needed upon it for a long time. I submit that what we are entitled to from year to year is an investigation by the department, and that the result should be placed before us, some general information as to the condition of public buildings and the amount necessary for their repair, judged by their condition at the present time. In addition to that, I admit that provision should be made for contingencies that are unforeseen. We should not discard the past altogether, and judging by the past we can form some opinion of what may be required from year to year. Until we have such an investigation from year to year, and the result laid before parliament, the department is not doing its duty by this Committee or by the people whom we represent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. There is another item where provision is made for repairs. This is simply an item for unforeseen expenses in the various buildings, of which there are 37 or 40 in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman will see that it is not a very large amount, considering the value of the property, and the number of buildings for which this general vote is asked to provide for contingencies. In cases where we know that considerable

repairs are required, we ask for another vote and the department give the details for which it is required. Cases do arise, as the hon. gentleman says, every year where unusual damage is done by some heavy storm, for instance, and where the department has to expend more money than has been voted. In such case we account to parliament for the extra expenditure when the House meets again.

Mr. LENNOX. Probably I did not make myself clear to the hon. gentleman, but the item itself is clear. It comes exactly within the lines upon which I addressed myself to the committee. 'Dominion public buildings, renewals, improvements, repairs, etc.' I submit that the Minister of Public Works has not explained away the difficulties that arise in the statement he made that he judged of the necessity of $12,000 by the fact that for several years we have had $12,000 expended.

Grosse Isle--Quarantine station, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give the details as furnished by the department in regard to this work. It is carried on in accordance with the estimate submitted by the Department of Agriculture. Disinfector for hospital, $2,000; building for bathrooms, $1,800; building for office of surgeon and vaccinating rooms, with four rooms upstairs for non-contagious cases, $2,600; fixing eighteen doors, $18; wire work over baths, $50; bath pipes, $30; smallpox hospital, $40; ventilation, $75; drain to the hospital for water supply, $300; repairs to disinfecting building, $387; repairs to police headquarters, $872; official quarters, $2,000; hydrants, $180; whitewashing, $800; walks, $795; incidentals, $353. As the Committee knows, a very large expenditure has been made during the past year at this station. I am informed by the deputy minister that this sum is expected to complete these improvements that are being made in the quarantine station.

Mr. SPROULE. If I remember correctly, it is only a few years ago that we made a similar apparatus for disinfecting.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was for a general building, this is for the hospital.

Mr. LENNOX. Could the minister tell us how much has been expended up to the present time?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say the department has not furnished me in this memorandum the total amount expended at this station.

Mr. SPROULE. I have a distinct recollection that for a good many years past we have been spending heavily at Grosse Isle quarantine station, which suggests that the work could not have been mapped out along intelligent lines at first, otherwise we would not require to make these improvements from year to year. We were assured a few years ago that the heavy expenditure then required was intended to complete the building. Every year we have the same answer: This is to complete. But we have no guarantee this will complete. Last year we were asked for $10,000, and this year for $12,000. If I remember right, we needed more than that the year before. However, it appears to be going on and I have listened to items being read out which seem to be very much as they were before even to the laying down of the walk. Here is nearly $2,000 for the official quarters. These quarters must be lavishly furnished and very extensive when $2,000 are required to furnish new quarters there after we have been called upon to make these improvements. I think there is either a reckless expenditure or there is something unbusinesslike in the way the money is spent, because we ought to reach a finality some time and we ought to know what this station will cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The $2,000 is for a new building. The only information which I can give to the Committee is that this station was established about 1845. The deputy minister informs me that it had gone very much to wreck and that in 1892 the rehabilitation of the whole establishment was commenced. We have spent, up to the present time, about $200,000. I quite agree with my hon. friend that in laying out a work like this if a full, detailed statement had been given and the expenses known it probably would have been better. The deputy minister informs me that this about completes the work as a quarantine station.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is in charge of the quarantine station now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, that is in the Agriculture department. Dr. Martineau is at the head of the station locally.

Mr. SPROULE. Dr. Montizambert is at the head of the service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. The statement is made by the hon. minister that this about completes the work. What other work is there in contemplation that will be done and what is the probable cost of completing it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Chairman, this estimate is based on a request made by the Department of Agriculture. We do not expect any further requests for improvements to be undertaken there. If any are received, they will, of course, be closely scrutinized. In connection with a large station like this there would be from time to time some expenditure required, but I trust that for the present there will

be no further improvements of a permanent or substantial character. I visited the station myself last fall and I must say that very great improvements have been made of a very permanent kind and I should think—I can only give the information furnished me by the department—that we should expect no further requests for a large expenditure at this station for some time to come.

Mr. CLANCY. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the $12,000 voted last year had been all expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

L'Assomption—public buildings, $10,000.

Mr. BROCK. I see that last year $5,000 was spent and that this year $10,000 is to be expended. Would the hon. minister tell us what the population of L'Assomption is ? The item says 'public building' but it must be for buildings, because, surely, there would not be an expenditure of $10,000 on one building in a place like this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I regret I could not hear all the hon. gentleman said, but I understand he asked the population ?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, for the population of L'Assomption.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the town of L'Assomption there is a population of 1,665 and in the adjoining parish there is a population of 1,275.

Mr. BROCK. What kind of buildings are those that are being put up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building is to be a two and a half storey brick with stone dressings—I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) wants to know what the building is for ?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, what is the purpose of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a general public building for the post office, &c.

Mr. BROCK. A town hall, or fire station? Surely, it is not for the collection of customs dues in L'Assomption ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Sometimes large customs dues are received in small places. I think, however, this is mostly to be used for a post office.

Mr. BROCK. In a town of 1,600 inhabitants, does it not strike you, Mr. Minister, that $15,000 in two years is a very large sum to spend ? I think there must be some mistake. Are they county buildings ? Is it the county of L'Assomption that this building is to be erected for or is it a village building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Their municipal constitution down there is different from ours in Ontario. It is more for the town and the parish surrounding it that this post office is furnished.

Mr. BROCK. Does the Dominion of Canada, because there is a difference in the municipal organization, supply municipal buildings in Quebec ? Are the provinces of Ontario and Quebec to supply the wealthy province of Quebec with municipal buildings ? I think there must be some mistake ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say a municipal building, I said a post office. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) is right in insinuating that the province of Quebec has public buildings in small places any more than the province of Ontario has. If there is any rule it has, perhaps, sometimes been violated ; perhaps, occasionally, for some reason or other, we have built public buildings in places where the population and revenue were rather small. The Committee must try and stick to the rule that the revenue and population should be taken into consideration in erecting public buildings. This rule has not been violated any more in Quebec than it has in other provinces.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the hon. minister if a contract for this building has been let, what is the amount of the contract, and what the purpose of the building is.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract has been let and it is for a post office.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the amount of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $10,000.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would like to ask the hon. minister what the revenue of the post office is at L'Assomption. My reason for asking is that I see an item following, No. 119, public building at the village of Alexandria, $17,000. I suppose that also is for a post office. I would like to get an idea whether it is the policy of the government to erect $17,000 post offices in villages throughout the different provinces. We have one in L'Assomption costing $15,000, and one in Alexandria costing $17,000, and I would like to know what the rule is in regard to post offices in villages of that size ? It seems to me that the revenue must be very small in a village the size of L'Assomption or Alexandria. While I am asking the question I would like to ask also whether these buildings are to be used for any other purposes than that of the post office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would be used for all Dominion purposes : customs, inland revenue or any Dominion service. The general policy of the government has not been changed in this respect from the past. It seems to have been the will of the majority of the House

that at least in the chief town of a county there should be a public building erected. Parliament perhaps had not as due regard to revenue as it might have had. In this case the revenue is $942.

Mr. MORIN. The government has certainly not much regard for the revenue received from a town in which they erect a public building. This building will cost more than $10,000, and the population of L'Assomption is 1,605 people. Now, if the government is going to put up a public building in every town of that size which will cost $10,000, where are they going to end ? In my own village we have a court house, a recording office, and a public building, and it is better entitled to a Dominion post office building than is L'Assomption. The government is very extravagant and if they keep on at this rate it must end in failure. I cannot conceive of any other town in the province of Quebec where this expenditure would be so wasted as in the town of L'Assomption.

Mr. BENNETT. When the Liberals were in opposition they prided themselves most on their undying hostility to what they called the plan of endeavouring to purchase constituencies. You yourself, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), being in the Chair, are of course prevented from speaking, but if you had the opportunity I have no doubt that you would denounce this departure from the old time Liberal policy. I am sure that the member for West York (Mr. Campbell) would also vehemently protest against this vote were it not that his appetite has been appeased by a similar grant for one of the towns of his own riding. But there is one gentleman on the opposite benches who does owe it to a constituency in the province of Ontario to move that this item should be struck out, and that gentleman is the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson). There is the town of Owen Sound, which has a revenue of $15,000 compared with $940 in L'Assomption, and Owen Sound has no public building. On a certain memorable occasion when the unkind electorate of South Brant sent the Minister of Customs to seek a haven of rest in North Grey, the town of Owen Sound was kind to him. His supporters promised that Owen Sound would be liberally dealt with in the matter of a post office building. It has a population of 10,000 but it gets no post office, while Alexandria, with a population of 2,000, and L'Assomption, with a population of 1,600, are to have post offices built at the public expense. How ungrateful is the Minister of Customs ? Will he not protest against this vote ? Will he not rise in his place and denounce this invasion of Liberal doctrine which he preached in opposition but which he does not practice in office now. As the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) has asked, where is this principle to end ? Are constituencies to be bribed when they return Liberal supporters, and are they to be punished when they do not ? Alexandria, in a riding represented by a Liberal, gets a post office; Bowmanville represented by a Liberal, gets a public building; Clinton, a small town in a Liberal riding, gets a post office ; Cobourg, where they have already a public building, is to be subsidized with a grant towards an armoury, and Guelph is to have a generous grant also for a public building. I remember that when the present Mr. Justice Lount was a member of this House, he went to North Grey to support the Minister of Customs, and he announced as the policy of the Liberal party that warm justice and cold justice would be dealt out in the future; that the Liberal constituencies would get warm justice and the Conservative constituencies cold justice. Owen Sound took the Minister of Customs in and gave him rest for his weary feet, but where is its reward ? Let it be known to the country that the policy of the Liberal government is that friends will be rewarded and enemies punished. The Minister of Finance got a public building for a small town in his constituency and the Minister of Militia got a similar building for a small town in his constituency. They set the example.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Since the hon. gentleman has referred to a town in my constituency, I may say that a vote was taken under the Conservative government to build a post office in Kentville, situated in the county which I have the honour to represent. It so happens that the county of King's afterward elected me, and next session the Conservative government dropped the appropriation out of the estimates. When the Liberal party came into power we had the post office built.

Mr. BENNETT. If that riding estimates that the real reason for returning a representative is whether or not there should be a little public money spent in it, I am quite willing that should be taken as a gauge of the intelligence of the people. It is not only the initial cost of a building that has to be considered. There must be a caretaker, at a salary of $400; there must be fuel at a cost of $200 or $300 more, and so throughout the ridings that return Liberal supporters this expenditure will go on. If towns like Owen Sound and other important centres have the hardihood to oppose the government then they can rest assured that Mr. Justice Lount's principle of warm justice and cold justice will be their reward. It is not the Minister of Public Works alone who is responsible. The whole government pass these estimates, and the whole government is to blame. I remember on one occasion during a session of the late parliament, a grant was made in the riding of East Peterborough to build a dock on a creek, and the hon. member for that riding, who was a government supporter,

defended it on the ground that there had not been any money spent in that riding before. Perhaps these grants may have that same sort of argument to back them up, and nothing else.

Lévis public building, $5,000.

Mr. MONK. What is this sum for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is towards putting up a public building in the town of Lévis.

Mr. MONK. Has the site been acquired?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. The department has been negotiating with the Department of Railways in the hope that that department may be able to provide a site on land owned by the Dominion. Lévis is a growing place and is entitled to a building.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend knows that the town of Lévis is almost all situated on the hill, and if the post office is located on a portion of the land belonging to the Railway Department, the people will have to come down from the top of the hill to visit the post office. There must be something wrong here.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend ought to be more frank and explain the matter fully. He knows that those who have business in Lévis come down by the roads leading to the ferry, and therefore the most convenient place for a public building would be in the neighbourhood of the Intercolonial station. The board of trade of the town of Lévis made representations to that effect.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I take issue with my hon. friend, and I would like to see the petitions of the board of trade which represented that the public building of the town of Lévis should be situated at the bottom of the hill. My hon. friend and all others who are familiar with the town of Lévis know that it extends from the brow of the hill very far back, that a large portion of the population live on the brow of the hill, and that only a few stores are below the hill near the Intercolonial station. If my hon. friends says there was a representation from the board of trade of the town of Lévis in favour of such a site, they are in a better position to know than I am; but I would like to see that representation. The public buildings of the town of Lévis, as my hon. friend knows, are on the hill. The town hall is on the hill, and if it is convenient to have the town hall there, it would be convenient to have the post office there also.

Mr. TALBOT. I would ask the hon. member for Montmorency to be kind enough to tell the House where the market of the town of Lévis is—on the top of the hill or below it?

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There are two markets, one below, a very small one, and the larger one on the brow of the hill, near the church.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A deputation from the board of trade of the town of Lévis, in addition to their written request, visited me at my office in Ottawa a short time ago and urged the selection of this site as in their opinion most convenient for the town. There were present Mr. Carrier, the president of the board of trade, and four or five others. That is the reason of the delay.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend probably knows that Mr. Carrier's store is at the bottom of the hill, and that is the reason he wanted the post office there.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I happened to be present at the time, and this Mr. Carrier is not the merchant at all, but is connected with Carrier, Lane & Co., and a supporter of the hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. CASGRAIN. His factory is down there also.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. His factory is there, but when he visited the government, he came to make representations on behalf of the people of Lévis.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If my hon. friend says there is a petition from the board of trade, I would be pleased to see it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall be pleased to have a copy of it sent to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MORIN. I do not doubt what the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Justice says; yet it does not look reasonable. They have a post office in Lévis close to the station. Then they have one on the top of the hill, on the main road leading south. Are the people of Lévis going to close their post office on the top of the hill and go down to the bottom of the hill to get their mail? It does not look reasonable at all. In the town of Lévis there are four post offices. There is a post office half a mile from the station, near Mr. Couture's store, and do you mean to say that he and others have signed a petition to have that post office closed and a general post office placed at the bottom of the hill? I have no doubt that some people want a good post office near the station, but the rest of the people know nothing at all about it. I know a good deal about that town, and I would like to see some of the people send another petition here. If the people of Lévis find out that a petition has been sent here, asking for a post office at the foot of the hill, you will have another to the contrary pretty soon.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood the hon. minister to say that the proposal is to get a site on some land belonging to the Inter-

colonial Railway. That being a government railway, I apprehend that there is not much difficulty in ascertaining quickly whether it will be proper for the Railway Department to part with that land or not. This I find is a revote; the money was appropriated last year. If the ministers are in harmony—of course, we sometimes think they are at loggerheads, and one will not speak to another—how is it that it has not been ascertained up to the present time definitely, whether or not that site is available ? The minister ought to able to tell us what is the difficulty or where the hitch is; so that if we are not going to have that site, we may get another.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be pleased again to explain to the hon. gentleman. I was asked how this matter stood. The board of trade of Lévis visited Ottawa and made representations to us that this site would be suitable. It turned out that it was on property belonging to the Department of Railways and Canals. We have referred to the chief engineer of railways to know whether or not we can get the land. If we can, it will save considerable expense in the way of securing a site which will be satisfactory to the people.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand that instead of the Intercolonial Railway being in a position to dispose of any land, they are anxious to extend their territory.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They do require more land, but it is represented that at this particular place they could spare the small amount that we require.

Mr. LENNOX. When did the Public Works Department apply to the Railway Department to see if they could get this land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Three weeks ago, when the deputation came up from the town of Lévis.

Montreal examining warehouse—additions and alterations, including fittings, furnishings, &c., $15,000.

Mr. MONK. I see that we spent $15,000 last year on this same building, and this will make $30,000. How did we spend the $15,000 last year, and what is intended to be done with the $15,000 this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year we put an additional storey on the annex. The masonry and brickwork cost $5,650; carpentering work, $3,167; plumbing, $400; heating apparatus, $3,800; concreting roof, $1,200; plastering repairs, $525; tile floor, $700.

Mr. MONK. Then you have spent $15,000 adding a story. What is this further expenditure for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is besides all the remodelling and furnishings inside.

Mr. MONK. Two years ago you spent $10,000 painting, kalsomining and whitewashing and repainting the third story of the customs warehouse. The following year you added another story. You spent nearly $10,000 finishing the inside and then spent $15,000 the following year adding one more story. Why are you now spending another $15,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two thousand dollars are due on the contract for the furnishing and fittings. The passenger elevator will cost $4,000; lighting fixtures, $3,000, and incidentals, $1,000. This will complete.

Mr. MONK. Is all this work done by contract ? I notice that always the same contractors get the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Every item appears to have been by contract.

Mr. MONK. Were public tenders asked for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They were not advertised for but a number of contractors were asked to tender.

Mr. MONK. It is a great pity that in Montreal, where we require so much for other improvements, we should spend in three years $40,000 on repairs that, as far as I can judge from the Auditor General's Report and the minister's explanation, appear to have been made wrong side up. We began in 1901-2 completely repairing the customs warehouse, painting, finishing, kalsomining and whitewashing the interior of the building. The following year we tore one-half of the building down in order to put up another story. This year we are going to destroy partly the work we did last year. But what I want particularly to draw attention to is this : This work is done without carrying out the principle of advertising for tenders through the press, and it is always the same men who get the work. Before we vote the $15,000 for next year, we should have the hon. gentleman's assurance that tenders will be called for through the newspapers published in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In small appropriations such as this, the advertising would take up the greater part of it. Divide up this into different items and advertise them in the different newspapers for tenders, and you will find that the cost of advertising would take up a considerable expenditure of the appropriation. We ask for tenders from those who are in the trade, and we get all the tenders we would by public advertising and at much less cost.

Mr. MONK. It is contrary to law that you should undertake a work of $15,000 without advertising for tenders. In the next place, the reason given by the hon. gentleman is surely not serious. All the minister has to do, in order to give the public a chance to compete, is to advertise three or four times in the papers published in Montreal, stating where the specifications can be examined. If he does this he will realize an immense saving. We have expended $40,000 in the examining warehouse in Montreal, and I am sure the work could be done for half the price. For my part I would ask the minister to give his pledge before we vote this $15,000 that tenders will be advertised for in the papers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have been looking over the items and I see that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is right. I shall be prepared to advertise the work for which this $15,000 is voted.

Mr. BARKER. I think this question of advertising or sending out circulars should be discussed in the House. It appears, from the Auditor General's report that the matter has been under discussion during the past year. The Auditor General has called attention to it and has taken the advice of independent counsel as to how far the government has the right to go. I understand the conclusion arrived at to be that where there are only half a dozen people in a particular trade in the Dominion, as, for instance, builders of railway cars or locomotives, it may be proper for the government to send circulars to these people asking for tenders. There is no object in spending hundreds of dollars in advertising where a few circulars will answer the purpose. But, that where there is a general trade, as, for instance, the building trade, the government has no right under the statute—it would be unlawful—to let contracts without advertising in the press. It seems to me absurd for the minister to say in the case of an item of $15,000 that it will cost more than the item to advertise. It ought to cost but a very little sum. If the advertisements were put in the papers of the city of Montreal, I am sure there would be many builders competing for the contract. I only rise to call attention to the facts, because it seems to be the general practice of the government to do as was done in this case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I undertake to say that that has not been the general practice since I became the head of the department. In practically every case, even the cases involving small amounts, I have advertised in the papers. But there are special cases to be considered. It is very easy for the hon. gentleman to talk, but one of the items in this case, for instance is an elevator. I believe there are only two elevator manufacturers in the Dominion, both in Toronto. There may be one in Hamilton, though I am not sure.

Mr. MONK. There are two in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, even so—we have a list of the people in the business and would send these specifications and ask for tenders. Could we do any better if we advertised ? If we put the advertisement in one paper, at once there would be a howl that it did not go into all. I have carried out the rule of advertising for tenders to the fullest extent, and I intend to do so, unless there is some change in the Act. But I think the department should have more latitude in these small matters, because of the delay and expense and because the public are not so well served as if we were to apply to the reputable people in the trade for tenders.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) takes the exception I put to be the rule in his department. If you want an elevator it may be proper to send out a circular to the few manufacturers in that line.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This $15,000, as I explained, is made up of small items like that. We have to advertise each separately.

Mr. BARKER. Of course, every extension of a building involves a number of small items.

Mr. MONK. Where there is a large quantity of repairs, as in the present instance, they might be given to one contractor. Or repairs generally might be advertised under specifications which show the details. I believe we spend too much money in advertising for government work. If the law was that repairs, and even more extensive works to be done by the government, should be advertised in such places as the post offices all over the country, people who wish to tender would go there to look for such advertisements and there would be an immense saving. Of course, that is a matter of administration. But where we see the government spending $40,000 to repair the examining warehouse in Montreal, and when we know what a miserable post office we have, one quite inadequate to meet the requirements of the city, we begin to look with a little caution and to wish that greater care should be taken in the expenditure of public money.

Montreal public buildings—improvements, alterations, repairs, &c., $8,000.

Mr. MONK. I would ask the minister if he has given consideration to this city of Montreal post office. I have called attention repeatedly in this House to the condition of this building. We are erecting public buildings in very insignificant places all over the Dominion, and yet, in the city of

Montreal we have a post office which is absolutely inadequate to the wants of the city. It is a great deal too small and quite insufficient in many ways. I believe the government has had under consideration for several years a scheme by which additional accommodation might be given in the Montreal post office. The hon. minister, no doubt, is aware that the government pays a very large amount of rent in Montreal. I do not know the amount, but I feel satisfied that it is more than sufficient, if it were capitalized, to give us in Montreal a large post office, where all those government offices now occupying rented premises, could be installed, and where the ministers themselves, when they come to Montreal, would have suitable rooms for the transaction of public business. I do not know if the present minister has given his attention to that subject, but I think some arrangement might be arrived at by which, by spending even less money than is actually spent, we could have a suitable public building in Montreal for the post office and other public buildings as well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter has received some attention since I have been at the head of the department. The Post Office Department have recommended a new system in dealing with the mails in large cities, where they think the service can be more efficiently carried out by the establishment of branch offices. They think that especially in large manufacturing centres it would be better to take the mails from the station, as they do now at Toronto and Montreal, directly to the branch offices. In the city of Montreal it is intended to have a public building at some distance from the present office, which will relieve the congestion in the head office.

Mr. MACLEAN. Regarding public buildings in large cities, I wish to direct the attention of the Committee to the fact that great progress is being made in architecture, and commercial and business reasons now decide the style of architecture rather than outside appearance. Architects will now give you a building that is expressly adapted for the business that you have in view, and I hope that hereafter the department will devote their whole energy, especially in the large cities, in adapting their public buildings to the business they are destined to serve. In Toronto we have a custom house which is a very florid piece of architecture, but is deficient in light. The public have to go up a large staircase in order to do business, there are no elevators, no telephones or anything of that kind. I hope the department will follow the example of the corresponding department in the United States and make their public buildings suited to the purposes, with all modern conveniences, and especially with an abundance of light. These improved buildings are now being erected in all advanced countries. They have got rid of this idea of monuments, and florid architecture, and sculpture, and are putting up purely business buildings where utility is the chief end in view.

Mr. MONK. Can the minister state about what amount the government pays in rents in the city of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Public Works Department are not paying rents for all the departments, so we cannot give the information at the present time. But it is an important subject and I am going to have the amounts made up in Montreal and some other cities, and will give them to the Committee.

Mr. BELCOURT. Since the attention of the minister has been drawn to the post offices in Montreal and Toronto, I would like to join the chorus of hon. gentlemen opposite and direct the attention of the minister to the post office in the city of Ottawa. This capital city is growing rapidly, proportionately more so perhaps than any city in Canada. The post office was built many years ago, and for a long time it has contained in addition offices for the customs, the inland revenue and the Ottawa Improvement works. Business is certainly in a very congested state in the Ottawa post office, and when the minister is looking into this question I hope he will not forget the capital. Of all the cities I am acquainted with, Ottawa has the greatest need of additional accommodation.

Mr. PUTTEE. Since attention is being drawn to public buildings in the large cities, I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that probably the most urgent case in the Dominion is the post office building in the city of Winnipeg at the present time. This may not be the proper time to speak of that subject on the estimate that is before us, but I would urge the minister to give his attention to Winnipeg, and hope that he will be prepared when the estimates for Manitoba are reached to announce his intentions of providing buildings adequate to the demands of the public services in Winnipeg.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I fully recognize the importance of this question. As the country becomes more prosperous no doubt additional facilities will have to be provided in all the large commercial centres. In regard to Winnipeg, I have had a careful report prepared and will have to ask the House for money to enlarge the building there. The situation in Montreal depends, as I have explained, somewhat on the policy of other departments. I believe it is the intention to build branch offices so as to relieve to some extent the central office. The same remark may be applied to Ottawa. I endorse every-

thing that has been said by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) with regard to architecture. I think if he will look at station 'C' built by the chief architect of the department, he will admit that it is a very decided improvement, and will give better satisfaction to the public than a more expensive building. There is no doubt that as regards the large commercial centres the question of increased accommodation will have to be met, and at a later stage I will have to submit some particulars to the House, and perhaps ask for a vote of money for this purpose.

Mr. MACLEAN. So far as I can gather, this new system of distributing the work of the post office and centreing it around the railway stations instead of taking it all to one building, is in the right direction. It will facilitate the handling of the mails and correspondence and, considered in its purely business aspect, the system cannot be expanded too soon. I am glad to hear the minister say that hereafter he will have the commercial and business aspect more in view in erecting or enlarging public buildings.

Mr. BRUCE. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if I heard him correctly when he put the question whether there were elevator works at Hamilton. I desire to tell him that the largest elevator works in Canada are established at Hamilton.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). May I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works, when he is looking up the amount that is paid for public buildings in Montreal and Toronto, to procure similar information concerning the town of Owen Sound.

St. Hyacinthe—public building—addition to, &c., $12,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister for some explanation in regard to the public building in St. Hyacinthe. There was $12,000 spent last year, or rather $12,000 voted last year and $12,000 is asked for this year. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the $12,000 voted last year was expended or is this a revote? What are these additions which are to be made to the public building at St. Hyacinthe?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not say so.

Mr. MONK. No, it is not a revote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It should state so. The deputy minister informs me that this sum was voted last year and that none of it was spent, and that this is a revote of the same amount to be expended upon addition to the building there to provide for the excise.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is the public building for in St. Hyacinthe? I suppose there is a post office?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There was a building erected in St. Hyacinthe, if I remember well, about 15 years ago, which has been used for the post office and customs house. About three years ago the division of St. Hyacinthe was enlarged. The excise service is in the same building and there are two or three rooms occupied by the gas and electric inspection service. The building is not sufficient to accommodate all the services. The revenue has increased; it has doubled, or trebled, and a new building is going to be erected next to the present post office.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is a very satisfactory explanation, but what I would like to know is why it was that the work was not begun last year. Can the hon. gentleman give a reason for that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was delay in procuring the site as there was some difficulty in the Department of Justice about the title. The matter was just settled two weeks ago.

Mr. CASGRAIN. From whom was the property purchased?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The first intention was to make an addition to the old building, but as the site was not found convenient the Department of Public Works thought it proper to buy another piece of land. The property was owned by Jule Laframboise, or rather by his wife, formerly Miss Buckley.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the item been amended?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no amendment necessary.

Mr. LENNOX. I submit there would require to be an amendment. The item appears as if $12,000 had been voted last year and that $12,000 is being voted again for the year 1903-4. If it is a revote it should appear in the first column and the item would require to be amended so that it will appear that we are only revoting that amount and not adding $12,000 to the vote of last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was perfectly correct in stating the amount voted last year, but I am mistaken in saying that this is a revote of the same amount. Four thousand dollars has been paid for the site and the chief architect says that the cost of the building will be about $15,000 or $16,000. This would leave the balance of the $12,000 after paying for the site and $12,000 additional.

Mr. LENNOX. Do I understand that we are to pay $12,000 in all or $24,000 in all for this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $24,000 in all.

Mr. MONK. Will that finish the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That will complete the work.

Thetford Mines—public building, $8,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. May I ask the hon. minister what kind of a public building he is putting up at Thetford Mines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost is estimated by the chief architect to be about $10,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. May I ask what kind of a public building the government is erecting at Thetford Mines ? Is this a post office, custom house, or excise office or is it a mint ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is used for a post office and custom house.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I want to call your attention to the fact that the population of Thetford Mines, according to the last census, is 1,605. Yet, you are spending $8,000 for a public building in that locality. I know that there is Thetford North and Thetford South but the population of Thetford South is only 600. Thetford Mines is in Thetford North and the population is only 1,600. In a place of this importance are we going to erect a public building which will cost $12,000 ? I cannot see what you are going to put in the post office or the custom house.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am pleased to say that the revenue warrants this very much more than some that have been voted. The postal revenue is $2,405, and the customs duties are $3,544, so that the revenue is very good.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether a site has been acquired ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the deputy informs me that a site has been procured.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much has been paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $1,900.

Mr. SPROULE. From whom was the site acquired ? Was it given by the village, or the town, or bought outright by the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site was purchased from King Bros. of Quebec for $1,900.

Mr. SPROULE. How much land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 50 x 100 feet.

Mr. BOYD. The hon. minister gave as a reason for the expenditure in Thetford Mines that there was an income of $2,405 from the post office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And a customs revenue of $3,544.

Mr. BOYD. And you are spending something like $12,000 in that place.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $10,000.

Mr. BOYD. For the whole province of Manitoba the estimates only include $5,000. I will read to the minister a few of the towns in Manitoba and the North-west which are left out in the cold, because the members who represent these constituencies seem to be backward in drawing the attention of the government to the post office revenue derived from them. Boissevan, a growing town, has a post office revenue of $2,651, but we don't hear the member who represents it asking for a post office in that town.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is he ?

Mr. BOYD. The Minister of the Interior; he is away. Take the town of Carman, in the county of Lisgar, which has a post office revenue of $3,440, and we are spending nothing there, and the member for Selkirk (Mr. Stewart) does not protest. The town of Deloraine, also in the constituency of the Minister of the Interior, has a revenue of $2,281, and there is no expenditure there. There is the town of Carberry, with a revenue of $3,335, and there is no expenditure there. There is the town of Neepawa, with a revenue of $4,135 and no expenditure ; the town of Selkirk, represented by that stalwart gentleman (Mr. McCreary) has a revenue of $2,193, and there is no expenditure there. The town of Souris, with a revenue of $2,728; the town of Virden with a post office revenue of $2,926, and also a large revenue from customs, is to have no expenditure. Then we come to Edmonton, in a constituency represented by a supporter of the government; its revenue is $6,039 from the post office, and there is no expenditure in that growing place. It is the same in the town of Lethbridge, which has a revenue of $4,524. The town of Moosejaw, that can scarcely accommodate the immigration flowing in there at the present time, has a post office revenue of $4,427. It is represented by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), and we do not hear a protest from that gentleman because there is no expenditure in that town. It is most unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that I have to get up to speak of these things. Surely, in the great province of Manitoba and in the North-west Territories, towards which the eyes of the world are directed now, $5,000 is not sufficient for public buildings, when the little town of L'Assomption with a post office revenue of $465 is to have $10,000 spent on a public building. The town of Prince Al-

bert, represented by another stalwart supporter of the government (Mr. Davis) is to have no expenditure made there. Why do we not hear from him ?

Mr. BENNETT. He is building railways.

Mr. BOYD. The town of Yorkton has a revenue of $2,410 and there is no government expenditure there. I could continue to point out, Mr. Chairman, that there are twenty-three post offices in Manitoba with a revenue of from $1,000 to $2,000, and fourteen towns in the North-west Territories with a revenue running from $1,000 to $2,000 that I have said nothing about.

Mr. BENNETT. You throw them in.

Mr. BOYD. We will make a job lot of them. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister of Public Works, who is a particularly good friend of mine, will admit, that it is most unfortunate that I should be compelled to become the champion of these towns in view of the fact that they are represented by stalwart and outspoken Liberals, who are usually here to speak for themselves if not too embarrassing to the government. I trust that when I come here next year I will not have to accuse the Minister of Public Works of neglecting these growing towns.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) has referred to the small vote for incidental and unforeseen expenses in the province of Manitoba. Now as a matter of fact there is $12,000 voted for Quebec and Ontario, $12,000 for the maritime provinces, and I think the committee will agree with me that considering the number of buildings in Manitoba the vote of $5,000 is comparatively large. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) that the department over which I preside could not think of putting up small buildings in the towns he has referred to. In view of the great progress and prosperity of that country, I have no doubt that in a short time they will require very much larger buildings than we would be able to give them at present. They will have due consideration when the time comes.

Valleyfield public buildings, $15,000.

Mr. MONK. How long is it since this building was determined upon ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is two or three years since this vote was first taken.

Mr. MONK. Is there any correspondence between the local authorities and the department with regard to the selection of the site.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister says that he does not remember of any.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps the ex-Minister of Public Works could give the information.

Mr. BOYD.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know Valleyfield very well and before determining on the site I paid a visit to the town. There was practically only one site available. There were other pieces of ground but they were not fit for such a building. The population of Valleyfield is to-day about 15,000, and if things go on as they have been going on within five years it will be a city.

Mr. MACLEAN. Provided the tariff is alright.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, it is to a large extent due to the fact that the tariff on cotton has been kept all right. I may say that I am responsible for the choice of the site.

Mr. MONK. When was the site decided upon by the department ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I paid a visit to the place with one of my officers, and chose the site without telling anybody. I then instructed Mr. Dandurand, who is the agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway for land purchases, to purchase the site. Let me say immediately that the site formerly belonged to the sitting member, but it was not bought from him. It was the only site available for a public building there, all other available sites having been bought in the rush of business. I instructed Mr. Dandurand not to say a word to the sitting member, but to take an option on the site. It had been sold previously by the sitting member to a man named Johnston, if I remember rightly. Mr. Dandurand took every possible precaution to secure the site at a reasonable price.

Mr. SPROULE. What price did he pay ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not remember exactly ; I lost sight of the transaction. But it was conducted all through by one of the ablest real estate agents in Montreal, and I think everything was done uprightly.

Mr. MONK. When did Mr. Dandurand close this transaction ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think it was closed after I left office. But I gave instructions and was responsible.

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister might tell us at what date the transaction was closed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Order in Council was passed on the 22nd of November, 1902, authorizing the purchase from R. B. Johnston for the sum of $10,000. The land is 77½ feet by 160 feet deep.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Bank of Hochelaga has bought a property there which is not worth half as much as this property and has paid a great deal more. I know we have made a good bargain.

Mr. MACLEAN. Speaking of this question of sites, I would like to throw out this suggestion. If the policy is to be continued

of giving public buildings to all these small places, at least put the onus upon them of supplying the sites. That will be a buffer between the government and the demand of these small places for public buildings. I believe it would often have the effect of preventing their construction ; and in cases where it did not, the country would at least be saved the cost of the site.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Who is this R.W. Johnston ? Is he in the employ of the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He certainly is not in the employ of the Public Works Department. I am not acquainted with him.

Mr. MONK. When was the money paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was paid on the joint order of the agent of the government at Valleyfield and Mr. R. B. Johnston.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is it R. B. Johnston or R. W. Johnston ? In the answer given by the minister the other day it was R. W.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The memorandum of the deputy says R. B. Johnston.

Mr. MONK. When was the money paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The date of the cheque is not stated here. There was some delay in the Department of Justice after the Order in Council was passed ; but so far as the deputy minister can remember, it was about the end of January.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I instructed Mr. Dandurand to secure the site without the knowledge of the sitting member. I suppose Mr. Dandurand arranged with Mr. Johnston so that he might purchase the site from Mr. Loy without Mr. Loy knowing that it was being purchased for the government. Mr. Dandurand did not let anybody know for whom the site was purchased. All who know Valleyfield know that my hon. friend could have sold the site at a greater price than we paid. Property is going up there by leaps and bounds.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 25, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

George Davidson Grant, Esq., member for the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Ontario, introduced by the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) and Mr. Holmes.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver—by Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—Mr. Ball.

QUESTIONS.

COMMANDERS OF GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. BELL asked :

1. What are the names of the commanders of government steamers on the Atlantic, the great lakes and the Pacific ?
2. What are the salaries of these commanders respectively to be for the ensuing year ?

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

1. Names of captains of government steamers on the Atlantic coast are as follows :

Captain Finlayson, steamer 'Minto'; Capt. Bélanger, 'Aberdeen'; Capt. Knowlton, 'Osprey'; Capt. Pratt, 'Curlew'; Capt. Kent, 'Kingfisher'; Capt. May, 'Constance'; Capt. Bissett, 'Lansdowne'; Capt McKinnon, 'Brant'; Capt. Johnson, Lady Laurier'; Capt. Milne, 'Acadia'; Capt. Chalifour, 'La Canadienne.'

Names of the captains of the government steamers on the great lakes are as follows :

Captain Dunn, cruiser, 'Petrel'; Capt. Zealand, steamer, 'Lord Stanley.'

On the Pacific coast : Captain Walbran, steamer, 'Quadra'; Capt. Newcombe, steamer, 'Kestrel.'

2. The salaries of most of these captains have not yet been determined upon for the ensuing season, and are now under consideration.

DUTY ON FOREIGN TOBACCO.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

What is the amount of duty collected on foreign raw leaf tobacco for the fiscal year, 1902 ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). By Inland Revenue Department, $1,137,279.05. By Customs Department, $33.60.

MILITARY RESERVE AT PORT MOODY.

Mr. EARLE asked :

Does the Canadian government claim jurisdiction over the military reserve situate at the entrance to Port Moody, opposite the Barnet saw-mill, on Burrard Inlet, British Columbia ; which reserve is said to consist of a narrow strip of rocky land, about a hundred chains in

length, by twenty chains in width, containing an area of two hundred acres, more or less ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). Yes.

COST OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. At what date was the selling prices of twine first given to the public, for the years 1901 and 1902 ?

2. What quantity of each kind of twine has the government in stock ready for sale ?

3. What was the cost price of raw material used in the manufacture of twine during 1901 and 1902 ; and what price per pound did it cost to manufacture twine during 1901 and 1902 ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll) :

1. March 20, 1901; June 3, 1902.

2. Two tons pure Sisal, two tons Monarch, eight tons Extra Standard, forty-three tons Kingston Special, and fifty-five tons pure manilla. The warden expects to have 200 tons pure manilla available for the coming harvest.

3. (a) The following prices were paid for raw material in 1901-02. (See Auditor General's report M-27). Manilla hemp, 7¼ cents, 7⅛ cents, and one small lot, 14 tons, 6 cents, per pound. Sisal, 8⅞ cents, 5⅜ cents per pound; Sisal pickings, one ton, 4⅜ cents per pound; New Zealand, 6 9-10 cents per pound; Cordage oil, 9 cents per gallon; bags, 6 cents each. (b) 1·58 cents per pound ; exclusive of capital expenditure.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all correspondence, &c., between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Town Council of the town of North Sydney, or any other person or persons, respecting the right of way and construction of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from North Sydney Junction to North Sydney.—Mr. Johnson (Cape Breton).

CORRESPONDENCE, RE NEW TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Hon. J. ISRAEL TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or Mr. C. M. Hays, per William Wainwright, or any other person, in relation to a new transcontinental railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I would ask my hon. friend not to press that motion at this stage of the session. Communications chiefly verbal have taken place between the government and the parties representing the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, but no definite conclusions of any kind have been arrived at. Matters are still under discussion. So it would be quite impracticable for us to bring down any correspondence. until a later stage, which we will be glad to do during the present session.

Mr. EARLE.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I will accede to the request made by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and will not press the motion now.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). A public policy with regard to this proposition was announced yesterday in Toronto, therefore I think the correspondence is ready and should be brought down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will invite the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. With the consent of the House, I will withdraw it if the hon. gentleman says it is in the public interest.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Until we have the promise of a ministerial statement on that question, I object to the withdrawal.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The matter will be fully dealt with at a later stage of the session. We shall make a ministerial statement on this question.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We should have it pretty early. I suppose a later stage will mean within one month.

The PRIME MINISTER. I could not say that, because we will have to come to a conclusion upon the application. At all events, in due time the whole thing will be brought before the House.

Mr. MACLEAN. The practice heretofore has been to bring down these railway subsidies at the tail end of the session, and I object to that. They ought to be brought down early in the session, and if there is a government policy on the subject, without correspondence, the House ought to be put in possession of it. The complaint was raised here yesterday that we do not get public papers in this House unless we ask for them. It was shown in connection with the colonial conference that the papers were immediately presented in the British parliament, but so far the only access we have had to those papers has been through reports coming from the old country. I take this occasion to say that the government are lax in bringing down those papers, and I hope they will improve.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Until any correspondence that has taken place is ready for submission to the House, it would be unreasonable to ask that it should be brought down.

Motion withdrawn.

SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (St. Mary's, Montreal) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the government, or any department, and the officers or managers of the South Shore Railway, during the last twelve months. Also, copies of all re-

presentations that may have been made to the government in reference to the working of that road.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I present this motion in order to call the attention of the House and especially the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) to the very unsatisfactory state of affairs which we all know in Montreal and in the South Shore district. The South Shore Railway Company has received, I suppose, about $1,000,000 in subsidies. I do not think I am very far from the truth in giving that figure. Still, the government do not seem to have any means of obliging the present owners of the road to work it in any satisfactory way. The road is worked to-day just to keep it alive. There is no service. I know as a matter of fact that there is nothing that can be called a railway service. This is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs and I would beg to call the special attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to what is taking place now. The road passed, last year, into the hands of foreign capitalists—so-called foreign capitalists—who came before the House and the Railway Committee of the House with big projects. Well, they went to the wall very shortly afterwards in New York. The same men to-day hold the road. God only knows what took place in reference to the South Shore Railway. The number of deals that have taken place in reference to that road are unknown. However, this is not the time to discuss questions of that kind ; I only want to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals once more to the state of affairs that is existing now and I hope he will find means to put an end to.

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN (Montmorency). Mr. Speaker, before the motion is carried I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to the very unsatisfactory state in which the railway law is in regard to an insolvent railway company. I know for a fact that what the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has just said in reference to this railway is absolutely true because I have had occasion to represent some of the parties who are interested in that company. Now, when a claim is urged against a railway company of this kind there is nothing in the law by which a creditor can have his claim recognized and recover under the statute. It is true that in the province of Quebec some years ago legislation was introduced granting the power to a creditor, or to the government, if the government had given a subsidy to the railway, to sequestrate the road, or to put it in the hands of a sequestrator, who, in another province, would, I suppose, be called a receiver who could operate the road for the advantage of all concerned. But, the difficulty was encountered that when the road had been declared a road for the general advantage of Canada, it was a question whether the statutes of the province of Quebec could apply to such a road. The constitutional question was raised in the case of the Hon. Mr. Nantel against the Baie de Chaleur Railway Company. Some of the courts of Quebec decided that the law as passed by the provincial legislature was not only constitutional but that it also applied to a railway which had been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. The question was raised whether this decision was a sound one and it was taken to the Supreme Court. Unfortunately for those who are seeking an authoritative decision upon the point the Supreme Court did not pronounce because of some understanding between the governments, or the parties ; at all events, the question was withdrawn and it was not submitted to a judicial decision. I do not see, myself, why the Winding Up Act should not be applied to railway companies just the same as to any other companies. If it were there would be, as in the case which is now before the House, a very speedy remedy for those creditors who have claims against railways and who cannot enforce them in the present state of the law.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker, proceedings upder the Winding Up Act must necessarily be very complicated but if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) will refer to the statutes of 1899 he will see an amendment to the Exchequer Court Act which provides for these cases. I will point out the Act to him. It is 62-63 Vic., cap. 44. I think that Act will meet the case in hand now. I have had some opportunity of considering the question recently and my own view would be that if this does not quite meet the case we might amend it so as to make it applicable to the case in hand. But, I think the Act goes far enough.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have looked into that Act and I have tried to make it apply to questions arising just as this one has arisen to which I have called the attention of the House, but I do not think it is workable under such circumstances.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I do not think there will be any objection whatever to the passing of this motion. I may say in regard to what my right hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has stated that, to-day, there is an engineer on behalf of the government making an inspection of that road.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The road is not safe, I understand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend the member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion)

called my attention the other day to the unsafe condition of the road, as it was represented to him, or as it was known to him and I immediately gave instructions and an engineer is now on the spot. In regard to what the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has said I would say that it is not by any means an easy matter to legislate practically in the direction which he suggests. In 1899 we had the subject up and threshed out and I think the very best experience and knowledge in the House was brought to bear on the question. In view of the difficulties which have occurred and which the hon. member for Montmorency has mentioned, the judgment of the Superior Court of Quebec was found to be such as to leave the law in quite an ineffective condition. The subject was brought up here, a Bill was introduced and it was amended, altered and changed so that it was then thought that possibly it would cover the particular case which has been mentioned. I understand now that it has been found the case was not sufficiently covered. I will be very glad to co-operate with my hon. friend to any extent in my power to remedy the existing law but I fear that owing to the conflict of legislative authority he will find it a somewhat difficult question to handle.

Motion agreed to.

SOUTH-EASTERN VALLEY AND UNITED COUNTIES RAILWAYS.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence received by the government, and of all answers made thereto, concerning the South Eastern Valley Railway, and the United Counties Railway. Also, copies of all reports that may have been made regarding the actual condition of such railways.

He said : The South-eastern Valley Railway which runs from Iberville to Sorel is at the present time closed up and is not being operated. It goes through a very important section of our country and it is a great pity indeed that such a thing can happen as the closing of this railway. This road has been heavily subsidized both by this parliament and by the provincial parliament, and it would now appear that neither parliament has any remedy at its command or can interfere in the matter. The road is closed. Perhaps there is a lesson to be learned from the existing state of affairs on that railway. We are bonusing railways right and left, but when there is an emergency we have no control over that. I repeat that this road is closed to the great detriment of the trade of that part of the country and to the great detriment of the farming community. I am not aware whether the Minister of Railways has tried to do anything in the matter. The South-eastern Valley Railway is in the same hands as the South Shore Railway. These people have no money and no backing, but still they find ways and means to hold properties of that magnitude, and apparently we are powerless to interfere with them. It seems to me that such a state of affairs calls for the serious attention of this House, and it is to achieve that end that I have made this motion.

Mr. VICTOR GEOFFRION (Chambly and Vercheres). I am glad that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has come to my support in the motion which I made a few days ago. I do not know whether the hon. member was in the House when I spoke of the question, but at any rate he has practically repeated what I said.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I want the papers.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Yes, I say that I am glad that you have arrived at the same conclusion as I have on the question. I stated to the House, that especially the South Shore Railway was in very bad shape. The hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte), says we have no remedy. I think we have. I think the railway law is quite clear on the subject. If the Minister of Railways is at any time informed that the road is not properly managed, or that it is dangerous to travel over the road, it is his duty to send one of his officers to inspect the road and make a report, and on that report the minister has the right either to force them to put the road in order or to close up the road. When the road is closed, then any creditor, or any person interested can ask to have the road put into the hands of a sequestrator and administered in the public interest and in the interest of the creditors. So far as that part of the road which traverses my county is concerned, I have already taken steps to see that if it is not put in proper condition it shall be closed, and I shall then apply to the courts for the appointment of a sequestrator to administer the road in the public interest and for the benefit of the creditors. I am informed by the Minister of Railways that already there is an officer of the department on the road making that inspection. When the report is made we will take means to have the road properly managed if the company itself does not want to take action. I cannot speak from personal knowledge of the other roads mentioned by my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) because I have not made a study of them as he has, but I repeat again, that in reference to the South Shore Railway we have already taken action, and as soon as I am informed that there is danger on the road, I will take the proper means, and the only means to have the remedy applied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I may say to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte), that as a matter of fact there is no correspondence whatever in the department of at all recent

date; the only correspondence we have, took place at the time of the granting of the subsidy and refers exclusively to that subject. There is no manner of doubt but that the condition which the hon. gentleman refers to is a serious one, but I question whether, even if there had been correspondence it would have tended to assist us in solving the difficulty which exists. The road is not being run—not as I understand it because it is unsafe to run it; it is not that the road is not in a fit condition, but it is that nobody connected with it in any way finds it to his interest or advantage to keep the road in operation. That is the real reason I apprehend why it is not operated. It is not because legal difficulties have occurred which we might legislate away. I do not understand that to be the cause; but it is simply that in granting the subsidy in aid of this road, parliament has not given assistance to an undertaking of sufficient merit in itself to justify its construction. That is apparently the difficulty. It is not only in this particular locality that we have cases of that kind occurring. I am happy to say there are not a great many roads in the same condition, but there are others. Now and then a road is closed down; business has fallen away; nobody will be responsible for the wages; the men leave the employment of the road, and the road stops. There is no remedy, as it appears to me. If anybody can suggest a remedy he will possess a great deal more ingenuity than I possess. What I mean to say is that there is no practical remedy. It cannot be suggested that the government would assume the responsibility of bearing the cost of running the roads that are thus unprofitable to companies. That cannot be done. Now, what is the remedy? If my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) can suggest any remedy, I think he would find a ready disposition on all sides to give to his proposal every possible consideration. Unfortunately it is the case that such roads do now and then stop until something occurs to revive business or to encourage some one to take them up. I again say that there is no correspondence in the department except with reference to the subsidies, and if the hon. gentleman would like to have that I will be glad to furnish it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Let me say at once that the minister is altogether wrong in his supposition that the South Shore and the Eastern Valley Railways are going through a country where the trade is insufficient to maintain them. That impression is altogether wrong. This railway runs through a fertile and wealthy country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, why is it not done?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend has just asked me if I have a suggestion to offer. I think the suggestion which would naturally present itself to any government would be to see first that the subsidies are properly applied. If the subsidies are diverted from their proper use, those who build the road and those who exploit it afterwards are short of funds. I do not mean to make any insinuation. I only state what I believe is in the mind of any public man of experience; and in these two cases I do not hesitate to say that it is within the knowledge of those who know anything of affairs in the province of Quebec, that the subsidies have not been properly applied from the start. When this parliament votes money the government should see that the money is applied for the purposes for which it has been voted. If that had been done in this case, I firmly believe that the road would have been to-day in full working order. The reason the road is not working is not because there is no trade, but it is because the road has fallen into the hands of people whom I may call schemers, speaking without any offence to them at all—men who have no money. Could not this be prevented? Is it not possible, when this parliament votes hundreds and thousands of dollars by way of subsidies to any railway, to provide that the road shall not change hands without the government being informed, or being in a position to prevent it falling into the hands of people who have no money to exploit it? I call the attention of the House to the position of these two railroads. In both cases large parts of the subsidies voted by this parliament and by the Quebec legislature have not been employed as they should have been. Nor are these the only cases. I might refer to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, about which we had a great deal of trouble, and for just the same reason. I do not make any party reference, because that railway was built under the Conservative regime. This is no party question; it is a question of public policy. This House should not vote any more railway subsidies without taking the means to see that those subsidies are properly applied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will my hon. friend permit me to ask him a question? I understand that this road is not now running and has not been for some little time. Is my hon. friend's object to have this road run? It has not been built in my time, so far as my memory serves me. Suppose there is something we could do in the future to see that the subsidies granted, if any are granted, shall find their way exclusively into the construction of the road. Is that going to help towards getting the present South-eastern Valley Railway into operation?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the whole of this road not operating or only a portion of it?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The whole road from Iberville to Sorel is not running and has been closed for two months. My hon. friend

the Minister of Railways asks what we can do in this case. I do not say that I can make that road run. It is not for me to make it run. I am a private member of the House. The government of the country are responsible for the conduct of public affairs. I do not know whether there is any law under which the Department of Railways and Canals could interfere. I am not prepared to argue that point at all. All I know is that it is within the knowledge of all the members from the district of Montreal that this road is of great importance, and that the subsidy has been misapplied. If I call the attention of parliament to the matter, it is to prevent future mistakes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let me ask my hon. friend one more question. Is he aware whether or not the people who own this road are financially strong and responsible ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend can judge of their financial standing. They are the same people who came before the Railway Committee last year headed by Mr. Meyer. They failed in New York and they have failed here. These are the same group of men who are fighting to-day over the ownership of the South Shore Railway and the South-eastern Valley Railway. There are all kinds of complications into which I do not mean to enter at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not sure, if the people who own the road were financially responsible and could be made to answer to any judicial tribunal in damages, whether or not, under the contract of subsidy, they could be held under an obligation to operate the road, or else have the road taken from them, and be made subject to damages besides. I am not sure as to that. But if they are not financially responsible, it is perfectly clear that there would be no remedy whatever in such a case as my hon. friend states.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, enough has come out of this debate to establish two things : that not only is there a responsibility on the government to try to compel the owners of this road to operate it and serve the public, but there is also a responsibility on the government to take steps that hereafter such things will not recur. I believe that a large part of the subsidies voted to railways in the past have not been applied to railways, but have been exploited by men who have become rich by those means. The whole tendency of legislation in this country is in that direction. We grant franchises, powers, subsidies of money and land, and we do not make provision for performance or against malversation of funds; and it is high time that he had in this country legislation of that kind. We have an ex-minister of the Crown saying now that our policy in the past has been wrong, and ought to be corrected. He is saying that to old friends of his; and that being the case, I hope there will be an improvement this session; and if any money is granted, though I do not wish to see any granted, I hope steps will be taken to protect the public, and when franchises are given, we shall take some kind of contract for performance. We have given banks great powers and privileges, but have never taken the means to compel them to serve the public. Nor have we done so in the case of railway companies or telephone or telegraph companies. Until recently the banks did not think it was incumbent upon them to try and serve the public, and for many a day, when asked to establish agencies here and there, they said that they were not in that business and there was no way of compelling them to do so, so that many towns had to do without banking facilities. To-day, however, that trouble has disappeared because the banks happened to be competing for business. But what I contend for is this, that when we give these franchises, we should take some means of compelling these people to carry out their obligations and serve the public and not allow them to divert the funds supplied by the public into the hands of private parties.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am told that on those roads there are several dozen cars loaded with perishable freight. This is a very lamentable state of affairs.

The PRIME MINISTER. No doubt a most lamentable condition of things exists in that section. The road has been closed for perhaps six weeks, but I will call the attention of my hon. friend from St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to the fact that though it is a matter of notoriety that this road has been closed five or six weeks, this is the first information we have of the fact. The road traverses a very fertile section of country, quite capable of supporting a railway. No doubt the law is imperfect and should be amended in some way so that precautions may be taken, when we are giving assistance to railway construction, to obtain some assurance that not only the road will be constructed but that it will be operated.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I am informed by a letter received from Quebec this morning, that the Quebec government has taken an action in this connection, and a petition is to be presented to-day or to-morrow to the Superior Court at Montreal, to have a sequestrator appointed.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). This discussion, Mr. Speaker, affects much more than simply the road under consideration. Session after session we vote large subsidies to railways. Session after session we take money in this way out of the public treasury and put it into private hands. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has told us that he knows, and all the members in the district in question know, that the subsidies have been diverted, misapplied and

wrongly used in the case of these two roads. There is, Sir, a deep seated suspicion in the public mind that the whole subsidy system is rotten. It comes from rottenness and it makes for rottenness, and it seems to me that when a matter of this kind is brought up by a member of this House, an ex-minister, one who was but recently in the cabinet, the government are in duty bound to give it their special attention. What has been said this afternoon should be made the subject of strict inquiry, and I hope the matter will not be passed over.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I have always thought that one of the great evils is the unlimited power we give companies to bond and to mortgage their roads. A subsidy is in some cases misapplied and not put into the road, sufficient care is not taken to see that every dollar of subsidy goes into the road, and the consequence is that with these additional obligations resting on it, no corporation can afford to buy the road out. Its debt is so heavy that its earning powers will never pay the interest on the money invested, and the road consequently cannot be operated at a profit. If we are to start at the root of the evil, we must be more circumspect in giving powers to bond roads, and we should also see that these bonds are sold at par, and that every dollar arising from the sale of the bonds and every dollar of subsidy should be spent on construction and not diverted into the hands of unscrupulous people, who care not what will be the result to the public provided they can only get their hands on the public money.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). When were the subsidies paid these two roads? It was rather surprising to hear the Prime Minister declare that although those railways have suspended operations during the past six weeks, the matter has not been officially before the government. When were the subsidies paid these two lines?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Before my entry into the department. I do not recollect that these contracts were made during my day. I think they were not, but perhaps the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) will recollect. I think the dates were 1892, 1893 and 1894. I may say further that when these subsidy contracts are entered into, the contractor is required to complete his work up to a certain standard; and when he does that, he gets his subsidy. It might be that, under some conditions, he would be paid by ten mile sections upon progress estimates, but always with the necessary guarantee that the work should be completed before the subsidy is fully paid. When the contractor has completed the road and earned his subsidy, it would be extremely difficult for us to impose on him some further check as regards what he does with the money. It may be that he got advances from the bank. Certainly the money must have come from somewhere to build the road, but when the contractor has complied with his contract there is no alternative with us but to pay. I think that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has laid his finger upon the source of the difficulty. It is the issue of stock and bonds in unlimited quantities and the distribution of this stock and the sale of these bonds at nominal figures, and not at all because the money given by way of subsidies does not go into the road.

Mr. MONK. I asked the question because I was under the impression and still am—that some subsidy was paid to the South Shore Railway within the last five years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not speaking of the South Shore. This motion has reference to the South-eastern Valley.

Mr. MONK. I am speaking of the South Shore, and of a bridge in connection with that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman meant that, he is right.

Mr. MONK. Because the rumours referred to, as to much of these subsidies having been frittered away, have been rife in the city of Montreal and throughout these districts for the past five years, and I think there must have been payments made during that time. I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) that it is high time the House should take some steps to investigate the manner in which these subsidies have been paid and disposed of.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The manner in which subsidies were paid when I was at the head of the department was this—after the vote was granted by parliament the money was paid when the road was completed in ten mile sections. These conditions, if I remember well are now altered. The rule, I believe, allows the minister to make advances on progress estimates in many cases.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In some cases, I think.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is one condition in which progress estimates are paid, and it was done as the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) will remember in order to cover the case of large expenditures being made in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass. It made a limit of $60,000 to be paid on progress estimates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought the payment of progress estimates had been ap-

plied to other roads. Under the old rule, upon the report of the officer of the department being made that a ten mile section of the road had been completed, a payment on account of subsidy was paid. If I remember well, a part of this Great Eastern Railway was let to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they ran that part of it from Iberville to the St. Lawrence, but abandoned that portion which ran to Sorel, doing so on account of the fall of a bridge somewhere on the road. It being run for some time, there was a vote, and I think the money was paid since the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) became Minister of Railways.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is mistaken. There are two roads. One is over the Yamaska River Valley and the other over the Richelieu River Valley. The hon. gentleman is speaking of the South-eastern Valley Railway, which runs from Iberville to Sorel.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood that either on the South Shore or the South-eastern there was a vote for a bridge since the present Minister of Railways took office.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. For the South Shore—yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And the payment has been made since the hon. gentleman come into office. However, I agree with the Minister of Railways; I do not see what possible remedy there is when a road is built, and the owners do not find it in their interests to run the road——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) allow me one moment?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In the case of the South-eastern Valley, that part of the road has been amalgamated with the Rutland Railway, an American concern. I am informed by a member of the House who is on the spot that he has learned on good authority that the earnings of the South-eastern Valley and the South Shore Railway are sent up to the Rutland Company, instead of being used in working the road. That is a very serious state of affairs, and surely it ought to be possible to put a stop to it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is the point I was trying to work out. I had an idea that a portion of this road was valuable and that it had been amalgamated with some other. I thought it had been taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway and part of it abandoned by them. It appears, however, that it was the Rutland road. There is a remedy in that case. Where only a part of a road subsidized is taken over by another, that part being valuable, it might be made a condition that, in order to secure a portion, they must work the whole undertaking, unless they get authority from the parliament to abandon a portion. But where a whole road is abandoned, as the hon. Minister of Railways says, I do not see that there is any remedy for it. I do not see what action the government could take or what law could be passed to prevent a difficulty of that kind. But what interests me particularly about it is that this was one of the grand schemes in connection with the Meyers syndicate. They must have some monetary connections in this country, some capitalists who are interested, and who have at least a part ownership in the stock and bonds of the road. It would be very interesting to the House to know who these capitalists are and whether their connection with this concern makes it likely that, some way or other, the undertaking will be put upon a good financial basis. Perhaps the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) would be kind enough to inform us who are the capitalists on this side of the line interested in this undertaking.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not know of any Canadian capitalists interested in the South Shore with Mr. Hodge and his partners. Of course, there are creditors of the two roads, large sums of money due. But Mr. Hodge and his partners or his principals—I do not know whether he has any partners with him—have managed to get possession of the South-eastern Valley Railway, the United Counties Railway and the South Shore Railway. There were two groups of men interested. They have amalgamated, as the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) will remember. But the two sides are fighting as to the way they have amalgamated. Now the South-eastern Valley Railway is detached from the South Shore Railway and attached to the Rutland Railway. I say again I am informed by a member of parliament, who is not well enough to stand up here and say what he would like to say, that he has it on good authority that the earnings of the Canadian mileage are being sent to the American concern; yet the creditors are not paid, the road is not being worked, and the population are really suffering for lack of railway service. It seems to me that the House can find a remedy for such a state of affairs. The earnings of a Canadian railway should not be allowed to go to keep alive an American railway. If the state of affairs I refer to is true—and I believe there is no doubt about that—something should be done.

Mr. CHARLES H. PARMELEE (Shefford). I do not think my hon. friend from St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is quite correct, though he is in absolute good faith in the statements he has made. So far as regards the South-eastern Valley Railway, I am informed the Rutland has acquired running rights over it and is working that portion of the railway by reason of that arrangement, and has a regular train service, though the Quebec Southern, which virtually owns the line from Lacolle to Sorel is not in operation. I have listened to

this discussion with interest. I know that it is a great hardship to the farming community that they have been deprived of a train service for the last six or seven weeks. There has been a great deal of disagreement and litigation. The people in possession of the United Counties Railway have been a set of schemers and railway promoters, and I have no doubt it is true that a very large portion of the subsidy has been diverted from the railway enterprise, leaving it in the position in which it is today. It is true that the railway runs through a fertile section of the country.

But unfortunately the products of that portion of the country, which is an old settled country, are somewhat concentrated, and do not afford a very heavy traffic; the traffic itself is comparatively light. Now it may be that that road, operated upon business principles, and by honest men, might be made to meet expenses. I know there has been a time in the history of the United Counties Railway when the traffic would hardly pay the cost of the axle grease. A good deal has been said about what the government might do to remedy this state of affairs. I remember that three or four sessions ago the Minister of Railways and Canals, at the instance of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Meigs), introduced into this House an amendment to the Railway Act, giving effect, if I remember correctly, to an Act of sequestration passed by the provincial legislature which required the confirmation of this parliament, as railways of this kind have been brought under the General Railway Act. Now the member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) says that the provincial government is contemplating action of that kind. Their position would be very much stronger had the amendment which the Minister of Railways and Canals introduced three or four sessions ago—

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did that Bill pass?

Mr. PARMELEE. It passed the Railway Committee and passed this House, but when it went over into the other Chamber, at a time when the Liberals had not secured a majority there, it was promptly killed. So if any one is responsible for this state of affairs, I think there is where the responsibility belongs. Now I do not think, unless something of that sort is done, that it is possible to relieve the situation to any great extent. It is useless to talk about subsidies, because subsidies are granted to secure the building of a road, but they cannot go further and secure its operation. In this case, with fair business management, if this road could be sequestrated and passed over into the hands of good railway men who would run it as a business enterprise instead of a speculative scheme, I think it might be made to pay. I think that the government has done all that it is possible to do to protect the interests of the people who are suffering from the unfortunate condition in which that enterprise stands.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would be sorry to be misunderstood. I did not mean to say that the South-eastern Valley Railway is closed. I know it is working with the Rutland Railway. What I said was that the United Counties Railway is closed.

Motion agreed to.

EARLIER SESSIONS OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. NAT. BOYD (Macdonald) moved

That this House is of the opinion that this parliament should be called for the dispatch of business on or about the last Thursday in November of each and every year.

He said : I fully understand the importance of this motion, and can anticipate the many objections that may be raised against it. Much can be said for and against the English system that we are following, and also there may be a difference of opinion with regard to the United States system that has been suggested. Now, regardless of what may be said in support of or in opposition to either one of these proposals, I think I am well within the opinion of this House when I say that the manner in which the members of this House have been treated by being called here at this most untimely season of the year, is not by any means in the interest of the members themselves, or in the interest of the country at large. As to the composition of this House, it is well known that the vast majority of the members of this House are men actively engaged in the ordinary avocations of life, farmers, merchants, lumbermen and business men. Whether it is wise in the interests of Canada that the electors should continue to select men of that class, or that they should select them from the wealthier classes, remains to be seen, but up to the present time they have selected for the most part members of the former class. Such being the case, I think I express the opinion of this House when I protest against the date at which we have been called together this year. In proposing this resolution I have no party end in view, and have no purpose of finding particular fault with the party in power, because governments that have preceded this one have been at fault in the same respect. At the same time, I feel confident that if this motion is voted on freely by the members of this House on both sides, it will be sustained. Now I do not believe that any government should be permitted to seek only their own convenience in fixing the dates, because that is largely what they are doing when they change the date and delay it month after month until we are brought now to a very busy season of the year. Any man in business, whether he is a farmer or not, loses his spring business, and is bound to suffer for the balance of the year. Now that being the case, what right has any executive of this House—because that is what they

are—to offer as a pretext, it may be that the Auditor General's report is not ready, that the public accounts are not ready, that the departmental reports are not ready ? Why are they not ready ? The public pays for getting them ready, and those who are in charge of government business can easily see that they are made ready in proper time for an early session of parliament. Why, Sir, every member of this House and every intelligent elector knows very well that the reason of the delay is not owing to the reports. It is more likely, Mr. Speaker, that political exigencies are the cause. It may be some by-election, or some similar excuse, of which members of this government and of past governments are well aware. Such being the case, I think the date that I have suggested is not an untimely one. If this House should meet in the last week of November the Address could be disposed of, important measures of the government could be submitted and legislation could be well advanced by the time of the Christmas holidays. The important Bills of the government could be printed and laid on the Table and hon. members could take the same with them to their homes during the recess, consider them, come back after the holidays and proceed with the business of the House in a careful and intelligent way not having their minds distracted by having their attention divided between their duties here and their private business. I may say that the views that I have given expression to here are not new to this House, and that they are not new to the Liberals of this House. I propose to quote from the leaders of the Liberal party in the past to show you that they held views very similar to those I hold at the present time, and I may add that the remarks of these gentlemen were delivered at an earlier date than the present one. I will quote from a speech delivered by the leader of the Liberal party during the session of 1886, as contained in vol. 1, page 8 of the Official Debates. The leader of the Liberal party at that time was the Hon. Mr. Blake who then said :

> The first observation I have to make is one I made a session or two ago, on the same occasion ; that is, to express a regret at the late period of the year at which we are discharging this, our initial duty. I express that regret with stronger feeling, because it was announced to us by the First Minister, last session, or the session before, that we were to meet earlier in the future, because we have for some years been meeting much earlier than we are now meet——

Mr. MACLEAN. What was the date of that utterance ?

Mr. BOYD. February 26th, 1886. That is earlier than we are now meeting.

> —and because there was a general understanding and pledge to a January meeting ; I do not mean to say a pledge that was not to be broken if a great public emergency should call for delay, but certainly a pledge that ought rigidly to be observed, unless there was some great emergency of which we have not heard as yet. It is to the public interest that we should meet earlier, because this is the period of the year which will best enable the legislators of the country to discharge their duty and best enable the people of the country to discharge their not unimportant part in connection with the business of legislation. As soon as the spring opens, both we and they are distracted with other things, and therefore it is a material thing for us, circumstanced as this business country is, that we should have a more distinct understanding, if such be possible, that our session should not commence at what I regard as an unreasonable time.

This was almost a month earlier than we have been called together for the present session. That is the opinion of a man whose opinions, I think, are respected even to this day. But, Mr. Speaker, I may say we have the opinion of the present right hon. leader of this House at a somewhat later date and I think Liberals will agree with me in saying that the opinions that were then expressed hold good to-day. I will now quote from 'Hansard' of 1894, Vol. 1, page 30. He was criticising the speeches of the mover and seconder of the address, Sir James Grant and Dr. Lachapelle.

Mr. MACLEAN. At what date ?

Mr. BOYD. The House met on the 15th March, just three days later than it met this year. He said :

> For instance, the hon. gentleman has not said a word, nor did the hon. member for Hochelaga, as to the late and inconvenient season at which parliament has been called. I am sure that this is a matter which the hon. gentlemen cannot approve. It has been the unwritten law of Canada for a great many years past, that parliament should be summoned at an early period in the year, at the latest, towards the end of January. The reason is obvious. In this country we have no privileged class. All the members of this House, with scarcely an exception, are engaged in the ordinary avocations of life, and it is an object of paramount necessity that after having discharged their duties to the country, they shoud be able to go back to their ordinary business pursuits, about the opening of the busy season. In years past, I say, it was the unwritten law of Canada ; still, this year the government have departed from that law. They waited, and waited, and waited, until the opening of the busy season was in sight, before summoning parliament, and as to this, not a word of explanation has been offered. Why, we might have expected, at all events, that the gods who rule over our destinies would have come down from the sphere which they occupy in majesty, and give us a word of explanation.

Now, I submit these very carefully considered words to the attention of the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and I trust whatever action he and his government may be disposed to take in regard to this, what I consider, most important question that he will keep in remembrance the words he then uttered when he

was on this side of the House and I trust that he will not forget that while he and his party are on that side of the House at the present time the day may come, and it is sure to come, when they will be on this side of the House. It is the duty of any government in legislating to bear in mind what are the best interests of the country and to so conduct the public affairs. Now, it is not necessary for me to remind the right hon. gentleman of the great disadvantage that the people coming from the more remote parts of Canada suffer in this connection. Coming here thousands of miles and being kept here in all probability four or five months to a very great number of men, as the right hon. gentleman knows, it means financial ruin, and I call upon the right hon. gentleman, considerate as he usually is, to bear that fact in mind. It is all very well for those members of parliament whose homes are within a hundred miles of Ottawa in Ontario and Quebec, who leave here every Friday evening, go home to their business, stay there Saturday and Sunday, and come back on Monday, but the members who are 2,000 or 3,000 miles from home—what about these gentlemen? Should they not be considered? The majority are here and to that extent they rule, but I wish to warn the government and the members of this House that the day is not far distant when this condition will be reversed. I do not think it is necessary that I should say any more. I am not submitting this question, as I think my remarks will show, in any party sense, or in the hope of obtaining any party advantage. I am submitting it in a fair and impartial manner and I leave it to the judgment of the House if I have asked for anything unreasonable. The date I have suggested, I think, is a reasonable one and a great deal of business could be done at a season when very few people are busy. The business of the House should be well moved up at the holidays, and an adjournment had for a reasonable time allowing us to get back to our business. It should not be as it has been in the past, ruinous to many men who have spent some years in this House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not find fault with the observations which have fallen from my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) though he will pardon me if I take exception, not so much to his statements as to the innuendos they contain. There has been a tacit law in this House existing for a great many years, that parliament should meet towards the end of January or perhaps the first week of February, but not at the period mentioned in the motion. This tacit law was at one time more honoured in the breach than in the observance, but the present government has observed it within all reasonable possibility. If the record of this government is examined it will be found that this is the first year in which parliament was summoned at a later period than the first week of February, which is the period, generally understood at which parliament should open. This year parliament was summoned at a much later period which I will frankly admit must be a great inconvenience to the members generally. The departments are not responsible for this; the Auditor General is not responsible for it, but I my own self am responsible and I throw myself upon the indulgence of the House. Circumstances to which I need not refer compelled me to be absent not only from the capital but from the Dominion for the best part of the month of November, all December, and part of January. I came back from the south about the 10th of January and it was not then possible to summon parliament at the usual period. I repeat that I am alone responsible. I was in such a condition that I could not attend to business. As soon as I came back we applied ourselves diligently to work. Parliament was summoned, and I can claim, I think that at no period was the business of the government so complete and so ready as it was this year for the consideration of members when parliament opened. In this way we endeavoured to atone for what was certainly a departure from the rule which has been observed in the past and which ought be well recognized. For my part I have no objection that the calling of the session at the end of January or the first of February should be a well recognized law of parliament, but in the speech of Mr. Blake quoted by my hon. friend, Mr. Blake admitted that there may be some cases in which an exception might take place, and I think that the members of the House on both sides will perhaps admit that this year, at all events, there was some reasonable ground for the government departing from the well understood rule. But, if we are to have a rule of the House to regulate the opening of the session of parliament, I am not prepared to accept the period which the hon. gentleman has mentioned in his motion, namely the last week in November. I doubt very much if this would be acceptable to the great majority of the people of Canada. The motion has been seconded by a friend of mine (Mr. Stewart) and I may with safety conclude that the period suggested in it would be acceptable to the people west of Lake Superior. I doubt very much if that period would meet with the approval of the people of the east of Lake Superior. Taking it all in all I think that the understanding that parliament should be summoned at the end of January or the first week in February would best accommodate all the people of this vast Dominion. There is such a variety of climates in our great country, which to some extent regulate the opening of the business seasons in different parts of the Dominion at different periods of the year, that it would be impossible to accommodate all members exactly. While I

am not prepared to agree to the motion, I think if it were to be generally understood that parliament would meet about the last week in January or the first week of February, I would be quite prepared for my part to agree to such an understanding.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I was under the impression that the late date at which parliament had been called this year was no doubt to some extent due to the illness of the right hon. gentleman, and for that reason I made no reference to it in the debate on the Address.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). However, I want to say to my right hon. friend that he is mistaken in his dates when he refers to the opening of parliament since his administration came into power. On one occasion we met here on the 6th of March, and on two other occasions we met in the later part of February, instead of the first week of February. If my right hon. friend looks up the record he will find that his government has departed more from what he calls the tacit law, than he now imagines. It is very desirable in the interest of all of us that parliament should begin its work as early as possible after the first of the year, and I see no reason why it should not do so, considering that all departments of government are well supplied with an efficient staff, that the public accounts should be made up, and that the government if it gives proper attention to the business of the country should be ready to meet parliament at the beginning of the year ; to the uninitiated member of parliament it does seem a mystery why year after year the opening of parliament is delayed until the middle or end of February or the first week of March. When we do commence parliament early in the year, it has come under the observation of every gentleman that there has been a great waste of time during almost every session since 1896 because the government is not ready with its business. It seems to me that it only requires ordinary business methods and intelligence to remedy this, and that in future at least members of parliament should not be subjected to the inconvenience of late sessions, and to delay because of the unreadiness of the government when there is an early session. My right hon. friend refers to the readiness of the government to proceed with business at the present time. I readily admit that the government went into Supply very early this session, but a number of important measures have been referred to in the speech from the Throne and we have yet no intimation from the government as to the date at which some of the most important of them will be brought down. I would remind the Prime Minister that in 1896 he laid down the doctrine that the redress of grievances such as is sought in some of these measures was a condition precedent to any Supply being granted. I would suggest to him that it would only be fair to the House, and particularly to this side of the House who have to fill the role of critics, that we should have these measures before us at an early date. I see no reason why the papers with regard to the Alaskan boundary should not have been laid on the Table on the first day the House met. The right hon. gentleman told us in the debate on the Address that they would be brought down at once, but they are not down yet. When they are brought down they should be printed and that will cause further delay. Then, the correspondence promised respecting negotiations with the colony of Newfoundland should be brought down at once and I would suggest that they should be printed and placed in the hands of members. If these things were done it would facilitate business. Then, the only information we have had up to the present time with regard to the colonial conference is that which some of us have been able to obtain from the blue-book issued by the imperial government. This Canadian government has given no information whatever as to the attitude of the Canadian representatives at the conference, and I can well believe that there is some information which the Canadian government desires to give to the House and to the country which is not contained in the imperial blue-book. In any case that blue-book is not available to all members of parliament as it should be, nor is it available for the public who want to know about the proceedings at that conference.

There is one matter which is touched upon very lightly indeed in the blue-book issued by the imperial government, but which is of great importance to this country, and that is the correspondence and negotiations which took place between the representatives of this and the imperial governments with regard to the embargo on our cattle. I had not the pleasure of being present in the House yesterday, but I understand that in the debate on this subject it was suggested that the matter had better be discussed after the papers are brought down. But why were not the papers placed on the Table the very first day of the session ? It was said, I understand, that the Postmaster General had had some negotiations with Mr. Hanbury. Why were those papers not on the Table when the session opened ? It is matters of this kind that tend to delay the business of the House, and in regard to which the government might make a very great improvement on the methods they have pursued in the past.

As to the particular date which has been selected by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), I dare say that it might suit some members very well and not suit others so well. There is probably no conceivable date which will absolutely suit every mem-

ber. I understand that the object my hon. friend has in view is more particularly to have the business of parliament begun at an earlier date in the year or at a late date in the previous year, so that we might not be kept here during the summer months on business which ought to be completed by the middle of March.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Parliament has been called at a later period owing to circumstances which could not be avoided, but I would suggest to the hon. the ministers not to give dinners during the session, not to have any at homes or nonsense of that kind, and let us continue to attend to business until 12 o'clock every night. If we will do that, we will get away at the usual time. Then it will be necessary that the members from Ontario and Quebec, who are in the habit of going home at certain times, should remain in their places, if they want to have the work done properly. The work may be delayed very often because of their absence. Let us get right down to business and have no more nonsense and we will get through sooner than expected.

Mr. D. A. STEWART (Lisgar). I must say that the calling together of parliament at so late a day puts us to great inconvenience, especially those of us who come from the west. As the business of this country goes on increasing our sessions will no doubt be longer, and this year we may possibly be here until the snow flies. It is a very serious matter for those of us who are engaged in the business of farming to have to leave our farms during seeding and harvest time. Further, as the west is growing, it is likely that the representatives from the west to this House will be increased and will no doubt be mainly drawn from the agricultural class. That is another reason why I am in favour of the motion of the hon. member from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd). I must say that I was pleased to hear the remarks of the right hon. the leader of the government concerning the unwritten law that parliament should meet early in January. And the reason why I support the resolution is that it gives hon. members an opportunity of expressing their opinions, independent of party considerations, as regards the period when parliament should be called together.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). I gather from the tone of the debate so far that it is the general desire of the House that we should meet earlier in the year or even late in the fall. We from the west are very much inconvenienced in having to spend the best part of the year in Ottawa attending to public business to the neglect of our own, but there is another feature of the case to which I would like to refer. I hope that the government will consider the advisability of changing our present system of meeting at night. I hope that they will look into the European and the American system, and that such a change will be made that our daily meetings may take place at an earlier hour in the day and be closed before the dinner hour, so that we may not injure our health by these long and tedious night sittings. Our committee meetings could well be held in the evenings or earlier in the morning. If that change were adopted, if our daily meetings were begun at an earlier hour and closed before dinner, the same amount of work would be performed and perhaps more in the day than is now done, and not so much time would be lost. No doubt owing to the fact that there is no limit to our night sittings, hon. members are tempted to take up more of the time of the House than they would do if they knew that the sitting would have to be closed at a fixed hour. I hope that this question will be looked into and that a change may be adopted before long, and I have no doubt that such a change would not only promote the physical well-being of hon. members but also expedite business.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). This question of the date of convening parliament is certainly one of very great importance to every member of this House. The circumstances that led to the late meeting of the House this year may fairly be considered unavoidable, but we have been in the habit of meeting at a date so late as to inconvenience the great majority of members. It is my opinion that we should not meet later than the second Thursday in January. The congress of the United States and the legislatures of the forty-two states of the American union all meet at fixed dates. In none of these commonwealths is there any uncertainty as to when congress or the legislature will meet, so that the members can make their business arrangements during the whole year with a definite knowledge as to when they will be required to attend to their legislative duties. The importance of this business men can thoroughly appreciate. The element of uncertainty and doubt as to the meeting of the legislature, whether it may be early in January, late in January, early in February or late in February, is a difficulty and a source of annoyance and loss. Even if the date were a late one, if it were known months ahead, the member could make his calculations and arrange his business accordingly; but that is not the case; there is always a degree of uncertainty. We are not taken into the confidence of the government. Very often the government is influenced by circumstances that might arise from time to time. If we had a fixed date of meeting, the members of the government would accommodate themselves to such an arrangement, and I verily believe that in doing so their own convenience would be consulted, and the business they had to submit to parliament would be attended to more promptly, satisfactorily, and easily to themselves than it is now. Of course, as the premier has said, exceptional circumstances may

arise under our system of government, and I do not know that it would be a judicious thing to have the meeting of parliament fixed by statute at an unalterable date, as in the cases of the legislatures of the various states of the American union and of the national congress. Still, we could arrange to have the meeting of parliament early in January unless exceptional circumstances arose, and if they did, they would be more likely to lead to an earlier than to a later meeting of the House.

With regard to our meeting at three o'clock in the afternoon, I have always considered that practice a piece of absurdity, unbusinesslike, detrimental to the health of members, and demoralizing in its effect upon the conduct of members when it leads to late night sittings.

An hon. MEMBER. What ?

Mr. CHARLTON. If we were to meet promptly at twelve o'clock or one o'clock, and have five or six solid, uninterrupted hours for business before six o'clock, the business of the House would to a large extent be prosecuted without night sittings, and it would be quite easy to have the meetings of the committees earlier—say at nine o'clock. Let the Speaker take the Chair at twelve o'clock, leave it at six o'clock, and follow the English rule that under no circumstances should a sitting go past midnight. When the hour of twelve arrives, the Speaker rises, takes his hat, and says : 'It being twelve o'clock, I leave the Chair.'

Mr. CASGRAIN. Everybody goes home.

Mr. CHARLTON. Everybody goes home. We would very seldom have a night sitting. It would certainly be an arrangement much more reasonable, more conducive to health, and I believe more calculated to lead to a prompt and satisfactory despatch of business than the system we have been following since confederation. It is very difficult to disturb old established usages. We have fallen into a rut, and it is very difficult to get out of it ; but if we take this matter in hand and govern ourselves by commonsense considerations, we shall have no difficulty in arranging our sittings in such a way as to enable us to do the main part of our work in day-light, between the time the Speaker takes the Chair, and the time he leaves the Chair for dinner. These views I have entertained for a great many years. I have felt that the meeting of this House after eight o'clock in the evening, prolonged sometimes till two or three o'clock in the morning, is almost criminal in its effects on the health of members. It has broken down the health of many men who have been members of this House. It is a practice which I think we should seek, in the interests of all, to remedy and reform.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). As a representative of one of the western constituencies, I would like to say that if the meeting of parliament could be called together as early as November, or at the latest December, it would be a great convenience to members representing constituencies west of Lake Superior. We occupy a different position from that of most members from the older provinces, in this respect, that as the House does not sit on Saturday, they can go home on Friday evening, and remain home till Sunday night or Monday morning, and have an opportunity to look after their business, whereas it is an absolute impossibility for us representing western constituencies to go home during the whole course of a session of this House, because it would take us three or four days to make the journey each way. The summer months are those in which we have the largest amount of business to attend to, and when the House is not called together until the middle or the end of March, it practically means that we have to spend the whole summer at the capital, and leave our business to go to the dogs. I do not know that I would be in favour of having the date of meeting fixed by law, because I suppose circumstances might arise which would prevent the government calling the House together at any fixed date. But I would like to impress on the government the necessity of trying to call the House together a little earlier than was done this year, because it is almost impossible for western members to put in five or six months here during the summer.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (East Prince, P.E.I.) I would like to add a few words to the remarks which have been made on this motion. I am in entire sympathy with the motion of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), in favour of parliament meeting at an earlier date. I am not wedded to the date fixed, the last Thursday of November ; but it certainly would be in the interest of the members to have parliament called a month or two earlier than has been the case in the last two or three sessions. The winter months are certainly the most advantageous time for the representatives of the people to be present here, when the business of the country is not so active as it is during the spring, summer and fall months, and there seems to be no reason why parliament should not be assembled one or two months earlier than has been customary. The members of this House are not all millionaires. They are men engaged in the various avocations of a growing country, and they require time and opportunity to carry on the different phases of business in which they are engaged, and that time is certainly not in the spring of the year, when the whole business of a growing country like this is opening up. It is all very well for hon. members who live within four or five hundred miles of the capital. They have an opportunity to

leave on Friday, remain at home over Saturday and Sunday, and consult their business managers or attend to their professional duties, then return in time for the business of the House on Monday. But for members who live in Manitoba, the Northwest Territories or British Columbia, or in Prince Edward Island, or Nova Scotia it is a matter of impossibility to go home and return in less than a week. So business interests of these members are, to a great extent sacrificed. That would be largely overcome if the House met two or three months earlier. As was pointed out by the seconder of this motion, the west is growing rapidly, and we are going to have a larger representation from that section. Moreover the representation of the west will be drawn, to a great extent, from the farming class. These men must be called here earlier and enabled to get through their legislative duties in good season, or their business will suffer. I think the government should take this motion into consideration, and, in the future, do everything possible to have the business of the session brought forward at an earlier day.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). I have an admendment to the motion, as follows:

It is the opinion of this House that this parliament should be called together not later than the first Tuesday after the second Monday in January in every year.

I have always been an advocate of the members of this House being allowed to know at what period they would be called upon to meet. I think that the time I have suggested, the first Tuesday after the second Monday in January—I have not said the full of the moon—would be the proper time. The Christmas holidays would be over, and people would be free to come here and attend to business. I do not see why the government should not accept my amendment, nor why all the members of the House should not support it. We all admit that it should be known at what time we are to meet, and we all admit the winter is the best time for the session for both farmers and business men. We shall remove difficulties from the way of the government, and we shall relieve the government from the invidious duty of choosing the time of session if we pass this amendment. I do not think I need say more, but I hope that all will vote for my amendment.

Mr. SEYMOUR E. GOURLEY (Colchester). I would not vote for any amendment of the character of that proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson). We wish to have in this country constitutional government, and constitutional government puts in the hands of the Cabinet the right to call parliament at any time they think best. Besides, to adopt the hon. gentleman's amendment would be to copy too closely the constitution of the country to the south of us, which is the worst jumble in the whole civilized world to-day. But, while we want constitutional government, yet constitutional government has always been found consistent with the wisest and best government in the world. Speaking in behalf of the maritime province members, I think there should be a well known time when parliament should be called, subject, of course, as in the case of the present session, to delay when circumstances arise to make it necessary. I think the explanations given by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with reference to the present session are ample, and I am perfectly willing to come here late in view of the peculiar circumstances of the present case. But this is exceptional, and we should have a time fixed when it should be well known that parliament would be called, subject to some exigency such as we have this year. Now, the question is, what that time should be. Some say it should be January. It strikes me that that is too late. The members who come from the maritime provinces want to get through the session of parliament by the last of April. Any member engaged in mercantile or agricultural business would prefer to get through his duties here by that time. It would be impossible to open parliament at the beginning of January and get through by the end of April. Therefore I think there is great wisdom in the proposal of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) that the session of parliament should open in November. We could open parliament, the principal Bills could be introduced and a large part of the business brought forward before the Christmas holidays. We could then adjourn feeling that practically all the business was before the House and before the country, and, after the Christmas holidays we could meet, carry the business through intelligently and prorogue before the 30th of April. I think that no date could be fixed after the beginning of the year when we could meet and finish business by that time. A man can stay here in winter, with the winds howling outside, very comfortably, and attend to the work of parliament. But in the hot days, when all outside is so inviting, one cannot give the attention to the business of the House that he ought to do. Moreover, if a man feels that his business is going to pieces at home, he cannot give undivided attention to his duties in parliament. So, with all due deference to the explanation of the Prime Minister, I think parliament should meet before the close of the year. It may have been well enough to have parliament called about the last of January a few years ago. But with the business coming before us in this 'growing time,' and now that Canada has become a nation under the inspiration of hon. gentlemen opposite, we must have longer sessions. Therefore, while January might have been well enough in the old Conservative days, when Canada was not a nation, it

will never do under existing circumstances. I concur in the proposition that we should meet in November, when there would be ample time, if the session proved unusually long, for the members to get away by the close of April. I support this motion, and I hope the government will not take an illiberal view of it, but will endeavour to adapt themselves to an earlier date, and will settle on the last Thursday in November as a practice. I think that would be better than to fix the date by statutory resolution such as has been proposed, because that would be copying the worst system of government in the world.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). While this question is under discussion, I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce what has become of the promise he made when we had the last summer session. He told us that as long as he was a member of this government we would have no more summer sessions. At that time we were called on the 6th of March.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I do not remember what promise I made, but I do cordially concur in the statement that we ought, if possible, to meet as early as we can, at the end of January, or the beginning of February. But it is not always possible, and no man knows that better than the hon. gentleman, for the government to carry out that project. I may remark, however, that when I had the honour of being Finance Minister, I delivered the budget speech very early in the session, and if the hon. gentleman will look over the records he will find that the budget speech was always delivered within ten days or a fortnight after the House met. I have no doubt but that my hon. friend beside me (Hon. Mr. Fielding) will be perfectly ready to do the same, if he can get the co-operation of the hon. gentlemen on the other side. However, there are difficulties, I may say, in this country in getting ready much before the 1st of February. This is becoming a very extensive country, with widely extended operations, and I doubt, if you make the fiscal year terminate on the 1st of July, whether you can expect to get the various public documents in readiness for parliament before the 1st of February, certainly not before the middle of January, so far as my experience goes. But I can tell the hon. gentleman that so far as I am personally concerned, I will strive earnestly to bring about as early a meeting as possible.

Mr. MONK. I wish to endorse the suggestion which has been made by my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), and which I think can be carried easily into effect at once. I believe the time has come when we must make some alteration in the hours of sitting of the House. Reforms have been made in the United States and different countries of Europe, as well as in England, although in England different habits prevail from those that obtain in this country. But even there they have made a reform in regard to the twelve o'clock rule, which has been alluded to this afternoon. It seems to me that, if it were possible, we should sit from three to six o'clock, and come back at eight; especially ought we to avoid, in the season which we are now approaching, the practice of sitting in the House until two o'clock in the morning, or even later. I approve of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Provencher that we should sit, for instance, from two o'clock until six, and have committee meetings in the morning, and if necessary at night, and perhaps special meetings in the evening. That would be a beneficial reform, and acceptable to all the members of this House. I think it could be carried into effect during the present session, at any rate, a set of rules to that effect could be framed and brought before the House for discussion. Some change, it seems to me, is absolutely necessary in the present hours of sittings in this House. As regards the suggestion made in the main motion of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), I do not know to what extent it meets with the approval of all our farmers from Quebec. But speaking for myself, I think the date suggested by him a very good one. It would enable us to get well into the work of the session before the Christmas recess, and during the Christmas recess we would have occasion to consult our constituents on some of the measures already submitted to the House; and upon returning here after a short vacation, we would be in a better position I think to expedite the work of the session and get away at an early date. I see no reason why we could not have the report of the Auditor General at a much earlier date. I think if we had that report before us ten days before the meeting of parliament, or three or four weeks before the Christmas holidays, the work of the session would be greatly shortened, and it would meet the convenience of members in almost every instance. I do not think it is possible by statutory enactment to fix the date of the meeting of parliament. Of course it might be done, but strictly speaking it would not be constitutional, if I may say so. But if the sense of the House is taken upon the main motion, and if the House says that the time suggested by my hon. friend is satisfactory, I do not see why the government should not make the change and break away from old habits and customs. Everything is changing, and I think the time has come to improve the hours of sittings of parliament, as the rest of the world is doing.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says that as the fiscal year ends the 30th of June, it would be inconvenient to call parliament together in the fall, because the departments would not have

time to make their reports. Now, I say that it is a mistake to end the fiscal year on the 30th of June, the fiscal year should be made to conform with the calendar year. We now end the fiscal year in the middle of the most busy season of the year, which we break into two parts, and I believe it would be far better to have the reports end with the calendar year. If we did that, there would be no trouble at all in having a fall session, because there would be ample time to have those reports ready.

Mr. W. ROSS (South Ontario). Before this question is put I would like to say a few words in regard to the motion. So far as I am concerned, it would be practically impossible to attend a session of this parliament in November, unless I was compelled to do so. We have had the explanation of the Prime Minister of the reason why parliament was delayed this year, and we are all thoroughly satisfied with that. But I really think that the best time for parliament to meet is about the middle of January, that seems to suit every one, and we could get through the business of this House in about ninety days. That would let us out by the first of May, at any rate, and would give us ample time to do the business of the country. We should be called together in good season. I appreciate the difficulty of the western members and of the eastern members, that has been referred to. But after all, speaking from my own standpoint, it would be physically impossible for me to come here in November, therefore I wish to enter my protest against meeting at that season of the year.

Mr. BOYD. The motion I submitted to the House is not the same as the amendment of the hon. member for Elgin. I do not fix a date, I say on or about, whereas the hon. member for Elgin suggests a specific date. Now I ask whether any valid argument has been used here to-day against an earlier meeting of the House, or at least against a meeting in the fall. There is no denying the fact that henceforth, as this country keeps growing, it will be impossible to transact all the business in less than four months, or four and a half or five months. I have watched for some years past and during the years I have been here the last month of the session is all hurry and bustle and push business through when it should get a great deal more consideration and attention than some of the business that has been disposed of in the earlier part of the session. The hon. gentleman who last spoke says that the business of the House may be done in ninety days. I wish to tell him that it is impossible to do it in ninety days. This country is becoming entirely too large to think of doing its business in ninety days. I have given this matter very careful consideration. I have not brought it to the attention of the House thoughtlessly, but I have done it with the expectation that the business which this House has to do will occupy four or five months. Such being the case, if the leader of the government is prepared to consider the business men of the country, the merchants and farmers and especially those who come from the extremities of the country, it will be necessary to call the House earlier, about the time I have suggested. In regard to the proposition of the hon. member that we should specify a date, the objection that I raised and which is one that appeals as I know to a great many members, will not be overcome because we will then be carried into spring.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, if I were to state my own personal view of the matter, I must say that I would very much prefer that the House should meet in November and December and then adjourn over until the first of March and sit during March and April. The two worst months in the year in this part of the country are January and February. Ottawa is very cold at that time and the travel in January and February is most dangerous in Ontario and Quebec at that period of the year. I can quite see that a fall session in November and December and a recess until March and April might suit the convenience of a very large number of our members. However, I think enough has come out of the debate to suggest to the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he ought to be prepared, either now or at a later stage, to suggest that a special committee to be composed of the leader of the government, the leader of the Opposition, the Speaker, and perhaps other members of the House be appointed to consider if some practical rule cannot be laid down as to the suggestions made by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). I am in favour of earlier sessions in the day as against these late sittings. I do not know what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) says about the social gaieties interfering with the business of the House, but at any rate I can say that there has been great neglect of the public business after dinner time. There are often not more than ten or twenty members in this House after dinner. There are very few members of the government present sometimes and the public business is not being transacted as I think it ought to be. But, enough has come out of this discussion to suggest the appointment of a committee and I hope that if the right hon. leader of the government is not prepared to do so at the present moment, he will after consideration be in a position to suggest something in that direction.

Amendment (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) negatived.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House and with the approval of my seconder, I would beg to withdraw the re-

solution. I think the object has been attained. I know well enough after the opinions that have been expressed by the right hon. leader of the House, what the result will be. I have been long enough in this House to understand what usually happens after the leader of the House speaks in the manner in which he has spoken this afternoon. However, I trust the views submitted will so impress themselves upon the minds of the members of the government that they will give the matter the serious consideration that we believe the subject is entitled to. I wish, with the permission of the House, to withdraw the resolution.

Motion (Mr. Boyd). withdrawn.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Board of Civil Service Examiners for the year 1902.—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

CENSUS OF 1901.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to inquire of the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), as I understand he is acting Minister of Agriculture during the absence of the minister, if he has brought down the return that I moved for on Monday in reference to the amount expended for taking the census of 1901.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has not been brought down. It will be brought down promptly.

THE FRENCH EDITION OF DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a point which I think is of great importance. The matter I am referring to is the backward state of the translation of the departmental reports from English into French. I think these reports are not translated in due time. I understand that a certain time must be allowed for the proper translation of those reports ; but, after all, I think the work could be done in a more expeditious way. Being given the fact that those reports have to be prepared by the officers of the various departments and handed over to the printing bureau long before the meeting of parliament, I do not see why a prompter delivery of the French edition could not be ensured.

Owing to the backward state of that translation, we are placed in this awkward position : that when people who are interested in what is published in these reports apply to us for copies of the same, as the French edition is not yet available for distribution, we have to send them copies of the English edition.

Mr. BOYD.

Now, it would be easy for us, in support of the statement I have just made, to call to witness the hon. gentlemen who, in reply to those who apply for copies of the French edition of the departmental reports, have to tell them that the French edition is not yet published, and that a long time is likely to elapse before it is available for distribution to the public. I quite understand that, in the case of the translation of the reports of our debates as also in the case of the numerous returns which are brought down and laid upon the Table of this House during the session, it is difficult for the translating staff to catch up with the work. But, as concerns the departmental reports, the position is quite different. So, I wish to urge upon the right hon. leader of this House the desirability of his taking the necessary steps to have the French edition of the reports referred to, laid upon the Table of the House, from the very opening of parliament.

ALASKAN BOUNDARY TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to call the attention of the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to a statement made in the press of the country in regard to the recent convention respecting the Alaskan boundary. I asked the right hon. gentleman whether the treaty had been made with the assent of the government and he omitted to give me any answer during the debate upon the Address. The following passage appears in an important journal in this county which is supporting the government :—

TO WHOM WE OWE IT.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, says the St. John 'Sun,' 'admits that this country cannot expect a fair verdict on the boundary question from the three United States commissioners,' and it asks: 'Then what is the good of the reference at all ?'

Then follows the editorial comment :

The 'Sun' apparently forgets that it was not Sir Wilfrid who made or even proposed the Alaska boundary reference. We owe that good gift entirely to the esteemed government of the United Kingdom whose chief aim in existence appears to be the cultivation of 'friendship' with the United States by running a 'hand-me-down' shop for their benefit in Canada. If our 'friendly' neighbours do not see what they want in sight in the Dominion, they have a standing invitation to ask for it, and are given permission to carry it off on their own terms.

I am not adverting to the fireworks part of this editorial, but merely to the one point which seems to be suggested rather than explicitly stated : That this convention respecting the Alaskan boundary was not made with the consent or approval of the government of Canada. I think we have a right to know from the government whether or not that is a fact, and I have no doubt that my right hon. friend will see his

way clear to make a statement in regard to it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I thought, Mr. Speaker, that in the debate on the address I made it perfectly clear that the government of Canada had been consulted with regard to the terms of the treaty. I thought I had made it clear also that we had assented to the treaty, not because we found it perfect, but because on the whole the terms of reference were perfectly fair. There was no advantage on either side, and that was the reason why we removed all objections that we had had hitherto. For the first time, in the negotiations which took place between Great Britain and the United States and between Great Britain and Canada in the Joint High Commission; for the first time the terms of reference proposed were such as could be accepted by Canada. We were not satisfied with the composition of the tribunal—not that we objected to the tribunal itself, but simply because the tribunal was so composed as that it did not ensure finality. That was the only objection we had, but the terms of reference being satisfactory, the character of the court, with an exception being also satisfactory; especially in this that it provided that the questions between Canada and the United States should be determined by impartial jurists of repute. We thought we had there all guarantees that the case of Canada would be properly adjudicated upon. But in the debate on the Address, I said also that it was a different matter as to how the treaty, which in itself was perfectly fair, was to be executed. I pointed out that there were objections taken to the commissioners which we learned from the press and upon authority had been selected by the government of the United States. I am sorry to say that at this moment the government is not yet in a position to bring down the correspondence which has taken place upon this particular subject. It is all ready, and I am in hopes that at an early date it may be placed on the Table of the House. All I can say at present is, that if the correspondence is not already on the Table of the House it is not because of any fault of any authority on this side of the Atlantic. We hope, however, that very shortly, the whole of the correspondence which has taken place upon the making of the treaty itself, and the selection of the commissioners will be placed before parliament. We hope further, that all the correspondence which has taken place between the two governments since the adjournment of the High Commission, in 1899, will also be placed upon the Table of the House at an early date.

SUPPLY—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask why the somewhat unusual practice of going into Supply on Private Members' day is being followed during this session?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). For the reason that we have exhausted the Order paper for private business, and we have come to Government Orders. That is the only reason, and it seems to me it is a good reason. If we want to reach the blessing of a prorogation within any reasonable time, we might as well take government business for the rest of the day.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I would be ready to go on with my public Bills to-day if they had been printed in both languages. I have been here every day this week waiting to see them printed, but so far they are only printed in one language, and under the rules I cannot go on with them.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is no fault of mine.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, the government is responsible for the way the public documents are printed, and therefore the government is to blame.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I have a Bill of ten lines long which was introduced last year and printed in both languages, and which I introduced at the beginning of the session this year, but it has not yet been translated. It is a most important Bill, and like my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), I am ready to go on with it. Why is it not translated and printed in both languages?

The PRIME MINISTER. The printing may be to some extent in the hands of the government, but the translation is not. My hon. friend had better address himself to the officers of the House.

Mr. MONK. Surely the government is responsible for the conduct of the business of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a rule of the House that private Bills should be handed in eight days before the opening of the session. The work has to be done carefully, and as a matter of fact this rule of the House has not been complied with, as most of the Bills were not handed in at the prescribed time. We have only one translator, and when all the Bills come in together, there is necessarily a little delay.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I have a Bill of four lines long that was introduced the second day of the session, and it seems strange that it should be kept back so long, because I am sure that the Bill to which I refer came in before the other private Bills.

Mr. MONK. May I ask if it is the case, as I have been informed, that there are

some translators who are drawing salaries and who have not come up here yet to attend to their work? I have been told that is the case, and the names have been given to me.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know of any.

Mr. S. HUGHES (North Victoria). I take the liberty of drawing the attention of the first minister to a cablegram which appeared in the papers last night in reference to the fact that Canadian beef is not allowed to be supplied to the British troops at the present time. I would suggest that when the papers are being brought down, that any data in connection with the army contracts in reference to the supply of Canadian beef may also be brought down at the same time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like again to point out that the practice of going into Supply on Private Members' day has not been heretofore pursued during the sessions I have been in this House. Having regard to the fact that there are important government measures which have not been brought down yet, we must protest against departing from the rule which has prevailed during previous sessions. I do not at all wish to obstruct the business of the House, but at the same time I do not want to depart from customs which have been deemed good enough for us in the past, unless some special reason can be shown for that departure.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). I would like to draw the attention of the House to this fact: We do not object at all to the business of the government proceeding; but there are a certain number of very important government Bills on the Order paper which might be proceeded with if the ministers were ready. There is one measure, for instance, in which a great many people, not only in this country, but in the United States and England, who hold Canadian patents, are interested. An Act has been prepared on the subject, but I humbly submit that it should have been ready for submission to the House on the very first days of the session. Some hon. gentlemen opposite know, the Minister of Justice and the hon. gentleman who represents the Minister of Agriculture, who is in charge of the Patent Department, must know, that the decision given by the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of Power vs. Griffin, has absolutely done away with jurisprudence with respect to an important section of the Patent Act. There are hundreds of patents affected by this decision, which was to the effect that no second extension of time can be given to people who have not imported their patented inventions into Canada during the time prescribed by law. Heretofore extensions of two years have been given from time to time, either by the Commissioner of Patents or by the assistant commissioner. The decision of the Supreme Court has done away with that practice, and as a result has invalidated hundreds of patents. I believe, from an answer given to a question of mine by one of the ministers at the beginning of the session, that it is the intention of the government to introduce an Act not only to amend the Patent Act in this respect, but also to give a retroactive effect to the law—remedial legislation, in fact. This is an important question, and I humbly submit that the measure should be brought before the House and passed as soon as possible, in order to remedy the great evil which has been done to the holders of patents by the unexpected decision of the Supreme Court. I do not at all criticise that decision. It is probably right, but it is altogether at variance with the jurisprudence held on this subject ever since the late Dr. Taché gave a decision on the subject twenty years ago. There are other important Bills on the Order paper which could be dealt with if the government were ready. They are not ready; so that if we make any observation on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, it is not because we are not ready to look into the measures which the government have promised to bring before the House. All we say is that we are not prepared to go into supply now, because we have not been able, during the short time the House has been sitting, to read the reports which have been brought down since the opening of the session. For instance, it has been physically impossible for us to study the Auditor General's Report sufficiently to enable us to criticise with adequate knowledge the items as they come up. I do not think this is quite fair to this side of the House, as it does not afford us the opportunity of dealing with the items in the Supply Bill in the way we are entitled to do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do not think that any remarks implying that there is any lack of readiness on the part of the government to go on with the business of the House, are justifiable. I venture to say that there never has been a time, certainly not in recent years, when the business of the government has been more ready for the meeting of parliament. The public documents have been brought down with great promptness. There are more public documents and reports on the Table of the House to-day than is usual at this period. We are still at an early stage of the session, it is true; but if owing to the speedy disposal of questions and motions, or owing to delay in translation, which I think should not occur, because I think we should have officials enough to attend to that more promptly, but that is not the fault of the government—if for these various reasons we reached Government Orders early in the day, and did not proceed with business, the people would ask, what is parliament doing? The peo-

ple, I am sure, will be glad to know that the routine business is disposed of quickly, and that we are ready to attend to the business of the House. The voting of the supplies is certainly important business of the House, and I am sure we should not be reproached with causing delay. When delay occurs, it is usually because we are asked to put something aside to suit the convenience of hon. members opposite. I think it would be a pity if at this time we adjourned at six o'clock, when the government are ready to go on with business.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whose duty it is to see that there are enough translators? Is it not the government's? We are not responsible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not say that my hon. friend is responsible, neither are we. These matters are in the hands of a committee of the House to a great extent. The officials of the House are not servants of the government, but servants of the House, and we among others have a right to complain if they do not attend to their duties.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to know why the government do not go on with the Act to amend the Act respecting the Publication of the Statutes, which is printed in English and French; also the Act to amend the Controverted Elections Act, which is also printed in English and French?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will answer my hon. friend. That is a fair question, though he takes a different ground from what he took a moment ago, when he said we were not ready to go on with the business. On the contrary, the Order paper is full of the business of the government. There are four or five subjects on which we are ready to go on. There is, for instance, a resolution of the Minister of Justice with respect to retiring allowances of judges; another of the Minister of Finance with respect to Civil Service superannuation; another by myself with respect to Chinese immigration. The reason we do not proceed with these matters to-day is that to-day not being a government day, we intended to proceed with them to-morrow, because we thought it would be more accommodating to members to have such important subjects taken up on regular government days, when they would expect them to be brought up. But we thought, as we have exhausted the business allotted to private members to-day, it would be proper to devote a few hours to discussing the estimates, with which the members are more or less familiar. But if hon. members say they are not ready to go on with the estimates to-day, we do not wish to press them, and are willing to adjourn if hon. gentlemen opposite so desire.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well, then, go on.

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

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

St. John, N.B., quarantine station—water service, drainage, heating, &c., $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). There was some criticism last night with reference to our spending so much money on furnishing water for this quarantine station. On examining the papers, I find a telegram to the Agriculture Department to be transmitted to the Department of Public Works, saying that the water supply was entirely inadequate and that the situation demanded relief, and that it would cost over $1,500 to provide fresh water for that station during that season. The reason for that is that the water has to be carried by boat from the city. I have here a detailed estimate of the cost, material and work for the water service for this quarantine station:—

250 cubic yards earth excavation.. ....$	100 00
3,500 lineal feet, extra heavy, 6 inch. wrought galvanized iron pipe....	5,964 00
176 flexible screw couplings, galvanized.	1,056 00
30 days service of a diver....	600 00
30 days hire of lighter....	120 00
30 days hire of tug.....	600 00
Ropes, anchors and gear.....	300 00
Labour, laying pipe across channel....	300 00
900 cubic yards rock excavation....	2,700 00
1,765 lineal feet, 6 inch cast iron pipe, 56,480....	1,412 00
2,000 pounds lead for joints....	100 00
2,500 pounds special castings.....	125 00
Labour, laying pipe, gaskets, also coal, &c.....	225 00
Six hydrants....	100 00
Stop cocks and blow-offs.....	75 00
Contingencies.....	2,223 00
	$18,500 00
Work to be done by city of St. John..	4,725 00
	$23,225 00

The city of St. John is laying a portion of this work from the present terminus of the water service to the island, and the government has agreed to pay two-thirds of the cost, which would amount to $4,735. From the information we now have, we will save money annually through having this pipe put in.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are these supplies being bought by tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS Tenders will be invited for the whole work. The estimate is made by the chief architect of the department and it is to be hoped that the work will be done within that amount.

Mr. MONK. Is a six inch galvanized pipe to be laid from the city of St. John to the island.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. In that estimate I see $2,223 for contingencies. I have not the special knowledge required to criticise the estimate, but $18,500 seems a very large amount for the laying of water pipe from St. John to this quarantine island a distance of some two thousand feet.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is more than that. What has been done with reference to the heating system ? I called the attention of the chief architect to the fact that the heating system was over the heads of the people in their beds and had a very bad effect. Has anything been done to remedy this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend took an appropriation last session for the purpose of making that improvement. The chief architect says a change has been made and is satisfactory.

Mr. BROCK. I think there is a matter of greater importance than looking into details in connection with this quarantine station. Last year we voted $17,000 in this connection and this year we are asked to vote $8,000 more. Will that be the last ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimate of the department is that this will complete the work.

Alexandria public building, $10,000.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would like to know if a site has been procured, and if so, from whom and when ? I do not want to object particularly to a public building in the village of Alexandria, if it be the policy of the government to build post offices costing some $17,000 each in villages having a population of less than 2,000. Looking at the census of 1901, I find that Alexandria has only a population a little over 1,900. I think that the total number of families in the village is 378. It seems to me that to spend $17,000 on a post office in that village, where the gross revenue is only a little over $2,500, from which you will have to deduct the expense of management and caretaking, will be anything but a profitable investment. However, as I said, I do not wish to make any objection. It is in the county adjoining that in which I reside, and it is no doubt the most important town in that county. But it seems to me a very large expenditure on a post office in a small town. I would like to ask if the land has been acquired and tenders called for for the building ; also will $17,000 complete the post office in the village of Alexandria ? If the land has been acquired, from whom was it purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site has not yet been procured nor the contract let.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would urge upon my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to give special consideration to the question of ventilation in public buildings. This has not been attended to as it should have been. Before I left office I called the attention of the chief architect to this point in several instances. I feel also that greater attention should be given to protection against fire. Many of our public buildings have no system of fire protection whatever. The chief architect is a very painstaking officer. I take this opportunity of stating that there is not a better officer in the Department of Public Works. But he has too much work to attend to, and I would call the attention of the minister to the need of giving the chief architect more help, more efficient help.

Mr. SCHELL. I desire to make a remark or two in answer to the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle). The hon. gentleman gives the population of Alexandria as 1,900. I may say that a special census of the town was taken last year, showing that the population was over 2,800. And, since that time Alexandria has been erected into a town.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the population by the regular census of 1901.

Mr. SCHELL. It was 1,911.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has it increased 900 in that time ?

Mr. SCHELL. It has. And, more than that, it has grown that much more during the past year. It has grown to such an extent that, within the last year the Union Bank has put up a building and now has finer bank premises than there is in the town of Cornwall. The Bank of Ottawa also has built a bank upon the opposite corner. The town of Alexandria is growing to-day at a rate exceeded by very few towns in eastern Canada or any part of Ontario.

Mr. BROCK. I would point out to the hon. Minister of Public Works, as he has not selected a site in Alexandria, that he is apt to meet with difficulty when he seeks to buy land in a town growing at such a rate as we have just heard of. It seems there has been an increase in one year of 25 per cent, and now there is a further increase of a like proportion. I think the hon. minister will have to add to this estimate, for he will hardly be able to please the people of Alexandria with anything like the money fixed by this vote.

Mr. SCHELL. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) that there are two sites under consideration, one at $2,000 and the other at $2,500.

Mr. BENNETT. How much land ?

Mr. SCHELL. One lot is 66x90 feet; I do not remember the size of the other.

Mr. PRINGLE. I took the trouble to look at the census of 1901, and I find that the

population given for Alexandria was 1,911. There were 359 houses in the village and 378 families. It is very extraordinary if the population is increasing at the rate of considerably over 30 per cent a year. I know it was a very ambitious village and anxious to be incorporated last year. It had a special census taken and became incorporated. I would like to know if the village of Alexandria volunteered a site for this public building. I understand they are a very liberal community and would have no hesitation in providing a site. We heard nothing about this public building from 1896 to 1900, when Glengarry was represented by Col. R. R. McLennan. It is only within the last year or so since my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Schell) was elected that this thing has been heard of. There are a number of villages in that section, for instance, Morrisburg, a larger village, which, no doubt, would be very anxious to see a good post office erected. If it is the policy of the government to build $17,000 buildings in towns having a population of less than 2,000, I have no doubt these other towns would be very anxious to have them built.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the proposed site a corner lot ?

Mr. SCHELL. One of the lots I spoke of is a corner lot, the other is not. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle) appears to be very much worried over this building and over the fact that nothing was done from 1896 to 1900. He knows very well, and I believe that many of the members of this House know the reason why there was no word of any post office during those years. In 1891 it was decided that there should be a Dominion reformatory built in Alexandria, and a vote was passed in this House to provide money for its construction. Before the change of government came, in 1896, the work upon that building was stopped, and when the new government came in they decided that this Dominion reformatory was unnecessary. They did not proceed to build that reformatory as it was then proposed, for what reason I shall not discuss. The fact remains that the site remained unused, and the material collected was left there. When it was decided not to build the reformatory, the people of Alexandria asked that some building should be erected there. The farm land upon which the reformatory was to have been erected, which had been bought for the benefit of some friends of the late government at more than double what it was worth, was sold. And I expect—that is the understanding, or consideration, to my mind—that the returns from that property will go back into this building. The people of Alexandria expect this post office in lieu of the great reformatory they were to have had.

Mr. PRINGLE. I am very glad to get that explanation. We see now that the post office is not to be built because the public service requires it, but simply to please the people of Alexandria, who have been deprived of a reformatory for which a grant was passed during the time of the late government. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) admitted very frankly that the consideration for the erection of this building was the doing away with the reformatory. I am pleased to get that explanation, that it is not on account of the public requirements, but simply to satisfy the people of Alexandria for having taken the reformatory away from them. I cannot conceive that it was for any public requirement, because the revenue from that post office was very trifling, and the building is not a necessity. However, we understand the matter now. The hon. gentleman tells us that there was a property bought at double its value. Well, I am informed that it was bought at a reasonable value, and was sold to some friends of the hon. gentleman for less than half its value.

Mr. SCHELL. That property was bought for the purpose of a reformatory, and Mr. McNeill sold the property for $2,700 to one of the political friends of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. That party sold it to another political friend for $3,700, and a few weeks afterwards that political friend sold it to the government for $5,000. That is the transaction that took place in those days, that is the way they did it. When the government had possession of it, they advertised it for sale, and the best offer they got was $1,800. I advised that the property should not be sold at that time on account of the general depreciation in value all over the country, and it was not sold. They kept it until, I think, the month of December or November last, when the property was sold for $2,800 cash, after some of the buildings on it had been removed. I consider the property sold at its full value, sold for a higher figure than it was disposed of in the first instance when it was proposed to build a reformatory. There are other things in connection with this transaction. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle) says he understands the reason now. Well, I have been very frank in the statements I have made, and they are the actual facts.

Mr. GOURLEY. This discussion ought not to have imported into it any reference like that made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell), because we must remember that this county was represented by a strong man, Col. McLennan, when the Conservative party were in power, and he was not able to get a post office. Now, however, we find that a large and costly post office is to be put up there. But there is one redeeming feature about it. I recollect a year or two ago, shortly after the publication of the census, one of my French colleagues reflected upon the Anglo-Saxon race in Canada—that they were not produc-

ing more children. Well, I am proud to say that there is one redeeming feature about this county which seems to justify the vote. It appears that there were 357 families in the county of Glengarry, and since the census the population has increased nearly a thousand ; so that during eighteen months every family must have had triplets. Glengarry is a Scotch county, and therefore we may congratulate ourselves that in this county at least the Anglo-Scotch race is not degenerating.

Mr. BENNETT. The case is somewhat different from a case we had last night. The contract has not yet been let, neither has the site been purchased. Now the hon. member for Glengarry states that a lot was offered to the department at $2,000, and having a frontage of 66 feet, that means $30 a foot. From the fact that one of the most desirable and eligible sites in this thriving town of Alexandria is only worth $30 a foot, I think the minister will hesitate whether to go on with such an expenditure. What is the minister going to do, backed up by his associates at the Council board ? I find on reference to the report of the Postmaster General that the postmaster of that town is allowed now for rent, light and fuel, $120 a year. Now is the minister going to invest the large sum of $17,000 in that building ? That is the proposition, and we know it will mean $20,000 before it is finished. When we consider the site at $2,000 it means about $100 interest on the money invested. Now add to that what must be added in every one of these public buildings, the annual maintenance, add the charges of the caretaker, and I suppose he will not sell his services for less than men are paid in other places, and that means a cost of $400 a year. I do not know whether there is in this enterprising town an electric light, but assuming there is, that light will cost another hundred dollars. Then let us add to that the sum of $175 or $200 a year for heating, and we find a grand total of $1675 a year as the actual cost to this country. Surely the Minister of Public Works is going to hesitate before asking the country to incur an annual expenditure of upwards of $2,000 a year where to-day we are getting a sufficient service for $120 a year. The hon. gentleman who represents that riding does not show that the present accommodation at this post office is inadequate. If it is inadequate then it behooves the Postmaster General to ask the postmaster there to make the needed enlargement. Are we going to lay down the principle that in a town of less than 2,000 people there is to be an expenditure every year of $2,000 to maintain a service that is now carried out for $120 ? No doubt the Minister of Public Works is beset by party exigencies, and I concede that he has made out a fairly strong case. Now how does the hon. member for Glengarry compare to-day with the gentleman who preceded him ? Col. McLennan was not able to impress upon the late Conservative administration the necessity of a reformatory in that part of the province, and had his wishes prevailed with the present government a large building would have been erected there. But the hon. gentleman who now represents that riding has no such large ideas. I have no doubt the establishment of a large building at this point would have served very useful ends, but he says : My constituents will be satisfied with securing the expenditure of a smaller sum of money. And if the hon. gentleman gauges the intelligence of his constituents in this way, I am sure no one else will grumble. The Minister of Public Works is laying down this principle to-day that he is going to saddle this country with an annual expenditure of $2,000 to meet a service that is now carried on for $120. I say he should hesitate. He cannot make flesh of one riding and fish of another. Surely he is not going to say to the Conservatives that because they send a Conservative to this House they cannot have a public building ; and he is not going to say to the Liberals on the other hand : Provided you send a representative to support this administration you can have a public building.

Mr. BRODER. As the government propose to establish a post office in the small town of Alexandria, I think it my duty to speak for the town of Morrisburg. It is easy to understand why the hon. gentleman is anxious to have this post office built at Alexandria. There is no doubt what is the real reason when hon. gentlemen opposite got into power in 1896. There was material on the ground to build a reformatory, and they saw fit to take it, and now offer these people a peace offering in the shape of a post office. It is not a post office, it is a peace offering. The town of Morrisburg has a revenue of something over $3,400, while the town of Alexandria, with all its prosperity, has only some $2,600, then there is a double reason why the town of Morrisburg ought to have a post office and custom house. They have a rented building for the custom house as well as for the post office. There is a stronger reason why Morrisburg should have a public building. If you want a stronger reason I am sorry to say that I can give it to you in the fact that there is a large Grit majority and if there is any shrinkage in the town that is the reason for it. There is the strongest reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should do something for their friends in Morrisburg and I do not suppose that they would care who the medium was if they got from their friends here what many of them would like to see—a reasonably valuable building. We do not ask more. If Alexandria is worth $17,000, Morrisburg ought to be worth $20,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite have gone away from a settled principle which was generally adopted in this country of not erect-

ing these buildings in places of less than 5,000 population. That was the generally adopted rule. Whenever it was departed from for any reason whatever by the party in power, the Liberals, who were then in opposition, raised a terrible storm in this House. Now they are as quiet as mice. Why are these hon. gentlemen going so far away from one of their settled principles? They have found out that human nature was just the same in 1896 as it is in 1903 and no man understands this better than the hon. Minister of Public Works. He is going to settle with his friends in Alexandria. They ought to have the building that was proposed to erect previous to 1896, when Col. McLennan was the member. The government did not erect this building because they were afraid that some credit would attach to Col. McLennan and his friends, but now that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) is very anxious that something should be done to settle the account it is proposed to proceed with this building. That is what this is for. It is not being erected in the general public interest. The hon. member for Glengarry does not even say that it is in the public interest. There is not a man in that county who says that the general interest demands any such building.

Mr. SCHELL. They all do.

Mr. BRODER. Not one. The hon. member for Glengarry says that the town has increased 1,000 in population in one year. What is the cause of it? There have been no new factories built at Alexandria; there has been an addition made to the carriage factory that would add perhaps 50 people to the town and no more. There has not been the wonderful expansion that the hon. gentleman talks about. Have hon. gentlemen opposite any plans of this building showing the estimated cost? If they have they have not been laid on the Table. They ought to be laid on the Table. We do not know anything about the size of this building, or the shape of it, and hon. gentlemen opposite do not know anything about the size of it.

An hon. MEMBER. And they never will.

Mr. BRODER. This committee ought to have some information in reference to the building we are going to erect, and a full statement of the estimated cost. If we vote $17,000 this year you may want $17,000 more next year, because Alexandria may grow a thousand in population before next year, and you will want to add to the building. For a post office in a small village like Alexandria, $17,000!—Well, there are 500 towns in this country that have equally good claims upon hon. gentlemen opposite if this is the rule they are going to adopt, and if it is they should surely let the country know it. Now, I venture to say that $2,000 for a lot in Alexandria of the size mentioned by the hon. gentleman is an enormous price. There are a great many towns that would give a desirable lot to erect a building upon if the government would give them a $17,000 post office. I venture to say there is not another town in eastern Ontario which would not be glad to give you a site for a public building. We will give you one in Morrisburg free and if you are going in for good bargains, you never will have a better chance. This Alexandria business is not a good bargain. This is the settlement of an old account; hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to repudiate it, but the town would not allow them to do it, and so they have to come to time with the cash. I want to speak in all seriousness, and to say that I have a right to demand some consideration for the town of Morrisburg. Hon. gentlemen opposite may think it is badly represented, but that is the people's business; it is not your business. I say it is fairly well represented, and I demand our rights in this matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Broder), I think has made out a strong case for the town of Morrisburg. I would not like to say, however, that the people of that town are badly represented after the able speech that the hon. gentleman has just delivered. My hon. friend is mistaken when he says that it is the usual custom to lay the plans of proposed buildings on the Table. The custom has been first to take a vote, and then, according to the vote, the architect makes a plan suitable to the place in which the building is to be erected.

Mr. SPROULE. I would just say in regard to these post offices, that I have thought for some years past, and I referred to it last year, as I do again now, that in all towns where they want public buildings there should be an effort made to get these towns to give the sites free. I know that several towns in Canada have offered sites free in the past, while in others large amounts of money have been paid for sites. I do not think that such should be the case. If an enterprising town is anxious to get a public building, it will usually be found willing to provide the site, or, at least, to bear a portion of the cost of the site. I think the government ought to endeavour to get a site from every town that requires a public building. I am not in favour of putting up expensive buildings in small towns. I have always thought that where we could get accommodation for the post office, or the custom house, or other public service, at a very much less cost than the cost of erecting and maintaining a public building, we should not put up public buildings. If it is a fact that in the town of Alexandria you could rent a suitable place and pay for rent, heating, lighting and everything about $300 a year, while, on the other hand the interest upon this proposed expenditure and the cost of heating and lighting will be somewhere

between $1,200 and $2,000 a year, why should you expend this amount for maintenance in addition to having a large debt hanging over you for the erection of a building? It is not good business to do this. In most of these places there is no provision to prevent the destruction by fire of everything belonging to the service. There is no safe, or vault or anything but the plain building. Yet, we go to the expense of erecting a building and saddling upon the country a permanent debt involving an annual charge for maintenance of three times that which would be incurred by renting a building. We have this expense imposed upon us from year to year, because the government thought fit, either to strengthen the position of their friends, or for some other purpose that we do not know, perhaps for the purpose of carrying elections, to saddle the country with a heavy permanent expense without receiving anything in return. The government ought to consider this, and I think the country ought to know what an expenditure of this kind involves. It is not a good business transaction. I am sure every one will agree with that. I can go into Ontario towns by the dozen that are larger than Alexandria, that do more business, that have a larger gross revenue from the post office and that have never yet asked to have a post office built. I think that when a principle is adopted it should be applied to the whole country instead of picking out a favoured locality here and there, a small town here and another there, and let places twice or three times as large go without the advantage of an expenditure of this kind. I do not think this is right. The government, when it puts up a large and costly building and saddles the country with a permanent expense as well as a permanent debt, when the same conveniences could be supplied by renting a building for less than one quarter the money required for erecting a building, is not doing the best that could be done for the country.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman, before we leave this interesting subject of establishing post offices in the Dominion, I desire to call the hon. minister's attention to another deserving town. I hope I shall be able to get the minister's attention, because if I succeed in getting his attention for a few minutes, I have no doubt I will be rewarded by having an appropriation made for this town which is very much a parallel case to the case of Alexandria.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What is the population?

Mr. LENNOX. The population is not over 1,500 or 1,600, and in this respect I regret to say that it has not increased with the rapidity of the town of Alexandria. It is a steadily growing town. They have the average number of births from time to time, but I do not think there has been such a rapid increase in the population as in the case of Alexandria. I refer, of course, to the town of Alliston, in the south riding of Simcoe. I want to be perfectly fair with the government and not take away from them any credit they are fairly entitled to. I will admit at the outset that the government have done pretty fairly for Alliston already. It is true that we have never had, in the south riding of Simcoe to my knowledge, one dollar expended on any public work. It is quite true, too, that we have never asked for the expenditure of one dollar on any public work, but the government have done something for the residents of South Simcoe and particularly of Alliston. In the neighbourhood of Alliston there resided Mr. Joseph Whitesides, a very respectable farmer and a candidate in the last election, who has been appointed postmaster of the town of Aliston, and it is on this account that I am so anxious to secure for the town of Alliston a post office. It is pretty nearly a parallel case with Alexandria. The net revenue for Alexandria is $1,595.78 and the net revenue for Alliston is $1,437.98. In urging this matter with all due earnestness, I call the minister's attention to the fact that this is the only way in which you can get public money into the riding of South Simcoe as far as I know. Almost any where else there are a variety of things on which you can spend public money, whether it is in the interest of the country or not, but in the riding of South Simcoe there is nothing on which you can expend public treasure except to build a post office in Alliston. It is true we have harbours; we have a little spot—I do not know if it has a name—on the south shore of Kempenfeldt Bay, which closely resembles the port of Hawkestone, on the other side, in which the government has built a dock. I have not seen my way clear to ask the government to expend any money upon a dock on the south shore, although I have been urged to do so by the way of equalizing the expenditure on the Hawkestone dock. I hope the minister will pardon me for urging this, perhaps too persistently, but having regard to the fact that the postmaster, who has been to some extent rewarded, has not all the accommodation he is entitled to; having regard to the fact—I know the minister will not overlook this—that South Simcoe has always returned a Conservative; having regard more particularly to the fact that there is no other means of expending public money in the riding; I hope the minister and the Cabinet will take this matter into their serious consideration, and will in the supplementary estimates put in an appropriation for a post office in the town of Alliston.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the item is adopted I hope the Minister of Public Works will state in reply to the hon. mem-

ber for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle) what the policy of he government is in regard to this matter. To say the least of it, it is not a businesslike way in the expenditure of public money, to select a little town here and there over the country and to spend $17,000 or $20,000 for a post office in it. If it is a good policy for the town of Alexandria in the public interest of Canada, it is a good policy I suppose for every other town of like importance. I have urged upon the government during the past two sessions that some definite principle should be laid down with regard to public works of this character. It is only right that the minister should state what the policy of the government is. Is it the policy of the government that in towns of this size there shall be a public building costing $17,000 or $20,000 for a post office alone. If it is not the policy of the government, why is an exception made in this case ? If it is the policy of the government, why is that policy not carried out in regard to other towns ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can remember that for a great many years when in opposition we demanded from the Conservative government to know their policy with regard to the erection of public buildings. Probably, in some cases we are not as careful as we might be to avoid following the example of our predecessors in office. I said last night that if we went into this policy of erecting public buildings at all, the principle town in each of the counties has a very strong claim. You can look at the records since confederation and you will find that previous governments have erected public buildings in towns which would compare very unfavourably with the town of Alexandria. There may be something in what my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) says, that the government is perhaps everywhere saving large expenditures of money by stopping what they consider to be unnecessary works in the public interest, and spending a very small amount instead. With regard to the policy of the government at the present time, I am not in a position to announce any particular change. Each application will no doubt be considered upon its merits. Previous governments having erected public buildings all through the various provinces, those places which have not had a public building feel very much agrieved at what they call the injustice done them in comparison with other places. That rule applies whether they are supporters of the government or not. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) says there is only one thing the government could spend money on in his constituency and therefore he wants a post office. That being the case in many rural constituencies they would appreciate very much if a nice public building were erected in the county town which they take so much pride in. I live in a rural constituency and in the chief town of my county we had a very strong claim for a public building. In that town the revenue derived justified the erection of a public building, but although demands were made it was always refused by the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Borden) and his friends when they were in power. I am quite willing to admit that there is great difficulty in satisfying the country with regard to any policy on this matter. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) has the great honour of living in a large city and we expend hundreds of thousands of dollars, I might almost say millions of dollars on public buildings in that city. We are asking now for a vote of $250,000 for a public building in his city and it will cost a good deal more than that before it is ready for occupation. Those of us who represent rural constituencies like my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and myself find that our people are not altogether well satisfied that all these large expenditures should be made in the city constituencies. Whether that is defensible or not from every standpoint, the fact remains that every member in this House from a rural constituency, be he Liberal or Conservative, knows that his friends do take that view, and they look for some recognition of this kind. This is one of the largest places in the constituency. It is an old established, growing and prosperous place. And the people feel that in view of what has taken place elsewhere, they are entitled to a public building. The cost of the building will be kept within the amount of the appropriation. It is not my intention to ask for a further vote to complete this work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hope that my hon. friend did not seriously put forward the proposition that because some previous government made appropriations which might not be defended, that is any reply for him on this occasion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a good deal of human nature in man.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend's statement of the policy of the government is a frank statement that they have no policy at all beyond political exigencies. They have no policy except to erect public buildings wherever they are demanded by political exigencies. That is a very frank statement on the part of my hon. friend. If his explanation means anything at all it means that whenever political pressure is brought on the government, the government will take that into consideration and expend public money provided the pressure be only strong enough. I do not think that that is after all a very high standard of public administration. I do not know that my hon. friend would so regard it himself. I am not criticising him personally, but the policy and

the system, and I must say that he has been remarkably frank. Is that the way in which the government, who are trustees for the people, and who are spending, not their own, but the money of the people, should deal with public revenue. Suppose they were to apply to the public expenditure the principle on which any ordinary corporation conducts its affairs, would they not have some policy with regard to expenditures of this kind ? Would they not be able to announce to the public, as private corporations do to their shareholders, some policy regulating these matters ? But no, my hon. friend fails to do this. He frankly confesses that the government has no policy and simply confesses that the government puts up these public buildings wherever they think the expenditure will do political good. In all seriousness, apart from party politics, I think the government should announce some policy. They are not spending their own money but that of the people, and they are spending it as trustees of the people, and certainly it does not seem at all satisfactory in the public interest that they should spend that money for the reasons given by the Minister of Public Works to-night.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). I come from a town which I consider a very good one indeed, but which certainly has not the population which the hon. gentleman would consider entitled it to a public building. It has a population in the neighbourhood of one thousand, but some few years ago, in the days of the late government, there was expended there the sum of $14,000 public money in the erection of a post office. On that occasion no request was made to the town to supply a site free of expense. The government in those days did not act on that line and should not to-day. If the government require a lot for a public building, they should pay for it and not encourage the bonus system of putting up buildings in towns which gave a bonus in order to obtain them. I may say that that post office has given satisfaction to the people of the town and that no caretaker has been required for it, which rather contradicts the anticipation of an hon. member opposite that the post office in Alexandria would necessitate a caretaker at a cost of $400 per annum to the people. As representing a rural constituency, I heartily agree with my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). His case and mine are very much similar. We have no very large towns in our constituencies, but is that any reason why all the expenditure of public money should be made in the cities and large towns and none in those constituencies which do not enjoy such large centres. The city from which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition comes—the most excellent city of Halifax—had an expenditure, in the days of the late government, of I believe $350,000 on a drill shed alone. I am not going into the argument as to the utility of expending so large a sum in that connection, but merely wish to point out that our large cities have been given, at the public expense, extremely fine public buildings and should not object to small places getting a far less share of the public money. Besides we should not consider merely the population of the town alone, but also take into consideration the fact that it is a center of a district, and the whole population of that district ought to be taken into account. We are asked by the hon. leader of the opposition to apply the same principles as would be applied by a private business corporation, but we know very well that we cannot apply those principles to the same extent in administration of public affairs. These public buildings are not only intended for the transaction of public business but also to beautify the localities in which they are built.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Now my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has got a principle and a policy laid down for him, and that is the policy of beautifying the different localities. I think on the whole that that is a superior policy to the one announced by the hon. minister. I am glad at all events to commend it to the Minister of Public Works for what it is worth. But I was not making any distinction between cities, towns and villages, but was simply pointing out the necessity of our having a policy in this matter. According to the very frank statement of the Minister of Public Works it is not the public interests which governs, but political exigencies, and these public buildings are not erected on any settled policy at all, but simply as they are necessitated by political pressure. I am quite willing that my remarks should apply to Halifax or any other place just as much as to any town or village in this country, and I should think that would be evident to any hon. gentleman who listened to what I said.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) would look up ancient history and see how long this House was held up by the opposition of that day, when the late government brought down a proposal to spend money on the erection of a post office at Cayuga, he perhaps would be convinced that he was rather rash in his remarks and rushed in where angels fear to tread. No people could possibly have condemned the government in stronger or more vehement language than his friends did for the building of that very post office, and now he comes forward and offers that as a defence of the conduct of the present government for doing likewise. If it was wrong in one case, it must be wrong in the other, and in proportion as the hon. gentleman commends it now he condemns the conduct of his friends in the past. He must be careful to inform himself of the history

of the past before he takes such a position as he has taken to-night. I find some other cases similar to this, and I would like to read them for the benefit of the House. At Alexandria, where it is proposed to build a post office, the gross revenue is $2,664; the table does not give the cost of rent. At Alliston, in Simcoe, the gross revenue is $2,434. At Aurora, one of the thriving towns in the riding represented by the hon. Postmaster General himself, the revenue is $2,974, and the cost for rent, fuel and light is $140. So that if you take the interest on $15,000, if this post office only costs that, at 3½ per cent, it amounts to $525 a year, besides which there are repairs, a caretaker at a cost of about $400 a year, and all the other incidental expenses. Why should you saddle the country with a permanent expenditure of from $1,200 to $2,000 a year for what you can get for $140? If the hon. Minister of Public Works desires to carry on a conversation while I am speaking, and the hon. member for Haldimand wishes to interrupt me, I would like him to understand we have rights in the opposition which we intend to exercise, and we expect to be treated with the courtesy to which we are entitled. I listened to him without interrupting him, and I ask him to extend to me the courtesy that is usually extended by one gentleman to another. I have heard the hon. Postmaster General years ago, in the time of the Conservative regime, saying that the principle we had adopted with regard to building post offices was that when we could get the accommodation necessary at a reasonable price by renting, we would not put up a public building. But he went further and declared it to be the policy of the government, when they proposed to put up a public building or to improve a harbour, to first ask the town or city where the improvement was to be made, whether it would be prepared to provide a site, or to contribute something towards the improvement. The hon. member for Haldimand says the town should not be required to do that, because this is the only opportunity we have of spending money in these rural constituencies. It may or may not be; but many of our towns would gladly give a free site if by doing so they could get a public building. They have offered it over and over again, towns of considerable importance, and the offer has not been accepted. In this case, what we complain of is that the Minister of Public Works does not inquire what the town will give, but purchases a very expensive site, probably from some friend of the government. Let me name some more of these towns. Blenheim has a gross revenue of $2,310, and no post office. Brighton has a revenue of $2,053, but no post office; Bowmanville, $2,721; Burford, $2,283; Campbellford, $2,344; but I need not go over them all. They are here in large numbers in the hon. Postmaster General's own report, showing that in most cases the people are accommodated at an outlay of from $65 to $150 a year for rent, fuel and light; and when we can obtain the necessary accommodation for such a small sum, why should we saddle the country with an expenditure of from $15,000 to $20,000, and a permanent outlay of from $1,200 to $2,000 a year? I do not think the country will endorse it or regard it as good business.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). I have to thank the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) for two things: First for having given me a lesson in manners. I must apologize to the hon. gentleman for having taken part in a short conversation with my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works while he was speaking. I think I listen to the hon. member of East Grey as often as any man in this House does. I find in his speeches very often a great deal of valuable information, which as a young member I am glad to obtain. I do not think in this particular case the hon. member should have called the attention of the Committee so pointedly to my case, because there were several gentlemen on his own side who were engaged in conversation; but they were behind his back, and probably he did not see them. Second: because he has called attention to some ancient history. That has always been a favourite pursuit of mine, and I have gathered from it that in the case of this very Cayuga post office, the hon. gentleman himself supported and voted for it. If so, how can he condemn the government for undertaking to do what he approved of in years gone by?

Mr. SPROULE. So far as my memory enables me to speak, I cannot say that I ever voted for it or supported it; but I am only pointing to the fact that the hon. gentleman is condemning his own friends so unstintedly when he cites that as an example to justify what is being done to-night.

Mr. LANCASTER. In view of what has been said by the hon. member for Haldimand, I think I ought to call his attention to a little modern history in the form of the Auditor General's report, which has been received only a few days ago. Looking into that report, I find under the head of Cayuga public building that the caretaker, G. A. Gibson, a name well known to me, got $50.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). I may tell the hon. gentleman that he is also the postmaster.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understood the hon. member for Haldimand to tell the House very frankly that there was no caretaker in the Cayuga post office. Of course, I do not live as near Cayuga as my hon. friend, but I live near enough to be able to look up these things. As we are getting more information from the hon. member for Haldimand than we are from the Minister of Public Works, I think we ought to warn

him to give us correct information, but, at the same time to encourage him to give us all he can. I will follow that Cayuga business for just a few more items. For instance, I find here expenditures amounting to $721 including repairs, polished brass door handles, oak grill and corners and so on. This post office at Cayuga was not supposed to be costing anything more than the ordinary expenditure, but last year, by the Auditor General's report there was this expenditure of $721 including caretaker. This is an instance in which the Minister of Public Works might perhaps do better than rely entirely upon the hon. member for Haldimand for information to be given to this House. I do not know what this expenditure would have been if the hon. member (Mr. Thompson) had been at home. He was away in England—properly enough, no doubt. But, in his absence, or before he went or after he came back, these expenditures of $721 of which he knew nothing, took place. I would almost be inclined to urge the Minister of Public Works to keep the hon. member at home so that he may look after some of these expenditures. I trust that when we come to the Postmaster General's estimates he will move to strike out some of these amounts as being improper. He had better find out who this G. A. Gibson is and make him refund that $50, as he is not a caretaker in a regular sense and has no right to it according to the statement of the hon. member for Haldimand.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I understood the hon. member for Glengarry—and I would like to ask if I did correctly understand him, for I have no wish to misrepresent him—he told us that before the item was put into the estimates last year to buy the site a census had been taken of the village of Alexandria. That census had been taken by the authorities there and they made the number something over 2,800, if I understood him correctly.

An hon. MEMBER. It was circus day.

Mr. SCHELL. 2,280.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood him to say 2,800. An hon. gentleman suggests that the census was taken while a circus was in town. I think I must have understood the hon. gentleman correctly, because his figures showed an increase of about 1,000, for someone who followed him asked if the place had increased eight or nine hundred in a year. I would like to ask if the census was taken prior to the $7,000 being put in the estimates last year to purchase a site ?

Mr. SCHELL. No, that census was not taken prior to the $7,000 being put in the estimates. The census was taken by the authority of the reeve and council, and taken under oath, as the census of that kind must always be, as the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) probably knows, and the statement was forwarded to Toronto with the request that the place be incorporated as a town.

Mr. BENNETT. At what time of the year was it ?

Mr. SCHELL. It was in 1902, I think in September or October.

An hon. MEMBER. Was there a circus there then ?

Mr. SCHELL. No, there was no circus.

An hon. MEMBER. Was there a fall fair on ?

Mr. SCHELL. No, there was no fall fair.

Mr. PRINGLE. Before the item passes I wish to place myself fairly on record with regard to this matter. Personally if it is the policy of the government to erect a seventeen thousand dollar building in towns of less than 2,000 population, there is no county outside of the county of Stormont in which I would rather see those buildings erected than in the county of Gengarry. I raised this question largely to ascertain from the government what their policy was in regard to the erection of post offices. I understood from the hon. member from Glengarry that it was not erected because the public service required it, but it was erected in consideration of the government having deprived the county of Glengarry of the reformatory for which an estimate was passed during the term of the late government. But, though I desired to ascertain the policy of the government, I have not ascertained very clearly what they intend to do with regard to post offices in towns the size of Alexandria.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the Minister of Public Works to say something about a free site. Is it the policy of the government to get free sites for all the public buildings that are erected ? What free sites have already been given ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry I have not the list of sites that have been given, but I know that such things have been done.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that in the riding I have the honour to represent there is a large, flourishing town by the name of Campbellford. It has a population of between two and three thousand. It is a manufacturing town and I think the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) will bear me out in saying that it is one of the busiest and most flourishing towns in eastern Ontario. I am not opposing the government in building post offices, but I think we should have some mode under which the population of the places in which these buildings are to be erected should be taken into consideration, and not show partiality. I can remember very well when the Minister of Public Works was in opposition, I used to hear considerable from him on that

line. Now, I hope he will not mete out to me what he thought it unfair for the Conservative government to mete out to him. I hope he will not discriminate against my riding because it happens to be represented by a Conservative. That is a line of argument, that I remember, he used to use in regard to his own flourishing village. Speaking seriously, it has always seemed absurd to me for hon. gentlemen opposite, when they are criticised by members on this side, to say, in effect. 'You're another ; you did it.' That is the most absurd argument that could be advanced by an intelligent man. I can understand that I may have made mistakes ; I can understand that the Conservative government may have made mistakes ; but I cannot see any common sense in these hon. gentlemen opposite arraigning the Conservative government before the House and country for making mistakes, and, when they themselves do the very things which they condemned in others, seek to justify themselves by the one answer, 'You did it.' That is the very height of hypocrisy. If they find they are wrong in the past, let them say frankly : We made a mistake, and we are going to take the responsibility of carrying out the principles that we condemned you for when you were in power.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to make a last appeal to my hon. friend. I have the honour of representing a riding containing two towns which are of great importance, Wallaceburg and Dresden. They are among the best business towns of the province. One yields a revenue of $4,000 and the other of $2,247. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has had an application for a public building in either of these towns, such as is being built in Alexandria. Within the last year a building has been erected in each of these places costing over half a million dollars, I mean the two sugar factories. There is a sad story connected with the history of public buildings, or the lack of public buildings in the county of Bothwell. The Liberals said that when Bothwell was represented by a Liberal it was punished for thirty years for sending a Liberal to parliament. There were many salty tears shed by hon. gentlemen opposite on that ground. To-day that riding has changed its political allegiance, and it is again being punished for the same reason. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me what solution he can offer us for this problem ?

An hon. MEMBER. Suicide.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, that is probably what it is coming to, because I see in the newspapers that that riding is to disappear in the new Redistribution Bill.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall take a note of the two towns the hon. gentleman mentions. I would just say to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) that he misunderstood me altogether. In his county, if I remember right, the county town had a very fine building, and some of these places are not so favourably situated.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is an agitation in the country to-day in favour of a rural postal delivery. That is an idea that is growing rapidly in the United States, and the farmers of Canada are asking to have the same thing. This money that is now being wasted on these public buildings, if applied to rural post office delivery, would give the farmers a substantial benefit for their money. For $500, which is the interest on these post offices, you could have four good rural postal delivery routes established; and for the money expended on thirty of such buildings, which we shall probably be asked to vote for, you could establish eighty rural postal delivery routes. That is something the people want. The government have been asked if they have a policy in regard to rural mail delivery, and they say they have it under consideration. I fear that their answer will be that they cannot afford the money. I appeal to the members of this House who come from rural constituencies to ask the government to cease wasting money in unproductive ways, and devote it to rural postal delivery. Let them at least commence with an experiment of 50 or 100 routes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Since the Minister of Public Works is receiving appeals for public buildings in towns of over 2,000 of a population, I wish to put in an appeal for the town of Durham in my constituency. It must be known to many members of this House that this is one of the most thriving and prosperous towns in Ontario, rapidly increasing in industry and population. It is very much in need of a public building of the character we are now discussing.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I do not hear the hon. gentleman complaining so much of the want of post office facilities. If it is the policy of the government to erect buildings in places of the size of Alexandria, there are several towns of that size in my constituency in need of public buildings. I will mention Rodney, West Lorne and Dutton, large and thriving villages with no public buildings. I am not anxious to have buildings erected where they are not necessary, I do not want to see public money squandered, but if we are going to squander it I want a share for my constituency.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Public Works should remember that he has just now heard from an independent member of the House, and if he wants his support, let him promise him two or three post offices in his constituency.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the policy of the government with regard to building post offices ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have explained as fully as I could that this vote is supplementary to the vote given last session.

Mr. SPROULE. He must have some policy with regard to putting up these public buildings.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The policy of the government is to erect these buildings where they are required, having due regard to the public interest and the revenue received.

Mr. SPROULE. If these are the rules we can only turn up the Postmaster General's report and find that they are violated in a hundred instances. So that, he is either admitting his own act, or, otherwise, is dishonouring his own rule, because, when you take places like Owen Sound, where there is a revenue of $14,000, you find there is no post office built there, but seven years ago I was there when the present Postmaster General was dangling that question before the people of North Grey, and saying that if they wanted, as the late Mr. Hardy said, 'warm justice,' they should send a supporter of the government to parliament. He said: 'Here is a thriving town and your friends have been in power for a number of years and they have not put a public building up.' He went around and looked at two or three sites that he said would be eligible sites for a post office, yet, that town which has a revenue of $14,000 has no post office. The hon. Minister of Public Works said last year: 'Our principle is this: If we require a post office, a custom house and an inland revenue office, we make an effort to put up one building that will accommodate the three, as we think it is better that we should have all these buildings together.' There is at Owen Sound, a post office, a custom house and an inland revenue office, and the three of them are realizing a large revenue, but there is no post office building. What rule is the hon. gentleman going to apply? Now, he has a post office rented there from one of his friends at $600 a year. However, I am not complaining if it appears that this plan has supplied the needs of the place, because, I hold that if the public needs can be supplied in this way for a small outlay, the government are not justified in making the large outlay necessary for the erection of public buildings. I ask the hon. gentleman what principle has he adopted, and if he has adopted the principle that was enunciated last year, why he does not follow it more closely, and why is it that we have such glaring examples of improper expenditures as the case that has been cited here to-night.

Bowmanville, public buildings, $10,000.

Mr. BROCK. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has bought a property in Bowmanville on which to put this post office, and if so, will he say from whom, and what figure has been paid for it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A site has not been purchased. There are some negotiations going on with the town, and I had an interview with members of the council. There has been a proposition made by the town to take some property they have, but the negotiation has not been completed. I hope that we will be able to come to some agreement that will be satisfactory, because this site will be more satisfactory perhaps than any other site we could obtain.

Mr. BROCK. Bowmanville is a very old town. It has been in existence and the post office has been there for about 100 years. I am not aware that the town has been increasing in population lately, and I have not heard that there has been any great fault found with the present post office arrangements there. Is there a demand from Bowmanville that $15,000 should be spent there? The hon. minister must remember that they have done a large business in the post office there at an expense of about $300 a year, and I do not think there has been such an expansion of trade in the town, or that there have been new factories established to an extent that would justify a very large expenditure at the present time. I say justify—I mean justify upon anything like business principles. I cannot attempt to enter into all the reasons that might induce the government to erect a post office in that town. But, I find that a new principle has been enunciated. We used to get most of our explanations in reference to expenditures from the minister himself, but I find that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) has spoken for his county and has given us some valuable information on some points, and I would suggest that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Beith) might probably give us a little information on this subject, together with the reasons why the important town of Bowmanville should have a $15,000 expenditure for a post office. Now, Mr. Chairman, the government are supplying the House with a rod with which to beat the backs of the people of Canada for a great many years to come. We know how demoralizing the cry is in the United States' 'to the victors belong the spoils,' but I can assure you that this is being taken note of in Canada to-day and that the honest, respectable Reformers are the people who are finding the most fault with it.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. BROCK. There is one of them; he is endeavouring to hide his light. The government have been asked this evening upon what principle they are carrying out the erection of these public buildings. I do not think that is an unreasonable ques-

tion to ask them. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works is quite capable of saying upon what principle the government are acting. It is a pleasure to go into matters with him because he so good-natured and I think he should allow his good nature to manifest itself to explain to the country, not to the opposition, upon what principle they are acting. Are you going to spend an amount of money proportionate to the size of the town, the village, or the city in which you are putting up these public buildings or are you going to take note of the important demands made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) and which is being made by the farmers throughout the province of Ontario very largely for a rural postal delivery ? Take the expenditure of $17,000 that you are making in Alexandria —the interest upon that sum alone will go a long way towards supplying the farmers of my hon. friend's constituency with a postal delivery to say nothing of the convenience it would be to them at the same time. It is, I know, a new departure, but the government have been making a great many new departures. When they were in opposition they took one course, now that they are in power, now that they are able to dispense patronage and now that they are in receipt of handsome salaries as ministers they are taking another course. We are anxious, we on this side of the House to know on what principle this expenditure is based, because we wish to see that the principle is applied in every case fairly and equitably. If the Minister of Public Works will to-night commit the government or commit himself to a principle, we will be prepared to let estimates of this kind through not only this session but other sessions without very much criticism, because we are not so anxious to criticise the particular items as we are the principle of the thing. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has characterized the action of the minister pretty strongly, and therefore he ought in duty not only to the country, but to his own friends, give an explanation. I am sorry to see so few of the gentlemen on the back benches coming to the assistance of the Minister of Public Works, or any other minister for that matter. They seem to have entrusted the affairs of their constituents to the members of the cabinet, when in the best interest of their people they ought to look after those interests themselves. Last night my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) had to draw the attention of the government to grievances in Manitoba and the North-west. There was not a Liberal member from the west to speak for that great and growing country, and it had to be done by a Conservative member. I am endeavouring to relieve the members of the government to some extent from a very unpleasant and very difficult duty, for if it is a very difficult duty for the Minister of Public Works it must be doubly so for other members of the government who have not that versified knowledge of general affairs that he has. Some of his supporters behind him are voluble enough at times, and I do not see why they should be silent now and allow money to be expended without a word of explanation and without being able to report to their constituents upon what principle the government is acting.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) asked a pertinent question as to whether the people of Bowmanville, in the county of Durham, requested this expenditure to be made. My hon. friend (Mr. Brock) seems very much opposed to expenditures of this kind, but I may tell him that this matter was as urgently pressed upon the government by the people of Bowmanville as was another expenditure pressed by two deputations from the city of Toronto, and it is my opinion that the Bowmanville expenditure is every bit as defensible as the other. I was pleased to give my support to the expenditure in Toronto although I had some little doubt, still I thought it was for the national benefit.

Mr. CLARKE. What was that expenditure for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That Fair of yours.

Mr. CLARKE. The Dominion Exhibition, was it not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) to remember that the Conservative government put an item in the estimates for a building in Bowmanville, and I think we are justified in following that example when we see that in this old prosperous and rich county of Durham the comparatively small town of Bowmanville gives us a revenue of $15,000 a year.

Mr. SPROULE. It is $4,500 if the Postmaster General is right.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This building will be for Customs, Inland Revenue and Post Office and the total revenue is over $15,000. I think the expenditure for a small public building in a town like that is perfectly justifiable on public grounds and I believe that the people of Bowmanville had a very strong claim upon this government as it had on the Conservative government who put an item in the estimates for this work.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $10,000 or $12,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But you vote $10,000 this year and $5,000 last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount I stated was for the building alone.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I was not in the election in West Durham some years ago, but it was there I first heard of a post office for Bowmanville. A couple of nights before the election, the friends of gentlemen opposite issued circulars to the faithful calling on them to vote for Robert Beith as member for West Durham in order that they would be in a position to appear before this government and get a post office. I would like to know if the minister could inform us who was responsible for the issuing of that circular.

Mr. BENNETT. 'Cap' Sullivan.

Mr. BEITH. I wish to state to the hon. member (Mr. Hughes)——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Beith) will be good enough to speak to the House ; I don't want to talk to him.

Mr. BEITH. I wish to say to the House that no such circulars were issued previous to my election in 1902, nor was there any promise from the government either directly or indirectly that a public building would be put up in Bowmanville. I might say to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), who asked me with regard to the necessity for a public building in Bowmanville, that prior to the Liberal party coming into power and when the government which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) had the honour to support was in office, a deputation came down from Bowmanville to interview the Conservative government, asking for the erection of a public building in Bowmanville. They were promised that building by the Conservative government, and that promise was used against me in my election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MACLEAN. I beg to move :—

That the Committee rise and report to the House that in the opinion of the committee the public interest would be better served by the expenditure of public money in the direction of establishing rural postal delivery routes, rather than in erecting post offices in towns of less than 3,000 population.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I agree that the question of rural postal delivery is one that is rapidly coming to the front, and under the able management of the present Postmaster General there is a probability at an early date of steps being taken in that direction ; at least I hope so. At the same time that does not do away with the necessity for erecting post offices, for even if we had a rural delivery we would still want post offices. The Motion is inopportune. So far as the question of erecting public buildings is concerned it is very amusing to those of us who have been in the House to hear that principle opposed by the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Taylor); the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and the member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), when we find from their record that they heartily supported the Conservative government in erecting post offices in towns where the revenue was only $400 or $500 or $600 a year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name one.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) that I never did so in this House, and I ask him to give me his evidence that I did.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Look over the records and you will find all about it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Cayuga has been named as one.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the revenue only $400 or $500 a year ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Look at Laprairie and see what the revenue is. In 1892 a post office was erected there. In the county of Peel there was another post office erected in a town where the revenue was very small. There is a good deal to be said in favour of the position of the Minister of Public Works when he points out that in those counties there has been no expenditure of public money at all. In all the large cities enormous sums of money are spent, and I do not think there is any serious objection to erecting reasonably good buildings in these comparatively small places, which are important as the centres of large sections. This custom has been followed ever since confederation. The old government followed it, and they were supported by the House at that time. There is considerable to be said in favour of it, because this is the only money that can be spent in these places, and it serves a good purpose. But coming back to the motion that has been made by the hon. member for East York, even if we had rural delivery, it would be necessary in my opinion to have a post office. We have in the city of Toronto a free postal delivery, but it is found absolutely necessary at the same time to erect postal stations in different parts of the city.

Mr. MACLEAN. We want one in West Toronto and one in North Toronto.

Mr. CAMPBELL. North Toronto is not in the city, and it has not free postal delivery yet ; but I suppose at an early date, when that system is adopted, it will have it. In Toronto we are spending $20,000 or $30,000 for remodelling the general post office ; we are also erecting a postal station on Queen street west ; and I believe it is intended by the hon. Postmaster General to

divide the city into several stations, and three or four more post offices will probably be required in the city. Applications are now in for three more. So that even if rural postal delivery comes, post offices will be required. We cannot have delivery without some place for sorting and distributing the mails. Therefore I think the motion of the hon. member for East York is not one that should receive the sanction of the House.

Mr. SCHELL. This discussion seems to have gone along the line of post offices, whereas in the case of Bowmanville as well as the case of Alexandria the accommodation for the customs office has also to be taken into account. I understand from the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Beith) that the revenue derived at Bowmanville from the post office and the customs office together amounts to about $15,000 a year. So far as the town of Alexandria is concerned, I may mention that when our importations come in from the United States, we never know whetner they come by way of Smth's Falls, Cornwall, or Montreal. Sometimes for weeks and months we are unable to get our customs returns. So that this expenditure is not alone for post office purposes, but is also for the convenience of the public in the matter of a custom office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think my hon. friend for East York is in earnest in making this motion.

Mr. MACLEAN. I beg pardon. I never was more in earnest in my life.

Mr. FRASER. That may prove nothing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. member may be right; but if he wishes to get a fair expression of opinion from this House in regard to the policy of rural delivery, he has taken the very course which any one would take who was opposed to it; because under the present circumstances members will be compelled to vote against the motion no matter what their view may be. The hon. gentleman is experienced enough in the House to know that that must be the result of his action at the present time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I just rise to correct a statement which was made in regard to the Bowmanville post office. My recollection is most distinct that it was made an issue in the last election. Unless my hon. friend from West Durham was safely caged away or knew nothing of what was going on, I can assure him that he must have known that the Bowmanville post office was used throughout the length and breadth of that town for one night at all events before his election.

Mr. BENNETT. It was Cap. Sullivan the night before.

Mr. MACLEAN. There may be a right way of proceeding with this matter, and there may be a wrong way; but I am taking advantage of the present situation to ask the representatives of the people in this House to-night to put themselves on record as against this expenditure of public money, which is not in the public interest, but, so far as we can gather, is for the payment of political claims. I am quite within my right in proposing to divide the House on this great issue. There is no question before the people to-day that interests them so much as the question of rural postal delivery. The farmers are awake to it, and I am an old enough member of the House to seize this opportunity to bring it before the people, and I intend to put hon. gentlemen on record on the question. I intend to make them say whether they are in favour of these extravagant expenditures for post offices, or whether, like me, they prefer to see the public money put into that experiment of rural postal delivery. Have they seen what it amounts to in the United States to-day? The expenditure is away up in the millions; but in the benefits it confers on the people, it has completely changed life in the rural districts of the United States. These postal routes are being established in that country for $500 apiece on the average. Look how we are expending public money for the delivery of the mails in this country. I know routes which are costing $500 or $600 for a poor service for four or five post offices, when, if the same money were spent on the modern plan, it would give the people ten times the accommodation. There is only one way to bring these questions before the public, and hon. gentlemen are up against a great issue. It may be a bolt from the blue, but it is in the right direction, and I ask them to say whether they are in favour of rural delivery or in favour of spending public money on these country post offices.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) This is a very important question, and it has assumed a very curious shape. But speaking seriously, if you want a successful rural delivery, you must have a proper place from which that delivery can take place. You must have modern post offices from which rural delivery may take place, and when the hon. member is advocating rural delivery he is at the same time going against it when he does not advocate the building of proper post offices from which this delivery may be made.

Mr. BOYD. As seconder of the resolution of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), I wish to say that I am heartily in accord with his proposition to establish rural mail delivery. There is no question to-day which is engaging the attention of our farmers to a greater extent. It is only those who have considerable intercourse with the farmers and who go among them who can understand the great benefits that such a delivery would confer on our agricul-

tural community. It would have the effect of bringing them in daily contact with the outer world, and in that way counteract the desire on the part of the young people to leave the farm and seek their living in the cities, which is certainly one of the great drawbacks to our country's advancement. In this connection it seems to me that hon. gentlemen on this side are levelling their criticisms at the wrong man. The member of the government who should be taken to task is the Minister of Finance. I have had a little experience in these matters, and I know that the man you must go to, when you want a post office built, is the Minister of Finance. Go to the Department of Public Works and you will be sent to the Finance Minister to see if you cannot get his consent to the necessary expenditure. After you have procured that consent, the Minister of Public Works is always delighted to let you have the building. Therefore, I think that the hon. Minister of Public Works has been called upon to stand entirely too much this evening, and I am surprised that the man who is really responsible has not shown up and endeavoured to shield his colleague from what he has undoubtedly brought upon his head. I would ask my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) if he would not in his motion, reduce the population in towns in which post offices should be erected from 3,000 to 2,000 ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I am quite willing to accept that amendment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am delighted to learn that the Minister of Finance is all-powerful. We all like to have our offices magnified, and I have no desire to deny the soft impeachment. The question of rural mail delivery is a most important one, so important that it is a pity to see it treated in the way it is to-night. It does not seem to occur to my hon. friend from East York, that one might be strongly in favour of rural post office delivery without at all opposing the building of a post office at Bowmanville. The two questions do not hang together at all. The question of rural mail delivery is one involving a large expenditure of public money, which must be dealt with by the Postmaster General, who has administered so successfully the Post Office Department, and if my hon. colleague is able to take a step further and give us rural mail delivery we shall be very much pleased, but we would not be advancing that project by voting for any such motion as this. It is quite possible that some hon. members may be of the opinion that it is a good thing to give Bowmanville a post office, and if so why should they not support this item and still favour a rural mail delivery system. If rural mail delivery can be obtained for the money spent annually on the small class of public buildings provided for post offices, or if it could be accomplished for six times the money these would cost, there would be no difficulty in the matter. But there can be no good purpose served by confounding two things which are entirely separate, and I hope the House will see the unwisdom of the course taken by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), if the hon. gentleman does not see it himself.

Mr. BROCK. Hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches have themselves to blame for this debate. If the hon. Minister of Finance had devoted his great ability to answering the fair question put by the hon. leader of the opposition, as to what principle the government were going on in connection with the expenditure of public money in erecting post offices, we would not have had this discussion. What we want to know is what principle they are acting on, or if they are acting on any principle. As regards the spending of $15,000 on a post office at Bowmanville, I am not opposing that particular vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE My hon. friend is opposing it in supporting this motion.

Mr. BROCK. I am speaking on the question of principle. I am not opposing the erection of a building, but I am insisting on our having a declaration as to the principle or policy upon which the government base this expenditure. No doubt the support of the hon. gentlemen sitting behind the Finance Minister is strong enough to vote down this proposition of rural mail delivery.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BROCK. But I tell the government that they are making a mistake in not acceding to the very reasonable request made by the hon. leader of the opposition that they should state to the House and the country upon what principle they are spending this money in erecting post offices here and there throughout the country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the Committee to the nature of the amendment. In my opinion it is not in order, because it asks the Committee to report upon a subject which has not been referred to it at all. Therefore it is quite irrelevant to the matter under discussion and in my opinion is out of order.

Mr. INGRAM. As other hon. gentlemen have been allowed to discuss the question, perhaps I may be permitted to say a few words. The hon. member for East York has made a motion dealing with rural mail delivery. While I am prepared to support that and believe it is a step in the right direction, yet there is another phase of free delivery which should not be overlooked. We have small cities and large towns in Ontario, which pay a good revenue to the Post Office Department. Many large manufacturing concerns are located in these places

and are deprived of free delivery. I could name a number of such cities and towns. There is the city which the hon. Minister of Public Works represents, the city of Woodstock. There are also St. Catharines, Sault Ste. Marie, Peterborough, Brockville, Berlin, Guelph, Stratford, St. Thomas, Chatham and Windsor. These are all important cities, and it is well known that workingmen employed in the factories in these cities find it very inconvenient to go to the post office during post office hours. I trust therefore that when the government are considering the question of free rural delivery, they will also consider the question of free delivery in these small cities and large towns. So far as rural mail delivery is concerned, although you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have ruled the motion out of order, I wish to say that I am heartily in support of the proposition as being a step in the right direction. The hon. Minister of Finance has given great credit to the Postmaster General for his administration of the Post Office Department. Well, I think it would be well for the hon. gentleman to urge on his colleague the advisability of not looking at this question of rural mail delivery mainly from the point of revenue or expenditure. The thickly settled districts of this country should be well served with mail matter even if that service should cost a considerable sum. We have an intelligent class of people who would not object to a small deficit incurred for the purpose of providing them with this great advantage.

Mr. NORTHRUP. This debate has proceeded to the length it has on account of the point raised by the hon. leader of the opposition. It is all important that we should have a declaration from the government of the principle on which they propose to incur this class of expenditure. I venture to think that a very clear principle could be laid down which the government might adopt and which would command the approval of the people. It is a principle that would save them from great importunities on the part of their friends, and a principle so sound that any succeeding party coming into power in Canada would not dare to depart from it. The principle I submit is that the government, in handling public moneys should endeavour to act as a trustee handling private moneys would act under similar circumstances. Wherever the business is such that a private individual acting as trustee would be justified in erecting a building to carry on business, let the government erect a building. But if, as a matter of business, no private individual would think of investing trust funds in a building there, the government should equally abstain. The hon. gentlemen opposite should not lose sight of the fact that every time an item appears in the estimates for the construction of a building in a town of two or three thousand inhabitants, the minister calls down upon himself frantic appeals from dozens of his own followers who would not make such appeals but for the encouragement they receive from seeing such items in the estimates. The country looks to us to practice economy. While we on this side do not necessarily object to this, that or the other item for a post office here or there, we are unable, and hon. gentlemen opposite are equally unable, to give an intelligent vote on these matters, unless some principle can be applied. The moment they can lay down a principle, no matter what it may be, which can govern these questions, we can consider them intelligently; but until a principle is laid down, both sides must simply go it blind, for there is nothing to guide or govern us. When we look about this country and consider the amount of money that is being spent in these public buildings, much of it certainly unnecessary, and when we find that the expenditure has grown, and when we find that it is proposed to construct a public building in one place that will entail an annual cost for maintenance of $2,000, whereas the service as it is now performed, as stated to the House, costs only about $150, I venture to say there are very few of the hon. gentlemen opposite who can stand before their constitutents and justify such a vote. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that the people before whom they must justify these expenditures are the people of Alexandria or the people of Bowmanville. But there are five millions of people in this country who are interested in every dollar that is spent, and it is to the great mass of the people that the representatives in this House must stand or fall upon, showing how they have appropriated or misappropriated the public funds. If hon. gentlemen would be good enough to lay down a principle—if a vicious principle so much the worse for them—but to lay down some principle to govern the disposition of public moneys and not merely throw it out haphazard here or there according to the personal influence or popularity of the individual members, it would be a great deal better for the country and better for hon. gentlemen opposite themselves.

Clinton—Post office, $8,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to know what the present expenditure is for the service there, and what would be the increased cost entailed by the construction of this building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The present rent for the post office is $200 per annum, and for the custom house $36, total $236. It is quite impossible for me to tell the committee what the increased expenditure will be. But, if the postmaster lives in the building, the highest allowance I have found in the department is $100. So, the difference between the present expenditure and the interest on the amount

invested would probably be $100 besides what might, from time to time, be spent in repairs on the building.

Mr. HENDERSON. I remember when the debate took place on the construction of this building the then minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) informed us that the post office at Clinton was to be built upon a new plan which he had approved of—the plan of erecting cheaper buildings and more of them. Year after year I had advocated the idea that, instead of spending $30,000 in one town in a county where there were four or five small towns, the sum should be divided up and cheaper buildings—yet quite sufficient for the purpose of post office and postmaster's residence—should be erected in each of these towns. I instanced the county of Halton, with five incorporated towns and villages. If $5,000 were appropriated in each town or village, leaving $1,000 to purchase the site—because I did not believe in the principle of the municipality buying the site for the government—the amount would provide a suitable building for each place. I instanced that county because, under the application of the rule that there must be a large revenue or a large population, it would never be entitled to a public building, as we have no town in that county—and not likely to have for many years to come—with a greater population than 1,700 or 1,800. I pressed this point upon the then Minister of Public Works year after year, and at last I believed I had made a convert of him. Not that he gave me any promise that he would fulfil what I required in the county of Halton, which is the county I have the honor to represent, but that he would adopt that principle generally. And he said across the floor of the House that, in the erection of a post office at Clinton that plan would be adopted, that building would be erected for a much smaller sum and the postmaster's residence would be provided for in the building and the postmaster would thus become caretaker of the building, and so the large expenditures which have been spoken of here for maintenance should be saved. I may say also that several years ago, not in the chamber, but outside of it in discussing the proposition with the present Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), that gentleman expressed himself as favourable to the plan I had suggested. I think that hon. gentleman will recollect that he gave me to understand the proposition was a fair and reasonable one, and was the only plan by which certain ridings in the province could obtain a fair share of public money. I am sorry to find that although the Minister of Public Works started out well in the case of Clinton—started out to show us how a public building could be erected for a very moderate sum of money and yet fulfil all the requirements, furnishing not only a post office of sufficient size for a town of 2,000 or 2,500 population, but a residence for the postmaster, thus doing away with the caretaker —I am sorry, I say, to find out that, year after year, we are asked to grant additional sums to this Clinton post office and that we have simply got back to the old plan of a costly building in a small town, a plan which was condemned by the Liberal party when they were in opposition as has been so often shown to-night. I am sorry that the plan approved by the late Minister of Public Works has been departed from, and that we are not to see introduced the new system of supplying small towns and villages throughout the country with sufficient post offices. I am sorry that we have no more hopes now than we had five years ago of securing post offices or public buildings in these small towns. I would like the minister to tell us whether he intends to adhere to the policy that was laid down by the late Minister of Public Works, and why it has been departed from in this instance.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will be pleased to know that the principle he has advocated so long has been carried out to a very large extent. He and I perhaps may be a little extreme in our views with regard to this question. My hon. friend knows that Clinton is a town of considerably over 2,000 population. The contract price for this post office is only $9,500. He will remember that we advocated buildings costing $5,000 for places of this size. Every business man in this committee knows that there has been a considerable increase in wages and in the cost of material during the last two or three years. The cost of heating, fittings and that sort of thing which will bring the total cost up to something like $18,000. Now the hon. gentleman will hardly say that, beginning at the old figure of $35,000, $50,000, $80,000, this case does not show considerable progress in the right direction. I have had several discussions with the chief architect with the view of adopting a policy of putting up public buildings in smaller places, and that policy is to be carried out. We should adopt a plan that will serve the purpose to the full extent, while costing less money than we have paid hitherto.

Mr. HOLMES. I would add for the information of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) who has been fair in his remarks, and for the information of other members opposite, that the principle advocated so far as the caretaker is concerned is being rigidly carried out in the Clinton post office. I had the pleasure of appointing a new postmaster in my own town within the last few months, and my only regret was that I had to take a lawyer. I appointed a postmaster on the strict condition that there was to be no caretaker for the office, and the party was glad to accept the office under those conditions. In fact a number of men would have been willing to live on

the ground floor if they could have got that position. I may say that the revenue from the post office and customs amounts to about $13,000 a year.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to congratulate the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) upon his elevation to the position of deputy Postmaster General. He tells us that he has recently apopinted some person to the position of postmaster, and that he appointed a lawyer because he could not get any one better. Well, I myself would be at a loss to ascertain where you could get a better man than a lawyer. Doubtless since the hon. gentleman was promoted to the position of deputy Postmaster General he has been doing valiant service in several ridings, and he has left his trail in proof of his devotion to the present government. The Minister of Public Works says there is ground for congratulation in respect to the Clinton post office in the fact that the contract price of the building is only $9,500. The estimates so far show that we voted $7,500 last year, and we are asked to vote $8,000 additional this year, making $15,500. Even if we stopped at this point I do not think there is ground for congratulation. The minister tells us that the total amount will be at least $18,000, and when we get this $18,000, I suppose, having regard to the history of the past, we will be requested to make a still further appropriation. So there is no reasonable hope that even $18,000 will finish the Clinton post office. There is no reason to believe that economy is being practised in this case, any more than in many other cases that have been before the committee. The hon. member for Halton tells us that he has been pressing the Minister of Public Works to do justice to the smaller towns and villages. There is every reason why this matter should be taken into consideration with a view of doing justice to the rural municipalities by giving them public buildings at a moderate cost. The suggestion made by my hon. friend from Halton that the residences of the postmasters should be combined with the post offices so as to dispense with the expense of caretakers, is, I think, a proper one.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I think in this connection it would be fair to call the attention of the government to the policy of the Public Works Department in expending large sums of money in small towns just emerging from the condition of villages, on buildings altogether too ornate, too expensive for the purpose for which they are designed, and which, in fact, are more ornamental than useful. In this way a gross injustice is done to the agricultural portion of the community, many of whom have to travel two, three or four miles to get their mail matter when a large amount of expenditure is made in erecting these monumental and expensive buildings in little towns, merely emerging from the state of villagehood. If favours are intended for towns of 2,000 or more, I put in a claim for a town in my own constituency, the town of Durham; yet, I am strongly in favour of some move being made in the direction of the motion made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) looking to the establishment of a rural mail delivery system. This, I believe, would probably be a very expensive undertaking and one that the department could not enter upon completely at the beginning; yet, some experimental steps might be taken in order to find out what the cost would be in extending it over the whole country. I believe that at any rate we should take some measures to show our disapprobation of the practice of erecting these costly structures, far more costly than the requirements warrant.

Mr. INGRAM. As I understand it, there was $5,000 voted for this building in the first place. Now, there is a contract let for $9,500 and the total cost will be about $18,000. Last year I drew the attention of the Department of Public Works to this kind of thing going on in respect to erecting public buildings. I asked then if there were any architects employed outside to prepare estimates, plans and specifications for these buildings. If there are surely the architect could come to some nearer figure than $5,000 or $6,000 for a building which we are subsequently told is going to cost $18,000. No private citizen would think of doing business in that way and no wonder that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House criticise items of this kind when they find these items growing to treble the amount at which they were placed when first introduced. I say it is high time that something should be done in the direction of putting a stop to this growing evil, for it is a growing evil. If the town of Clinton is entitled to a public building, one that will meet the requirements of the town, has not the department an architect who has brains enough to say whether a building proper for such a town shall cost $5,000 or $10,000? Instead of coming down with figures of this kind, the minister ought to be prepared to state exactly, or within a few hundred dollars, what a public building in a town of this kind should cost. I object very strongly to this kind of thing occurring year after year in this House. The time of this House has been taken up in discussing items of this kind more than with the discussion of any other subject in the House. I am not blaming the hon. Minister of Public Works; this is an old, crying evil. He is not the father of this evil by any means, but I hope our good-natured minister will use his best efforts to have this kind of thing stopped and if he does I am sure he will deserve great credit and he will be commended on this side of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this building intended for the joint purposes of the customs and post office, or the post office alone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for the customs and the post office.

Mr. INGRAM. I find in the Auditor General's report, page V—100, the following account:

Potter, F. A., Potter, D., and Moore, T., executors estate of late Ann Moore, purchase of site, $2,500.

Is that what this site cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is what the department paid for the site.

Mr. INGRAM. Then we have :

Weatherald, T., surveying, &c., $31.80.

Who is that gentleman ?

Mr. HOLMES. He is the Conservative surveyor of the town of Goderich.

Mr. INGRAM :

King's Printer, $69.08 ; advertising, $152.89, $221.97.

Mr. INGRAM. Does this amount of $69.08 mean paying for the advertising of this contract to the government Bureau, or to whom ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the account of the King's Printer and it must have been for the plans and specifications.

Mr. INGRAM :

Advertising, $152.89.

Will the hon. gentleman tell us what papers this advertisement appeared in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the list of papers in which this contract was advertised.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister bring it down ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be very pleased indeed to bring it down.

Mr. INGRAM. Now, there is this account:

Travel of Ottawa officials : L. F. Taylor, advanced ch. 960, $25.

Who is this gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is an architect in the department at Ottawa who went up to attend to this work ?

Mr. INGRAM :

Legal expenses, James Scott, $34.

I suppose this is in connection with the plans, specifications, &c.

Mr. HOLMES. It is in connection with the transfer of the property.

Mr. INGRAM. Was there any local architect employed in Clinton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the work was all done in the department here.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year I brought up the question of architects in this House, and I find there are some ten architects engaged by the Public Works Department, or, at least, the Auditor General's report shows that number. I want to say to the hon. minister that this system of engaging architects in this country to look after public buildings is one that is not in the interest of the country. Last year I drew the attention of the department to it, quoting several buildings throughout the country where they paid large sums of money for clerks of works, to men who are architects residing in the localities in which public buildings are being built. The abuses that these men create in connection with the erection of these public buildings are simply these : They are paid so much per day as clerks of works, all the way from $2.50 to $7 a day and by reason of these architects receiving that amount of pay per day from one end of this country to the other the public buildings are being delayed in their construction. By reason of that payment by the day system, the work is extended for twice as long, yes, three times as long as it is necessary to construct these buildings. That abuse should be wiped out. It would pay the department better to have their own architects, or if they are obliged to engage outside architects to pay them on the principle of so much per cent on the contract price. Why, the way in which the armoury in my own city was constructed is a disgrace. They had two or three men employed on that building months at a time, whereas if they were paying an architect by fees he would not have put up with the method of construction; he would make the contractors whoever they were put more men on the work so that it would be completed quicker, and there would be less money to be paid the architect. I am not going to find fault with the present Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) because he is a new man in the department, but I say that the system has been going on for years and it should be stopped.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as possible I have adopted the policy of making an arrangement with the local architect, as to what shall be charged by him for the building. I think the rule is a good one, that it will probably save a considerable amount of money, and that we may get better service. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) remembers as I do, the erection of the public building at St. Thomas which lasted for so many years, and in which they had a permanent caretaker. We have to take warning by the abuse in that case and try to do a great deal better.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have tried on some occasions to employ local men to prepare

plans but nearly in every case it was a failure. After six years of experience in the department I say that it is better that the plans should be prepared here in Ottawa. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) must not lose sight of the fact that there is always a time limit fixed in the contract, so that the employment of a foreman to supervise the work at $2 or $3 a day cannot result in extending the time. I stated last year that it was not desirable to spend too large sums of money on public buildings and I am still of the same mind. At the same time we cannot forget that this country is growing pretty fast, that we are not building for one year or for two years, that we are putting up these buildings for at least fifty years. It would be imprudent and unwise not to look to the future. Might I suggest to the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) that if I was in his place, I would not be too much impressed by what is said in this House about the erection of these buildings—tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis (times are changed and we are changed in them). If the minister will make a search in his department he will find hundreds of applications for public buildings. I was perhaps never able to gauge public opinion as my hon. friends on the other side have done, but I remember very well that for the past ten years complaint has been made in this House that we are not erecting enough public buildings, and the Public Works Department has had hundreds of petitions for public buildings from both sides of the House. If public opinion does not want public buildings, I verily believe that governments have not much interest in building them, because it is my experience that they give more trouble than power. The future of this country will be great; nobody can tell how many millions we will have in ten or twelve years. No one can say what the population of this town or that will be in ten years. I would suggest to the Minister of Public Works, that while remaining within the bounds of economy, he should not be too much impressed by criticisms which are indulged in by both sides of the House every time that a public building is erected.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not wish to unduly criticise the erection of public buildings, but I ask any member in this House if he were erecting a public building to cost $39,000, does he think it would take over a year to erect that building. In my judgment it would not require more than six months, and that being so, what is the necessity of employing a clerk of works by the day at a large salary for so long a period as it now takes to erect these buildings.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If there was no clerk of works, the building would not be satisfactory.

Mr. INGRAM. There should be a limit to the time.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is necessary to have a good clerk of works and he should be there all the time or otherwise you will have botched work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was there a clerk of works employed on this building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) to say that where an arrangement could be made with the local architect he should get a percentage on the value of the work. I believe in that principle and I have done so in several cases lately. It would be a great mistake to let a contract and not have proper supervision on the work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who was the clerk of works here and how was he paid?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. His name was Henry Stevens and he was paid the usual fee of $3 a day—it was perhaps lower than the usual fee.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is his usual occupation?

Mr. HOLMES. Contractor and builder.

Mr. BROCK. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has told us that we do not know to what extent this country may grow, and that is the reason why I am so anxious that we should be economical and careful. I have been doing business in the province of Ontario for forty-five years and I can tell you that you would be very much surprised to find how very little most of these towns and villages have grown during the last twenty years. The population of these towns and villages is being depleted all the time on account of those who go not only from Ontario to the North-west, but also to the larger cities and towns. Concentration is the order of business nowadays, not scattering. The policy of the present government seems to be to scatter their favours all over the country. I contend that it is better to concentrate, and that if a building is really required you should put up a good building, but these small amounts you are spending through the villages of Canada are not justified by the requirements. I can tell you that the post office and custom business has been as well attended to in the past, as it will be in the future in these new buildings. Because the Dominion of Canada is going to have an immense population, is no reason why the little villages and towns in Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario should have buildings that will be an expense for all time, and the expense of which buildings will prevent you from developing in the right direction, namely, in the direction of our North-west and the larger towns and cities.

A good deal has been said about a large amount of money being spent in Toronto. In consideration of the importance of Toronto as a commercial centre, I contend that

she has not had anything like the expenditure in proportion that many small villages have had. I have the greatest possible respect for the opinion, the energy and the courage of the late Minister of Public Works but I would not like to follow him in all matters of expenditure, not only on buildings, but on canals, railways, harbours and wharfs. We have spent an immense amount of money that is not productive and never will be, and I would urge the Minister of Public Works to be very careful how he allows himself to be pressed by his followers or any one else into large expenditures in the towns and villages throughout the province of Ontario. I am speaking as one who does business with them. I do not care about their politics or their votes. I am here only to speak as I feel and as my experience tells me is the right thing, regardless of the effect on politics or elections or anything of that kind; and I contend that if we spend hundreds and thousands of dollars in these ways in the province of Ontario, some day, when we pass off the crest of the wave, we shall be sorry for those expenditures and regret that we have not made them in some other direction. You will excuse me for extending my remarks to this length, but I do so because I feel anxious as a business man. I know that times are good and the government are getting more money than they expected; but I tell you that now is the time to be careful. It is not when times are hard and business is bad and money is scarce, but it is when money is plentiful, when people are filled up with ozone, that you ought to be careful, and that is why I warn you that you are making a mistake in moving in the direction that you are doing, and you will be making a greater mistake if you allow the late Minister of Public Works to urge you into expenditures that are not justifiable.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not mean that we should spend money without sense or reason, or erect buildings right and left without cause. But it seems to me that in government matters we should follow the same rules that are followed in ordinary business. The sense of the country to-day is that we should build well. My hon. friend in his own business has erected splendid buildings. This country is growing, and it seems to me that the government of the country should follow the course of ordinary business. I do not mean to say that we should spend money right and left, but I say that when we make up our minds to erect a pubilc building, we should build it well. I do not mean to say anything more than that, and I believe that is a sound principle. My hon. friend has a great deal of confidence in this country. I have always found him to be a good patriot; he has always expressed himself in the House as a sound Canadian. I think I am not wrong in saying that in ten or twelve years we may have 10,000,000 people in Canada, and if we are going to grow in population as fast as we all hope, let us in our policy act accordingly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works that I find a policy stated with a good deal of frankness on certain matters of this kind, in a journal which strongly supports the government, published in the town of Owen Sound. The editorial from which I will read was written with reference to the recent election which was in progress there. I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works had much to do with that election; some other members of the cabinet were interesting themselves more actively in it. The paper gives some names, and perhaps I had better read them first:

> The members of parliament who have taken part in this campaign so far for the Liberals are Colonel Thompson of Haldimand, C. B. Heyd of South Brant; R. F. Sutherland of North Essex, and R. Holmes of West Huron, the latter being the only one remaining in the riding. Mr. Joseph Haycock, ex-M.P.P., of Frontenac, is also doing effective campaign work. On Tuesday evening, Hon. D. C. Fraser, the Guysborough giant, and Dr. Macdonald, deputy speaker, will adress the electors of Owen Sound; other speakers are expected during the week.

I am glad to know that our honoured and respected Chairman was having so good a time on that occasion, in company with our hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser).

> Hon. Mr. Fielding will address a meeting here on Friday afternoon, which is intended to be for those who reside out of town, and will also address a meeting of the townspeople in the evening. It is expected that Hon. Mr. Mulock will also be in the riding next week.

That, however, is only by the way. The doctrine of the government is stated here with a great deal of fulness and precision, and I am going to read it for the information of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who has hardly expressed himself with considerable frankness but not with the brutal frankness of the writer of this editorial:

> The country has never been more prosperous than it is at this moment under the able administration of the Laurier government——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Now, we shall see how much these hon. gentlemen will cheer something that follows, particularly the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes), who was so prominent in leading the cheering, and who took occasion to announce to the people very much the same doctrine as that set forth in this editorial:

> ——and the town of Owen Sound never stood a better chance of securing the expenditure of a large amount of money for the erection of public buildings and for additional improvements in her harbour. These are considerations that invariably weigh well in a by-election, and, with ordinary care, should in-

sure the return of almost any candidate the party might choose to put in the field.

These, I suppose are the sentiments of the hon. member for West Huron.

Mr. HOLMES. Certainly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad that my hon. friend is equally frank with the editorial writer. Here are some further suggestions which I have no doubt equally commend themselves to my hon. friend's judgment :

This town is slated for certain favours within the gift of the government, and, to make a long story short, the electors cannot afford to kill their chances for securing them by electing an oppositionist.

That also, I take it, was the view my hon. friend from West Huron presented to the electors on that occasion; and possibly the fact that there was a certain disappointment in the result of that election may afford the reason why we do not observe the name of the town of Owen Sound in these estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are not all the estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Oh, I see; my hon. friend proposes to put it in the supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I advocated it some years ago, and I shall probably have to advocate it again if I hope to succeed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That election was held some weeks ago, and my hon. friend has had time to consider the matter between the date of the election and the time when these estimates were brought down. If the reason I have suggested had nothing to do with the absence of the name of the town from the estimates, I cannot understand what the reason is.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are not the right estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The editor of this newspaper was evidently very high in the ranks of the Liberal party, he seeems to to have enjoyed the confidence of the leader of that party, because he seems to have known all about these gentlemen who were going to speak in the riding and the promises which they would hold out to the electors. Speaking seriously is it not a sad state of affairs that appropriations from the public revenue should be promised to or withheld from any constituency according as it returns a Liberal or Conservative candidate ? Is not that bribery pure and simple ? Is not that as direct an offer of a bribe to the voter as if you offered him $5 for his vote ? The only difference is that in one case you are bribing the electors individually and in the other you are bribing them collectively. The hon. member from West Huron (Mr. Holmes) is another of these gentlemen who addressed the constituents of North Grey on that occasion. He addressed the electors along those lines, and affirmed the principle in this House, when I read it to him from the newspaper to-night. If these hon. gentlemen can draw any distinction between bribing the electors individually and bribing them wholesale, let them draw it. The hon. member for West Huron speaking from his place has told us that these are proper appeals to be made to the electors and that these are proper considerations on which the electors should vote.

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. gentleman must not misrepresent my position. I was simply laughing and speaking in a bantering and jocular tone, and I do not think that the government should be held responsible for the editorial opinion of any newspaper.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps this may be a lesson to my hon. friend another time not to laugh too soon. I understood him to assert distinctly, though with a somewhat jeering smile, that that was exactly the kind of thing he believed in and that these were proper considerations to submit to the people. I am glad to know however that he did not believe what he said, or that he has concluded that the position he took is one which cannot be well defended. But it is not the first time that the constituency of North Grey has been treated to that sort of thing. When the Minister of Customs ran an election there some years ago, the people were invited to consider whether or not they would prefer that cold justice which they might expect if they elected the Conservative candidate or the warm sympathy to which they could look if they elected the Minister of Customs. It is not the first time in many ridings that that consideration has been put forward. It is very much in line with what seems to be the policy of the government as announced here to-night, and against that policy I raise my voice in protest and submit that there is not the slightest distinction between the offers of wholesale bribery of that kind and offers of individual bribery to the electors.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see in one of the evening papers another evidence of this policy in North Ontario. The article is headed :—

DELIVERED GOODS, WANT THEIR PAY.

Bracebridge Would Like Government to Fulfil North Ontario Election Promises.

Bracebridge has long been the principal point for a large summer resort territory in the Muskoka district, and is also in a constituency that lately turned down the ex-Minister of Finance and elected George D. Grant, a government supporter, and on both counts Bracebridge has something coming to her. A delegation from Bracebridge, composed of Mayor J. D. Shire, John Thompson, P. Hutchison, G. H. O. Thomas and H. J. Bird is registered at the Grand Union and is here to press the claims

of the town. They will see Sir William Mulock and Hon. Messrs. Sutherland and Paterson this afternoon and will ask for a new post office building.

I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Public Works if it is his intention to grant that application.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know what paper my hon. friend has quoted from, but every city is quite within its rights in sending a delegation to wait on any minister in order to press its claims. This deputation was not entirely composed of Liberals but of both Liberals and Conservatives. In the same way we have deputations from the city of Toronto to which we have given considerable time the last few days, and which are largely composed of very active Conservatives. As far as I am personally concerned I have always given all the time I could to receiving deputations, irrespective of politics. As regards Bracebridge, the question of giving that place a new post office was being negotiated before ever the election in North Ontario was thought of. Our late respected friend, Mr. McLeod, who supported the opposition and represented North Ontario, was pressing the claim of Bracebridge for a public building, and if the late member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) were here, he would also say that that matter was engaging our attention while he was a member of this House and that it had nothing to do with the last election, or the election of the present representative. I also received a deputation headed by my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. McCormick) which was composed of supporters of both parties, prominent merchants and manufacturers, and I am always pleased, when I think it is in the public interest, to grant public assistance from any of the departments irrespective of the political leanings of the hon. member who urges the claim. I remember that years ago, when the constituency which my hon. friend represents now was represented by Mr. Masson in this House, I, in my humble way, tried to impress the late government with the desirability of recognizing the claim he was making for a building at that time. While I am not prepared to say that all things being equal, the government would not be more influenced by their supporters than by their opponents, I for one will always ask the House to vote such expenditures solely in the public interest. If more of these votes are for constituencies represented by Liberals during many years in this House than for those represented by Conservatives, it is simply because, under the policy which was carried out by the late government, the majority of constituencies represented by Conservatives do not require public buildings. For many years the late government carried out the policy of refusing any consideration, except in extreme cases, to constituencies represented by Liberals. I for my part am not disposed to adopt any such policy. I think that the less partisanship you have in these matters the better and that in every case fair consideration should be given on its merits to the demand of any constituency.

Mr. DAVIS. It is refreshing to hear the hon. leader of the opposition talking about the government trying to bribe constituencies in a wholesale manner. But let me draw his attention to the fact that for eighteen years the party he leads resorted to that policy. I remember that in my constituency they went so far as to promise a mounted police barracks to a certain portion of that constituency if the government candidate were elected, and to show their bona fides they hauled a lot of sand on to the ground and got the surveyor to lay out the location. But after the election the stone and sand were hauled away and nothing more was done. On another occasion not only did their newspapers publish articles, but their candidate himself told the people plainly that if they voted for the government they would get a barracks worth $60,000 to $70,000. The government candidate was elected and the people got the barracks. I remember that on the occasion of another election we had in my constituency, the members of the mounted police were promised scrip and medals if they would vote for the Conservative candidate. They were paraded by their officers in the barracks square and telegrams were read from the Conservative government to the effect that if they voted for the Conservative candidate they would get the scrip and medals. They voted, but they have never received the scrip or medals to this day. That sort of thing was carried on throughout the Northwest. One candidate used to say: What is the use of voting for an opposition candidate ?—you can't get anything for your riding; if you want improvement or public buildings, or more police, vote for me. It is amusing to find a gentleman rising here talking economy, when I understand that it is only two weeks since that hon. gentleman headed a delegation to the Minister of Public Works asking for a grant of $250,000 to spend in the city of Toronto.

Mr. BROCK. What for.

Mr. DAVIS. It makes no difference what it was for. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) headed a delegation asking for that expenditure in the city. Now he says it is not right for the government to spend a certain amount in the small towns in Ontario, because they are at a standstill or going back. But I think the small towns have as good a right to have public moneys spent in them as the larger cities have. They are contributing to the revenues, and I do not see why they have not the right to get the benefit of some of the expenditure. It is just as necessary to have a post office in a small town as in a big one.

I hope that the Minister of Public Works will continue to look after the interests of the smaller communities as well as of the larger ones that can have a delegation wait upon the minister headed by influential members of the House of Commons.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I do not think that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) does justice to the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes). That gentleman did hold out inducements—a post office, dry dock and other public works—to the electors to support the Liberal candidate. But he made amends for it on the following Sunday, when he lectured in the Young Men's Christian Association and I understand his subject was, 'The Right Road to Heaven.' I am glad to hear the hon. Minister of Public Works say the fact that North Grey had elected a member in opposition to the government would not interfere with the department spending money in public works there. The government derive a large revenue from the town of Owen Sound. We have no public building. I believe it would be in the interests of the country, even as a matter of economy, to erect a public building there. I asked the hon. minister last night if he would let us know the amount expended by the government for rent in Owen Sound. It was a very considerable sum, and I believe that if it were capitalized it would pay for the erection of a splendid building. Therefore, I hope the hon. minister will not refuse to consider the erection of a building because the riding has sent a representative in opposition to the government.

Mr. BROCK. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) attacked me just now, stating that I had headed a deputation that asked the government for the expenditure of $250,000 in Toronto. In the first place—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) wishes to criticise anything I have said—

Mr. BROCK. No, I am criticising what the hon. member for Saskatchewan said. He told us how extravagant the late government were and how wrong the expenditure of public money in his constituency had been and stated that I had called upon the hon. minister at the head of a deputation to ask for the expenditure of $250,000 in Toronto. If the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Davis') other statements about drawing stone and leaving sand and so on, in his constituency, were exaggerated to the same extent as his statements about me, he has not added much strength to the government's case. I can assure the hon. gentleman that what he has stated as to my demands on the government on behalf of the city of Toronto is ridiculously exaggerated.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) a question: Does he mean to say that he did not attend with the delegation that waited upon the Minister of Public Works to ask for the expenditure of an amount of public money on Toronto?

Mr. BROCK. Most assuredly I say so. Either the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) was misinformed or else he is wilfully stating what is untrue. I was one of a deputation that called upon the minister to ask him for $50,000 for the Dominion exhibition, which $50,000 was to be expended largely for the country from which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) comes, in paying freight on cattle and other products from there to be exhibited.

Mr. DAVIS. I am credibly informed, and I think I am right, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) was with a delegation that asked for $250,000 which, if not to spend in the city of Toronto, was to be spent on Toronto harbour improvements. Was that not the same thing?

Mr. BROCK. I say I was with no such delegation.

Mr. DAVIS. I hope, then, that we may conclude that the hon. gentleman does not approve of that expenditure of $250,000.

Mr. CLARKE. It seems to me that the Minister of Public Works had to go far afield to find an argument to justify some of these items when he brought up the fact that a delegation had waited upon him a few days ago asking for an expenditure on behalf of the city of Toronto.

An hon. MEMBER. That was the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis).

Mr. CLARKE. No, the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) made that statement in the early part of the evening. The hon. member for Saskatchewan was not in his place. But that makes no difference. If the Minister of Public Works had been as frank as we have generally found him in making explanations to this House, he might have explained for what purpose the sums asked for were required. A committee, non-political in its character, and headed by the mayor of Toronto, who is a Liberal, came to ask for a grant in aid of the Dominion exhibition. He was supported by gentlemen, a large number of whom are supporters of the government and on the directorate of that exhibition. And what was it they asked for? I think hon. members will agree that the Toronto Industrial Fair offers the best opportunity that is afforded, from one end of Canada to the other, and year after year, for those who are producers, to exhibit their products to the best advantage. For the last twenty-five years the Toronto exhibition has done a great work, whose benefits have not been confined to Toronto or Ontario, but have been as wide as the Dominion. The splendid progress which has been made by the Domin-

ion since 1878 was mirrored year after year in the exhibits made at that fair. In saying that a political deputation came down and asked the government for $50,000 to aid in holding a Dominion exhibition this year, it should be stated that the purpose for which that money was required was not primarily to advance the interests of the city, but to give those at a great distance from the city an opportunity of getting their products brought free to the city and sent back again. That $50,000 would be spent wholly in paying freight on exhibits from all parts of the country, from the west and from the east, in order that the exhibition might be still more successful as an educator of the Canadian people, as a great fair held from year to year, the most successful on the continent of America, where the exhibits of the farm, where the manufacturing and mining industries of this country, might be presented to the people of Canada to show them what this country is capable of producing. I think the city of Toronto did the government a great favour in pointing out the opportunity that exhibition affords them of having a proper Dominion exhibition held at the least possible cost. How much have the citizens of Toronto contributed from year to year for the maintenance of that exhibition ? The late government gave them the land on which the exhibition is held, at a nominal rental of $100 ; but the citizens of Toronto have spent more than half a million dollars in the erection of buildings. And if the site is favourably located for an exhibition, the citizens of Toronto have taken advantage of the location, and have been liberal in the expenditure of money to provide the necessary buildings and to make possible these magnificent exhibits the advantages of which have been felt from one end of the country to the other.

Now, it has been charged that the city of Toronto is not modest in its demands ; that instead of asking for $50,000 it has asked for $250,000. Supposing it did ask for $250,000, what would it have been required for ? For the development and completion of our great water routes. The finest harbour in Lake Ontario should not be neglected as it has been by the hon. gentleman's predecessors as well as by the present government. The harbour of Toronto has been practically destroyed by the vast quantity of silt brought down in the fall and spring from the River Don and deposited in the harbour. Any hon. gentleman who knows anything about the situation knows that it has been a crying national evil that that harbour should have been permitted to fall into the state it is now in. And if a deputation of leading men representing both political parties came and asked the government to make a reasonable expenditure to undo the damage that was done by government officials, by the harbour commissioners, supported as they were by government engineers, Toronto is surely within its rights in asking that that should be done, that that harbour should be made fit for vessels of full canal size. This will be a substantial advantage to all the producers in the west, by giving them the advantage of water communication which the improvement of Toronto harbour would place within their reach. Toronto asks for nothing unreasonable in its demands upon the government. The citizens have done their full duty in placing the city in the proud position it holds to-day, they have been liberal in their expeditures in making the city what it is, and I say they were quite within their rights and their duty in asking, not as a favour but as a right, for a reasonable expenditure of money in that city, both in the direction of improving the character of the exhibition and in asking that the harbour should be made what it ought to be. If it had received the attention that has been given to numerous less important harbours for political reasons, it would be the finest harbour in Lake Ontario, and the trade of Ontario, as well as the trade of Toronto and other parts of the Dominion, would be substantially benefited by the expenditure of that money. Toronto is not asking for anything mean, or selfish, or local ; and I should think my hon. friend from the west, who is so deeply interested in the transportation question, would back up Toronto in asking that the harbour should be made what it can be made with a reasonable expenditure, so as to give the producers of the west the advantage of competition which would be theirs if the means of communication by water to the head of Lake Ontario was made what it ought to be. I think it was unworthy of the Minister of Public Works to bring into this discussion the question of a deputation of political opponents as well as of political supporters asking for these grants, without stating what the grants were and why they were asked.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend reads me a strong lesson, but he is proceeding on a wrong basis. If he had been in the House and had heard what was said previously, he would not have given me the scolding we have just heard. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto asked me a question as to whether an application had been made by the citizens of Clinton for the grant that was being considered. I thought he was very unfairly criticising the vote and the action of these people in asking for this grant, and it was in that connection that I said that the people from other constituencies had just as much right to wait upon the members of the government and to present their claims as had the deputation from Toronto. I do not think my hon. friend need be quite so thin skinned about it. He knows that I have always lent my assistance to him when I thought his appeals were in the public interest. I do not think Toronto is neglected. I did not mean to be offensive in giving my answer, or in making that re-

mark in replying to his colleague in regard to the particular vote that was then under consideration. As I said, last year a deputation headed by the late member waited upon the government stating that they were entitled to consideration. I had no intention of reflecting on my hon. friend in any respect whatever. I said that every citizen was within his right in making an application and supporting it by the assistance of other citizens of the town in question. If my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) criticises us very unfairly and unjustly on some votes made for outside constituencies, he must not get so hot if we take our own time. We are within our rights as long as we are not offensive in our language, and as long as we do it in a parliamentary manner, the hon. gentleman must not get cross and scold. I have recognized the importance of the city of Toronto as well as he has done ; I think he has always found me an active supporter of the institutions and of the commercial and business interests of that city, and I have done everything that I could to advance its progress. I propose to do so in a public way in future, notwithstanding the attack made upon me by my hon. friend. I suppose that the reason I am called upon to defend myself is that he was very much in earnest in opposing this vote, and thought that the town of Clinton should not have the same consideration as a large city.

Mr. CLARKE. I would be sorry to get the reputation of being a scold. I appeal to the records to show that I have not taken up the time of the House in criticising harshly or adversly the votes asked by the government. What I objected to was that occasion should be taken by the hon. gentleman of this vote to Clinton to drag in Toronto. I spoke with the greatest possible respect of the ministers of the Crown. I said, and I say still, that I think the Minister of Public Works should have been franker in his treatment of the reasonable request made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) in asking upon what principle these grants were made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He asked a question as to what particular vote I supported. Other representations were made to me by the deputation. If the hon. gentleman had been attending to the wants of the city of Toronto he would know that they asked for three more public buildings.

Mr. CLARKE. I was quite aware that it was the intention of the hon. Postmaster General to ask that three branch post offices be erected. I heard what the hon. Postmaster General had to say. The hon. Postmaster General was not in his place or we might have criticised the wisdom of establishing these branches rather than providing a central post office near the railway station. I took the opportunity a few years ago of making a statement in the House to the effect that notwithstanding the technical knowledge that the hon. Postmaster General has acquired since he has been at the head of the Post Office Department the public interest and the interests of the people would be better served if there was a central post office near the chief railway station than by establishing branch post offices. I paid a great deal of attention to what the hon. gentleman had to say when making reply to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), and I expressed regret that he was not in his seat at the time when these appropriations were asked for. The hon. gentleman has admitted very frankly that the appropriations asked for by the deputation from Toronto are appropriations in the general interest. I may say that the city of Toronto only asks what it believes itself to be entitled to, and that in making the request that is made on this occasion it is merely asking that the public generally shall be enabled to reap a greater advantage than they have reaped in the past from the industrial exhibition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The people of Clinton think the same in regard to their appropriation.

Mr. CLARKE. I was going to say so far as the appropriation of $50,000 asked for the industrial exhibition is concerned, the object for which it is asked is one that commends itself to the wisdom of this House. And, as far as the $200,000 is concerned, we are merely asking that tardy justice be done for the injury that has been wrought to the city of Toronto in the past, for the injury that has been done the Toronto harbour through the action of the government in days gone by. We are asking that the harbour should be put in first class condition and we believe that if this were done a substantial advantage would be given, not only to the people of Ontario, but to the people east and west of the city of Toronto by reason of the greater facilities for the shipment of different kinds of commodities.

Mr. DAVIS. I should like to say a word in reference to the complaint made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is all out of order. Hon. gentlemen are discussing questions absolutely and entirely irrelevant to the item under consideration.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman put me in a false position. The hon. gentleman tried to make it appear that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) has a right to answer the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman made the insinuation when he was on his feet that I was opposing a certain grant of money that was made for the harbour of Toronto

and he said that the harbour of Toronto was a harbour that was being improved in the interest of the whole country. I did not intend nor do I intend to oppose any expenditure of money on the harbour of Toronto, but I was merely pointing out that if the people of Toronto wanted money spent in their own town they should not be so small as to object to the amounts of money being spent in the smaller towns and in rural districts.

Mr. INGRAM. I asked the hon. minister about the parties the department bought this lot from and I quoted :

Potter, F. A., Potter, D. and Moore, T., executors estate of late Ann Moore, purchase of site, $2,500.

The hon. gentleman said that they bought this site from these people. Is that correct ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is that this property was owned by the executors of an estate. There is no doubt about that, because the hon. gentleman has read the names of the executors.

Mr. INGRAM. Who is the party that the lot was bought from ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an estate known in Clinton as the Potter estate.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there any name that the hon. gentleman could give us ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You have the names there.

Mr. INGRAM. That is what I cannot understand. Last year, we were not told that; we were told an entirely different story. We were told last year that the lot had been purchased from Mr. A. W. Wilkie, who happened to be a good Tory.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Wilkie was simply the tenant of the property. The property was bought from the Potter estate.

Mr. INGRAM. All I have to do is to quote the Minister of Public Works :

We have bought the site there from a good opponent of ours, Mr. A. W. Wilkie. We will spend more than $8,000 on the building.

Which statement is correct ? I am bound to believe that of the hon. member for West Huron, in view of the fact that he displayed such a Christian spirit at the Sunday school convention recently held in Owen Sound during the late election there. I am bound to say also that we have a good running mate for the hon. member for West Huron, in Preston, the gentleman who sang at a meeting of Sunday School children in St. Thomas, during the famous corrupt election in West Elgin. 'There is Sunshine in my Soul.' I would like to put these two gentlemen together as they make an excellent team.

Mr. DAVIS.

Cobourg—Towards construction of armoury, $15,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not suppose we will be called upon to sit all night.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps it is a little unreasonable to sit here wasting time altogether. If my hon. friend has any proposition in regard to these items we may arrange to adjourn.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course I sympathize with my hon. friend in the obstruction he has sustained on his own side of the House, but, we are not responsible for that. The suggestion I was going to make was that as we have made pretty fair progress with these three items, and as we have discussed some of these matters pretty fully, which no doubt will save discussion on similar items in future, we should now rise and report progress.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Allow the present item to be passed and we will agree to adjourn.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We will allow that item to pass on the understanding which I have with the minister that if any hon. gentleman who is not here wishes to discuss it he may do so on some other item.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Perhaps the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) will give us some explanation about that Sunday convention.

Mr. HOLMES. I will if the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) will tell us something about limelight views in North Ontario.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I accept the hon. gentleman's challenge and on a later occasion will throw some limelight views on his actions there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid we will not have to call the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) to account for doing much Sunday school work. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 26, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Brown.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Great Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 39) to make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to animals and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—Mr. Brock.

QUESTIONS.

CANADIAN TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

Have any representations been received by the government of Canada from the imperial government as to the advisability of locating the next Canadian Transcontinental Railway in such a manner that it may be remote from the frontier, and useful for military purposes ; and so placed that railway and telegraph communication between eastern and western Canada may not be liable to be cut off ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). No such representations have been made by the imperial government to the government of Canada.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.—SPUR LINE FROM RIVIERE OUELLE.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. How much of the sum of $43,000, included in the Appropriation Act, 2 Edward VII, Chapter 1, 'for the building of a spur line of railway from the Intercolonial Railway station at Rivière Ouelle to the wharf on the St. Lawrence,' has been expended ?

2. Is the spur line in question finished ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to establish in connection with the said spur line a ferry between the wharf at Rivière Ouelle and the north shore of the St. Lawrence ?

4. If so, have any arrangements been made with any person or company to establish such a ferry, and with whom ?

5. Has the establishment of such ferry been recommended in writing by any member of the House of Commons; and if so, by whom ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The amount expended up to the 31st January, 1903, on Rivière Ouelle branch is $19,578.08.

2. No.

3. Yes. We have it in contemplation to arrange for a connection of that kind.

4. No arrangements have yet been concluded.

5. It has not been customary for the government to make public the names of parties with whom it has advised on questions of this kind.

DOUKHOBORS HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. WILSON asked :

How many Doukhobors have entered for homesteads in the North-west Territories in the years 1900, 1901 and 1902 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir William Mulock) :

Calendar Year.	No. of Entries.
1900	None.
1901	62
1902	207
Total	269

HOUSES AND FUEL FOR IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. WILSON asked :

In view of the large immigration into Manitoba and the North-west Territories, what action has the government taken to see that they will be provided with houses and fuel for the next winter ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The department has no reason to believe that the immigrants coming into Canada will not be able to provide themselves with houses and fuel.

DOUKHOBOR PILGRIMAGE.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. How many horses, sheep and cattle did the Doukhobors turn at large in the fall of 1902, in the Yorkton District ?

2. How many of these animals did the government officials take in charge ; what was done with these cattle, and what was the cost to the government ?

3. If these cattle were sold, how much did they bring; who sold them and what was done with the money ?

4. When the Doukhobors of the Yorkton District went on their pilgrimage, in the fall of 1902, what did it cost to take them back to their homes; who paid it, and to whom was it paid ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. The exact number is not given, but there were about 120 horses, 95 sheep and 285 cattle.

2. The government officials took charge of 120 horses, 95 sheep and 285 cattle. They were sold at auction at no cost to the government.

3. The stock realized $16,024.25. They were sold by C. J. Macfarlane, an auctioneer authorized by the department, and the money was placed in 'trust' to be expended in the relief of the Doukhobors.

4. The expenses in connection with the Doukhobors' pilgrimage amounted to $7,292. and this was paid from the trust fund. This money was expended by the officials of the department and a receipt was given by three leaders of the Doukhobors duly authorized to do so at a special meeting of the Doukhobors held for the purpose. The details of this expenditure have not been sent to Ottawa.

GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM.

Mr. HOLMES asked :

What was the total shipment of grain, during the season of navigation, from Port Arthur

and Fort William, during the years 1901 and 1902; and to what points were the shipments made?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson).

The total grain shipments from the undermentioned ports during the season of navigation were as follows:

	1901. Bushels.	1902. Bushels.
Port Arthur	709,032	6,801,209
Fort William	13,856,168	29,400,352

Particulars of grain shipments from Port Arthur during the following seasons of navigation:

	1901. Bushels.	1902. Bushels.
To Parry Sound		34,000
Meaford		329,053
Collingwood	45,602	
Point Edward	55,919	
Sarnia		56,540
Kingston	272,255	780,389
Goderich	134,682	882,578
Montreal	45,814	229,133
Midland	26,061	1,821,484
Owen Sound	50,111	362,857
Depot Harbour	35,000	458,989
Total to Canadian ports	665,444	4,955,023
To Buffalo	8,012	1,690,916
Port Huron	35,576	155,270
	709,032	6,801,209

Particulars of grain shipments from Fort William during the following seasons of navigation:

	1901. Bushels.	1902. Bushels.
To Midland	2,160,090	6,710,898
Parry Sound	42,000	
Depot Harbour	636,000	3,354,382
Owen Sound	1,809,136	1,080,934
Meaford	100,000	322,588
Goderich	1,179,182	1,866,788
Sarnia	678,000	636,463
Kingston	2,459,570	3,993,522
Montreal	118,000	100,000
Collingwood		31,000
Total to Canadian ports	9,181,978	18,096,575
To Buffalo	4,674,190	10,343,319
Port Huron		960,758
	13,856,168	29,400,652

SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N. B.

Mr. WILMOT asked:

1. Has M. E. Bourgeois been dismissed from the position of sub-collector of customs at Tracadie, N.B.? If so, when was he dismissed, and for what reason?

2. Was any complaint entered against him? If so, what was the nature of the complaint, and was he given an opportunity of defending himself?

3. Who made the complaint, and upon whose recommendation was he dismissed?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). M. E. Bourgeois, sub-collector of customs at Tracadie, N.B., was retired from the customs service, from 1st February, 1903, on account of age, it being considered necessary to have a younger and more energetic officer for customs service at that place.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to remind the Finance Minister that yesterday he promised to bring down immediately, a return which I moved for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I did not promise it 'immediately,' but I promised it promptly. The return may be brought down to-day, or at all events to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it a complicated and lengthy return?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There should be some uniformity regarding this matter of answering questions. The Minister of Customs to-day gave a very long answer to a question propounded by one of his supporters, and I have not the slightest doubt that if the question were asked by a member on this side we would be compelled to move for a return. The same principle should apply to both sides of the House regarding questions of that character. I do not see why the slightest discrimination should be made. Discrimination of that kind will not advance the business of the House. I want to be fair about it, but I have observed more than once that it makes a considerable difference whether the question comes from that side of the House or from this side.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There should be no discrimination of that kind, and I do not think there is. There has been no unreasonable delay about this return and it will be brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I gather that the question asked by my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) will probably involve a shorter answer than the question put by the member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes), which was answered by the Minister of Customs, and yet in one case we were compelled to move for a return and in the other case the answer was brought down at once.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sure that there is as great a disposition to answer a question from that side of the House as from this.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We would like to see it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). We have to get this information from the different ports and we try to get it as rapidly as possible, and when

we do get it we give it as soon as it comes into our possession. We do not know any other way of dealing with the business of the House.

THE FRENCH TRANSLATION OF THE PAPERS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN (Montmorency.)—(Translation.)—Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the way in which the translation of our papers is done.

The PRIME MINISTER (The Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.) (Translation.) Is the hon. gentleman referring to the 'Hansard'?

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) No, I am alluding to the papers of the House. Last year I had the opportunity of bringing to the attention of the House that very same matter, and now I wish to give an instance which shows how faulty, to say the least, that translation is.

I have placed on the Order Paper of the day a question in connection with a ferry boat which is to accommodate Rivière Ouelle and the north shore of the St. Lawrence. Now, they have translated the word 'ferry' by the French word 'bac.' I would not have thought it was worth while to correct that error, were it not that I do not wish to be made a laughing stock to the community by leaving the public under the impression that I used the word 'bac' to describe the character of the accommodation which is to be given to the public by a ferry boat plying between Rivière Ouelle and La Malbaie. If you take the trouble of referring to Bescherelle's dictionary, you will find that 'bac' is described as follows: A large, flat boat, chiefly used for ferrying over a river, cattle, carts, &c., by means of a cable fastened on both shores.

The PRIME MINISTER. (Translation.) Where are the words to be found which you are complaining of?

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) At the top of page three of to-day's Order Paper. It would have been absolutely preposterous for me to have used such a word in describing the service which is to be provided by means of a ferry boat plying between Rivière Ouelle and the north shore of the St. Lawrence.

So, I think, the officials whose duty it is to translate the papers referred to, should give a closer attention to their work.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES ACT—PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend chapter 8 of the statutes of 1900, authorizing the granting of railway subsidies. He said: Chapter 8 of the statutes of 1900 makes a provision which I desire slightly to amend. This provision is contained in section 3, subsection 'C' and is as follows:

> Upon progress estimates and the certificate of the chief engineer of Railways and Canals, that in his opinion, having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than $60,000.

In practice, this provision is found to work to the detriment of roads whose subsidies are within the sum of $60,000. A road with a larger subsidy, may upon a progress estimate apply for an allowance from the subsidy and upon the report of the chief engineer, that allowance can be made. But a road with a subsidy of $60,000 or less, although it may be almost completed, although the progress estimates would show that a very small sum of money would be required to complete the road; yet a road of that character is absolutely debarred from an application for an allowance upon its subsidy under the progress estimate. It must be apparent to the House that this inadvertently works an injustice by putting a road with a small subsidy at a disadvantage as compared with roads having a larger subsidy. In view of this I have introduced this Bill which contains the simple provision that the figure '$30,000' shall be substituted for '$60,000.'

Mr. MONK. Is this amendment going to apply to railways which are only entitled to a subsidy of less than $60,000, or has it a general application?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I might be permitted to explain that in 1898 we introduced a departure from the ordinary rule which governed the payment of subsidies, by providing that in respect to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and I think the Victoria bridge, which were likely to earn very large sums, and which would not be able to complete their line in ten-mile sections; that we should be authorized to make payment on progress estimates providing the amount earned on the said progress estimates would not be less than $60,000. Not that the whole subsidy then earned would not exceed $60,000, but when the amount to be earned with respect to such progress estimates would not exceed $60,000.

Mr. MONK. Was that in 1900?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was before 1900. I think it was as early as 1898, because it was then that the Crow's Nest Pass contract was entered into. At the same time the Grand Trunk Railway was building the Victoria bridge.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Railways may remember that yesterday there was a debate on this very subject, in which I stated that the Railway Act was amended so that progress estimates might

be allowed as the road was under construction. The Minister of Railways then stated that that had application only to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, my hon. friend is in error as to that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If you look at the debate of yesterday, you will find that I am strictly correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood the hon. gentleman to have reference to the original adoption of this particular change in the law, which was in respect of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. My statement was that the Railway Act was read so as to allow the government to make advances on progress estimates instead of on the completion of 10-mile sections. The hon. minister stated that that applied only to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not intend to convey that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Act provides that the subsidies hereby granted, and any subsidies heretofore granted under any Act of parliament of Canada, still in force, but not fully paid, may be paid upon progress estimates on the certificate of the chief engineer of Railways and Canals that in his opinion, having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than $60,000. It has no such application as the Minister of Railways now states. He states that this only takes effect when there has not been ten miles of road completed, and where there has been $60,000 spent on a section that does not constitute a complete section of ten miles. There is no such application as that at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say there was.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, it is unfortunate that when I repeat a statement that has been made by the minister just a few seconds before, I have so misunderstood it that I am subject to a correction by the hon. minister. I leave it to the House if I am not correct in saying that the hon. minister left the impression on the House which I have stated. He may not have intended to say so, but the fact is there that payments can be made on progress estimates, not taking into consideration whether ten miles are completed or not; and the present Bill is for the purpose of amending the Act in order to extend the application, as I think properly, to sums not less than $30,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Act contemplates dealing with a class of railways—there are not many of them—that have a subsidy coming within or very near the limit set in this Bill. For instance, there may be a road fifteen miles in length entitled to a subsidy of $3,200 a mile.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to call the hon. member's attention to the fact that he has already spoken, and he cannot continue except with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. The subsidy on a road of that length would be something like $48,000. The road might be almost completed. There might be work enough to have completed fourteen of the fifteen miles, and yet the ten-mile section not fully completed. Although there might be only $2,000 or $3,000 of expenditure required to complete the work, the subsidy would be hung up by this provision, which was not intended to discriminate in that manner against the smaller roads; and the Bill simply asks for the substitution of 'thirty' for 'sixty,' so that these smaller roads may be treated with the same degree of fairness that would be accorded to the larger and more expensive roads. It is for the purpose of rectifying an unintentional hardship, and not for the purpose of prejudicing in any way any public interest, that this Bill is introduced.

Mr. MONK. It does not seem to me very wise for us to change the statute of 1900. By the terms of section 3 of that statute we provide that subsidies shall be paid in two cases: first, in the case of the completion of a ten-mile section. That seems fair enough. Secondly, upon progress estimates on the certificate of the chief engineer of Railways and Canals, that in his opinion, having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than $60,000; or with respect to part one way and part the other; that is to say, when part of the ten-mile section is built and part of the $60,000 is earned. It seems to me on general principles that this gives the government and the railway company quite latitude enough. We should not, I think, reduce the limit of $60,000 to any smaller figure, particularly in view of the facts which were commented on yesterday in this House, showing that these payments of subsidies are very often abused. Unless there is some very special reason, graver than that given by the hon. gentleman, I think we should adhere to the enactment of 1900.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know whether I shall be taken as having spoken, because of the explanation I made; but if I have, I would ask the indulgence of the House for the purpose of making one remark on the Bill. While I have no objection to offer to the hon. gentleman's motion passing, and would not set up any direct nor indirect opposition to it, at the same time I think that we might very well consider whether or not it is desirable to continue in the future the

system of paying on progress estimates. I see no such objection to it as has been referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), because I think the public interest can be safeguarded as well if you are paying from progress estimates as if you were paying according to the original plan. But there are drawbacks which are largely departmental, and which it would not be desirable for us to continue. It will be in the memory of hon. members that some years ago—I think in 1898—we adopted the plan of allowing payments to be made on progress estimates and not limiting the payments of subsidies to the completion of ten-mile sections. Very strong representations were made that it would be impossible in a work such as was contemplated—the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway—that ten-mile sections could be completed. There was a great deal of heavy work on it. The company desired to prosecute the work with all dispatch, to go on with its grading over the entire length simultaneously, if possible, and it would not be possible to grade and do ballasting and station building on every ten miles with the expedition they had in mind. Therefore parliament consented that in respect of these two undertakings, the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and the Victoria bridge, upon the companies showing that they had expended a sufficient amount in the work to earn a payment on subsidy account of not less than $60,000, the government might make payment to them of such an amount. Since then a clause has been inserted in this general Act, and we have paid in a few instances on progress estimates when the parties have been able to bring themselves within the limitations of the present law. I think that the law is attended with some disadvantages. We are often called upon to send engineers for the purpose of making an inspection of a road, and are called upon for payments with a great deal of frequency, which adds to the work of the department. And if this were to go on to a greater extent, it would exceed the capabilities of the department. The lower you reduce the amount, the more frequent have the surveys to be made and all the machinery put into operation in order that these payments may be made. It was chiefly for that reason that we made the limit as high as we did. I do not think that any great hardship is likely to be done in this case—at all events none that the companies ought not be expected to bear. Therefore I should be disposed to drop this portion of the conditions attaching to payments altogether from future subsidy Bills and confine payments to the ten-mile sections as was the law prior to that change. I would not offer any opposition to the present Bill because I think if it becomes law, it would not long continue in operation, as we should have to revert to the original conditions which existed before we made this change.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

On section 1.

Mr. MONK. In view of the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that although offering no opposition to the Bill, he is in opinion that we should revert to the previous system of paying subsidies on the completion of ten-mile sections, it seems to me that it would be prudent for us, before proceeding still further in the direction upon which we entered in 1900, to have this Bill examined by the Railway Committee and have the report of the Committee before taking any action.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sorry to meet with the opposition of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier in this matter. If he understood all the circumstances, he would see that this does not involve any dangerous departure but is merely a provision to treat fairly and equitably projects already under way and nearly completed, and not place them at a disadvantage as compared with larger concerns. The denial of the provision asked for will work hardship in one or two cases, where roads with subsidies of less than $60,000 are nearly completed and in much better condition to ask for progress estimates than many larger roads which have asked for these estimates and received the money. I have introduced this Bill with a full knowledge of the facts. I do not think that the opposition of my hon. friend was called for, and I trust that the application will not be opposed.

Mr. MONK. I do not deny that hardships may be caused in one or two instances but we have the foreshadowing of the granting of very considerable subsidies during the present session, and if the remarks which fell from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals are to be entertained at all by the committee, it will be wiser for us to revert to the old rule and pay on the completion of each ten-mile section. That is the reason why on a question of this kind we should have the opinion of the Railway Committee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We should have the policy of the government. This is an extension of an important principle in the old Bill and which the hon. Minister of Railways thinks is perhaps a bad principle. The government gives money to railways for what purposes? That they may be of use in the sections where they are built, and they can be of no use until they are completed. On what principle then should the government be asked to advance money on a road which may never be completed and never used. Nearly the whole of the subsidy may be paid and the road never be completed or operated. I do not know the particular case the hon. gentleman mentioned and which he seeks to meet by the Bill. But it seems to me it cannot be of

much importance. The expenditure with regard to which progress estimates are required must be less than $60,000, and he seeks to lower the minimum $30,000. Surely, if the undertaking is of any importance whatever, the company are in a position to finish it; and when they finish it, they can get the full amount of subsidy they are entitled to. What I protest against is the advancing of money on progress estimates on a work where there is a possibility—not a probability only but even a possibility—of the road not being completed and used. Surveys, obtaining of the land, clearing it, putting it in shape to build the road—there may be advances on all these under the clause of the Railway Act, yet the road may never actually be built; and in that case the country simply loses the money paid in advance on the progress estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is another consideration to which, perhaps, the Minister of Railways and Canals will attach some importance. It has been stated in the House that subsidies for certain railways which are not now in operation were diverted in some way from the purpose for which they were intended. I have no knowledge of it myself, but if it is the case, as has been stated, does it not make it the duty of the government to announce a policy which will make more stringent the conditions touching the payment of these subsidies, rather than relax them? I do not know how many of the roads would come within the operation of this Bill, nor have I any idea as to the roads referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). But certainly the statements which have been made in this House with regard to this matter within the past few days should make us move in the direction of tightening the purse strings in the payment of these subsidies, rather than in the direction of a more lax system.

Mr. MONK. I would move that the Committee recommend that this Bill be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would call the attention of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to the fact that his motion is not in order. This motion is one to be made in the House, not in committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion is out of order.

Mr. MONK. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that I should offer any objection to this motion, nor shall I offer any. But I think that before we are through with the matter the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) will, perhaps, be ready to admit that he has been rather captious and unreasonable with regard to it. However, let that go.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is not for the purpose of killing the Bill, but to make the motion in the House that the Bill be referred to the Railway Committee where it can be more fully considered.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CATTLE-GUARDS ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. EDWARD A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to amend the Railway Act. He said: Mr. Speaker. For the third consecutive session I deem it my duty to press this measure upon the attention of the House. I should feel like apologizing to the House for taking up time with this matter did I not know that it is not my fault that it had not already been disposed of. I have discussed the principle of this Bill on the floor of this House and in the Railway Committee over and over again during these three sessions. We have discussed it, I am sorry to say, without getting any further on than we were at the beginning. The government has seen fit, on each occasion, to take some way of disposing of this Bill other than meeting it fairly and squarely and deciding for or against the principle. Two sessions ago, when the Bill was first brought up, I did not demur to its being sent to the Railway Committee, assuming that it would be considered in a reasonable way, brought down to the House in reasonable time and decided upon its merits. It went to the Railway Committee, therefore, I will not say with my actual consent, but without opposition on my part. In feeling that it was fair to give the government a trial with respect to it. But, in the Railway Committee, the government, with their majority, sent it to a small sub-committee, which disposed of it by reporting, practically, that it was not in the interest of the country to adopt it. That was adopted as a matter of course, first by the Railway Committee and then by this House, in consequence of the well known rule that the committees reports are to be adopted. Last session it came up in the same way, and on the second reading I felt it my duty to oppose it going to any Railway Committee, but it went in spite of the division that was taken, and it was there debated upon its merits to a considerable extent and was voted down, not on its merits, but in view of some promises made, some pledges of what would be done by the government in the meantime if it was allowed to stand. It was the opinion of the majority of the committee it should not be proceeded further with that session.

Now, sir, as you know, justice delayed is injustice, and we are here again another year without any expression of opinion against the merits of this Bill and without anything having been done. But I understand, and I want the Minister of Railways and Canals to correct me if I am wrong—I must be more or less uncertain about it until I see his Railway Bill, which has been read the first time

but is not yet printed for distribution—I understand that he proposes to refer this great question of the liabilities of railways killing animals belonging to farmers and others, to a railway commission without any positive declaration given by this House as to what principles are to guide that commission. If I am wrong about that, the Minister of Railways will correct me. If I am not wrong—and he does not rise to correct me—then I say at the outset that that is an absolutely wrong principle. There are 214 members in this House elected by our constituents to enact laws, and no railway commission ought to be allowed to decide from time to time, one year one thing and another year another thing, concerning this great question as to who is to be responsible for animals that may be killed on a railway by the railway company running its trains across highways. I say that such a large and important question as that should never be decided by any commission of gentlemen who are at perfect liberty to decide, as I say, one thing one year and another thing another year, and no owner of stock can know from one year to another where he stands, or what the law is, or what the law is likely to be next year. If that statute is amended so that justice is done, if the House, for instance, thinks that this Bill of mine should be carried, and if they think that a railway commission will do that which is reasonable and which we have a right to expect of them in enforcing it, the best way to get them do so is to pass a statute and oblige them to do it, only leaving it to them to carry out the details of the law which we pass. For that reason I am compelled to say at the outset that I feel that the only thing that we can do in the interest of the country is to fasten this responsibility upon the railway companies and by enactment to decide once and for all, right here, that the members of the House believe that it is right, and that the farmers should be protected in their rights, to secure which I am providing in my amendment. But referring it from time to time, first to a railway committee, then to a special committee, then to a commission that is to inquire into the question, then to a permanent railway commission, that may, as I said, do one thing one year and another thing another, is, it seems to me, not to use a stronger word, trifling with the rights of the parties. It would be much better, much more proper for members on both sides of the House to stand up manfully and say: I do not think or I do think the law should be as the member for Lincoln says it should, therefore I will vote against it or for it. That is what I want the House to do, because I want to be governed by the majority, and I want the majority to vote upon an intelligent issue, understanding all the time that they are accomplishing something and not trifling with the question.

Now, not unduly to delay the House, but at the same time to present this case fairly, I must ask the indulgence of the House while I describe the main history of this legislation. In the early days of this country when the railways began to do business, the law was not at all what it is now. I have heard it said by opponents of this legislation which I have been introducing, and trying to get passed during the past three years—I have heard it said more than once that my legislation is radical, that it is going backwards, that we are not going forward as we ought to do, that we are allowing the farmers to go back in civilization, so to speak, allowing them to get careless, to become indifferent as to their rights and as to the rights that other people have against them. That is one view of it, that is a view that comes from the opponents of this Bill, and it is so partial that I think I am right in assuming that it originates with the railway companies, because the railways themselves have been going back and have declined to carry out what in the early days they felt they were obliged to carry out, and which they did carry out as long as they thought it was necessary being compelled to do so, and until they found that the representatives of the people were not as careful in watching the people's interests as they, the railway companies, were in looking after their own interests; and they managed to get the law amended so that they were relieved of responsibility. Now, the original law is to be found in the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1886, section 13. It declares that cattle-guards at all highway crossings suitable and sufficient to prevent animals getting on the railway shall be maintained and kept up by the railway. That was the whole law upon the subject at that time, that was an absolute liability, that was a responsibility thrown upon them to keep cattle-guards sufficient to prevent animals going on the railways. In 1888 the Railway Act was revised and consolidated, that section was re-written, and instead of their being required to keep cattle-guards on all highway crossings suitable and sufficient to prevent animals getting on the railways, it was amended so that they were required by section 194 of the Consolidated Railway Act of 1888, to maintain and erect on each side of the railway, through any township, fences with openings, gates or bars, sliding or hurdle gates, and so on. Also cattle guards on all highway crossings sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals getting on the railway. And with this declaration of liability added:

> Until such fences and cattle-guards are duly made and completed, and if after they are so made and completed they are not duly maintained, the company shall be liable for all damages done by its trains or engines to cattle, horses and other animals, not wrongfully on the railway, and having got there in consequence of the omission to make, complete and

maintain such fences and cattle-guards as aforesaid.

Now that began to take away responsibility. They had then only to pay for the animals that were not wrongfully on the railway, and all this time there has been a section in this Act preventing animals from being lawfully upon the highway within half a mile of the railway crossing; so that when, in 1888, they got that section into the Act, that the animals should only be paid for by the railway if they were not wrongfully on the railway, then they were not responsible, and they are not responsible to-day in any case that can be suggested. They are responsible if the animal is not wrongfully on the railway. If the animal is not in control of a human being, as it has been decided by the courts, it would be wrongfully there, in view of the section of the Act which I last mentioned, the section that makes it unlawful for the animals to be within half a mile of a railway crossing; for then they are not rightfully upon the railway.

Now, what are cattle-guards for? Is there a case that can be suggested by any gentleman in this House where a cattle-guard is required for animals who are in charge of a human being? If an animal is in charge of a human being, one sees at once there can be no responsibility, because the human being would then be guilty of contributory negligence in allowing the animal to get upon the track. So we have since 1888 a statute which is absolutely nonsensical, a statute which ought to be repealed, if it is not amended, because it does not enact anything practicable. That legislation as it stands to-day is absolutely impracticable, it does not legislate for the redress of any grievance that can possibly exist. It does say they shall be responsible if they kill animals that are rightfully upon the railway, but at the same time they cannot get there in a case where responsibility would exist. That Act was further amended in 1890. It was amended so as to read:

> If the company omits to erect and complete as aforesaid any fence or cattle-guard, or if, after it is completed, the company neglects to maintain the same as aforesaid, and if, in consequence of such omission or neglect, any animal gets upon the railway from an adjoining place where, under the circumstances, it might properly be, then the company shall be liable to the owner of every such animal for all damages, &c.

Then it goes on to enact that any animal allowed by law to run at large should be paid for. Now, I am coming to the case of an animal that is not allowed by law to run at large because that is the animal that requires to be protected. An animal escapes without the knowledge of the owner, goes down to the railway crossing, and passes on from the highway to the point of danger on the railway property. If the animal is killed there the owner cannot get paid for it. That is a condition of affairs that should be remedied and one which I have been endeavouring to have remedied for the last two years. I may say that the only argument that has been used against this legislation, so far as I know, is that there is a principle involved and that we should encourage the farmer to prevent his cattle from running at large. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. The railway companies are deliberately violating an Act of parliament; they are deliberately refraining from carrying out the object of this legislation, they are not doing what it is contended they should do, they are not maintaining cattle-guards at highway crossings. That of course is no reason why the farmer should deliberately violate the minor law but it comes about in this way: The farmer's animal escapes without him knowing it. We must assume that he does not wish to break the minor law and that he is anxious to keep his animals at home. However, an animal gets upon the highway. Has he not a right to expect that it will remain upon the highway? That is where he should be responsible for everything that happens to it. If it gets upon the highway through his carelessness or otherwise, it should be expected to remain upon the highway. But now, if it gets to the point on the highway where the railway crosses and is killed at the point of intersection the farmer should suffer the loss of the animal. It is fair enough that he should stand the expense of an accident happening at the point of intersection. Animals accidentally get upon the highway in different ways without the knowledge of the farmer. For instance, a neighbour visiting a farmer and then going away, may leave the gate unfastened, and though no act of negligence has been committed by the farmer, his animal may get upon the highway and go to the railway crossing. The farmer should lose the animal if it is killed while it remains upon the highway. The responsibility is fairly divided by the Bill which I have introduced, because the farmer sustains the loss himself if the animal is killed while it is on the highway; that is, if it is killed at the point of intersection between the places where the cattle-guards ought to be. If there are cattle-guards provided the animal will pass along; if it is not killed at the point of intersection it will not be killed anywhere else, because, if this amendment is adopted and railway companies are obliged to provide cattle-guards, the animal will be prevented from getting on the railway property. Every owner of property in Canada has to fence his own property. The railway company has to fence its own property at common law, and if the railways and those opposing this legislation contend that we are violating a principle which we ought not to encourage the farmers to violate by allowing their animals to run at

large, they forget that they are violating a much older and stronger principle which is that they should fence their own property. But, we must be practical. I admit that a railway company must cross the highway and that it would not be possible to erect fences there. In the older countries they are even compelled to have gates which are moved from time to time as the train goes along, or they are compelled to tunnel underneath the highway or to bridge over it and in most of the states of the Union they are compelled to tunnel under or bridge over it. As the law stands to-day, in Canada, they are allowed to do what they can do in no other country. They do not have to protect the public with gates except where the Railway Committee of the Privy Council orders it in some very populous part of some very large city. They do not protect the farmer with gates when they cross on the level ; they are not obliged to go underneath or to bridge overhead. Then, it is said that in the interests of the country and of its development, we ought to encourage the construction and operation of railways, but the railway company ought to do something in order to prevent these accidents that occur without any deliberate or actual negligence on the part of the farmer. What can they be asked to do that will be less burdensome than that which my Bill will bring about ? They will be required to keep cattle-guards at the highway crossings to keep cattle from getting on the railway property. Is there anything harsh or unreasonable in that principle ? If they do not do this they will be obliged to pay for an animal that gets on their property because of their own negligence, and that is the only time they will have to pay for it. The responsibility is divided. It has been said that my Bill is one-sided. Well, I have asked hon. members on both sides of this House to draw me a Bill that will not be one-sided, and I have said to them that if they would draw such a Bill I will support it—such a Bill as will carry out the principle of making a fair division of the responsibility. Not one of them has said that he could draw up a Bill that would better accomplish this purpose, and as this is a principle that should be carried out, I submit that it is fair that this Bill should be passed in the shape in which I prepared it. Now, as I said a minute ago, and I think it will bear repetition, the Bill that I am introducing here, and for which I have fought for three years, because I thought its adoption was in the best interests of the country, does not put all the responsibility upon the railway company. It puts more responsibility on the farmer than upon the railway company. It only puts upon the railway company the responsibility of carrying out what is plainly their duty of fencing their own property so far as they can and at the same time do the business that they are chartered by the country to do. The railway companies should either be willing to bridge over the highway, or tunnel under it, or provide cattle-guards. They should not have an unprotected and dangerous railway, at common law, running across the highway and they should not encourage animals to get upon their property for want of a cattle-guard to prevent them. The responsibility is chiefly placed upon the farmers, because, if you consider the matter, you will agree with me that the animal is much more likely to be killed at the point of intersection than on the railway. It is more likely to remain on the highway than anywhere else. If the cattle-guard is there there is only one place it can go ; that is, it can continue on the highway, but if the guard is not there there are three places it can go when it gets to the point of intersection. If the cattle-guard is not there the only way in which we can get a practical result is to make the railway answerable in damages if they do not do what you say they should do. If the law does not hold the railways responsible for animals getting on the railway because of the absence of a cattle-guard, you cannot expect the railways to put up a cattle-guard. When an animal gets to the point of intersection it has to turn to the right or to the left, or to go straight ahead, and if it goes straight ahead no danger will happen. It is our duty in this House to so legislate as to prevent loss to anybody. We do not legislate to put any loss on the railway or on the farmer, but we should legislate to prevent loss of any kind. If the animal at the point of intersection does not go straight ahead, then if there are no cattle-guards or insufficient cattle-guards he will turn aside, get on the railway, and the chances are two out of three that it is the fault of the railway that the animal gets on the track. If there are not cattle-guards, the railway is responsible for two out of three causes of death ; that is to say the animal is twice as likely to be killed as not. Therefore, if a railway is required to have cattle-guards it cannot complain at being made responsible when it has no cattle-guards or cattle-guards that are not sufficient for the purpose for which they are intended. We ought to hear no more about this legislation being one sided. It has been said that you cannot get a cattle-guard that will on all occasions turn animals and that there are some animals that no guard will turn. That may be so. But it is also true that there are some fences that will not turn animals. I would like to ask those who oppose this legislation to apply the same rule to the railway company as they do to the farmer. Why cannot the farmer say : I have an animal which will jump over my fence and it is not my fault, and therefore you ought to provide some standard fence which if I put up and my animal gets over I cannot be held to be negligent. That is practically the argument that the railways bring against the farmers in this case. They say : We

do not know of any guard that will keep animals from getting on our track, and we think therefore we ought to be allowed to escape all responsibility. Of course the railways entirely disregard the fact that 90 or 95 per cent of the animals would be turned back by the ordinary guard, but they argue that because there is a small percentage that will get over any cattle-guard that therefore they ought be at liberty to kill 100 per cent of the cattle and not be responsible for it. I wonder would the railways pretend for a moment that we ought to determine on a standard fence and then say to the farmer that because there are some breachy animals that will get over that fence, they would pay for that animal if he is killed, and the farmer would not be responsible. It would be no more unreasonable for the farmers to contend that, than it is for the railways to contend that they should not carry out what by common law they are required to do, what by statute they were first required to do, but which they have for years escaped doing by virtue of the legislation of this parliament not having been watched on behalf of the people as energetically as it was watched on behalf of the railways. I have some further authority since last session for submitting to the House that the Bill which I now introduce is the only practical solution of the difficulty. The Toronto 'Daily Star' which ought to be an authority for some members of the government at least, spoke as follows on March 27th of last year:

> Necessity is the mother of invention, and if the railways were responsible for animals killed anywhere but on the crossings, they would not be long in finding a cattle-guard that would largely, if not altogether, prevent animals from turning from the road into the track.
>
> As it is now, the railways in Canada have no interest in the question at all. They have abolished guards, and trust to the power of their engine to throw aside any animal that gets in the way.
>
> This is not right, and parliament will not get much rest until it is made right.

In view of that expression of opinion in the Toronto 'Star,' I hope I shall get the support of the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), although I have not had his support for this Bill before, so far as I am aware of. I think, Sir, that this matter should be dealt with now once and for all, and I trust this will be the last time I shall have to address the House upon it. I do not wish the railways or the government or any one else to infer from that, that if the Bill does not pass you shall hear no more about it, for so long as I have a seat in the House, I shall try to get a remedy for this grievance, and I shall keep on knocking at the door in the hope that it will be opened some day. In view of the attention which has been given to this Bill during last session and since last session. In view of the fact that there is no other solution suggested, and in view of the fact that it has never been rejected by this House on its merits, I think I have good grounds for again submitting it to the House. Last year the Bill was referred to the Railway Committee and discussed thoroughly, but under that reference to the committee it only required fifty members of this House to prevent the Bill passing. Fifty members of that committee as against forty-three, a majority of seven, reported that in the opinion of the Railway Committee it was not wise to pass the Bill at that session. They did not report that it should not pass sometime, or that it did not provide a remedy for the evil, but that it was not wise to pass it during that session. Therefore, fifty members of the committee were able to accomplish what it should take one hundred and seven members, or more than half the House to accomplish. The right hon. the premier found fault with me for taking exception to the report when it came from the committee, and he suggested that I was practically appealing from the report of the committee and that it should not be allowed because it was against the rule that reports of committees should always be respected by the House. Well, Sir, it is time for the House itself to take this thing into serious consideration and decide whether it is reasonable that a farmer should take all responsibility for any accident that may occur, and that the railway company should have no responsibility cast upon it. The railways are permitted to expropriate property, and to cross highways with their dangerous machinery, and yet they are not to be liable for any damage they may cause by reason of their operation. I grant that it is necessary to have railways in order to carry on the business of the country, but why should they not be compelled to treat their neighbour, the farmer, the same as any other neighbour would be compelled to treat him? Accidents will happen in spite of the most absolute care; you cannot help a fence rail falling down or a gate blowing down and animals escaping. Under my amending Act if the animal does escape and gets to the point of intersection, and is there killed, the farmer will lose the animal; but if it gets on to the railway from the highway the railway will be responsible for not having guards to stop it. The only way to get a good guard is, as the 'Star' newspaper of Toronto says, to put the responsibility on the railway. If a railway company wants to get a new coupler, or a new brake, or a new steam whistle, or a new telegraph instrument, is it to be expected that the country at large or parliament will provide them? No, the railway company finds all such things for itself, and it should be bound to find cattle-guards. They may not get guards that will turn back every animal; but they will get guards that wil turn back 95 per cent of them. If this legislation passes,

they will perhaps pay slightly unfairly for about 5 per cent of the animals that will be skilful enough to pass over any guard; but is it not better that the railways should pay for that 5 per cent, even wrongly, than not pay for the 95 per cent rightly ? It is simply a question of the greatest wrong being done the greater number, or the greater right to the greater number. Because there is a trifling percentage of cases in which the result might be hard on the railways, that is no reason why they should escape all responsibility in 95 per cent of the cases.

I do not think I ought to trouble the House any longer on this question. I dare say other members desire to address you upon it. If the Bill passes its second reading, as I think it ought to, we shall all have an opportunity to discuss it in committee, if the House goes into committee upon it, as I trust it will ; and if any member there can propose an amendment which will provide a better remedy for the wrongs that exist or one more applicable to the rights of the railways, he will have my support in amending the Bill to that extent, so long as the principle of the measure remains, namely, that the responsibility ought to be on the railways to protect their own property, and to keep animals from getting on their property from the highway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I may say at once that I have no opposition whatever to offer to the second reading of this Bill. I shall propose, however, that the Bill, after being read a second time, shall be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. I shall do so for this reason, that it is quite impracticable for us to discuss in this House a question of such apparently contentious character with the same effect or advantage as we can before that committee. I have no fault to find with the desire which the hon. gentleman has expressed, that the utmost justice shall be done in connection with this serious trouble. I realize the gravity of it. I know there is a very strong public opinion, in some parts of Canada at all events, in respect to it. I know that many people desire a remedy. I am confident that what they desire is that when the remedy is applied, it shall be a just, fair and equitable remedy, and I am prepared to act to the utmost of my ability with any gentleman who is interested in this question, in order that a remedy shall be devised which shall be an ample remedy, but which shall also be a just and equitable remedy. When the Railway Committee a year ago dealt with this question, it was perfectly clear that there was a very divided opinion among the members of that committee as to the form which the remedy ought to take, and seeing that the committee were far from likely to agree upon this, I suggested that during the recess persons should be chosen who would examine into the question of cattle-guards, have tests made of all the cattle-guards in use, and report at the conclusion of their labours what the result was ; and if they were able to report that one or more cattle-guards could be found which would answer the purpose and afford a sufficient protection, the government would introduce legislation whereby the use of such guard would be enforced. My hon. friend fell in entirely with that suggestion. If I am not mistaken as to what occurred, the hon. gentleman moved or seconded a motion in this House for the purpose of having the matter disposed of for the session in that way. After the session a commission consisting of two gentlemen was constituted. They have made investigations and held tests, and they are preparing a report, which I hope will be available in a very few days. Whether or not that report will be of material assistance to us in determining the character of the legislation which we shall adopt, I am not now in a position to say. But I am in a position to state here now that when this question shall have been dealt with by the Railway Committee, if that committee comes to the conclusion that the principle on which the law is now based should be changed and some other principle adopted as more equitable, then it will be the simplest matter in the world to incorporate such an amendment into the Bill creating the Railway Commission, and making it part of the general railway law of the country. That is the way in which I think this matter can be dealt with in a business like manner, and a manner that will produce the very best results.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Did I understand the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to say that the commission has not yet reported ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not yet.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Is it possible that they will report before this session is over ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). This is a very important matter, and we want to deal with it this session.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will engage that it shall be dealt with this session, when the Railway Bill is going through.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). How long is it since that commission was appointed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the commission was appointed in August. They have been visiting different parts of the country, and the delay which has occurred has arisen largely from the desire of the experts to have every cattle-guard submitted to a test. There are some people who think that they have very effi-

cient guards and who have asked to have the tests still further applied. The tests will be applied very shortly and the government will then be in possession of the report of the commission.

Mr. T. G. SPROULE (East Grey). I would like to ask how that one-eyed steer has fared lately ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid that my hon. friend will have to wait for the report.

Mr. SPROULE. I have always been in hearty accord with the principle of this Bill. I think it is intended to do justice to a very important class, who have scarcely had justice done them by the railway companies in the past. But I regret that the hon. Minister of Railways has not been more active in putting that commission in operation so that we might have had the report at the opening of the session.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will have it very soon.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman knows that there are many delays and many dangers and difficulties which beset measures of this kind when not brought down early. They are apt for one reason or another to be put off to the end of the session and then summarily disposed of in a very unsatisfactory manner. That commission might reasonably have anticipated that after the long discussion we had last session, this House would be anxious to deal with the question at the earliest possible moment. Why is the report not down now in this, nearly the third week of the session? I am afraid that unless the commission are hustled by some one, their report will not be down until it will be too late for the House to deal with it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No danger of that.

Mr. SPROULE. From the somewhat lengthy experience I have had in this House and on the Railway Committee, I am inclined to view with suspicion the sending of Bills of this nature to that committee. I have found it to be frequently the graveyard of the hopes of those interested in such measures.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let us hope that this will be an exception.

Mr. SPROULE. Some how or other such Bills come to very unfortunate termination in that committee, and I am afraid this will meet with a similar fate. After the lengthy discussion we had last year in this House and in the committee on a similar Bill, I should think that hon. members would be quite prepared to deal with this matter in Committee of the Whole and not send it to any other committee. I do not care what committee you send it to so long as it is dealt with fairly and put before the House as it should be, without having to submit to the fiat against it of some force we cannot account for. I think it would be fairly dealt with by the Committee of the Whole without any injustice to any of the interests concerned.

Mr. ROBERT JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I understand, Mr. Speaker, that every railway charter contains a clause providing that the company shall provide sufficient cattle-guards, and certainly whenever our municipalities have granted bonuses, they have done so under the understanding that such protection shall be afforded. But it seems that there is another law in our statutes which prevents our farmers collecting from the railways compensation for animals killed on the track. We have been trying to have this defect in our law remedied, we have been trying to have the railway companies compelled to afford the farming community adequate protection, but after three years agitation in this House and in the country, nothing has yet been done, and our farmers have to suffer the loss of their cattle without being given the means of recovering compensation. What guarantee have we that this condition of things will not continue another year ? A railway company runs a train across a highway, that train kills cattle when on the railway property, and the owners can recover no compensation. We have laws which provide that when an animal strays into another man's field, it can be impounded, and there is nothing to prevent railways impounding cattle which stray on their property. From the start to the finish the railways have the advantage. If a man shoots an animal which wanders on to his property, he will have to pay for it, but a railway engine can kill an animal and the owner has no recourse. That is not treating the people fairly. And after we have had this question delayed for three years by being sent to committees, I think we ought to deal with it in this House in the Committee of the Whole and get through with it. Two years ago it was sent to a committee of five members, of whom two were in favour and three against compelling railway companies to put up better cattle-guards. It is time that something should be done. I do not see why the government should say what sort of cattle-guards a railway company shall build. The companies have accepted their bonuses on condition that they will furnish proper cattle protection, and are compelled to do so by their charters. It makes no difference to us whether the guards are of steel or wood so long as they are effective, and the companies should be allowed to judge what kind of cattle-guards are required. All we ask is that they be efficient. That is what they agreed to put up when they got their charters and when they canvassed the municipalities for bonuses. This matter has been before the gov-

ernment three different years, and yet they are no further than when they started. I hope that parliament this session will do justice to the farmers and compel the railway companies to put up cattle-guards that will turn the cattle. All that the government have accomplished so far is to find out that this one-eyed steer, which has been referred to, can jump any cattle-guard which so far may be put up. I would ask that in all fairness we should deal with the railway companies as we would with any individual who broke the law.

Motion agreed to ; and Bill read the second time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I move that this Bill be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

House divided on motion (Hon. Mr. Blair).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Mackie,
Beith,	MacKinnon,
Belcourt,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Bernier,	Macpherson,
Bickerdike,	McColl,
Blair,	McCreary,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McEwen,
Bourassa,	McGugan,
Bourbonnais,	McIsaac,
Brown,	McLennan,
Bureau,	Madore,
Calvert,	Malouin,
Campbell,	Marcil (Bagot),
Carbonneau,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Carroll,	Martineau,
Christie,	Matheson,
Copp,	Mayrand,
Costigan,	Meigs,
Davis,	Mignault,
Delisle,	Mulock (Sir William),
Demers (Lévis),	Murray,
Desjardins,	Parmelee,
Dugas,	Paterson,
Emmerson,	Proulx,
Ethier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fitzpatrick,	Riley,
Fortier,	Roche (Halifax),
Fraser,	Ross (Ontario),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Rimouski),
Geoffrion,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Gibson,	Ross (Yukon),
Girard,	Russell,
Gould,	Schell,
Grant,	Scott,
Harty,	Smith (Vancouver),
Heyd,	Stephens,
Holmes,	Stewart,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sutherland (Essex),
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Kendall,	Talbot,
Lang,	Tarte,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Thompson
Laurier (L'Assomption),	(Haldimand and Monck),
Lavergne,	Tobin,
Law,	Tolmie,
LeBlanc,	Tucker,
Lemieux,	Turcot,
Lewis,	Turgeon,
Lovell,	Wright.—99.
Loy,	
Macdonald,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Kidd,
Avery,	Lancaster,
Bell,	Lavell,
Bennett,	Lennox,
Birkett,	Léonard,
Blain,	Maclaren (Perth),
Borden (Halifax),	McCarthy,
Boyd,	McGowan,
Broder,	McIntosh,
Bruce,	Monk,
Cargill,	Morin,
Carscallen,	Northrup,
Casgrain,	Pringle,
Clancy,	Puttee,
Clare,	Reid (Grenville),
Clarke,	Richardson,
Cochrane,	Robinson (Elgin),
Culbert,	Roche (Marquette),
Earle,	Seagram,
Gourley,	Sherritt,
Hackett,	Sproule,
Hale,	Taylor,
Halliday,	Thompson (Grey),
Henderson,	Tolton,
Hughes (Victoria),	Ward,
Ingram,	Wilson.—53.
Johnston (Cardwell),	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Wade,	Simmons,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
McCool,	Vrooman.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Order being called for :

Second Reading Bill (No. 18) To amend the Interpretation Act.—Mr. Monk.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). My hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) is not in his place. He has a Bill very much to the same intent and purpose as the one I have before the House, and I would prefer to await his arrival before discussing the merits of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

Order allowed to stand.

TICKET OF LEAVE ACTS—RELEASES.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency) moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council, documents, papers, correspondence, &c., in relation to the release from imprisonment under the Ticket of Leave Acts, since the 1st of January, 1902, to the 12th of March, 1903. And a statement showing :—

1. How many persons have been released from imprisonment under the Ticket of Leave Acts, since the 1st of January, 1902, to the 12th of March, 1903 ?

2. Of what offences had they been convicted, and at what dates were they so convicted ?

3. At what dates were they so released from imprisonment ?

4. Have any of the licenses of ticket of leave so granted been revoked ; and if any, how many ?

He said : Mr. Speaker, the motion as I gave notice of it, contained the following as paragraph 2 : 'What are the names of such persons.' In view of the remarks made the other day, when this subject was up in the House, by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick), I ask leave to amend the motion by striking out that paragraph.

Motion agreed to.

PREROGATIVE OF PARDON.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency) moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council, documents, papers, correspondence, &c., in relation to the exercise of the prerogative of pardon exercised by His Excellency the Governor General in cases of conviction of offences against federal or provincial laws, since the first day of January, 1902, to the 12th of March, 1903 ; and a statement showing :—

1. The number of the persons in whose favour the prerogative of pardon was so exercised during the said period.

2. Of what offences the said persons had been convicted.

3. The penalties to which the said persons had been condemned.

4. The dates when the convictions were pronounced against the said persons.

5. And what date the prerogative of pardon was exercised in each case.

He said : In this case I have to ask the leave of the House to amend my motion in somewhat the same way as the one that has just been carried. The motion as I gave notice of it, called for 'the names of the persons in whose favour the prerogative of pardon was so exercised.' I ask leave to amend that by substituting 'number' instead of 'names.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Perhaps my hon. friend would allow that motion to stand for the present. It is my intention to oppose it on the ground that it is contrary to the well-established usage in England, and also to the practice which has been adopted in the Justice Department. I make this suggestion because I have not been able to put my hand upon the particular case in which this rule was adopted in the Justice Department when Sir John Thompson was head of that department. I hope to have it within a day or two. I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the Minister of Justice look up the authorities ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps there would be no objection to furnishing us with a copy of that memorandum in the meantime.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will have a copy made and send it to the leader of the opposition as soon as I have found the particular case I refer to.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

A DIVORCE COURT.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved :

That this House is of the opinion that the laws of Canada should clearly and within narrow limits define the causes for which divorces may be granted. But that the present system of granting divorces by legislative enactment is unduly expensive, and often capricious, and unreliable. That if cause for divorce may exist, the means for obtaining a decree should be rendered less expensive than at present. And that as the justification of divorce by virtue of law, defining adequate cause, can only be established by investigation and evidence, the proceedings upon which such decree may be obtained are judicial in their character ; and that consequently divorce proceedings should be taken before, and decree of divorce emanate from a properly constituted divorce court.

He said : I stated last session upon an occasion when a divorce Bill was before this House, and when assigning reasons for my reluctance to act in a judicial capacity upon a matter of which I knew nothing, that I should this session introduce a motion asking for a change in divorce proceedings in the Dominion, at the same time laying stress upon the fact that in my opinion the method of granting divorces in Canada was unique in the respect that the decree emanated from a court not one-third, perhaps, the members of which knew anything of the case upon which they were passing judgment; that divorces were often subject to capricious influences, were uncertain in their character, and were in all cases expensive. For that reason I expressed the opinion then which is expressed in the resolution I have the honour to place in your hands now, that the method pursued in this country in divorce proceedings should be changed, and that the proceedings should take place before a judicial tribunal and not before a legislative body. The member of this House, the member of the Senate, on such a case acts in the capacity of a judge, and I have never felt in my thirty years' experience in the Canadian House of Commons that the question of divorce was treated with that degree of solemnity that it is entitled to. There has generally been manifested a spirit of levity, and often indeed influences have been brought to bear in securing a result which had little or nothing to do with the merits of the case. A member of this House in nine cases out of ten, if he has any opinion upon the matter at all, founded upon investigation, takes for granted the evidence that is received in another body, takes for granted the evidence in securing which he had no participation. He knows

nothing of the character of the witnesses, he knows nothing of the circumstances under which their evidence was given, he has had no opportunity to cross-question, which a judge necessarily must have in forming an opinion as to a case ; still he takes the report presented to him by the other branch of this national legislature and is called upon to act on that report as a judge in a judicial capacity. In giving my vote upon a divorce case I have never felt that I was acting in a way in which I was entitled to act. I have always felt that so far as my vote was concerned, I was taking action in the dark without a proper knowledge as to whether my action was justified or not. Now, I have always felt a desire to avoid this responsibility. I have always felt that a divorce was a judicial proceeding, that if a divorce was to be granted at all, the question of granting it was a matter of law and evidence, and was a proper subject for investigation and for action by a judicial tribunal.

There is another element in this question so far as this House is concerned which may sometimes, and perhaps has often prevented the consummation of proceedings that had been initiated and passed in the other House, and that is the fact that a large element in this House is opposed to divorce and do not believe in it under any circumstances whatever ; who are opposed to divorce per se, and who, as a matter of principle, will vote against any decree whatever. Now, if the case were referred to a court, and if the judge upon the bench entertained opinions which debarred him from granting a decree that the law provided for under certain circumstances, of course there could be no justice in the proceedings of that court. The very object of the court might be nullified by the prejudices of the judge, who would allow these prejudices to rise superior to the law and evidence, and to govern his conduct in that matter despite the law and the evidence. That is necessarily the case in this House, because there are members here who religiously, and conscientiously, believe that divorce should never be granted. It may perhaps be a question whether it should be granted, and if I believed that there was no warrant for granting a divorce, I should never introduce a resolution of this kind, I should never propose the establishment of a divorce court.

But I believe there is Divine warrant for divorce under certain circumstances. I believe that divorce, as the resolution provides, should be confined within the narrowest limits, and that there is only one cause that will justify the granting of a decree of divorce, and that cause is laid down in Holy Writ, laid down by the Saviour in two passages in Matthew, where it is said that divorce, except for the cause of fornication, is not permitted and cannot be granted. But for that single offence, for the offence of infidelity, I think we may say that we have Divine warrant for granting a divorce. Well, if we assume that is the case, and we do assume it in our proceedings in this House, we do assume it in the laws in force in this Dominion—if, I say, that is the case, then the question arises, in what way that provision of the law should be carried into effect. In what way should this offence be provided for ? What should be the machinery provided ? Should that machinery be of a cumbersome, costly, unworkable character, liable to be set aside by prejudice, or counter influences, or political influence ? Should such be the kind of a court to deal with this question, or should we establish, as has been established in all other civilized countries except Canada, so far as I am aware, a judicial tribunal, a divorce court to deal with this question ?

As I stated a moment ago, a divorce decree under the law is a question of law and evidence. The proceedings are properly and strictly judicial, but the proper conduct of proceedings of this character is not attainable in the parliament of Canada. Strictly judicial proceedings, entirely free from all prejudice, entirely free from all influences that may sway the opinions of the members, or influence the decision of the case, such proceedings, I say, are not attainable in a legislative body such as this, or in any other similar body. You must have judges who will examine the case, hear the evidence, and be governed by the law in arriving at a decision, impartially governed by the law as it exists, which defines what their actions should be on the evidence that is taken, proving to them whether cause for divorce exists.

Now if divorce under the constitution is a legal right on the part of any person who is aggrieved, who is sinned against, when the offence has been committed under the law that makes it proper for him to apply for a decree of divorce, if, I say, that is a legal right, then the great mass of British subjects in Canada should be at liberty to avail themselves of that right under the law. The expense is now onerous, the inconveniences and difficulties that beset the applicant are very great. The times when this case can be tried are very infrequent, they must be tried when this parliament is in session. Witnesses, respondents, applicants all must come, perhaps from very long distances, and they must dance attendance here upon the Senate. These proceedings are surrounded by circumstances that are apt to deter people of fine feelings from attempting to come here at all. Great publicity attends these investigations and all the circumstances attendant upon a trial befor the Senate, of an application for a divorce are of a repellant character, are of a non-judicial character and are of a character so antiquated and so full of objections that it is time a change was established in reference to this matter. It would be better, I believe, Mr. Speaker, to abolish the

privilege of divorce entirely, than to continue proceedings as they have been continued and are continued at the present time. It would be better to abolish them altogether or to have a properly constituted divorce court to take cognizance of cases of this kind. I assign briefly, for I shall not detain the House at any great length on this question, the reasons to be urged against the present procedure. The first of all is undue publicity, a degree of publicity that is not beneficial to public morals, a degree of publicity that is not dignified or desirable. I assign, in the second place as a reason for a change in the method of obtaining divorce, the great inconvenience inflicted upon the parties who appeal to this House for the remedy which ought to be placed within their reach in the easiest and most expeditious manner. I assign as another reason the prohibitive cost. As the law now stands the rich man may take his proceedings here and get his redress, but the poor man is absolutely barred out from making an appeal for what he deems to be and what the law says is an act of justice. Another reason I assign for a change in the procedure is the liability to a miscarriage of justice here as has been the case and as is liable to be the case. As we all know the result depends upon the condition of the House. Those who believe that divorces are permissible under certain circumstances may be in the majority at one time while the elements opposed to divorce under any circumstances may have a majority at another time and thus the case miscarries and the Bill is lost. Whatever may be the circumstances, whatever may be the evidence, whatever may be the reasons that exist for putting that Bill through if it so happens that there is a certain element in the House in the ascendancy for the time being the Bill will be lost. That element of uncertainty exists to such an extent that justice may often miscarry. Another reason I assign is that personal interest may and often does affect the result of the trial of these cases in the parliament of Canada. These are some of the reasons for providing for a change in the mode of procedure in reference to the granting of divorces.

The reasons that I would urge in favour of a divorce court are that the proceedings before such a court are strictly judicial; no other elements will enter into the case, no uncertainty, or doubt, or political influence being exerted by the element that is opposed to divorce under any circumstances whatever. The proceedings will be strictly judicial and the case will be decided upon the evidence and under the law. Another reason is that there will be an impartial administration of the law. Another reason is that it will minimize the cost and inconvenience, not that I would admit, Sir, that it is a desirable thing to promote divorce by rendering the thing easier, but the law assumes, when it puts upon the statute-book a cause for divorce, that it is a proper thing to apply for divorce under the provisions of the law. It assumes that where a party is sinned against to the extent that he is entitled to apply for a legal remedy he should have his remedy. If the law contemplates that the aggrieved party should have a remedy, then it is the height of injustice to make the securing of that remedy, so difficult, so inconvenient, and so excessive in cost as to neutralize the effect of the law. And so, we have under this proposed arrangement of a divorce court the minimum of cost, the minimum of inconvenience, and an administration of the law that is speedy, impartial and to a certain degree inexpensive. In addition to this we would avoid indefensible delays. Here we have a parliament meeting once a year. Perhaps an attempt may be made to institute divorce proceedings and the case will go over for another year. The delays are intolerable, the expenses prohibitive, while with a divorce court these cases could be tried promptly, tried according to the usages of law and order, and tried and decided in accordance with the evidence. Now, if divorces are to be given at all, there should be some degree of solemnity, some degree of attention to appearances in the proceedings and in the granting of divorce. Do we have that here? Are there not often scenes of levity, are there not often undignified and uncommendable features in parliament in connection with these proceedings, features that would be disgraceful to a law court if it was called upon to give a decision upon a case of such momentous consequence as that of divorce. We would invest the trial, in case we establish a divorce court and the deliverance of that court, with not only the supposition that there was justice done, but with the unquestionable fact that the decision would be in accordance with justice. We would invest these proceedings with dignity, we would have them conducted impartially in conformity with the law and with the evidence of the case and we would remove a stain from our judicial proceedings that now exists through the operation of our divorce laws the granting of divorce by this House of Commons. It is surprising, Sir, that thirty-five years, after confederation, this crude, objectionable, expensive, cumbersome, ineffectual system should be allowed to continue. It is time that this state of things was brought to an end. It is time that we had conformity in this respect to the usages of other enlightened states. It is time that we had a court established charged with the duty of dealing with these cases in accordance with the provisions of law and in accordance with the testimony placed before that court under which its decisions would be given and which would be of a

character that would command public respect, that would do justice and meet the requirements of the case.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). The only divorce court we have in this country is the Senate, and it seems to me that there ought to be some other court. I am not one of those who would like to see divorce granted as in other places for trifling causes such as incompatibility of temper, but I do not think that the Senate of Canada is the proper place to try these cases. It is deplorable that they should publish the proceedings relating to divorces in the Senate and send the evidence to every member of this House. The most frightful trash I ever read in my life has been put in my hands since I have been a member of parliament. The page boys get hold of this, and all classes of people get hold of it in this city, and I am strongly opposed to this evidence being sent from the Senate and distributed all over the country. It is contaminating—I was going to use a stronger word. I think that the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) has done well in bringing this matter before the House, and if no action is taken on the divorce question itself, I hope something will be done to prevent that filthy evidence being printed by the Senate.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) brought a similar motion to the attention of the House on a former occasion.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to say that I have never brought in a motion of this kind before. I spoke on the second reading of a divorce Bill, to protest against the existing system, but I have not before brought a motion.

An hon. MEMBER. It was Mr. Britton's Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes; my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) expressed the same opinion on that occasion as he did to-day. The House at that time did not endorse his views, and so far as I know, nothing has occurred since to induce the House to change the attitude it took on that occasion. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) told us that Canada is the only civilized country which has not a divorce court. To a large extent that assertion is perfectly true, but I do not think it is a blot upon the fair name of Canada, that for the thirty-five years since confederation, no pressing want has been found for a divorce court. For my part I think it is always a grave matter to change, even by way of improvement, the institutions of a country. If the people are satisfied with their institutions it is far better to leave them as they are even though in the eyes of some they may be deficient.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no doubt that among many people in this country there is a disposition to believe that Canada, like some other countries, should have a divorce court. This opinion, however, is far from being unanimous, and so far as public opinion has the right to speak and can speak in this matter, none of those evidences by which public opinion does reach parliament have come to us upon the floor of this House. There have been no petitions inviting Canada to establish such a court; there have been no resolutions passed anywhere in the country, except on some occasions by religious bodies of certain denominations who hold strong views upon the subject. But these resolutions are far from being general and far from representing the whole country. Therefore, so long as more is not heard from the public opinion of the country, so long as no general demand is made in favour of such a court, I think Canada ought to be satisfied to leave things as they are at the present time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is no discredit to Canada; on the contrary it is to the credit of Canada that there are so few demands for divorce. In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia there are divorce courts which have existed prior to confederation, and so far as I am aware, the applications for divorce are so few and far between, that the judges of these courts have much of a sinecure. In the remaining provinces divorce must be sought by a private Bill originating in the Senate, and even in that case, I am glad to say, there has been no increase in the number of applications from year to year. The records from confederation to the present day show that the number of applications for divorce has not increased, although the country, I am glad to say, has increased in population and in many other ways. It is a testimony to the good morals of Canada that we are so free from the causes which generally lead to divorce. Public opinion as a rule has not expressed itself in favour of such a reform in our system, if reform it can be called, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) ought to be satisfied to let well enough alone. If the time comes—which I would deplore sincerely, and which I believe will never come—when public opinion will move in this matter, and the morals of this country instead of improving would degrade to an extent so as to make the number of applications for divorce more numerous than they are now; then my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), holding the views which he does, might be justified in coming before parliament. I speak with some diffidence on this question, because I belong to a persuasion which does not permit of divorce; but putting aside that feature of the case altogether, and appealing to those whose views are different upon the ques-

tion ; appealing to those who believe that under certain circumstances divorce ought to be allowed, it seems to me that the argument is overwhelming that there is no necessity for the establishment of such a court, and I hope that will be the view taken by this House.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Mr. Speaker, evidently the spirit of reform is dead in this House. The representatives from Ontario used to pride themselves on being great reformers, and yet, on a question of so much importance as this they appear to be indifferent, and to be willing to leave on the records of this Dominion such a crude, I was going to say savage, way of dealing with a subject of this kind as we have at present. Why the savages do better in this manner than we do. They confine their divorces to the same cause as our Saviour did, and when they find any unfaithfulness on the part of one side or the other, particularly if the squaw is unfaithful, the Indian takes her to the camp where her people reside, and there the divorce is completed. I think there is some decency in that, compared with the way in which we deal with the matter. Let us look at it. A man may come here from the farthest part of New Ontario. He has to pay $200 ; he has to pay all the expenses of his witnesses ; he goes before a Committee of the Senate, composed of men who perhaps have no experience or training in legal matters, they take the evidence, and that evidence is submitted to both Houses. I need not say anything about the nature of the evidence itself. It is often so filthy that the pigs would not sleep on it if it were placed before them as a bed. The charwomen who go to clean the Senate in the morning will get piles and piles of printed paper ; they take it home, they scatter it among their families, and it is read there to their moral injury. Why should not the Dominion of Canada copy the reform that has been in existence in New Brunswick, in British Columbia, and in Nova Scotia, on this matter ? In Nova Scotia the case is tried before a judge of the Supreme Court, and not a trace of the evidence is copied or goes into any of the papers. The only statement is that such and such a case has been tried before Judge Graham, and he has granted or refused the divorce, as the case may be. That is all that the world knows of the proceedings in the case. When the maritime provinces came to be united with the Dominion, we forced certain reforms on the people of Canada. At that time dual representation existed in Ontario and Quebec, but by the good example which we brought to this House, that system was abolished. Then you had elections on different dates, and the strongest seats, those most likely to return men favourable to the government of the day, were contested first. We abolished that system, and induced the Dominion of Canada to accept a simultaneous polling day, which was in force in the maritime provinces. Now, I think the Dominion should go a step further and copy our method of dealing with divorces, which is the only rational one, and which does justice to the poor as well as the rich. The law as you have it now is only for rich people, and does the grossest injustice to the poor, who cannot afford to avail themselves of it. In the maritime provinces we have no distinction of that kind, and I am happy to say that I believe the number of divorces which take place in those provinces is as limited as the number in the Dominion. We can speak with pride of the high moral character of our people in that respect, although the law as it exists makes it easy for them to obtain divorces. Now, I think that a sense of justice should lead this House to see that equal justice is done to the poor as to the rich. If that were done, there are people now in the Dominion of Canada who would avail themselves of the law ; but, being poor, they cannot avail themselves of it as it exists. I am not going to say much more on this subject, but I think it is time that people who claim to be reformers should take this subject up and abolish the present system, which is crude and is certainly not found in any other civilized country in the world. The premier said there were no petitions for this change. I do not remember that there were any petitions for these other reforms which I have mentioned. I do not know that there was a single petition for the abolition of dual representation or for simultaneous polling when these measures were adopted. I do not think that is any reason at all. If my hon. friends the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) were free to speak their minds, they would speak boldly and logically and effectively on this question. They do not want to offend their master who presides over them, but they know very well that the law that exists at present in Canada is one we would never think of adopting in the enlightened maritime provinces. I do not expect that anything I say on this subject will have the least influence on this House ; but I think the country will in time see the necessity of making such a change in the method of dealing with this matter as will bring about something like equal justice for the poor as well as the rich in the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the motion proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is one involving much more important considerations than have

at times been attached to it in this House. In all civilized countries, I believe, the law of divorce is recognized. In respect to this divorce law Canada is unique among the civilized countries of the world. There is no judicial law of divorce in this country. There are divorce courts in several of the provinces, as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has so well explained. The proposition, therefore, is a broad one, and in my opinion ought not to be dismissed from serious consideration because of the fact that heretofore the hon. gentlemen who have brought it before the House have not succeeded in interesting the House in it sufficiently to make any progress with it. The hon. gentleman who last brought this subject up in the House is now a distinguished judge. I refer to Mr. Justice Britton, who when he represented Kingston in this House, brought this matter before and excited a more exhaustive discussion than my hon. friend's motion has brought forth. The result, however, was nil, and certainly in view of the position which the right hon. the Prime Minister has taken, the present motion is not likely to be any more successful. But I go with the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House (Hon. Mr. Ross). I think with him that even if the leader of the government takes, on a matter of this kind a contrary view to that entertained by many other members of this House, that is no reason why those who are in favour of the motion should not be at perfect liberty to support it without impairing their political allegiance in any way. I am a strong Conservative, generally classed as a Tory, and I believe that although party government is the best for the well being of the country, still, unless there is a question of government involved, we should, on each side of the House, be free lances and freely express and assert ourselves on all questions beyond the pale of party discipline. This will stamp our legislation as being of a higher standard, and show the people that we are not mere automata to be freely moved at the will of the leaders on either side. The question before the House is a very broad one, to be considered from all points of view, and I must say that from what I have heard of divorce, and in view of the fact that all free civilized countries acknowledge that under certain circumstances divorce is justifiable, I am in favour of the motion before the House. I do not of course expect every one to entertain the same view, but one of the great lessons taught by free institutions, especially in a country governed by British institutions, is that we can differ in our religious faith and recognize that the views of those who differ from us are entitled to every respect, and that while we may differ in opinions, we agree that the majority must prevail and we can be very good natured and sensible over it. I am one of those who believe that divorce is a necessity, but at the same time I have been brought up in the old school which teaches that we ought to have as little of it as possible. One of the strong objections to any change in our divorce laws is the fear entertained by the ordinary domestic people of the country that any change may lead us to fall into the other extreme of the too great freedom of divorce which prevails in the great republic to the south of us. I think myself that that feeling is merely a prejudice, but the strongest argument that could be presented against any change is that which was made by the right hon. the Prime Minister. He claimed that there was no great call for it. I agree, however with the hon. member who has just taken his seat that the fact that there are no petitions calling for this change is not a good reason for not granting it. I am not so much of a believer in petitions as I was in my younger days, because my experience has taught me that many of those petitions are the result of the agitation of some individuals, who want to make us believe that there is a great cry in the country, when in reality there is not. I am of the opinion—and I think most hon. members will agree with me—that according to the capacity which God or nature has given us we are responsible for our actions and judgments, and I am not disposed to give any heed to petitions except when there is something in them which appeals to my judgment or when they spring from something which I believe calls for action on my part. Is the right hon. the Prime Minister well founded in his statement that there is no desire in this country for a change in our divorce law ? I think he is only right to the extent of the dread to which I refer on the part of many people that a change would bring about too much freedom of divorce, but I submit that this parliament of Canada ought to be responsible to the public for a definition of the causes or reasons for which divorce should be granted, and I understand that my hon. friend's resolution is based upon that principle. This House ought to define these causes and be careful not to make them too extensive. I am one of those who believe that the trying of divorce cases should be relegated to a judicial tribunal. A judicial tribunal could better take the evidence and in every way be more desirable and more competent than any committee of this parliament, and that is a strong answer to the plea of the right hon. the First Minister that there is no call for any change. If we can devise a simpler, a better and cheaper tribunal than the one we now have, both Reformers and Conservatives must agree that it would be wise for us to do so. This question has been brought before the House within my memory several times. Long before I had the honour of being in parliament, it was introduced. It has been stated that the principal reason against the establishment of a divorce court is a religious one. Well, there is no one who respects the religious convictions of others

more than I do. I have proved this in times past; when it was not in my interest politically to do so, and I am prepared to show the same spirit in the future. The religious views of every one ought to be respected, but when we come to a question of this sort, we come to a question of moral suasion, and until we learn to stand up face to face and consider it in all its phases, we will not be apt to come to any satisfactory conclusion.

And I am sure that every hon. gentleman within the sound of my voice and every Catholic that knows me or has ever heard me speak, will do me the justice to say that I am as ready to concede to them full freedom of opinion as I am to claim it from others, ready to be convinced by them, and to change my views or prejudice or whatever you call them. My claim is that, assuming that we are to have divorce, a judicial tribunal can best deal with the evidence in divorce cases. The proceedings before those tribunals will not involve the danger of injuring public morals that may attach to our present system. As my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) has said, the evidence will be confined to a court and not be spread throughout the country by having printed copies of the evidence sent out, very much of it of a nature that we would not desire to see in the bosoms of our families. Therefore, on moral grounds it would be better to make this change. On legal grounds, there can be no question. The evidence upon questions involving the marriage tie should be taken in a court of law, for there is only one thing more solemn than the marriage tie, and that is the belief in a personal God and a future life. If these divorce cases are to go before any tribunal, they should be sent to the best and soundest tribunal. Beyond all peradventure, my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) is right, and we should thank him for bringing this matter before us. The consideration of these grave matters relating to the very foundations of our social life must have the effect of improving, elevating and strengthening our people. We must decide these questions according to the principles of British freedom, for, under that flag, which now, I believe, is being recognized more than ever as holding the freedom of the world with other enlightened nations, there is no man, be he heathen or Christian but is assured of freedom such as no other but British institutions can secure for him. If it is necessary, as I believe it is, and as the practice of all civilized nations seems to sanction, that society should authorize the severance of the marriage relation, the bond should be unloosed only upon conditions which this parliament lays down. We should restrict as closely as possible the grounds upon which the divorce shall be allowed. But, having provided for this, we should relegate the rest to the courts of our land, which I believe are, and which history, I am glad to say, proclaims to be, in this as in other British countries, the best fitted to pronounce a verdict in such matters.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I am a little surprised to find that the House, apparently, takes no great interest in this very important question. The reason may possibly be found in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Ross) that a number of hon. gentlemen in the House—amongst them, if I understand him, the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick)—were not free to take the stand that they would like to take in this matter. In our deliberations last session, we learned from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) who moved this resolution a good deal as to the inner workings of the Reform party, or Liberal party, as they are usually called, and from the hon. member from Victoria we are again learning to-night something more as to the tendencies of that party. The hon. gentleman tells us that Ontario, at one time, prided itself upon its reform principles. If the hon. gentleman is referring to the members who form a majority of the representation from Ontario in this House, I do not know that he has any reason to attack them upon this question, because, I am not aware that, as yet, any of them have declared themselves hostile to the resolution. But we can well understand such remarks from an hon. member who has had long experience of Liberal practices, who can look back to the day when the position of the party upon many questions was not what it is to-day, who can look back to the stand taken in this House by the Liberal opposition and to the stand taken in Ontario years ago, and contrast it with the unfortunate position occupied, for instance, by the Liberal party in Ontario to-day.

Now, as to what the hon. gentleman has suggested as to the desirability of secrecy of proceedings in these cases, we need not go into a careful discussion of that matter now, because, if it is determined by the House that it is desirable to change the mode of procedure in obtaining a divorce in the Dominion of Canada, the details of the measure and the procedure to be fixed can be dealt with later on. I am not sure, however, that we should do wisely to revert to the old system of jurisprudence with its secret proceedings, as secrecy was then understood. There may be many things to be said in favour of the position advanced by the hon. member for Victoria as regards not transmitting the records of these proceedings in all their noisome details to the public through the newspapers. But, on the other hand, I do not understand that in Nova Scotia they have an absolutely secret tribunal such as obtained in days gone by. As to the question of lessening of costs, that, too, is a debateable subject. In the course of my practice as a lawyer, I have known many instances of parties who con-

templated divorce, and were about to seek redress by applying to this parliament, but were deterred by the consideration of expense. These parties would have separated and made their families homeless, but were prevented by the expense involved from making application for divorce. And in the end it was found that they lived happily together. On the question of expense, a good deal can be said on both sides. It is no doubt a hardship that a poor man or a poor woman who has just cause for seeking a divorce—and the cases are very limited where there is just cause—should be debarred from a remedy by reason of the expense. It will be found unwise, I am sure, and unfortunate if we make the means of obtaining divorce any easier than they are now, except in the matter of expense alone.

I did not hear the right hon. leader of the government speak on this question, but I gathered from the remarks of the member for Victoria that the leader of the government said that this motion should not be adopted at the present time because there had been no petitions in favour of it. Why, is that a sufficient answer to this proposition, or to any other? So far, experience seems to show that in this House, at present, the greater the number of petitions against a grievance, the less chance there is of getting redress. Not only during this session of parliament, but during preceding sessions, we have had petitions pouring in in favour of certain measures and nothing has come of them. Take for instance the cattle-guard question. If we are to judge of the effectiveness of petitions by the history of that question in this House, we would rather come to the conclusion that the fewer the petitions the greater the probability of obtaining redress.

Now I come to the resolution itself. The hon. gentleman who moved it says:

> That this House is of the opinion that the laws of Canada should clearly and within narrow limits define the causes for which divorces may be granted.

Upon that point I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman. I believe it would be greatly in the interest of Canada to define exactly what causes may justify the granting of a divorce. I entirely agree that we should define within narrow limits those causes. Speaking for myself, I must say that I am entirely opposed to the principle of divorce except in the most extreme cases. Every effort should be made, both by legislation and by educating public sentiment to minimize as much as possible the number of cases in which a divorce may be obtainable in this country. It would be very unfortunate if we opened the door for divorces as widely as it is open in the neighbouring republic, where so great facilities exist for obtaining divorces, and where so great a number are granted in consequence. The hon. gentleman then says:

> But that the present system of granting divorces by legislative enactment is unduly expensive, and often capricious and unreliable.

A word later on about the question of expense, but I agree that the present means for obtaining divorces are to a large extent capricious and unreliable. He says further:

> That if cause for divorce may exist, the means for obtaining a decree should be rendered less expensive than at present.

I submit that the means can be rendered less expensive without going to the opposite extreme of facilitating the obtaining of divorces. I hope parliament will take this matter up, not in the sense of encouraging divorces—and I think that is what makes some hon. gentlemen afraid to speak upon this question—but recognizing the fact that in some isolated cases parties must have divorce. Recognizing this fact, I submit the resolution is probably on the right lines when it asks parliament to declare that proceedings for obtaining divorces should be less expensive than at present, in order that the poor man may have the same facilities for obtaining redress as the rich man. Then he says:

> And that as the justification of divorce by virtue of law, defining adequate cause, can only be established by investigation and evidence, the proceedings upon which such decree may be obtained are judicial in their character; and that consequently divorce proceedings should be taken before, and decree of divorce emanate from a properly constituted divorce court.

Now whatever opinion may be held on the abstract question of divorce, there can be no difference of opinion as to where the investigation can most properly be had. It should surely take place in a court of justice, where the machinery and procedure are adapted for eliciting evidence, where the court is in the habit of restraining every expression of levity, and where the utmost decorum is always observed. There can be little doubt I think that the investigation can better take place in a properly constituted divorce court than elsewhere. I am not quite certain that I understand the meaning of the mover of this resolution. If he intends that we should have a separate divorce court, distinct from the existing courts of the Dominion, I would not be prepared to agree with him; but if his meaning is, as I apprehend it is, that some court at present constituted should have these functions added to it, or that some of the judges of the Supreme Court or of a Superior Court should constitute this court, then we would avoid the additional expense which would be incurred by constituting a new court. In this view of the matter I would be in favour of the resolution. I am rather happy at the fact that for the first time in my very short parliamentary experience I have been, to a large extent, with the distinguished gentleman who has

moved this resolution. I had no very great desire to speak upon it because I did not feel that I could add anything to what hon. members of the House know and understand more thoroughly than I do. I felt that I could say nothing but what could be very much better said by many hon. members of this House of greater experience and ability, but I venture to say, that when an important question like this comes up it is just as well that we should have an opinion upon it one way or the other.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I suppose we must acknowledge that in this case, as in several others, we owe a considerable debt of gratitude to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who is not afraid to face the indifference, or the quiet and sometimes effective inertia of the public and who has on several occasions, and in connection with a good many different subjects which are of great importance, found himself capable of taking hold of a case long before it has received popular support. It is gratifying to find that while there is not very much evidence of great interest there is a great deal of gravity and decorum about the debate so far as it has proceeded. There is no disposition to treat the subject with levity or to improve the opportunities which it affords for jocosity, but, evidently the House is disposed to regard the matter as of a somewhat serious character and of very great importance. It cannot be forgotten, in dealing with this matter, that the subject of divorce is inevitably associated with our civilized life. From the beginning of time almost, at least, from a very early date, in fact since marriage was established as an ordinance, occasional interruptions to married life have arisen from various causes. In Canada the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk would not materially change the position of affairs. In the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and British Columbia, divorce courts are established and have been established since before confederation. These give relief from time to time to those parties who find the conjugal bond one of intolerable weight and one which must impose conditions to which they can no longer comfortably submit. Divorce is a subject that must be dealt with and although the effect of the sentiment in the province of Quebec has so far and probably will perhaps for ever prevent the institution of such a court in that province, still, we find that in the absence of provisions by which married persons can secure the relief which the divorce action affords they do, in the cases of the several provinces, where divorce courts do not exist, overcome that difficulty by appealing to the law of our country which enables them by legislative enactment to procure the relief which the courts of their provinces cannot afford. The presumption is that the number of divorces granted would not be materially increased if the present system were done away with and if we substituted a more easy, economical and what would be of the utmost importance, a procedure which would involve much less publicity. Reference has been made to the character of the proceedings before the Senate and of the circulation of the evidence disclosing the relations between the married persons to the action and other corespondents. Literature of this character would not be tolerated at all if circulated in our country in the ordinary way. The courts and legislatures of the country would forbid the circulation of such material as this through the mails, of such material as under our system is put out in large quantities and which finds its way by one course or another into the hands of persons who should not have access to it. It is most unsatisfactory that such must be the case and I feel some sympathy with the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) who really seemed to look upon it as a grave infraction of his rights that he was compelled to receive, at the hands of the Senate, communications of such a very improper character. Still, I suppose it is an infliction to which we must all be prepared to submit unless we should determine to rid ourselves of that infliction by giving our moral, our personal and our active support to the cause which the hon. member for North Norfolk has espoused. It would be utterly wrong and intolerable that we, here, as a branch of the legislature of Canada, should give our contributory action to the effecting of a divorce without acquainting ourselves with the circumstances, the grounds and the evidence upon which the petitioner relied in each case of divorce. I do not know that all the members read the evidence in every case, but, certainly, in every case it is the duty of every hon. member, representing a constituency and forming part of the legislating body of Canada, to give effect to the legislation which secures a divorce, to satisfy himself that the evidence is sufficient to warrant him in voting so as to give legal effect to the Bill which has its origin in the other Chamber adjacent to this. Now, that the subject is of considerable importance a review of the statistical record of our country in connection with it will show. Taking the figures as they appear in the last volume of the Year-book up to June, 1901, we find that in the provinces of Canada which have no divorce courts, parliament has granted divorces numbering seventy-one. Seventy-one divorces have been granted by the parliament of Canada in the course of thirty-four years, not a very large number, it is true. In the province of Nova Scotia, in these thirty-four years, 102 divorces were granted by the courts. In the province of New Brunswick seventy-three divorces were granted and in British Columbia fifty-four divorces

were granted in that time. In the case of Prince Edward Island there is evidently a state of conjugal felicity which can scarcely be paralleled in any other portion of His Majesty's dominions. In that little island, the garden of the gulf, the most highly civilized, prosperous and happy under the flag of His Majesty in North America, not one single divorce has been granted in these thirty-four years. Evidently, in the province of Prince Edward Island there is an understanding of the advantages, the benefits and blessings of union that the other provinces fail to realize to the same extent as they do in that happy country. The result is that in Canada 300 divorces have been granted in thirty-four years, or almost an average of nine divorces per annum. We are told that if there were greater facilities for divorce there might be more divorces granted, and therefore, it might be argued by some that by furnishing divorce courts in the several provinces and by doing away with the present tedious, cumbersome, expensive and odious system of coming before the Senate of Canada and substituting a more convenient, more cheap and less public process of hearing applications before a judge of the Supreme Court of a province, divorces might be multiplied in number. We have no evidence of this to show this would be the case, and I do not know that any strong presumption exists that it would be. One thing that is established as a fact is, that in Canada for the last thirty-four years, three hundred divorces have been granted—six hundred married persons have secured release from the marital tie, and that is sufficient to show that there is a want of civilization and of social life as organized, which cannot be winked out of sight. Marriages are necessary to our civilization, and everything that tends to heighten and elevate and improve the condition of woman amongst us, is something that ought to receive our most anxious support. And concurrent with the institution of marriage; apparently inevitably associated with it, must be some reasonable provision by which in certain cases one party or the other who is bound by the marriage bond may secure a release when its conditions become intolerable or too irksome for them to bear. I find on further reference to the Canadian Year-book, that according to the census of 1901 there were in Canada 661 divorced persons—339 men and 322 women. That is almost exactly the number that would be supplied by our divorce courts since 1867, the year of confederation, were all the parties to these divorces still living. But manifestly a comparatively large percentage of the divorced persons who are presently living in Canada must have procured divorces elsewhere. It is utterly impossible that the 600 persons who have been divorced in Canada since 1867 could now be alive. The great probability is that at least one-third of these persons are dead. As a product of our own divorce courts and of divorce proceedings taken in the parliament of Canada, there are possibly 300 divorcees in this country, and the other 361 who are in Canada at present must have procured divorces somewhere else, or must have been divorced before they came to Canada. It is quite well known that in certain cases, in all the provinces of Canada, persons who are determined to procure divorce do go to the states of the neighbouring union and seek separation from their married partners in the courts of that country. The result is unsatisfactory, because those persons who being Canadians go to the United States and there secure a divorce, are only divorced so far as they continue residents of the United States, and they cannot return to Canada, and they cannot resume the marriage tie with another person, without practically bringing themselves within the operation of the law against bigamy, or making themselves liable to action for adulterous living. If, as I think we must grant; if there be an absolute certainty that to a certain extent—not at all to encourage, but on the other hand to be repressed and to be controlled by making the conditions onerous and the reasons for granting divorces of the most grave and serious character, limiting it so that there would be no flying with flippant ease to this court for relief; to make the conditions so that it would be only under circumstances absolutely in the eyes and known to the neighbours and fellow-citizens of the parties concerned justifying the divorce that such a thing could be obtained—with these conditions it seems to me that it is the duty of the people of Canada not to lose sight of this question, but to consider whether or not there be not a number of fellow-citizens in our country who are entitled to receive at our hands a strictly limited opportunity to secure release from the marriage tie when circumstances render it impossible for them longer to bear it with comfort. It is very evident that this is a question which will not have many advocates in parliament. It is not a matter in respect to which any person who is personally interested could easily make himself or herself heard. It would be only on a personal appeal, and that of a very strong character, that any member of parliament could be induced to advocate such a matter. Therefore, it is all the more important that this being a question which to the most of us is absolutely impersonal, that we should not on that account lose sight of its importance, but should rather devote ourselves to a fair and earnest consideration of it, the more so on account of the fact that it is a thing that can scarcely count on very hearty support on the part of any of the representatives of the people in this parliament. There must be to a very great extent, a large feeling of indifference in the minds of most of us here, and yet a little

reflection will show that in this matter we are dealing with one of the institutions of our civilization which is inseparable from it, and one which ought to be most carefully controlled. An avenue ought be opened up through which escape may be had from the conditions of married life when they become intolerable, and at the same time every condition of secrecy, every condition of solemnity, every condition that would prevent anything like shock to the sensitiveness of the public on matters which ought to be concealed from them, ought to be attached to the process by which divorce may be procured in our country. That I believe unquestionably, to any one who gives the matter consideration, will be found to be, by applying to this parliament, not for a Bill of relief, but rather by some quiet and orderly resort to the judges of the land in whose hands we may safely leave the administration of this matter. The statistics of the provinces go to show, that where divorce courts are in operation, they have not been largely availed of. In Nova Scotia the average will be about three cases in a year, and it is quite possible that several of these cases are not of native Nova Scotians, because it is naturally to be expected that in provinces in which no divorce courts are existent, persons who desire to procure divorce may migrate there for the time-being. It seems to me quite probable, that either in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia it may turn out to be the case, that many of the actions for divorce that have been commenced and concluded there, have been set up by those who really were not citizens of the province. That being the case, it is very evident that the number of divorce actions is not encouraged by the fact that courts in which such actions may be taken have been set up in the province, but that this is a remedy which the parliament of Canada may to a certain extent permit without any fear that it is all going to weaken the strength of the marriage bond among the citizens of our country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). My own views on this question are naturally influenced by the experience of my own province, which has been referred to by my hon. friend from Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Ross), and if it were necessary to come to a decision I would express the hope that the other provinces might adopt the method which is employed in Nova Scotia, with, as I think, success. I think, however, that I am correct in stating from the tendency of the discussion here to-day, that there is no great zeal on the part of members generally to deal with this question. The right hon. Prime Minister suggested, just before six o'clock, that perhaps the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had served his purpose for the time being by a discussion of the question, and might withdraw his motion. If he is disposed to do that, my own judgment is that that would be the course most satisfactory to the House. I merely make the suggestion to the hon. gentleman, but I am quite prepared to vote if the division takes place.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, of course I did not introduce this motion for the mere purpose of taking the time of the House or leading to an inconsequential result. Still, the discussion of the motion has probably accomplished all that can be reasonably expected at the present time. It is very true, as the right hon. Prime Minister says, that the House at large does not appear to take a deep and active interest in this question. It is a matter which, I presume, will require a good deal of discussion in the country before legislative action can be secured upon it, and one which we ought to approach with due deliberation and some degree of caution. While my own wish, of course, would be to have this motion go to a vote, and have an expression of this House favourable to it, yet I am in the judgment of the House, and if it is the opinion of the House that it would be better under the circumstances to accede to the desire expressed by the leader of the government, as a matter of etiquette, I would feel disposed to do so. If I have the concurrence of the seconder of the motion, and if no objection is made by any member of the House, I am quite willing that the motion, having been discussed in so agreeable, proper and instructive a manner, should be withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) As the seconder of the motion, I think the end we have in view has been served to a large extent. We have listened with a good deal of pleasure to the very excellent speeches which have been made by gentlemen on the other side of the House. Those speeches will go to the country, and in this observing age the country will by and by begin to see the necessity of adopting a different method of divorce from that which exists at present in the Dominion of Canada. I know what the law is in Nova Scotia, and I know that there is no publicity given to the evidence. The only thing stated is that the case has been tried and the judgment has been given. When the excellent speeches which have been made on the other side are sent to the country, they will perhaps effect the first change in public opinion on this subject. This is perhaps a small beginning to a great reform, but all reforms in the past commenced with small beginnings, and we must not despise the day of small things, because great things will be the result at some future day.

Motion withdrawn.

GOVERNMENT OFFICE BUILDINGS.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey) moved for :

Return showing the number of buildings, or portions of buildings, rented or occupied by the government for offices or other purposes, in Ottawa, outside the departmental buildings; from whom rented, terms of lease or leases, and rent being paid for each.

He said: My object in making this motion is to ascertain the number of buildings or other apartments rented by the government and used for government purposes, from whom they are rented, the rent that is paid, and the terms of the leases. I do so because of the rumours that have been current for some time, that the government have rented many buildings or portions of buildings which are not suitable for the public requirements, that they are rented from political friends, and that exorbitant rents are being paid. I am told that there is no provision in most of these buildings for protecting valuable papers and other goods belonging to the government, from the danger of fire. I do not know how far these rumours are correct, and I make this motion so that we may get the correct information. If it is true, that we are paying very heavy rents for these buildings, and that it has cost considerable to fit them up for the needs of the government, it seems to me that it would be much better and wiser for the government to buy land and erect buildings suitable for the needs of the country. They could be made fireproof, and we would save a very heavy outlay in rents. After I get this information, if I am correctly informed, I may follow it with another motion later on. Now, I have heard it said by supporters of the government that we cannot get land in Ottawa on which to erect public buildings. Well, the longer it is put off the more difficult it will be to acquire land. It is true, the government might be obliged to pay a pretty good figure for suitable land; but I imagine that they would pay a smaller figure now than they would be likely to do fifteen or twenty years hence. I have often thought that the time will come when it will be almost compulsory on the government, in order to provide office room, to purchase the piece of land from the Langevin block to O'Connor street, and fill it with one large block. It would certainly greatly enhance the appearance of the government grounds, and the buildings surrounding them. There are other places where buildings might be erected, such as Nepean Point and a portion of Major Hill Park. It is for the purpose of drawing attention to this matter and of putting ourselves in the position to be able to determine whether it would be the part of wisdom or otherwise for the government to purchase grounds on which to erect new buildings or whether it would be better that they should continue the present system of renting buildings from outside parties, that I make this motion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Hon. James Sutherland). I should be very pleased indeed to bring down the return called for by this motion. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that it is in the public interest that this House should be possessed of all the information obtainable on the subject. My hon. friend has referred to the splendid site obtainable on Wellington street, and I agree with him that it would be a great improvement and add greatly to the appearance of the parliamentary grounds and buildings, that we should procure that site. But there are one or two rather serious objections raised. One is the heavy expenditure we would have to incur, owing to the valuable buildings that have been erected there within the past few years, and another and a more serious one is that unless we have the whole block from Wellington to Sparks street we would always be liable to injury from fire communicated from the other blocks and the safety of our valuable records and books would be endangered. There is also a serious objection to our taking Major's Hill Park. I doubt very much if the hon. members of this House would like to see that beautiful park covered with buildings. It is certainly a fine breathing spot for the citizens of Ottawa and visitors and members of the House. Parks are a great necessity in a growing city, besides being a great luxury to the people. However, the suggestion is well worthy of consideration. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right when he says that the time has arrived when this House must seriously consider the erection of departmental buildings so that public business may be carried on more conveniently than it is now. I have not the figures and therefore cannot make a fair estimate at present, but if it be the case, as the hon. gentleman says, that we are paying now in rents and other expenses more than the interest on capital and maintenance would cost us, if we purchased a site and erected new departmental buildings, we certainly should not hesitate doing so. I am not aware that either the previous or the present government has been guilty of paying excessive rents because buildings rented by the government happen to be owned by political friends. I think that the buildings required by some of the departments since this administration has taken office, have been rented from political opponents, and I have no doubt that the best bargain possible was made by the officials of the government. However, it is a very important and serious question, this question of the desirability of procuring property on which to put up better buildings than we now have, and I am satisfied that it is in the interests of the country that these buildings should be erected as soon as possible. This matter has in the short time that I have been in the department, received some attention from myself and my officials. During the past few weeks we have gone into it to a considerable extent in order to ascertain what properties were available and what the buildings would cost. I hope that even during this session we may be able to report some progress so

that hon. members may be in a position to give us the benefit of their advice as to what, in their opinion, would be the best course to take. I shall have much pleasure in bringing down the papers at the very earliest possible moment.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OTTAWA, Friday, March 27, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SUBSIDIES FOR PUBLIC HIGHWAYS.

Mr. SPEAKER. In regard to the petition of W. H. Rosevear, mayor of St. Lambert, and others of the counties of Verchères and Chambly, praying that special subsidies be granted for the improvement of public highways, I beg to state that this petition is against Rules 85 and 86. In the first place it is not properly signed, and in the second place, as the petition asks for subsidies, it cannot be received. The same decision will apply to the petitions of the Rev. L. J. S. Sirois, and of the Rev. A. Audette, because they are asking for subsidies. A petition asking for subsidies is out of order.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 40) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the International Railway Appliance Company.—Mr. Brock.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Regina and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. McCreary—by Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Nipissing and Pontiac Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

CATTLE EMBARGO—CORRESPONDENCE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I beg to lay on the Table of the House a return to an Address for copy of all correspondence since last session between the Canadian government and the British authorities on the subject of the embargo on Canadian cattle. As some interest was manifested on the subject I beg to move :

That the Rule be suspended and that these papers be printed forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 48) to amend the General Inspection Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. McCARTHY. Last session I had the honour of introducing a similar Bill to this, and I explained it pretty fully at that time. It being late in the session, I explained that I would not press it to a finality that session, but that hon. members would have an opportunity of circulating it through their ridings and ascertaining whether public opinion was in favour of it. Since that time I have heard no complaints against the Bill. The explanation I gave last session is in Hansard. The Bill is for the purpose of obtaining a uniform inspection of hides, skins and leather in the cities mentioned in the Bill, to which only it is intended to apply. By that means the hides, it is expected, will be taken more carefully off the animals, and will thereby be increased in value.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMMORAL ENTERTAINMENTS.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved third reading of Bill (No. 12) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

Mr. J. E. E. LEONARD (Laval). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is read a third time, I wish to move :

That, the said Bill be not now read a third time but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole with instructions to make the following amendments thereto :—

1. That the words 'or immoral' be added to the words 'or obscene amusements' in the fifth line of the first paragraph of Section 179a, as well as to the words 'obscene amusements' in the fourth line of the second paragraph ;

2. That the following paragraph be added :—

'5. Will be considered immoral, for the purposes of the present Act, all representations, plays or scenes, and all theatricals that may ridicule the marriage tie or laws or the misfortune of a deceived spouse, or that may present in a favourable light concubinage, adultery, adulterous love, or the life of the debauchee, or of the girl of public character, who is kept up, or that may

picture, without censure, the life or the conduct of concubines, or of those who habitually live in a state of forbidden love, concubinage, or prostitution.'

If I understand aright the debate that took place in committee the other day, the reason why the hon. member for Pictou (Sir C. H. Tupper) objected to the Bill, was mainly on the ground that the meaning of the word 'immoral' was not clearly defined. With the amendment I am now moving and the definition which it embodies I think the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. C. Fitzpatrick), who has so willingly complied with the demand of the Quebec authorities, will not object to accepting this amendment as it contains the definition of the word 'immoral.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. After having heard this definition read to the House, I need not say how very difficult it is to define such terms as immoral or impure. I think any attempt of that sort must fail, as this attempt fails. I would have preferred myself that the Bill had remained as it was introduced, with the words indecent or immoral continued. But I can quite appreciate the idea of those who suggested that the word obscene should take the place of those words, because in the Criminal Code, which the Bill seeks to amend, the word obscene occurs ; and it is good legislation to use the same term as much as possible in the same paragraph or section of a code.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

House went into Committee on the following resolutions :

1. That it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and to provide that if the period of service includes a fraction of a year less than one-half, the service shall be taken to be the number of years served, not including the fraction. And if the period of service includes a fraction equal to or greater than one-half, the fraction shall be deemed to be an entire year.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to confirm all superannuation allowances heretofore granted, calculated in the foregoing manner.—(The Minister of Finance).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The resolutions before the Committee, on which a Bill is to be founded, are designed to remove a small difficulty which has been created by a recent ruling of the Auditor General, a ruling which is strictly in accordance with the law, but which nevertheless is at variance with the practice of the government and parliament for the long period of 32 years. The Superannuation Act passed in 1870 made provision for the retirement of officials upon pensions, which should be in proportion to the amount of their salaries and the length of their services. Immediately after the passing of that Act, an Order in Council was passed as a regulation, making provision respecting fractions of a year. By that Order in Council it was determined that where an official on his retirement had a few months service beyond the year to his credit, if it was less than six months, it should not count in his superannuation, but if it was more than six months, it should count as a full year. That continued to be the practice of the government from 1870 down to a very recent date. Two or three months ago the Auditor General objected to a superannuation which was based upon that rule, and although we have been following that practice for 32 years, he raised a question as to the validity of these proceedings. Upon an appeal to the Department of Justice, it was decided that as a strict matter of law the Order in Council passed 32 years ago was void, inasmuch as it was beyond the authority of the Act. Still, I think the House will agree with me that the practice established in 1870, of dealing with a fraction of a year in the way I have described, was fair and equitable, though perhaps a little liberal towards the official. The object of this Bill will be to confirm the superannuations of the past as respects those fractions of a year, and to provide that henceforth the same rule shall apply and be a legal proceeding—practically confirming the Order in Council of 1870.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, who is of course very familiar with the terms of the Act, whether or not there is any provision in it with regard to the repayment of amounts paid in on superannuation account by officers who have been dismissed from the service ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no provision of that nature until the year 1897 or 1898, when I myself introduced a measure to amend the Superannuation Act by providing that where an officer was dismissed for political partisanship, he should not suffer the loss of the money he paid into the superannuation fund. As in such case, though he may have acted unwisely, there was no malfeasance or anything discreditable in a moral sense, I consider that he was punished enough by being deprived of his office and ought not to be further deprived of the money he had paid into the fund. Application has been made from time to time for a return of the superannuation money to parties dismissed for other causes, but although the Act is not restricted in its terms and we might be justified by the Act alone in returning the money, still as it was designed to apply only to cases of dismissal for political partisanship, we have not thought fit to interpret it as applying to other cases.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I have a case in point in which the inspector hap-

pened to see a collector of customs who did not appear to be attending to his duty at the time, and the inspector reported unfavourably, and the man was consequently dismissed. This dismissed official has since reformed and is now as steady and temperate a man as there is in the Dominion, which is saying a good deal. I have been trying to have justice done to this man by having the money returned to him which he paid into the superannuation fund but have not succeeded. I think that something should be added to this Bill which would enable the government to deal justly with a case of this kind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course it sometimes happens that a man is dismissed for what is alleged to be cause but really is not cause. Take a case in my own city, that of Capt. Stewart, who was dismissed ostensibly for cause but really for something else. No investigation was ever granted although Capt. Stewart was anxious to have one. In a case of that kind, an officer who has been long in the service receives back no portion of the money which he has paid to the superannuation fund. I am not so familiar perhaps with the practice of commercial institutions in this regard as some of the other hon. members, but I know that some institutions of this country which have created pension funds, repay to their employees, even when dismissed for cause, the amount contributed by them to the fund, and they do this because they think it is only fair and equitable. They do not think it fair to keep the money of these men even if they are dismissed for cause. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister of Finance has considered the question in this aspect?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Superannuation Act as respects these matters is precisely in the same condition as it has been for many years. There is no provision which would enable repayment to be made in a case such as my hon. friend has mentioned. The difficulty is if we once open the door, it will be impossible to draw any line. I have had cases brought to my attention, in which the wives represented that their husbands had been dismissed because of intemperance and other offences, and the dismissal of whom brought great hardship on their families. Such cases appeal forcibly to our sympathy, but once you begin to entertain claims of that kind it will be impossible to draw any line. We have been simply following the practice continued ever since the Act was passed some thirty years ago.

Mr. OSLER. As regards banks, no clerk is dismissed, no matter from what cause, without having the money returned to him which he paid into the pension fund, and I think that is only fair.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under what is called the Civil Service Retirement Act, which has been passed in recent years, we return the money paid in. Under that Act the money contributed constituted a savings fund, and when an officer retires from the service he gets back his money with interest. This Act now takes the place of the old Superannuation Act as respects new officials.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why should there be any difficulty in dealing with cases such as those brought to the attention of the hon. minister. Of course there may be cases of malfeasance in which it would not be desirable to return the money, but I think that the practice followed in commercial institutions should be followed by the government. I think that the practice should be followed even in cases of malfeasance, but where there is no actual taking of money. It seems to me that there would be no difficulty in making a general rule.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a broad distinction between the Superannuation Act and the Civil Service Retirement Act. In the latter there is no charge on the public treasury at all. We simply return the money paid in with interest. But in the case of the Superannuation Act, there is a large drain on the public treasury. For every dollar paid into the superannuation fund, we pay out three or four dollars. If we were to accede to my hon. friend's request, we would have to pay out considerably more. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister reminds me that under the Superannuation Act, no matter how long and meritorious a man's services may have been, if his death occurs before superannuation, his family receive nothing. In the case of life insurance, a man must die to benefit by it, but in the case of the Superannuation Act, a man must live to get any benefit from it. I may say that while the contributions to the superannuation fund under the Superannuation Act amount to $60,000 a year, we pay out annually $330,000, and if we were to take the course suggested by my hon. friend, we would add considerably to the burden.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The same argument would apply in the case of corporations because the pension fund of a private corporation is not only built up by the contributions of the employees but is also supplemented to a large extent by the institution itself. Then so far as the cases of death are concerned, I think there is always a gratuity—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Only two months salary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That might not be very much. But the fact that that seems, perhaps, a not altogether desirable state of affairs is no particular reason why the government should depart from what is the ordinary usage among commercial institutions

throughout the country. However, I brought the matter to the attention of the Minister of Finance, and have no desire to say more at present. I am not going to move an amendment, because I have not considered the matter sufficiently myself. But I think it a matter that the government might well take into consideration.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. How would this affect the case of clerks who entered the service as temporary clerks but were afterwards appointed to the permanent service ? On their retirement, would they be entitled to have the retiring allowance based upon their whole time, including the time of temporary service ? The Act of 1871, I think, provided for temporary service, but it did not provide that a temporary clerk should contribute to the superannuation fund. In 1884, I think, an Order in Council—not an Act—was passed providing that a temporary clerk would have to contribute the same amount that he would have had to contribute had he been from the first a permanent clerk to entitle him to superannuation on his whole time. I would simply like to know how such cases would be affected by this measure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would say to my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) that this measure does not touch that point at all.

Resolutions reported and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 49) to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

House went into Committee on the following resolution :

That it is expedient to amend the 32nd chapter 63-64 Vic., 'An Act respecting and restricting Chinese immigration,' by providing :

1st. That a tax of $500 shall be imposed on every person of Chinese origin entering Canada.

2nd. That the person in command of, or in charge of, any vessel or vehicle, bringing Chinese immigrants into Canada shall be personally liable to His Majesty, for the payment of the said tax, with respect to any such immigrant carried by such vessel or vehicle.—The Prime Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Chairman, the House is aware that in the province of British Columbia there exists a very strong feeling against Asiatic immigration. This feeling is confined exclusively, in Canada to the province of British Columbia, and, as we are told, does not extend to other provinces of the Dominion, for the reason that there is no Asiatic immigration which is settled outside the province of British Columbia. As far back as twenty-five or thirty years ago this feeling which exists in British Columbia commenced to manifest itself. In this regard, the province of British Columbia is not at all isolated from other portions of the world in which Asiatic or Mongolian immigration has settled. In California, in Australia, in fact wherever the two races, Caucasian and Mongolian have come into contact, the same feeling has manifested itself. After giving it full consideration, every one who has looked into the matter must come to the conclusion that this antagonism is based upon ethnical considerations, the difference between the two races. It seems impossible to reconcile them, and the conclusion of all who have considered the matter seems to be that the amalgamation of the two is neither possible nor desirable. There are so many differences of character that it is supposed to be impossible to overcome them. At all events, in the province of British Columbia this feeling is very strong. In 1885, the government of Sir John Macdonald introduced a measure to impose a capitation tax of $50 on Chinese immigration coming into the Dominion. It was supposed that this tax would be sufficient to prevent, for the time being, the increase of this immigration; and for some years, it had that effect. But, of late years, the immigration has increased very rapidly, and a new agitation arose in the province, and representations were made to the government that there should be an increase in the capitation tax. In 1900, we doubled the capitation tax, making it $100. It was represented to us at that time by the members of British Columbia, whether they sat on this side of the House or the other, that the resolution then introduced would be inadequate to effect the purpose in view which was to check the immigration of Asiatic labourers into the country. We were aware that there was a good deal to be said in favour of the contention which was urged upon us. At all events we proceeded with our legislation and we then organized a commission to investigate the subject and report. The commission made its report. That report has been in the hands of hon. members of this House for eighteen months, and I presume that by this time it has become familar to all of us. The commissioners who seem to have done their work very thoroughly, came to the conclusion that this kind of immigration ought to be prohibited, and that, if it was not absolutely prohibited the tax should be increased to such a figure as to restrict the immigration to very narrow limits. I would call the attention of the House to the conclusion of the commissioners which is found at page 279 of the report, as follows :

4. In reference to the representations made by the people and legislature of British Columbia, wherein it is alleged :

That the province is flooded with an undesirable class of people, non-assimilative and most detrimental to the wage-earning classes of the people of the province, and that this ex-

tensive immigration of orientals is also a menace to the health of the community ;

That there is probability of a great disturbance to the economic conditions in the province and of grave injury being caused to the working classes by the large influx of labourers from China, as the standard of living of the masses of the people in that country differs so widely from the standard prevailing in the province, thus enabling them to work for a much less wage ;

That it is in the interests of the empire that the Pacific province of the Dominion should be occupied by a large and thoroughly British population rather than by one in which the number of aliens would form a large proportion :

We find that these representations are substantially true and urgently call for a remedy.

We also find that the increase of the capitation tax from $50 to $100 is ineffective and inadequate.

Your commissioners are of opinion that the further immigration of Chinese labourers into Canada ought to be prohibited ;

That the most desirable and effective means of attaining this end is by treaty supported by suitable legislation ;

That in the meantime and until this can be obtained the capitation tax should be raised to $500.

The only point upon which your commissioners could not agree is the date when the capitation tax of $500 ought to come into effect. The chairman and commissioner Foley are of opinion that the capitation tax should be raised to $500 at once, while commissioner Munn is of opinion that $300 should be imposed for two years, and if a prohibitive treaty be not obtained within that period, that it be then raised to $500.

I may say that I entertain no hope in the present condition of China of having such a treaty as is here indicated ; therefore, we have taken the course of asking parliament to increase at once the capitation tax from $100 to $500 as here recommended. Now, with regard to Japanese immigration, the same prejudice, I am sorry to say, exists in British Columbia concerning the Japanese as the Chinese. I say I am sorry for it, because for my part I make a distinction between Japan and China. Japan is one of the rising nations of the present day. It has shown itself to be very progressive, it does not seem to me at all doubtful that within a short period Japan will have placed itself in the fore front among the civilized nations of the earth. But whatever may be my feelings in this matter, it is a matter of record for there can be no dispute that in British Columbia the feeling towards the Japanese is exactly the same as towards the Chinese. The Japanese is not looked upon as a desirable immigrant. But as I said a moment ago, though I am prejudiced in favour of the Japanese, I must confess that there is little probability that it will be possible to assimilate the Japanese immigrant to the standard of Canadian civilization. The ethnical differences are also of such a character as to make it very doubtful whether assimilation of the two races could ever take place. But the problem has been solved so far as British Columbia is concerned by the Japanese government themselves, who have undertaken not only to restrict but absolutely to prohibit Japanese immigration from that country to Canada. The report of the commissioners upon this point is also very pertinent. Some two or three years ago the Japanese government issued an order, I cannot say whether it was legislative or executive, but at all events a legal order, absolutely to prohibit within certain limits, immigration from Japan into Canada. The report of the commissioners upon this point is to be found at page 399 :

Your commissioners fully appreciate the action taken by the government of Japan on August 2, 1900, whereby the governors of the prefectures of Japan were instructed to prohibit entirely for the time being the emigration of Japanese labourers for the Dominion of Canada. It is stated in a pamphlet purporting to be published by the Japanese consul at Vancouver : 'the principal reason for the measure thus taken was to avoid any friction that might occur by allowing them to come into British Columbia where their immigration was not desired by a certain element of that province,' and that 'the government of Japan wholly stopped the issuance of passports to any intending emigrants for Canada since the 1st of August last (1900), and still continues to do so, under a provision of the Immigration Protection Law. (Law No. 70, 1896).

The course adopted by the Japanese government, if we may without presumption be permitted to say so, is most opportune, eliminating all cause of friction and irritation between Canada and Japan, and so favouring a freer trade and intercourse between the countries than could otherwise obtain.

Nothing further is needed to settle this most difficult question upon a firm basis than some assurance that the action already taken by the government of Japan will not be revoked.

Your commissioners desire to express their earnest hope that in the continuance of this friendly policy, legislation on this subject by the Canadian government may be rendered unnecessary. Should, however, a change of policy be adopted in this regard by the Japanese government whereby Japanese labourers may again be permitted to emigrate to Canada, the welfare of the province of British Columbia imperatively demands that effective measures be adopted to take the place of the inhibition now imposed by the Japanese government.

Your commissioners recommend that, in that event, an Act be pased by the Dominion government on the lines of what is known as the Natal Act, made sufficiently stringent and effective to accomplish the desired result.

There is no necessity to go back to that, because the action of the imperial Japanese government is sufficient of itself to cover the ground. Under the action just taken by the Japanese government, three classes of persons only are allowed to leave the shores of Japan for Canada. First, those who hold both a passport and a certificate of the Japanese consul at Vancouver certifying that they are resident in Canada, and are only returning to this country ; second, those families of Japanese resident

in Canada coming out to join them upon approval of the Japanese consul at Vancouver; third, merchants and students duly qualified. Within these bounds, even according to the most extreme views which may be entertained in British Columbia, no harm can come from Japanese immigration, because no Japanese immigration except what is here specified is possible; therefore, it is not necessary at this time to pass any legislation to prohibit that class of immigrants. For these reasons we maintain that restriction only to Chinese and not to Japanese immigrants.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman on what the action of the government was based in disallowing the recent acts of the British Columbia legislature? Perhaps he will be good enough to give us information as to what the acts were which were disallowed.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot at this moment, speaking from memory, state the nature of the Acts. Speaking in very general terms, the Acts which were disallowed were of a nature which prevented Japanese and Chinese working in the mines. We had had communication several times with the government of British Columbia to the effect that if they would restrict the operation of their Act to Chinese labourers only and exempt the Japanese labourers, we would not object and would not disallow the Act; but if they were to continue to apply these restrictions to Japanese labourers as well as to Chinese, we thought such legislation would come into conflict with our views upon the obligations which rested on Canada as part of the British empire. Japan being an ally of Great Britain, we thought it extremely unadvisable to pass any Act which might cause friction between the empire of Japan and the British empire. Of course if the Japanese government had refused to take any action and had allowed the subjects of that empire to flood the British Columbia labour market, we would have been probably induced to reconsider our own views. Representations were made by our officials, at all events, I may say that verbal representations were made by myself to the Japanese consul. In view of the fact that the Japanese government had prohibited their own people from coming to Canada, we thought that there was no necessity for enacting such legislation, and therefore we took the action that we did. I have had further communication with my friend, Mr. Prior, the present premier of British Columbia on this subject, and I hope that in future any legislation that may be passed in British Columbia will be confined to Chinese labourers, and in that view we have notified the government of British Columbia that we see no cause to interfere.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did the disallowance take place upon the initiative of this government or was it upon representations of the imperial government?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not looked at the correspondence for some time, I am not aware that we have any correspondence upon the subject, but I think it was done upon our own initiative.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the right hon. gentleman consider that the statutes passed by the British Columbia legislature went beyond the provisions of the statutes which are now in force in other colonies, for example in the colony of Natal, and I think in some of the Australasian colonies?

The PRIME MINISTER. Beyond its legislative powers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, is there any really good reason why the province of British Columbia should not have the same rights in regard to legislation of that kind—I am speaking from the standpoint of the empire, not from the Canadian standpoint alone—is there any good reason why British Columbia should not exercise the same rights in regard to legislation of that kind as are at present exercised by the colony of Natal? My right hon. friend is aware of course, that the Act which is enforced is printed in this report and I understand that it goes very far indeed towards the exclusion of immigration, even to the prohibition of Asiatic labour. I would like to understand, if this disallowance took place from the imperial standpoint, and I would gather that from the right hon. gentleman's remarks, why it is, that these imperial concerns more directly touch the province of British Columbia than they do the colony of Natal or the Australasian colonies, to which I have referred. I am as ready as my right hon. friend would be to give all due weight to imperial interests in regard to legislation of that kind, but I have been unable to understand why these interests would more directly concern the province of British Columbia than the colony of Natal or the Australasian colonies.

The PRIME MINISTER. The reason seems to be a very obvious one. The action taken by the Canadian government in this matter was not dictated solely from the point of view of imperial interests, but solely from the point of view of Canadian interests. The geographical relation of Canada to Japan is very different from the geographical relation of Japan to Natal. We intend to have a trade between Japan and Canada. We intend to bring about a development of the relations which exist between that progressive people and our own people. We have steamers plying to-day between this country and the orient, steamers which are subsidized by this government. We have at present in Japan exhibition commissioners who are trying to promote trade between Canada and Japan. Un-

der such circumstances I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) whether it is not good policy to try and promote friendly relations between Canada and Japan. The conditions would have been very much different if the Japanese government had not undertaken to act in a friendly manner towards the government of Canada. The Japanese government went out of their way to prohibit their own people coming to Canada. They did this as a friendly act towards Canada. They wanted to preserve the good relations that existed between us. Under these circumstances was it not good Canadian policy, not from considerations of imperial interest, but from considerations of Canadian interest, to take such action as was calculated to promote the best interests of Canada and not to irritate people who wanted to have friendly relations with us. What was the cause of irritation between us and Japan ? It was that there were Japanese subjects coming to Canada who were settling in British Columbia and working in competition with our own workingmen, where their presence is not welcome. They have undertaken to remove that cause of irritation by preventing their own people from coming into competition with our workingmen, and under such circumstances, it seems to me that the action of the British Columbia legislature was, to say the least, ill-advised, that it was not calculated to promote the best interests of Canada, or those friendly relations that ought to obtain between two neighbouring nations, such as Canada and Japan are, because, after all, we are neighbouring nations. For this reason we represented to the legislature of British Columbia that if they were to restrict their action to Chinese immigration, that if they were to except Japanese immigrants from their legislation, we would not interfere, leaving them to exercise their own will in regard to Chinese immigration. It did seem to us that it was an ill-advised action to still persist in giving a slap in the face to the imperial government of Japan by including Japanese labourers in their legislation. The action which we took was dictated not only from considerations of imperial interest but from considerations of Canadian interest.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It almost seems to me that the right hon. gentleman, in the attitude which he has taken, was constituting this government as a court of appeal from the British Columbia legislature. Assuming as we have right to assume, that this legislation was within the competence of the legislature of the province of British Columbia, my right hon. friend, nevertheless, suggests that because they did not really understand their own affairs, this government has the right to reverse their legislation. Upon what ground ? Because Japan is a neigbouring nation, and because we may expect to have some trade with that country in the future. Well, I thought that my hon. friend was a more pronounced champion of provincial rights than to adopt an attitude of that kind. Here is the province of British Columbia acting admittedly within its legislative rights.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not admitted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am dealing with the question in the light in which the Prime Minister has placed the matter before the committee. The ground that has been placed before the committee is that this legislation was properly disallowed, because it is ill-advised and not in the interests of Canada. I respectfully submit that the legislature of British Columbia is the judge of that, when it is acting within its jurisdiction. If we are to have another ground put forward, we will deal with that when it comes, but I am now dealing with the ground that has been taken up to the present time. If it is a good reason for disallowing such legislation that we are to have a trade with Japan that circumstance might also be a reason for asking the Japanese to revoke the restriction which they have made, and if the probability of trade is made a good ground for disallowing this legislation, why is it not a good ground for rejecting the legislation which the right hon. gentleman is introducing now, because, I suppose we have as good reason for supposing that we will have a trade with China as with Japan ? I do not profess to be very familiar with trade questions in reference to these two countries, but I should imagine that perhaps we have as much trade with China as with Japan and possibly more. It does not seem, when looking at the question of the disallowance of the British Columbia legislation, that very valid reasons have been put forward by my right hon. friend. I would think that the considerations, if they are purely Canadian considerations, which he has put forward, are not a sufficient justification for the action which he has taken, and if there are more than Canadian considerations, in questions, if there are imperial considerations in question, then, I repeat again, as I said before, that I know of no imperial interest which touches this legislation emanating from the province of British Columbia which does not equally touch the legislation which has been enacted in the colony of Natal and in certain of the Australasian colonies.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to the fact that the first disallowance of British Columbia legislation of this character, as far as I recollect, took place in 1884, and I would like to read an extract from the report made at that time by Sir Alexander Campbell, then Minister of Justice.

Having reference to the condition of Canada at the time of the union with the province the undersigned is of opinion : That the authority given by the 95th section of the British North America Act is an authority to regulate and promote immigration into the provinces and not an authority to prohibit immigration.

A law which prevents the people of any country from coming into the province cannot be said to be of a local or private nature. On the contrary it is one involving Dominion, and possibly imperial interests.

The measure was then referred to the imperial authorities and the result was that the Act was disallowed. That principle laid down by Sir Alexander Campbell at that time has been followed ever since with respect to British Columbia legislation on the subject of Chinese emigration.

As regards the Natal Act, I have not it before me and I do not like to speak from memory regarding it because this is a matter of very considerable importance, and I do not like to discuss the question without having the documents so as to be able to speak with accuracy. But my recollection of the Natal Act is this : That the question at one time was considered as to whether or not, in British Columbia, it would be possible to adopt the Natal Act. The people of British Columbia said that the Natal Act did not go far enough. My hon. friend will bear in mind that the Natal Act has no reference to Chinese or Japanese immigration, but has reference to immigration generally. A person who cannot comply with certain conditions laid down in that Act with respect to the speaking of the English tongue and being able to read and write cannot settle in the colony of Natal. The Natal Act would be impossible of application here ; it would be impossible for us to allow the province of British Columbia to have such an Act governing immigration. It is necessary for us to have an Act which would be applicable to the whole of the Dominion of Canada and the Natal Act is impossible of application to the whole Dominion. I do not want to go any further at the present time. This question is one of considerable importance and it requires to be discussed with a present knowledge of all that has taken place. I say to my hon. friend, that the principle adopted, in so far as the disallowance of this Act is concerned by the Department of Justice on a recent date, is the principal laid down by Sir Alexander Campbell in 1884.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to have some information before the resolution is adopted, as to whether or not, as has been alleged in the press of British Columbia, it was suggested by the imperial government that the very Act which was disallowed might be passed by that legislature and would be regarded as satisfactory. No papers have been brought down to this House on this subject. Substantially this has been asserted in the press of British Columbia. I do not know as to the truth of that, but I would like to have some information on the subject.

The PRIME MINISTER. That despatch is in the report.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Could my right hon. friend refer me to the page.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot at the moment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that the position which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice takes is : That this Act was beyond the powers of the legislature of British Columbia and therefore was disallowed. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, whether it is the practice of the Department of Justice to sit as a court of interpretation upon provincial statutes and deal with them all in that way ; disallowing all those that are possibly ultra vires—or is it the practice to leave that question to be determined by the courts in the usual way.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When a question comes before the Department of Justice for the purpose of settling as to whether or not a law is ultra vires of the provincial parliament ; representations in the first place are invariably made to the provincial government asking that as a doubt has arisen it may be set at rest by subsequent legislation. If subsequent legislation is not passed and if in the opinion of the Department of Justice the legislation is clearly ultra vires, then disallowance takes place. If there is a doubt as to whether legislation is ultra vires or not, it is left then to its operation and to be settled by the courts. The course to be pursued with respect to Acts passed by the provincial legislatures was settled by an Order in Council passed 8th June, 1868.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does my hon. friend mean by that ? Does he mean that in case the provincial authorities contend that their Act is within the competence of the povincial legislature, and the Department of Justice arrives at an opposite conclusion ; that in such case the department constitutes itself a judge instead of leaving the provincial authorities to have that question determined by the courts.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a door open under the statutes. If the question is one on which the provincial authorities want to have the matter referred to the courts and will say that they will have a case stated for the courts ; then the Department of Justice is always ready to meet them half way. That question has now arisen in the province of Ontario with respect to the rights on the rivers, and will be disposed of in that way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would consider that a fair way of dealing with the subject. The provincial authorities adhere to their view that the Act is within the legis-

lative competence of the provincial legislature, and desire to have the question referred to the courts, and the Department of Justice expresses itself ready and willing to do so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was that option given to British Columbia in this case?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. As I have said, Sir Alexander Campbell stated in his report that the law was ultra vires, and he said it was contrary to imperial interests and he said in addition to that, that it was contrary to the general interests of Canada. My hon. friend is well aware that an Act may be perfectly ultra vires of the powers of a province, but if that Act is contrary to the general interests of the Dominion of Canada that is sufficient cause for disallowance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know; but let us not revert to the other ground. I was dealing with that a moment ago and my hon. friend raised the question of ultra vires; let us not mix up the two things. I want to know from my hon. friend this—I want to know whether or not the option to which he refers was extended to the executive of British Columbia; whether or not they had an opportunity of having this question referred to the courts and determined by the courts instead of having it referred to and determined by the Department of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not like to discuss the language of documents without having these documents before me. I read what Sir Alexander said and I shall read it again, and it is all that he said on that point.

> Having reference to the condition of Canada at the time of the union with the province the undersigned is of opinion: That the authority given by the 95th section of the British North America Act is an authority to regulate and promote immigration into the provinces and not an authority to prohibit immigration.

That is what the British Columbia authorities attempted to do at the time.

> A law which prevents the people of any country from coming into the province cannot be said to be of a local or private nature. On the contrary, it is one involving Dominion, and possibly imperial interests.

By that rule we have been bound ever since.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Evidently I do not make myself clear to my hon. friend. Does he take the position, that the province of British Columbia, with respect to the Act passed last year or the year before—

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There have been four or five Acts passed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).—is bound by what Sir Alexander Campbell said seventeen or twenty years ago.

The PRIME MINISTER. The principle is the same.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The principle is not the same.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) pardon me a moment. The hon. gentleman speaks of an Act passed two or three or four years ago. There have been several Acts passed in that period of time, one was left to its operation and it came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council a year ago. I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) to be more precise and to specify which particular Act he refers to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am referring to the Acts which were disallowed; I am trying to find out why they were disallowed. I am told by the right hon. gentleman that they were disallowed because they were considered not in accordance with Canadian interests and not in accordance with imperial interests. I discussed that matter very briefly. Then I was told by the Minister of Justice that they were considered ultra vires of the province of British Columbia.

Mr. RUSSELL. And not in accordance with Canadian or imperial interests.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will have my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell) to the rescue in a moment, but I hope he will pardon me until I finish and then I will give him an opportunity. Assuming now that they were disallowed on the ground that they were ultra vires, I want to know whether or not the province of British Columbia had an opportunity of having that question determined by the courts, and if not why it did not have that opportunity. I am told that it depends upon an opinion given by Sir Alexander Campbell in 1884. Well, Sir Alexander Campbell was not sitting as a court; Sir Alexander Campbell was Minister of Justice; and the province of British Columbia if it is bound as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice seems to think it is bound by the decision of Sir Alexander Campbell in 1884, has had no opportunity of having the question settled by the courts. Therefore, I think that that advances the matter not very much further; it still leaves it as it was before. If it be a fact, what is the reason that the province of British Columbia had not an opportunity of having this question determined by a proper court?

The PRIME MINISTER. I thought I had made myself clear, but I will try once more to give the reason to my hon. friend. We considered first of all, that it was very doubtful whether or not it was within the power of the British Columbia legislature to enact such legislation. But, apart from that consideration, we had no doubt whatever that it was not in the interest of Canada, either from an imperial or Canadian standpoint. We did not give the opportu-

nity to the province to have the matter brought before the courts, because our conviction was too strong in that respect. From the days of Sir Alexander Campbell such legislation was thought to be contrary to imperial interests; we also thought it extremely contrary to the interests of Canada; and for these two reasons we disallowed it. We intimated to the government of British Columbia that if their legislation had been confined to Chinese immigration and had exempted the Japanese, we would have left it. In the case of Japan, the Japanese government, acting from motives of friendship, has undertaken to prevent the emigration of Japanese to Canada, so that there was no reason for restriction on our part. But the Chinese government has never attempted to restrict or prevent Chinese emigration to Canada. That emigration is increasing; and, though in restricting it, we run the risk of injuring our trade with China, yet we felt that of two evils we should choose the less, and restrict the immigration even if it injured that trade. This is the reason we make the distinction between Chinese and Japanese immigration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we have practically got back to the first ground again.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is the only ground.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Minister of Justice gave another ground.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, my hon. friend assumed that there was power.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Railways is now going to elucidate the situation. I regret that I require so much assistance ; I have no doubt it is my own fault. I will just make one or two further remarks in regard to what the right hon. gentleman has stated. It is from the standpoint of Canadian interests that this legislation was disallowed, I understand now.

The PRIME MINISTER. Partially.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And for that reason the government were not willing to refer it to the courts.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is one of the reasons.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Had it not been for that, I presume it would have been referred to the courts.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not say that at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My right hon. friend does not say yes or no to that. He has still some confidence in that opinion of Sir Alexander Campbell of 1884. I think, as the Minister of Justice stated frankly today, it ought to be the rule, if a provincial government desires to have the question of the validity of its statutes referred to the courts, it should be referred, unless some overpowering reason, apart from the question of ultra vires, makes it necessary that the Act should be disallowed. I think that would be in accord with the views expressed by my right hon. friend in the past with regard to provincial autonomy. Therefore I take for granted that the real reason which operated in the minds of the government in this case was the reason last assigned by my right hon. friend. Now, I would like to ask my right hon. friend in what respect he thought those statutes of the province of British Columbia conflicted with Canadian interests, and on what principle is it that a provincial legislature, being the only judge appointed by the constitution of matters which are within its competence should have its legislation overridden by the act of the executive at Ottawa.

The PRIME MINISTER. I thought I had given that answer already at least four times ; but I am sorry to see that I have not made any impression on the mind of my hon. friend. I am afraid that whatever answer I give I shall not be any more successful. I would suggest, as the best way to get at a solution of the question, that he should move for the correspondence and the Act of disallowance, and he will find all the reasons for our action.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The absolute power of disallowance is given to us by the British North America Act when we choose to exercise it. It was held that this power should be exercised on some principle, and that principle is laid down in an Order in Council, in which the subjects, the reasons, and the distance we ought to go, are stated. Therefore I think the complete answer of the premier ought to be that we exercise that power in accordance with the British North America Act, and that the rules under which we exercise it are laid down in an Order in Council.

Mr. PUTTEE. As regards the Japanese, I wish to ask the right hon. first minister if any assurance has been sought or obtained that the action of the Japanese government, which was so timely so far as Canada is concerned, shall not be revoked.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, we have no assurance to that effect.

Mr. PUTTEE. Does the right hon. gentleman not think it would be wise to get that assurance at this time, when there is no friction ?

The PRIME MINISTER. So long as matters remain as they are, there is no necessity of invoking any trouble. Should the action of Japan be revoked, it would then be time for this government to take action.

Mr. PUTTEE. It seems to me it would be to late then. The commissioners re-

commend that assurance be sought from the Japanese government at this time. If they give an assurance that their action will not be revoked, it will be unnecessary to pass any legislation here; but should they revoke their action, it would mean more agitation in this country, and perhaps more friction between this government and the imperial government, and Japan. All this could be avoided by getting an assurance from the Japanese government at this time, and I think it could be got if it were sought.

Mr. INGRAM. If I remember rightly, a Bill was introduced last session to divide the capitation tax among the different provinces, I am not sure whether that is the law or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is the law.

Mr. INGRAM. Now that it has been increased, is it still the intention of the government to divide it among the different provinces.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. MORRISON. I would like to ask the right hon. first minister, in the event of Japan receding from the position it has taken, say after the session of parliament, what machinery could be invoked to stop an influx of 8,000 or 9,000 Japs within a few weeks or months? If that number were to go into British Columbia, it would have a most disastrous effect. It strikes me that before legislation could be passed, a great deal of harm would be done.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have to say to my hon. friend that he is contemplating a contingency which has not the slightest probability of taking place.

Mr. MORRISON. It is not remote.

The PRIME MINISTER. I consider it is not only remote but improbable, because all the negotiations we have had with the Japanese government—and our negotiations can only be through the Japanese Consul at Montreal—are of such a character as to assure us that there is not the slightest intention on the part of the Japanese government of revoking its present orders with respect to emigration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I presume this is the despatch to which the right hon. gentleman referred a moment ago. It is a despatch from the colonial office to the Governor General, dated 9th April, 1899. The first portion of the despatch up to and included in the 7th paragraph, is taken up with the reasons alleged against the passage of such legislation as was adopted by the British Columbia legislature. The 8th and 9th clauses are as follows:

8. Her Majesty's government earnestly trust that on consideration of these explanations the government of British Columbia will at once procure the repeal of the provisions complained of and the substitution of legislation on the lines indicated above.

9. If this is impossible, Her Majesty's government feel compelled, however reluctant they may be to cause inconvenience to the province, to press on your ministers the importance in the general interests of the empire of using the powers vested in them by the British North America Act, for cancelling these measures to which Her Majesty's government object on grounds both of principle and policy.

Is that the despatch to which the right hon. gentleman refers?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That brings me to quote to my right hon. friend the language of one of the sections of the Natal Act:

The immigration into Natal, by land or sea, of any person of any of the classes defined in the following subsections, hereinafter called 'prohibited immigrants' is prohibited namely:

Any person who, when asked to do so by an officer appointed under this Act, shall fail to write out and sign, in the characters of any language of Europe, an application to the colonial secretary in the form set out in schedule B to this Act.

This provision, it is needless to say, would absolutely prohibit any immigration from China or Japan into the colony of Natal. I think that provisions of a similar character have been passed by some of the Australian colonies. What I desire my right hon. friend to say is whether or not this legislation of British Columbia was disallowed in consequence of this despatch I have just read from the colonial office, and if so, in what respect was the legislation passed by the province of British Columbia more injurious to imperial interests than that passed and now in force in the colony of Natal?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have nothing to add to what has been said. If my hon. friend will move for the correspondence, he will there find the reasons given. I cannot say whether disallowance took place in consequence of this legislation, I do not think it did, but my hon. friend will find all the reasons set forth in the correspondence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought everything was here that is of any importance.

The PRIME MINISTER. With regard to the disallowance there is further correspondence, and I shall be very glad to take the opportunity of discussing the question from the standpoint of the disallowance of provincial legislation on some future occasion.

Progress reported.

EXPROPRIATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 8) to amend the Expropriation Act.—The Minister of Justice.

On section 2.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). When this Bill was last under consideration, it was suggested by the hon. member for Pictou (Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that there was not sufficient provision made for the compensation of the owner of property who might have lost the opportunity of selling it to advantage through the fact that the government had given him notice of expropriation. In view of that objection, I decided to offer an amendment to section 3 of the Bill, which will make that section read as follows :

> The fact of such abandonment or revestment shall be taken into account in connection with all the other circumstances of the case, in estimating or assessing the amount to be paid to any person claiming compensation for the land taken.

I put the objection raised to the deputy minister, who drafted the Act. He said that he thought the Act was broad enough to cover the case put by my hon. friend from Pictou, but in order to make the matter absolutely clear, I would move that after the word 'account' in the second line of paragraph 3, the following words be inserted : 'in connection with all other circumstances of the case.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I would like to ask my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) whether he can quote any precedent for such legislation as this. I confess I cannot find any. The Crown assumes to take a man's property only temporarily, leaving him with a qualified interest at their sweet will, and they keep it or abandon it as they see fit. If you are going to adopt such a principle for the Crown, how are you going to prevent corporations and other institutions to which we are in the habit of giving powers of expropriations claiming a similar power ? Surely my hon. friend must have some precedent, and is not going to take the responsibility of initiating a principle of this sort. It surely cannot be that the Crown, for ordinary public works—government railways or other such works though clothed with all the powers they now have, will demand something more than they are willing to grant to private interests similarly situated. I say it is a vicious and a wrong principle. If specific cases are to be dealt with, they can be shown and can always be dealt with by the Crown——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. How ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. By a special Act or resolution. Why should parliament grant to the Crown powers that it will not grant to other institutions ? If my hon. friend has a precedent to quote, I will not say more at this time, for I do not wish to prolong the discussion. From the fact that he does not answer, I infer that he has no precedent for this measure. All the greater reason, then, why the dangerous character of this proposition should be pointed out. It is wrong in principle, especially wrong in view of the fact that the Crown has so many rights against the owners of property beyond what private individuals have against each other. And it is especially dangerous, because if you enact such a Bill, you establish a precedent in the case of the Crown for which corporations will clamour, and which you will find it difficult to deny them. Suppose that I am the owner of property, and the Crown wants that property. They have the same right to take it for the public service that a corporation would have. But the Crown say : We are not satisfied with that, we want to introduce a new principle ; we want to take your property for a time. But is it not plain that this involves the impossible proposition of making a fair comprehension of damages for the future ? It is impossible to foresee what the effect will be upon my rights in the property. It is contrary to all business principles. The law of damages is well understood. One must show direct damages, or he cannot claim compensation. This Bill involves a dangerous innovation upon an immemorial right, a right which is embodied in the old saying that a man who is in his house is in his castle. It is contrary to those rights of property which were particularly impressed upon me in my legal education, when it was made clear that the rights of property were the rights of individuals, and were the most sacred things that the law deals with, next only to personal liberty. Many wars have been waged to compel the recognition of these rights in the subject as against the Crown. Yet, here in this advanced age of the world and of legislation, we are to have a principle embodied in our laws for which there is no precedent—or if there were I would say it was a dangerous precedent, and it would be well to be careful how we acted upon it. Why cannot the Crown buy a man's property if they want it, and, if they cease to want it, sell it ? I can get a jury of my countrymen or a board of arbitrators to fairly say what my property is worth. I would not sit on an arbitration—and I am no prude and no poser—between the Crown and an individual to say what was fair in the cases to be brought up under this Bill. I could not assess the damages fairly without knowing the future. It is so simple to me, the case is so unanswerable, the wrong is so patent, that I am bound to protest as strongly as I feel. Here is my farm, or my house, and you want to take it for public purposes. You can find plenty of men to say what is the value of the property. If you want it you can pay me for it as the governing authority in any free country does when it takes the property of an individual. But to say that the Crown may take a man's property and not pay for it is to attribute to the Crown a power against which the barons of England stood out firmly in

Magna Charta days. Under the existing law, which nobody finds fault with, you may take my farm and pay me for it; and when you are done with it you can sell it to some one else. But I deny that you have the right to take it from me for the time and hand it back to me when you please. It is impossible to say what compensation I should have in that case, for it is a question of the future and there is only one Being, and he is not in this world, who knows the future. This is a clear invasion of the individual rights of property. Then there is the other consideration, and second in importance only to the first—that, if parliament confers this right upon the Crown, this right of qualified expropriation, the corporations will demand the same, and trouble will commence the end of which no man can foresee. Do allow my protest to have some effect and go no further with legislation involving so vicious a principle and likely to arouse so undesirable a feeling.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I would ask the hon. minister what necessity there is for passing this Bill? Have any cases arisen which seem to make such a law as this necessary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend from South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) has spoken with a great deal of feeling. I apprehend that he has convinced himself that a grievous wrong would be perpetrated and some very obnoxious infraction of principle or some great iniquity result if this Bill should become law. My hon. friend must have been dwelling upon this until it has assumed a much greater magnitude and importance in his mind than the facts would justify. There is nothing alarming about the proposition which my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) has embodied in this Bill. There is nothing strange, there is nothing unusual about it. It is simply a moderate and reasonable extension of a principle already recognized, and which is practiced every day of our life. That principle is that whatever individual interests may be, they should be subordinate to the public requirements, awarding every possible compensation to the individual who may have suffered pecuniary injury. Now this Bill surely makes ample provisions for compensation to the man who is injured; and if it appears that in the public interest either the whole or the part of any man's property must be taken for public purposes, we provide that he shall be compensated therefor. Now my hon. friend seems to think that there is something outrageously wrong in the idea of expropriation itself?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, I qualified it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not proposing to give power to any railway company by this legislation; we are only proposing to give to the Crown power to make a qualified expropriation, just as you do when you give to a railway company power to take a portion of a man's farm, or to run through the middle of his farm. This legislation is qualified in the same way. My hon. friend thinks that we must not touch a man's property, that we must not even touch the hem of his property, unless we take the whole of it.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. No, I made no such argument.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not professing to give his exact words, but in effect he argued as I have stated. It is no more a qualified expropriation to take part of a man's property, or to take it for a limited time, than it is to take it for all time. I fail to see wherein the principle is different. As I tried to argue the other day, unless hon. members are of opinion that it is wholly impossible for any tribunal to make a just estimate of the amount of compensation a man ought to receive when you take a limited interest in his property, unless you are driven to that conclusion, there is nothing wrong in this Bill, because if you give him full and ample compensation what more can he expect? It is not a desirable thing, I admit, to take a man's property away from him against his will. I do not like to do that any more than anybody else, but that principle is so imbedded in our law and jurisprudence, in our whole system of government, that it is altogether too late in the day to complain about it. You do it everywhere. You give that power to every kind of a public organization; you give it to cities and towns, to expropriate lands for the purpose of parks, groves and gardens. My hon. friend goes back to Magna Charta. Well, we are doing lots of things to-day that were not done in the days of Magna Charta.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the question of limited expropriation a settled principle in Canada?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not exactly know what my hon. friend means, but if he means to ask if there is any established law to authorize it in Canada, I say there is not, certainly not as respects Dominion public works, because we have advanced beyond the conditions out of which grew the existing legislation, and we have advanced to a period when the extent and magnitude of our public works make it necessary that the Crown should be invested with some additional power in order that these public works may be carried on at the least cost to the country.

Mr. CLANCY. The reason I asked the question was that the hon. gentleman based his whole argument upon the other principle, something that is now in existence in Canada, and well understood, namely, that pri-

vate interests must yield to public interests, under a general expropriation system as practised in Canada. The hon. gentleman was basing his argument upon that, although in his Bill he provides for a different state of things, namely, limited expropriation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I take exception to the hon. gentleman's statement that this is the adoption of a new principle. It is not. The principle is the principle of expropriation, of giving power to the government to take a man's property for its use. Now, it is a mere extension, a mere enlargement, to say that when you require a man's property, if you do not require it all, or only require it for a limited time, you may make a limited use of that property. That is not the adoption of a new principle at all. He is mistaking the enlargement and extension in a moderate way of a principle for the principle itself. The principle is already laid down and established. Everybody admits that it would be impossible to carry on the government if you did not have that power. Therefore no one ought to oppose the provisions of this Bill unless he strikes out the basic principle itself. Now my hon. friend says that in the prosecution of public works it is often found in Canada wholly unnecessary to take the whole of a man's property or to take it permanently; all that is necessary in any instance is to take only a part of it, and for a limited period. Now upon what ground is it contended that while you can take the whole of a man's property for all time, you cannot take a portion of that property for a part of the time, even though you make him ample compensation.

Mr. CLANCY. The difference between the hon. gentleman and myself is not whether he should take the property, but the difficulty is to provide means by which a proper compensation would be given in each case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friends have to admit that they are here. Is it impossible, or is it improbable that the courts of the country cannot have such evidence and assistance given to them by the parties who are concerned in showing the value of an interest which has been taken as will enable them to name the sum which will safely and surely be sufficient compensation for the interest in the property taken ? Take the case of any property that the Crown may want to occupy for four or five years. Take a farm ; if my hon. friend has a farm, or a dwelling house, if my hon. friend has a dwelling house, which the Crown would require to use for five or ten years—does he argue against the Bill upon the assumption that it would be impossible for any tribunal to say what the use and occupation of that farm for ten years would be, or to arrive at the amount of compensation that he should receive for taking the property away from him during that time ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman seems to be reasoning backwards. He is putting up a case and he is asking : Would any person suppose it is possible to arrive at a fair compensation ? What we say is, that it should be reasonably possible to arrive at a fair consideration.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why can you not be reasonably positive ? If you cannot be reasonably positive there is a difficulty as to the value, the price, or the accurate amount which a man ought to get, but there is not a tribunal which would deal with such a case, or which would be called upon to adjudicate upon it, which would not allow ample latitude so as to cover any possible contingency. We know that in our experience—the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) doubtless knows as the result of his experience in the department which he presided over for a number of years—that the Crown invariably gets the worst of it in all these cases. This has been referred to by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). He knows that the disposition of every tribunal is to give to the individual claimant the benefit of every doubt, and to give against the government every advantage which it can give to the other side.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We are not debating the question as to how the Crown is used, or whether it has been obliged to pay greater damages to individuals than it should have paid. It is the clause which is immediately before us that we are discussing. The question is : What is the meaning of the clause which is immediately before us ? The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals asks if the court cannot fix the amount of the remuneration for a limited estate in any property. They can. They can describe a limited interest just as well as they can the value of a complete expropriation, but how are they to arrive at the compensation when the hon. Minister of Justice says that the Crown may use a property for one, two, or three years before payment of the compensation may take place ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have to name the time during which you require to use the property.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. You have to put that in the notice of expropriation.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am dealing with the clause immediately before us, and you have not to do anything of the kind. I will ask the hon. Minister of Justice if notice has been served at the present moment in regard to any land intended to be expropriated, and on which the amount of compensation for the expropriation is not paid, would not that clause apply in such a case ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have to state just what term you want the property for; and you have to estimate the damage.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am asking the questions of the hon. Minister of Justice. If notice is given of the expropriation of any property that the Crown is in possession of at the present moment and has not paid the amount of the expropriation, if this clause passes, cannot you abandon the land, get the compensation fixed, and compel the owner to take the land back again ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Why should he not ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The difference between the two ministers is this : The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says the amount is to be fixed at first——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He never said anything of the kind.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART——before the partial interest in the limited estate is taken. There is a difference as I understand it between these two hon. gentlemen.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not if we are understood. We both say the same thing.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will admit for argument that if you fix the limited estate at first, or the interest in the land to be expropriated, if you fix it in your notice and serve it upon the party whom you take the land from, you can fix its value, but this clause goes a great deal farther than that. It goes so far that you can serve notice on the man whose land is to be expropriated, you need not pay him the amount of the expropriation, or any money, for the user of it till the time expires, and when the time expires you can fix the amount of the expropriation, or get the arbitration to fix the amount which is to be paid to the man for the user, and the clause gives you power to do so and to hand back the land. Another reason why we object to a Bill such as this is, that it will have an ex post facto effect. It applies to lands which are at present under process of expropriation. Does it not do so ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It has no retroactive effect at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does it not apply to lands on which the government are at present working, and in regard to which they have not paid the amount of the expropriation ? Are there not hundreds of cases at present in the department that the Bill applies to where the Crown is in possession of the land ? Certainly there are, and this Bill applies to them. It is intended to apply to them. It is intended to apply to some difficult cases of expropriation perhaps running, not for months, but for years, and to lands of which the Crown is at present exercising the user, or using the lands at the present moment, because the parties have not been able to settle with the Crown or to get their claims settled. By this plan the government will be able to say : We have used your property as long as we like, we will leave it to the court to fix the value of the expropriation for the user, and we will hand you back your property. This can be done under this Bill if it becomes law. I agree with my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) that there is no justification for any such action as that. There is no justification for the Crown, or any individual, taking from a person who owns a property a partial interest in the property for a small number of years. The law of eminent domain should apply solely to the absolute taking of the property, and as my hon. friend says, when you have taken a property for public purposes and when there is no more use for it for public purposes, you ought to put it up to auction and give it to the highest bidder. That is the only honest, fair way of doing. This is new legislation as the hon. Minister of Justice himself admits. He cannot show a precedent in any other country in the world for it. He knows it is the exercise of a right which is an extreme right. The taking of property from an individual is a right which most countries do not allow the government to exercise except under the strictest conditions, such as are provided, for instance, in the constitution of the United States. It is not for the state to determine, nor for the federal government to determine the reasons for which they may exercise the right of eminent domain ; it is fixed in the constitution. But here is an extreme right of absolutely taking property where it is necessary in the public interest, and when you have no further use you can sell it or give it back. I am afraid that under the law this right may be exercised in connection with suits which are pending.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If such be the case I object to the principle of the thing.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As to the retroactivity of the law, I will take the opinion of the leader of the opposition, as to whether it is retroactive or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If there are cases in the department where land has been expropriated and the compensation money not paid ; the statute would seem to have the effect which the ex-Minister of Railways states.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) say that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is at least open to question whether the language is not sufficiently comprehensive for that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If there is any doubt on the subject I will insert language that will remove that doubt.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is perfectly fair. In this country, as in all other countries we have the power to take a man's land against his will because sometimes it is in the public interest to do so. It is an invasion of private rights and it is desirable it should be made as little oppressive as possible. The argument from this side is that you are making this more oppressive when you introduce complications of this kind. The Minister of Justice knows, that when the Minister of Railways talks about a tribunal absolutely determining the amount of compensation for land; he does not mean that any tribunal can absolutely determine that with anything like certainty. What is the usual practice? A number of expert witnesses, perhaps fifteen or twenty, are called on each side—in one province, I believe, the number has been reduced to five—and they give varying estimates as to value. In one case in which I was concerned the estimated value of a piece of land expropriated by the Crown varied from $15,000 to $90,000. The tribunal in the end must simply make a guess, and the objection to this legislation is that you are making the guess much more difficult, and you are imposing upon the owner of the land the duty of proving what his damages are.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think the burden of proof is on the expropriated party.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In an ordinary case in the Exchequer Court the proceeding is this: The Crown proves that it has taken the land and the party proves in the first place the amount of damages and the Crown gives evidence in rebuttal. That is the practice in the Exchequer Court in all cases in which I have been concerned.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The origin of the proceeding is notice, and the deposit of a certain amount.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Quite so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Then the party to whom the money is offered determines whether or not he accepts, and if he declines the proceeding is taken in the Exchequer Court, and a deposit is made and the question is whether the amount is sufficient or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is part of the issue; but the real issue is: What is the value of the land. The expropriated party must prove the value of his land, and it comes to what I said at first. If he agrees to what the Crown offers of course there is no litigation, but if he does not agree the burden of proof as to value is upon him. Thus you are imposing a burden upon the claimant and you are making it much more difficult to determine the compensation. Is it desirable in the public interest that that should be done. At present the court makes a mere guess formed upon the opinions of people who come to court and say: This land is worth so much or the detriment to this land by reason of taking part of it is so much. You might get a very extreme case under the provisions of this statute, and I would invite the attention of the Minister of Justice to a case of this kind. Suppose you take ninety feet from the middle of a farm to build a railway, and the owner sells the balance of his farm. After you have had that land for some time you come to the conclusion that you do not require it, and you file a document under section 2 of this Bill stating that you desire only a limited interest, namely, that you desire that land from the period of time which has elapsed from the time it was first taken up to the filing of the notice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That must be done at the inception. You must bear in mind that the preceding section is the origin of the proceeding.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the Minister of Justice mean that this section only applies to land taken for a limited interest in the first place. This section is general, is it not?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is general in the first part; in the second part it is limited.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The second part seems to make provision that the Crown may retrace its steps and say that land taken absolutely in the first instance should only be taken for a limited interest. Am I correct in that?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, before the compensation money is actually paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I guarded myself in that. Then it is general in its terms. The Crown may file such a document as I mentioned, the result being that a piece of land ninety feet wide through that farm is handed back to the original owner who sold the rest of the farm, and the burden is cast upon him of determining what compensation shall be paid by the Crown to him for that: Is not that a rather complicated position, and is it desirable in the public interest that an obligation of that kind—and I have mentioned only one case out of hundreds that may arise—should be imposed on the property owners of this country. As has been said, the Crown has the remedy in its own hands. It takes a piece of property; let it take it absolutely; if it finds out afterwards that it does not need the whole of that property; if it finds it only needs it for a limited interest; let it retain that interest and sell the balance of the property and every one's right is preserved by that. Is the Minister of Justice

familiar with the Land Clauses Act in England—I have no doubt he is. And is it not a fact that courts in England under that Act have the power of determining whether or not the whole of a man's land shall be taken where part is taken in the first instance. I have not refreshed my memory by recent examination, but I think there is some provision of that kind in the Land Clauses Act—does the Minister of Justice think there is not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. I would not care to say anything about the Act, unless I had it before my eyes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Justice is quite right in regard to that, but I thought that perhaps in connection with these matters he would have frequent occasions to refer to that Act. That English law would seem more in consonance with what we should do. I think you are going far enough when you take part of a man's land, leaving on him to prove not only the value of the land, but the damage which is done by severance as it is called in England—when you go beyond that, and take a man's land absolutely in the first place, or take it for a limited interest at first and hand back to him a portion of that limited interest, and in every case impose upon him the duty of proving his damages, it seems to me you are going very far and passing legislation for which there is no precedent.

Mr. OSLER. Notwithstanding what the hon. Minister of Railways says, I think there is a very marked distinction between the powers given here and the powers given under an expropriation Act. The powers given here are the powers of expropriating an option, not buying the property. The government under this clause may virtually get an option on a quarry, hold it, and by increasing the amount they require from time to time, practically continue to hold that option on it for all time. Look at the power this would give, say the Minister of Railways. Suppose you have a contract to let in connection with railway bridges or canals, requiring a large amount of stone. The minister advertises for tenders. Say there are two tenderers. One man looks about for a stone quarry. The other man, who is a friend of the government, has the promise of the minister that they will expropriate a quarry. That is open to happen under this Act. It puts a power into the hands of the government which might lead to corruption at any future time. It practically allows you to take a man's property and tie it up for an indefinite period; and in the end the government will only pay for the comparatively small amount that they use, or perhaps they will not use any at all. This is a power that should not be possessed by any government or corporation. It might lead to serious abuse, and probably would, if any contractors knew that the government had such power when they were tendering for a contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am at a loss to understand how it is that my hon. friend, when he enters into the discussion of any Bill or proposal emanating from the government, absolutely takes leave of his ordinary good, sound judgment and sense. It is the wildest distortion of language for my hon. friend to say that this Bill authorizes the Crown to take an option for an indefinite period on a man's property. What is the use of trying to conduct an argument in such a fashion ? Is he going to ask parliament to condemn this Bill because he asserts that the government are asking power to take an option on a man's property for an indefinite period ? I am amazed to hear my hon. friend address an argument of that kind to this committee. There is not the word option in the Bill from beginning to end. The very moment the notice is given, the property is vested in the Crown, and the moment the Crown takes charge of the property it has to pay for it. It has to pay for just what interest it declares it is taking ; and there cannot be any indefiniteness in it, because the notice must say what interest it is taking, and for what period its interest must go.

Mr. OSLER. Let me ask the minister a question. Assuming that the Crown has served notice on the owner of a quarry adjoining a public work, and the government contractors are working on that quarry ; while they are working there, the quarry man cannot work. As I read this Bill, if the government expropriated a small amount of that quarry and used it for six months, they would have the power to expropriate a further amount for the next six months; and in that way they would be getting an option on the quarry as fully as if it were in writing under seal of the government, and signed. No one else could work that quarry so long as the government were working it. Therefore, as a matter of fact, this Bill gives the government power to expropriate an option on a man's lot. Whether I am legally right or not, I am right technically, as to the effect of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has arrived at that conclusion without the slightest data, foundation or authority.

Mr. OSLER. May I ask the minister to answer my question, whether the government under this Bill has the right to expropriate more than once on the same property ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think probably the government would have the right to expropriate for a further period, but it would have no more right to make the second expropria-

tion than it had the first; and if any man is working in the quarry at the time the expropriation takes place, he will get his compensation. Every time an expropriation was repeated, it would be dealt with as a distinct and separate expropriation, and compensation would have to be awarded in respect of it. I say it is not a fair way to discuss the Bill at all. The Bill is plain, easily understood, and capable of being easily worked. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition saw a difficulty in determining as to the mode of doing justice to a man whose property had been cut in two by a right of way being taken or the construction of a railway. After that was done, the land might be turned back to the owner; but in the meantime he might have sold the rest of his land, and that part would be of no value to him. If my hon. friend had read the section, he would have seen that that is a question that would have to be dealt with by a court.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it would undoubtedly, and I will point out the reason why. After the expropriation notice is given, some little time must elapse before it would get to the tribunal. At all events before payment is made—and I presume that would have reference necessarily to the payment the Crown would offer in respect of their valuation—they would have to declare whether or not they were going to retain the whole or surrender any portion of the property. If they were going to surrender any portion, then the Act provides that such abandonment shall be taken into account by the court, in assessing the amount to be paid as compensation for the land taken.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What would the claimant have to go into in the case I have suggested, in order to prove his claim ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He would simply have to show that after these proceedings had been taken for expropriation, under which his property had been cut in two, he had parted with his interest in the property. Would it not be perfectly apparent to any court that to throw back on his hands ninety feet or whatever might be the extent of the right of way, would be the throwing back of property on his hands which would be of no value, and the court would have to take that fact into account ? He cannot suppose that any court could view the matter in any other light.

Mr. COCHRANE. Suppose he did not sell his land until after the court had assessed the damage ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not the case my hon. friend presents. If he had not sold his land, he would be getting it back just as it was originally, and there would be no strip or right of way cut through his entire property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend thinks he has settled the matter most satisfactorily. He says that in the case cited there would not be the slightest difficulty because the land handed back would have no value whatever. That would absolutely depend on the circumstances. I will tell him one case in which it might have a great deal of value. Suppose the land had been laid out in lots and a populous settlement created and a street laid out immediately along the line of the ninety feet taken ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It would depend upon circumstances.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would depend upon the facts and it is for the courts to determine the meaning and effect of those facts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, and I am pointing out that the provision of this statute imposes an oppressive burden on the claimant in proving his case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is there any more difficulty in determining what the value of a two or three year's user of a man's property is than in determining the value of the whole property ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Take the case I have referred to. What you would have to do would be to prove in the first place what damage was occasioned to the man who continued to own the farm. Then you would be met with the difficulty that the land was handed back to him after it had ceased to be of as much value as it would be if he had retained it. I would like to point out that sections 92, 93 and 94 of the Land Clauses Consolidation Act of the United Kingdom provide that in certain cases the whole of the land must be taken and a part cannot be taken.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Where a man is injuriously affected.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is a different thing altogether.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. You would not take the land that was not affected by the appropriation at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that my hon. friend is possibly confusing two things. In England if you do not take any portion of a man's land at all, although his land may have been injuriously affected by your expropriation of adjoining property, the general rule is that he cannot recover damage.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the law in Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But if you do take a portion of his land, you must con-

sider the injurious effect which that has on the remaining portion. If you take a portion of his land and leave only a certain portion on either side, the owner can call on you to take the whole property and give you a counter notice. I merely bring this to the notice of the Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is practically the same with us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The power of expropriation should not be oppressively exercised.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Are these clauses to which the hon. gentleman is referring in the Consolidation Act of the United Kingdom, not limited to the cases of expropriation cases by railway companies ? The Crown is not included within the provisions of this Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is a good principle in a case of expropriation by the Crown should be a good principle in the case of expropriation by an ordinary railway company ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know about that because the great public interests of the country are concerned in the one case in our not paying any unnecessary money for the user we want. But in the other case, it is only the particular interest of a private company which is involved.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not the interests of a private company at all, but the public interest in every case, which is considered.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Justice referred me to my leader as to the interpretation of the clause we are considering—as to whether it had a retroactive effect and affected lis pendens. Let me give an illustration which I have received in a letter complaining particularly about this Act, and in which the opinion of a leading lawyer is given with reference to this particular clause.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the Peterborough case.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes. In 1865 the government expropriated land at Lakefield. for the Trent canal. The land belonged to one John Hull, and was attached to a flour mill worth some $30,000. The land was taken on which were the store houses, sheds and other appurtenances of the mill. In this letter, after describing the litigation, the writer proceeds to say that the goverument has brought in this measure apparently with the view of defeating Hull, not on the merits, but by an Act of parliament of their own passing, while the case is pending in appeal. The solicitor of Mr. Hull thinks that this Bill is intended to apply to Mr. Hull's case, litigation in which has been going on since 1865 to the present day. While this Bill would not apply to actions settled, it certainly applies to action pending.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have read the letter to which my hon. friend refers and my opinion is not in any way affected by what the learned gentleman says. If the case of Hull is not proceeded with, the writer of that letter may probably inform my hon. friend the reason why. It is not due to any fault of the Crown. And, in any event, I give it as my opinion that there can be no doubt about it that this law will not have a retroactive effect. Legislation of this sort has never had such an effect. But, if there is any question about it, I am prepared to make it absolutely clear. There is no intention to make this Bill applicable to pending cases. When the Bill was introduced before.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is what I said—

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When the Bill was introduced before, the hon. gentleman will see it was made applicable to pending cases, and it was largely because of that it was rejected by the Senate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hope the hon. gentleman does not mean that I said that this was retroactive in the ordinary sense. But if the Crown should file a document creating a limited interest in a man's property——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I see—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is wavering between his reputation as a lawyer and his desire to come to the assistance of his friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By no means.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am willing to set the question at rest by accepting an amendment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will ask the hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick's) opinion—as he seems to want opinions—on one point. Does he mean to say that it is plain that if the Crown file, under the provisions of the section, a document stating that it will take only a limited interest—

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what I am talking about, and that is the case the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) was putting. I confined my remarks to that. I am prepared to stand by that and to say that it is open to serious question. It is not a desire to support my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) in an indefensible position that leads me to say this, but because I believe there is a grave question about it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The observations of the Hon. Minister of Rail-

ways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) seem to confirm the view I touched upon when this Bill was before the committee on the last occasion. That hon. gentleman hesitates to say that this would be a safe power to give to private corporations and draws a distinction between the exercise of this power by such corporations and by the government. That hesitancy seems to confirm my idea for there being no similar provision in the legislation of other portions of the empire. I understand that it is conceded that this is a unique piece of legislation ; and I suggest for the consideration of the committee that the reason it does not obtain elsewhere is not merely that it is a dangerous and unfair power to put into the hands of a private corporation, but that it is an equally unfair and dangerous power to put into the hands of the government. To illustrate, let us apply the principle as in the case that the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) stated the other day when he was explaining the measure. Suppose the government want the temporary use of land for the erection of derricks in connection with the public works, and they want to get that right from the owner at a reasonable price. They do not want to pay the amount that would be involved in taking the title in fee. Therefore, some such legislation as this is deemed desirable. It is desirable from the point of view of the government, there can be no doubt about that, for it will enable them to get what they want at a cheap rate. But there is something to be said also from the point of view of the owner of the property, and it is because of that, I believe, that other legislatures hesitate before passing such a law as this. The result of the Bill will be that the government can drive a hard and small bargain every time it wishes to use the land of a private owner for temporary purposes. They can get the use of the land at, perhaps, $150 or $300 less than the real value. And for this reason—the owner, let us say is a farmer ; he has a strong belief that the temporary use of his property is worth a certain sum, but he is face to face with the fact that he may be drawn into a contest with the government, and must retain counsel and be put to expense. He may be well advised by cautious counsel that, though there is good reason to believe he is entitled to so many hundred dollars, it is impossible to say what the tribunal will fix, for the evidence has to be threshed out, and if he appeals, he will be mulct in costs as a result of the contest with the government. The result may be that he will sacrifice so many hundred dollars, as represented by the Minister of Justice, and will accept the proposition of the government. I do not think that is putting it as an extreme view, as in the ordinary run of cases, that would be the result.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Assume that the case is one of the permanent expropriation of property.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is always the difference in value—in that case you get into bigger figures. As I understand, the hon. minister based his plea on the fact that he is dealing with insignificant figures and does not want to pay a big sum. The smaller the amount involved the less likely the individual will be to engage in a contest with the government. It may be an evil that the government cannot drive a cheap bargain when it wants to, but the very fact that the government hesitates to give this power to private corporations is good reason why we should hesitate to give it to the government, as it may be a detriment to the farmer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see the force of that argument—that because some hesitation is felt in giving this power to railway corporations, therefore, parliament cannot safely confer it upon the government. It seems to me the arguments would be all the other way. Parliament can safely confer this power upon the government, but we may well pause and consider very carefully whether we should give the same power to railway companies. The argument of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is against all expropriations where only small values are involved. It would apply to every case of expropriation in which the value did not represent such an amount as would make it worth while to the owner to employ counsel. We are expropriating small properties every day in the week.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

WINDING LEDGES POWER AND BOOM COMPANY.

Mr. MacKINNON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—Mr. Costigan.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that this Bill be read the second time, and that it be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Bill should go in the usual way to the Committee on Railways and Canals, where all similar Bills have, up to the present, gone. I merely make the suggestion as I know that Bills of that character have heretofore gone to this committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Has it been the practice to refer Bills of this nature to the Railway and Canals Committee? There can be no objection, but I do not think it is the custom.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I am only speaking from what I understand has been the practice. I know that the Bill of the Grand Falls Power Company, asking the right to build a dam and to construct booms at Grand Falls was sent to the Committee on Railways and Canals and that when an extension of power was asked by the company the Bill went to that same committee which discussed it very fully. These Bills asking for certain powers under the Railway Act have always gone to that committee, I know.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask if this is the Bill a very large deputation is coming from New Brunswick to oppose?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Then I object to the Bill going through until it is printed in English and French.

Mr. SPEAKER. We established the rule last year in regard to Private Bills that if they are not printed in French and if there is an objection to their being proceeded with, we must observe the rule requiring them to stand. In regard to this Bill the point of order is well taken. The Bill stands.

Order allowed to stand.

THE ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order for:

Second reading of Bill (No. 36) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—Mr. Ball.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). Mr. Speaker, I object to this Bill as it has not been printed in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

Order allowed to stand.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Eastern Townships Bank.—Mr. McIntosh.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 30) to incorporate the Federal Oil Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

EXPROPRIATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 8) to amend the Expropriation Act.—The Minister of Justice.

On section 2,

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with very close attention this afternoon to the debate which was very largely confined to the legal gentlemen in this House. It had more the character of a legal argument than that of an ordinary parliamentary debate, and I may feel some little fear of being classed with those individuals who sometimes step in where angels fear to tread in venturing upon a legal argument. However, I paid as close attention as I could and listened very closely for one argument which I thought was very essential to be advanced by the promoters of this Bill, and which I listened for in vain and that was the reason why legislation of this character was called for, to what extent, where and when the public interests had been so seriously prejudiced for lack of the extension of the expropriation powers which are asked for in this Bill. It is true that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) presented a very strong, voluble and vigorous argument in defence of the powers of expropriation exercised by the government, a principle that is conceded and which is well understood in this country, one that we all understand to be the law of the country and which we believe is a very great concession by the people who are willing to subserve their own private interests for the public welfare, and I think the sense of the House will concede that this ought to be enough, that it is sufficient and ought to be sufficient and as much as should be asked for by this government or any government. But, when they are asked to make such a large extension of it as is asked for in this Bill, we must call a halt and we must call upon ourselves and the government to step cautiously and carefully before arousing a strong public sentiment, a public prejudice in a matter of this kind. I said just now that we conceded the right of the government to expropriate property if the public interest demands it, but so far the promoters of this Bill have failed to show to any extent

that the public interests are prejudiced for lack of this extension of the expropriation powers. During this afternoon the Minister of Railways repudiated the expression used by my hon. friend from Toronto with respect to the term 'option,' saying that the government were asking for power to expropriate options on private property. One of the strong arguments that he used was that the word 'option' did not occur in the Bill. Now, I am not a lawyer, and may not understand an argument of this kind, but it seems to me there was no necessity for using the word 'option' in order to express the principle. If I offer to my neighbour a piece of property and say: 'You may have this property for a certain sum of money any time within the next thirty days.' I do not think it is necessary for me to put into that offer the word 'option' in order to convey the idea that it is essentially an option that has been given to him. There is nothing in the position taken by the Minister of Railways that the power of expropriating options in private property is not contained in the Bill, because the Bill certainly does contain that principle.

Now, as I have already said, the hon. gentleman and his friends have failed to show to what extent, if any, the public interests are prejudiced by the lack of these extended powers. I think this proposition is a very serious invasion of private rights, and one that is likely, if put into practice, to lead to interminable litigation, vexatious in character and unsatisfactory to the public at large. More than that, it is one that is capable of very extensive abuse by the agents of any government that may be in power. I think it has been clearly established during this debate that the public interests are very well served and protected by the law as it now stands, and that the invasion of private rights to any further extent in this direction would arouse a good deal of feeling in this country. If it became known that any man's farm, any man's homestead, whether in town or country, was liable to be invaded in consequence of this Bill, certainly it would arouse a grave feeling of disquiet, and create uncertainty in the tenure of real estate of any kind. All the requirements of the public interest are sufficiently served by the law we now have. It does appear to some persons that this Bill is not being promoted in the public interest, but it is brought in to benefit some private individuals, and the promoters of the Bill have not had sufficient candour to state their object plainly to the House. But if such is not the object, I see no sufficient reason in the public interest to grant these extended powers to the government that are asked for in this Bill.

3. The fact of such abandonment or revesting should be taken into account in estimating or assessing the amount to be paid to any person claiming compensation for the land taken.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved to insert after the word 'account' the words 'in connection with the other circumstances of the case.'

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that another clause be added as clause 6, to read as follows:

That nothing herein contained should affect any pending interest or claim.

He said: This is to make it absolutely clear that the Bill will not be retroactive, as I promised to do before recess.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported.

JUDGES' RETIRING ALLOWANCES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved:

That Bill (No. 7) to amend chapter 138 of the revised statutes with respect to retiring allowances of judges be dropped from the order paper.

He said: It is intended to bring this Bill up in another form.

Motion agreed to.

THE PUBLICATION OF THE STATUTES.

Bill (No. 11) to amend the Act respecting the publication of the statutes (the Minister of Justice), read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On Section 1.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Under the law as it exists, when you apply for a copy of a Bill to the clerk of parliament, you are obliged to pay 10 cents per folio of 100 words. In the case of a long Bill like the Bill to amend the Railway Act, or the Criminal Code, this charge becomes excessive. The amendment provides that after you pay $2 to the clerk for his certificate, then you have to pay the actual cost of printing and no more.

Mr. SPROULE. Will there be any saving in the case of short Bills when you have to pay the $2 anyway.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This Bill is introduced at the suggestion of the clerk himself, who finds that the charge has been excessive, and that many persons who apply for Bills have complained.

Mr. HENDERSON. I always thought that when the Bill was signed by the King's printer there could be no stronger certificate as to its accuracy.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The law is that you have to apply to the clerk for a certificate that that is the Bill introduced which was in parliament.

Mr. LANCASTER. It could be left optional with the applicant whether he wanted the certificate or not.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are dozens of Bills that can be had for nothing, but it is only in case he requires the certificate of the clerk that he pays for it. The law is so very old that I do not wish to change it.

Bill reported; read the third time and passed.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 13) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. He said: This is intended merely to arrange for the place of trial. At the present time the trial of an election petition may take place either in the electoral district in which it arises or in the chef-lieu of the district or vice versa, and there are times when that may become convenient. The second amendment proposes that the judges shall have the right to issue a bench warrant for a witness to appear. At the present time the only proceeding is by way of contempt and it is very unsatisfactory. What is wanted is that the witness should be compelled to attend.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to study this Bill a little before it goes through the committee stage. Has there been any suggestion from the judges with regard to this.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes; from the chief justice of Manitoba. It is for the convenience of the judges and the witnesses. It enables the judges to move to where the witnesses are instead of bringing the witnesses to the place provided for the trial at present.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I realize the force of that, but I wish an opportunity to consider whether it may not operate as a hardship some times. Of course I know we must leave a good deal to the judges in that regard.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It was represented that it was intended for convenience and for the purpose of reducing expenses.

The House resolved itself into Committee on the Bill and then rose and reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Dominion public buildings, Ontario—renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). This vote is to carry out works of repairs and renewals not covered by the general appropriation made by parliament and undertaken in the fiscal year 1903-4. I do not suppose my hon. friends will want me to read the whole list.

Mr. SPROULE. You might read it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Most of the items are very small. The largest are: Belleville, $2,170; Berlin, $178; Brampton, $14; Brockville, $604; Chatham, $704—something in connection with the water pipes.

Mr. CLANCY. Who is the person in charge at Chatham?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the work was let by contract. I forget the name.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works whether his attention has been called to the state of the new Railway Committee room? The ceiling has been discoloured, I suppose because the roof leaks. It is a pity that a fine room like that should be spoiled because of a leaky roof.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My attention has not been called to it. I shall be glad to make inquiries.

Fort William public building, $22,300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the public building being erected at Fort William. The contract was let on the 22nd of July last. The amount of the contract was $20,400. $5,000 has been voted before. The total expenditure estimated by the architect is $27,551.61.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the contract was considerably less than the sum voted. What is the balance for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The balance is for the fittings and furnishings, including the letter boxes, $3,500; the heating, $1,400; the wiring and electric light fixtures, $500; incidental and travelling expenses, $200.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you get the site for nothing?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, a site free of cost to the Crown was given by the city corporation.

Mr. BROCK. Is the fitting up of the letter boxes not usually done by the postmaster, who receives the revenue from them?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It depends on the size of the office. Pro-

bably in an office of this size the receipts would be divided.

Mr. SPROULE. What rule do you follow in regard to fitting up these offices or leaving the postmasters to fit them up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have never known a case of a post office being built and the postmaster fitting it up. In an office of this kind, I think the postmaster will receive 50 per cent of the revenue.

Of course it is as broad as it is long. The postmaster's salary is fixed on the percentage of the revenue and in some cases a percentage is allowed him on receipts from the boxes.

Mr. SPROULE. In all cases where the postmaster furnishes the boxes himself, he gets all the revenue from them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Where there is a public building, does the postmaster not get salary instead of percentage ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that where the post office is declared to be a city office the postmaster gets a salary. In other cases he gets a percentage.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the contractor, and was the contract given to the lowest tenderer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contractor is Robert Campbell, of Almonte, and his was the lowest tender.

Mr. SPROULE. Was any application made to the department by the town to furnish a site ? Or did they voluntarily offer the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That happened some considerable time before I was in the department. The building is on ground belonging to the corporation.

Mr. SPROULE. In some cases the town furnishes the site and in other cases the government pays for the site. It seems to me that all places should be treated alike. Where an application is made for a post office, the town should be called on to furnish the site. It is not fair that in one case the government should pay for a site and in another the town should furnish it.

Guelph—public building, addition to, $21,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For many years the accommodation for the public has been altogether too small. I asked the chief architect to visit Guelph himself and look carefully into the present requirements and a little to the future, so that we might not be called upon to again make any additions. He found that the lowest estimate he could make would come to something over $21,000. I found that to make a temporary addition would not give the public satisfaction and that we should soon be called upon to make further improvements, so that the report of the chief architect was adopted. It will cost us this amount to complete the work. This expenditure is very well warranted from the revenues received from the government at that city. The postal revenue is $25,000, and the customs over $113,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the inland revenue office in the same building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not prepared to answer that question as my officer has not put into this memorandum the revenue from inland revenue.

Mr. HENDERSON. Have tenders been called for or has the contract been let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think the contract has been let, but tenders have been called for.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is understood there Mr. Kennedy has the contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Now that my hon. friend mentions the name, I believe that Mr. Kennedy was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SPROULE. What will the building cost in full ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the cost of the original building. That was begun in 1874 and completed in 1877.

Mr. SPROULE. What will the present addition cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will cost $30,000. Nine thousand dollars were spent last year, and $21,000 are required this year, which makes $30,000. The contract is not yet let. We advertised for tenders, and I remember that the tenders came before the deputy minister and myself, and the amount was something over $27,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Did the government own the site on which the addition is being erected ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Public works—chargeable to income, public buildings, Ontario—Kingston military buildings, stable accommodation for field battery, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote has been taken several times, I believe. A demand was made a number of years ago for suitable accommodation for the field battery, Royal Canadian Artillery. They want a stable for forty horses. There has been great difficulty about the site, but that has now been purchased at $5,000, which is represented to us as a very reasonable price. Later on I intend to ask the House for a vote for the erection of the

stable. The plans have been drawn for a wooden building one story high and about 150 feet long by 25 feet wide.

Mr. SPROULE. This has no connection with the military college ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, this is for the field battery, Royal Canadian Artillery.

Mr. CLARKE. Part of the permanent force ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. The conclusion of the inquiry made was that if we were to maintain this force, we must have stables for the horses. The present conditions are very unsatisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the whole expected to cost ? There was a vote of $5,000 last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was voted several years, I believe, but it was not used. The difficulty was to procure a suitable site. One has been secured at $5,000 which is satisfactory to the military college, the citizens and the permanent corps. It was originally held at $8,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the size if it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give the exact size, but it is a good big piece of land.

Mr. SPROULE. From whom was it purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think from a widow, a Mrs. Garvin.

Mr. SPROULE. This does not look to be exactly a business like way of doing it. It is usual, when the House is to be committed to an expenditure to give us the means of judging what the whole is likely to be, and not call upon us year after year for several small sums.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) but the circumstances in this case are peculiar, the work having been delayed owing to the difficulty of procuring a site. But I have given the nature of the building and I should think it could be built for about $6,000. That is an estimate of my own. But I think the chief architect would agree with me.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose in the absence of better information we must take what we get.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before we go on with the next item I wish to ask one or two questions with regard to the Cobourg armoury, for which $8,000 was voted last night just as we were about to adjourn, but with the understanding that further questions might be asked with regard to it. I wish to know whether the government is buying that site or whether the town is giving it; and, if the government is buying it, what is the price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand we have a drill hall there which is not satisfactory as to site. It is the intention of the government to dispose of that property and build in a more suitable place. The site has been bought for $4,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. The town is not doing anything towards a site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. What will the Cobourg armoury cost when completed ? With this vote, you will have $20,000 at your disposal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The original estimate was $15,000 but since that time the headquarters of the Durham Field Battery have moved to Cobourg. This makes it necessary to provide more accommodation in the armoury. But the amount voted we expect will complete the work.

Mr. SPROULE. And give accommodation to the battery as well as—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As well as to the 40th battalion.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the old armoury been sold ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. OSLER. What is the reason of the changing of the site ? Surely, in a town like Cobourg, the question of a site is not so important as to make it advisable to put up a new building. What is the reason for buying a new site when the government has the old one ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because the old one was not suitable for the purpose either in location or in size.

Mr. OSLER. But in a town like Cobourg, surely there is not such great difference between one site and another.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there not something behind that ? I think there was some discussion about this last year, and I thought then there was a nigger in the fence somewhere. I think we ought to get some further information about this, and I suggest that it be allowed to stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The request was made to the Department of Public Works by the Department of Militia. I am aware that the local officers were a long time asking for the accommodation. I have no knowledge of any local differences of any kind, or that there is any objection to a settlement. I understand from the Militia Department that everything is satisfactorily settled.

London drill hall and armoury, $60,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site has been purchased and is 252 feet on Dundas street, and 120 feet on Grenville street. It is to be constructed of brick, with stone dressing on a stone basis.

Mr. OSLER. Is there a drill hall there now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister informs me that he doesn't think there is.

Mr. OSLER. You do not know; but supposing there is one.

Mr. HYMAN. There was a drill hall constructed in 1872, which got out of repair and became practically useless. Besides, the site of the old hall was not conveniently situated, and was altogether too small.

Mr. LANCASTER. From whom was the site bought ?

Mr. HYMAN. I fancy the site was bought from eight or ten different people who owned different portions of this land.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a memorandum that the site was purchased from seven different parties, and I will give the hon. gentleman the names : The Dominion Savings and Loan Company, Mr. Caravella, Mr. McKellar, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Crouch and Miss Durkin. The total cost was $5,507. The total cost estimated to complete is $175,000 to $180,000, including the site.

Mr. OSLER. I think a city like London ought to have a good drill shed, and if the old site was not large enough the new one should be larger. In the case of Toronto, we paid a large amount towards buying the site before we could get the government to entertain the idea of building a drill shed. I think the same rule ought to apply to all cities. The Toronto building is in proportion to the size of the city, still I do not think it cost as much as it is proposed to spend in London. I am inclined to be very liberal with all these expenditures for drill halls, but I think the same principle ought to apply to all the cities. I do not begrudge the expenditure at all, but I want to see all treated alike.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it would be good policy on the part of the country to build these drill sheds on a somewhat less costly plan, and have good headquarters in all the counties for the militia. It is true that in the large cities they require a great deal of accommodation, and the buildings are expensive. I think the building in Toronto cost between $300,000 and $400,000. Even yet I know from applications I have received lately from the Militia Department that the local corps complain that they have not all the accommodation that they require. I believe the Militia Department are considering a policy of providing accommodation on plans that will call for very much less money than we are expending now.

Mr. OSLER. Toronto paid $150,000 for the site.

Mr. HENDERSON. I fail to see any reason why municipalities should be called upon to furnish the site for public buildings of this character. To my mind it is the duty of the government not only to furnish the building but the site. As a rule, I have no sympathy with the idea that municipalities should tax themselves to furnish the site of any public building. In the present case I have a pretty fair recollection that when this building was first proposed to be erected we had strong assurances from the Minister of Public Works that the cost would not exceed $100,000, and quite a lengthy debate took place at the time the first vote was given. I see that some $14,000 were expended prior to the 1st of July last, some $10,000 were voted last year, which I presume will be expended before the 30th of June coming. Now we are asked for an additional $60,000. Those sums alone would be somewhere within the estimate given us by the Minister of Public Works when he first asked for an appropriation for this building. I confess I am astonished now to find that the architect was so far wide of the mark in his first estimate that he now tells us he will want from $160,000 to $175,000, about $75,000 more than the original estimate. But this is not the only occasion that similar mistakes have been made. From year to year this House is led to vote money for public buildings on the assurance that the cost will be limited to a certain amount. But, before these buildings are completed, we find that in many instances the construction of the buildings costs from 50 to 100 per cent more than was originally contemplated. Now, the objection I take to it is this : I am not so particular whether that building costs $150,000 or $175,000—the country can afford it—but I do protest against this principle of engineers and deputy ministers spending the money of this country contrary to the wishes of this House. We are the men who should say how much money should be expended. We are, as a matter of fact, not the men. It is the officials of the government, not the ministers—they do not control it—but they allow their officials to control the whole of this expenditure and I say the sooner we stop that system the better. I do not believe in coming here and taking the responsibility for the expenditure of money in this country year after year when practically the entire expenditure on these public buildings is brought about, not by the minister who is supposed to be responsible to parliament, but by his deputy or by his other officials. I think the ministers should

draw the line, and when they come and say to this House that a building is not going to cost more than a certain sum their officers should be instructed to make an estimate within that amount. That was the tenor of the discussion which took place two years ago when this building was first spoken of and it was the distinct understanding at that time that the engineer should get his instructions that the building should be erected and completed for a sum not to exceed $100,000. Who is responsible for this over-expenditure ? Is it the minister, or is it the department, or is it the chief engineer, or some other official of the government ? I say that the time has come when we should protest and I intend to protest against it in every instance when the officials of any department undertake to spend the money of this country and compel parliament to vote it. If we are to be responsible for the expenditure of money then I say let us have the fixing of the amount and not the officials of the government as has been the practice year after year. I enter this protest and I intend to repeat it in every case where the same thing occurs. So long as the minister has assumed the responsibility himself and has the responsibility I have not much to say, but when I know, as in this case, it is the officials of the department and not the minister, then I say, we ought to enter a strong protest against it and see that a stop is put to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Chairman, I may say that I am in full sympathy with the position taken by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). I hope he will not have on many occasions to protest as far as I am concerned. In this particular case I am satisfied that the minister was perfectly frank and candid in his figures as to the cost. So that no member of the committee would have reason to complain when asking for this vote for $60,000. I requested the chief architect to make a complete estimate so far as possible so that I might announce to the committee what the entire cost of this building will be. My hon. friend knows that it has been the practice to ask for a vote for a portion of the money required and then to come back to parliament and get more to complete the work. It is not my intention to do that in this case so far as I can avoid it. It is my intention to do what the hon. member suggests ; that is to ask the engineer, or the architect of the department to give me a carefully prepared estimate and to announce this to the House. I can quite understand that in many of these cases it is unnecessary to vote the full amount of the money required in one session for the simple reason that we all know and well know that it sometimes takes two or three years, even when reasonable progress is made by the contractor, to complete the work. But, I agree with the hon. gentleman that if there is one thing that parliament is entitled to, it is that when work is undertaken a fair, and straightforward estimate of the total cost should be given. So far as I am concerned I intend to carry out that policy.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am obliged, indeed to the hon. minister for his very frank statement and I presume that he will endeavour to carry out that principle, but he has missed my main point. I have a very distinct recollection, and I think it is the recollection of the other members of the committee, that we were assured that this building would not exceed in cost $100,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I admit that.

Mr. HENDERSON. I want to know how in the world it is going to cost $175,000. Who is responsible for that ? I do not think that the cost of material, or the cost of labour has increased in any such ratio as 75 per cent in all. I fear very much that the officers of the department have full liberty to draw such plans as they think fit and that they are the men, and not the ministers, who actually fix the price to be paid for the completion of a building. We have no control over it because we have no control over these officers. If the minister allows his officers to go on and draw plans of a building that will cost 75 per cent more than parliament is given to understand it would cost, how are we going to put a stop to it ? We cannot say now : Let us stop the construction of this building. It has been started on that principle, and will have to be completed on that principle, but I do trust that a closer watch will be kept and that when a pledge is given to parliament in regard to the cost of the building the minister will see that his engineer, his architect, and those who seem to me to have control of the expenditure will not overstep reasonable bounds and will keep somewhere near the limit fixed by parliament.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman allow me one word of explanation ? It was out of my desire to give the full cost that the amount stated appears to be more than it should. The building itself will cost $133,000. It was in carrying out the very policy that the hon. gentleman advocated, and of which I am in favour, that I insisted that the architect should give full details as to the amount that would be required to complete everything in connection with the building and I am giving the committee now the full and complete cost including fittings, furniture, boilers, ventilation, fencing, electric wiring, and everything connected therewith. I am giving the committee, as far as the architect has prepared under my instruction, the full amount required. Of course I am not asking for the full amount

for all these purposes now because hon. gentlemen know that the balance will have to be asked for later, but to arrive at what may be considered a complete estimate I have brought this further information.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say that this is another illustration of what we have over and over again here. When it was contemplated to put up this building had the House been told that it was going to cost $181,000, I have no doubt the House would have hesitated before consenting to authorize this expenditure, but on the ground that it would only cost $100,000 the House somewhat reluctantly and after a lengthy debate consented to it. That was the commencement of an expenditure which at the outset was said to be $100,000. We had scarcely got into the work when the expenditure began to creep up and within two years it had almost doubled. Are there not reasonable grounds for complaint that there is something wrong with the architect, with the government, or with somebody. Would this House have consented to going on with this building if it knew in the first place that it would ultimately cost $181,000—I am not talking here for pastime or for the purpose of obstructing; I am protesting against a growing evil and I think the Minister of Public Works should give me his attention instead of speaking to his friends around him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I beg your pardon, I was speaking to the deputy minister.

Mr. SPROULE. It is only when the House knows what the total cost to complete will be that it can intelligently pledge the resources of the country for a vote of this kind. This building will cost twice as much as was intended originally and we find the same thing over and over again with regard to these public works and public buildings. It is an improper system and should be put an end to. I am obliged to disagree to some extent with my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) as to the propriety of towns and cities paying a share of the cost in the way of furnishing a site or paying portion of the cost of a site for these buildings. Public buildings embellish a town or city and confer a benefit on it, and I do not think there is any injustice done if the town or city is asked to pay a fair share of the cost. But whether that principle is right or not, the fact that Toronto contributes $150,000 for a building which costs $300,000, and that London does not pay a cent towards the building which is to cost $181,000, seems to be very unfair towards Toronto. There should be some fixed principle. Let it be either that nothing should be contributed or that each place should contribute a certain proportion. All should be served alike. As my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) has pointed out, Toronto has just grounds for complaint at this discrimination. I am not complaining of the present Minister of Public Works, because I think he shows a commendable desire to give all the information he can, but I do say that when he asks an initial vote for a public work he should be able to tell the House what the entire cost of it will be so that the House may form a correct judgment on it.

Mr. CLARKE. I agree with my colleague from Toronto that when an armoury is to be erected in a town a good building should be put up. I find no fault with the expenditure of a reasonable sum for this purpose in the city of London. The objection taken on this side is, that so to speak, the House has been hypnotized into approving of this building by the inaccurate statement made at first as to what the ultimate cost would be. We are not holding the present Minister of Public Works responsible for that. The principle laid down by the hon. members for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is one that cannot be controverted. Those who pay the piper should be able to choose the music. It is not fair to the House that it should be told a building will cost $75,000 or $100,000 when the fact is that it will take double that amount to complete. Now, I want to draw the attention of the minister to the oft told tale that while the city of Toronto contributed $150,000 to purchase the site for the Toronto drill shed, that drill shed is not yet completed. Representations have been made again and again to the department. I have myself raised my voice in my own humble way in this House to urge upon the minister in all fairness that the additional drill hall accommodation required in Toronto should be provided. I commend the matter to the serious consideration of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland). It is not unreasonable to ask that the armoury should be completed. I would remind the minister that in addition to what else we have done, the city of Toronto has provided accommodation for the military stores. The city will be ready to give accommodation for any of the military stores in any of the municipal buildings, but surely a drill shed is the proper place for these stores. A last word to the minister. I hope that he will bring down in the supplementary estimates a vote to complete the original plan of the drill shed in order to give the needed accommodation to the garrison at Toronto.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter has not been brought to my attention before, and I am not familiar with the details of it. but I have made a memorandum and will look into it.

Mr. CLARKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the contract for the London building let by tender.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was let to the lowest tenderer for $133,-

897. I am afraid I will have to retort to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) and complain that he is talking to the hon. gentleman behind him while I am giving this information.

Mr. SPROULE. When is the building going to be finished ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. December, 1904, is in the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any danger that the price will be increased between now and then.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I explained to the House that this is a carefully prepared estimate, including everything that would be required for the building.

Rideau Hall—drainage, $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the Minister of Public Works ever thought of building a new hall, or will he keep on for ever repairing the old building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must say that officially I have not given the matter any attention. I do wish something could be done to stop these large expenditures from year to year. But this I am given to understand is a very necessary work. The drain at present empties into the Ottawa river. It was choked up, and the odour from it was very offensive.

Mr. SPROULE. Where does it empty now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Into the city sewage system.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the total cost is $10,647.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the work let by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. A portion of the work was done by the city, for which the city was paid. The balance was done by day's work under officers of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. When was this work commenced ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last summer. It will be completed in a short time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is the length of the sewer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 2,065 feet. My hon. friend must remember that the work had to be done by blasting through the rock.

Toronto Custom House—underpinning walls, $10,000.

Mr. KEMP. Will the minister please explain the nature of that work ?

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose the great majority of the members of the Committee are familiar with the splendid building we have in Toronto. It was reported to the department that the piles on which the building was originally constructed were decayed, and that there was danger of the building falling down. The chief architect of the department made a careful examination, and came to the conclusion that this was correct; and the work seemed to be so necessary and so urgent for the preservation of the building, that I took the responsibility of ordering it to be commenced. This is one of the cases in which it is somewhat difficult for any one to estimate at the beginning just what the total cost will be. The chief architect estimates, however, that it will be between $15,000 and $20,000. The work is done in sections, six feet of the wall being taken down at a time and reconstructed. The timbers are cut away down below the water line where they are decayed, and a new foundation built up of hard brick set in cement. It is a somewhat dangerous work. I may say, as I may be criticised afterwards, that I ascertained who the original contractors on the building were, and as they were responsible and reliable men who could be depended on, I authorized the chief architect to make an arrangement with them to do this work. If I had let it by tender to other contractors, and a mistake were made, there would be great danger of a valuable building being lost.

Mr. CLARKE. What are the names of the contractors ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Brown & Love.

Mr. KEMP. Is it the main building or the examining warehouse ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The custom house itself.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that no tender was asked for, but that you gave the work to Brown & Love without tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They gave a price, and it was agreed on between them and the chief architect under my authority. I did not ask for any other tender.

Mr. CLARKE. Who supervises the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The architect's name is Mr. Curry.

Mr. KEMP. Has the minister had any application from the officers at Toronto looking to the enlargement of the buildings there, or are they considered large enough for the work at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have had applications from all over the Dominion for increased accommodation, including Toronto. I have not been able to inform myself of the necessity that may

exist in Toronto, but will look into it at the earliest moment.

Mr. CLARKE. Did the architect, Mr. Curry, recommend that this work should be given to Brown & Love without tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. When the matter was discussed between the chief architect and myself, he looked up the papers and ascertained that Brown & Love were the original contractors. The architect was appointed afterwards, when it was decided that that was the best mode of proceeding with the work.

Mr. SPROULE. On what principle is the work done? Is it at a schedule price?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. The price was agreed on between the chief architect, the contractors and the department at so much per foot.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you paying per foot?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not here the figures which were agreed upon.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose there will be no difficulty about bringing down the correspondence?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No objection at all. I was very sorry to know that there was a danger of the building falling down. It was an extreme case, and I thought this was the best way to proceed.

Mr. CLARKE. The firm of Brown & Love are certainly good contractors, there is no doubt of that. They have a very high and enviable reputation. There are other firms, of course. We would like to know what price has been agreed on with them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have to take the responsibility of ordering the work to be proceeded with on the recommendation of the chief architect; and I thought it was much safer and cheaper to have it done by the men who had originally erected the building than to take new men. We will not put more on it than necessary to make the building safe. The architect has examined as closely as he could. When they come to cutting these piles they must continue the work until the building is safe.

Mr. SPROULE. The architect ought to be able to come to some conclusion now as to the repairs which have to be made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have given the detailed description of the work to be done. We are asking for $15,000 and hope that that will do the work.

Mr. SPROULE. They must have done most of the expensive work or as much foundation work as would enable them to tell how they have to finish it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect states that this will complete the work. If it does not, he will be able to give very satisfactory explanation why.

Toronto—Dominion public buildings—renewals, repairs, &c., $8,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. minister allow this item to stand and also the one that follows, Toronto post office. I have been requested to ask that these two items stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am quite agreeable.

Items allowed to stand.

Toronto Junction—public building, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide a building for post office and customs purposes. The total estimated cost is $38,135. That includes the site and the building, as well as the fitting, heating, lighting, &c.

Mr. CLANCY. What did the site cost and how much will the building cost, and the heating, fitting and lighting?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site cost $4,500. Including all expenses, $4,625. I need not give the estimated cost of the building, heating and fitting as I have already read the particulars.

Mr. CLANCY. From whom was the site bought?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site was purchased from the Real Estate Loan Company of Canada, limited.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the contract been let?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Then this is just an estimate. There is one pleasant feature about this. When the hon. member for that riding was running his election, he and his friends gave the word that if he were elected, there would be a good post office put up, and now the government are redeeming their promise. It is so unusual to see this government redeem any of their promises that I cannot but help giving them credit in this instance. Whether the transaction might be considered bribery or not, I am not going to discuss. Toronto Junction requires a post office and should get it. No doubt the site was bought from some very good friend of the government. I do not know whether the government paid double its value or not, but they probably paid a good round figure. They will no doubt follow that up by giving the contract to one of their friends, but I would advise them not to give it at too high a figure and then

ask us next year for an additional sum to complete or they may expect much more severe criticism.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The site was bought at a very reasonable price, $75 a foot for 60 feet on Dundas street and 130 feet on King street. It is one of the best sites in the whole town of Toronto Junction. Toronto Junction, as everybody knows is growing rapidly. It has a population of nearly 7,000. The post office receipts are nearly $5,000 a year, and the customs about $60,000 a year. This all appears under the head of Toronto, as Toronto Junction is an outport of that city. The present post office is very small and the amount they are paying for rent for the present post office and also for the customs will pay a reasonable sum on the cost of the building.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the government paying for rent ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it is $150 a year for the post office.

Mr. SPROULE. How much for the customs ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. For two rooms they are paying $20 a month. Four or five years ago rents were very low and they made an exceptionally good bargain renting the two rooms for $12 a month. But when the lease was to be renewed, rents had gone up and they had to pay $20 a month. I am sure that when the time expires again the rent will be still further advanced.

Mr. OSLER. These rents are a little more than three quarters of one per cent on the amount to be expended.

Mr. INGRAM. Last night I asked for a list of the papers in which tenders for the Clinton post office were advertised for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Orders have been given to have a list prepared, and I shall be glad to send it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram).

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I was not in my place when the minister gave details with regard to the Cobourg drill shed. Though a little out of order I ask leave to go back to that point. I wish to know if the Minister of Public Works has outlined any policy in relation to these drill sheds erected throughout the country. I think he should prepare some plan by which drill sheds could be erected at much reduced cost. In that way all the regiments could be provided for, but, at the present rate of going, and each drill shed costing a great deal of money, it will be years before the country will be anything like fully served with these sheds.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) had been present he would have heard me express my views on that subject. Of course, the policy with regard to these matters rests largely with the Militia Department. I expressed my personal view that every battalion should be provided with a good building for headquarters, and, that to that purpose we should try to reduce the cost of the buildings to some extent. I am not complaining about the cost that has already been incurred in some of the large cities. But I think we should provide in the counties good substantial buildings at the least possible cost as headquarters for these battalions.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). The hon. member for West York (Mr Campbell) gives as a reason for the construction of a public building at a cost of $35,000 for postal purposes in Toronto Junction, that the post office receipts last year were $5,000. I may say that, in Owen Sound the receipts of the post office are about $15,000, while the customs collects $40,000. Yet we have no public building. The rents paid by the government for buildings used in connection with the customs, post office and inland revenue, amount to $965 a year, which, capitalized at 3 per cent would give about $30,000. Reference was made the other evening to the promise made to the electors in the recent by-election that there would be a public building put up in Owen Sound. I merely submit these figures to the Minister of Public Works, and hope that it will enable him to see his way clear to put a sum in the supplementary estimates, so that we may have a building there adequate to the business of the town and of a character creditable to the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have to be consistent. As I have spoken of the necessity of a public building in Owen Sound, I can express my sympathy with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thomson) in agitating for this expenditure. But, of course he would not expect me to make a promise, because that would be unconstitutional. Though I am not very anxious to be in the government, I would rather leave of my own accord than be kicked out. If I were to announce anything not in accordance with the constitution the hon. gentleman knows what would happen. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the case will have every consideration when it comes up.

Mr. SPROULE. All over the country there seems to be drill sheds which are going out of repair. The government are doing nothing to preserve them. The hon. Minister of Public Works speaks of intending to provide headquarters for the different regiments, but how about retaining the buildings already in existence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say we were going to provide headquarters ; but I stated my personal opinion in favour of that policy. In many cases, the rural battalions have quarters. The

policy has been recommended to the militia department, and, I believe, is being carried out to some extent, of providing comparatively cheap buildings, but many of them, so that our accoutrements, rifles, etc., may be better taken care of than at present and greater encouragement given to the young men to join. The buildings referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) are under the management of the Militia Department. We are getting more expensive arms and accoutrements, and it will be a saving to the country to provide buildings where they can be kept free from injury.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The drawback to the old system was that the municipalities paid half the cost of these buildings and had the use of them. It was very convenient for the town, but it was inconvenient to the militia companies to have their armouries almost open to the public.

Mr. SPROULE. Several buildings in my own county are going to rack. Nothing seems to be done to repair them. I have always thought there ought to be some headquarters for these militia companies, and if these buildings are too expensive, smaller and less expensive ones should be provided. Take the case of Flesherton, I do not think the municipality has any interest in the building there, and it is all going to rack. If it is government property the government ought to take care of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It may be there is some neglect. I will call the attention of the department to it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is a little matter I want to bring before the attention of the government, possibly the Department of Justice. I chanced this year to be coming down on the train from Edmonton to Winnipeg. There were four criminals on the train, being brought to Regina; one was a murderer, and the others were about as tough looking subjects as one could see anywhere. They were in charge of the police. These fellows rode first class; and on the same train there were about twenty young ladies who were coming to the normal school at Regina, and all the way they had to sit in seats adjoining those occupied by these criminals. I want to draw the attention of the government to the fact that I do not think the people of Canada are inclined to pay for criminals riding first-class. In Ontario our volunteers have to ride third-class, frequently in freight cars, when going to serve their country. I do not know whose business it is to look into this matter, but I trust that the coming Prime Minister will take note of it, and give it his serious consideration.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When he comes in.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, the House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 30, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PETITIONS REJECTED.

Mr. SPEAKER. Two of the petitions presented to the House this day asked aid in subsidies from the government. They are consequently contrary to Rule 86, and can not be received.

The petitions were rejected.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

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

Your committee recommend that their quorum be reduced from eight to five members.

L. N. CHAMPAGNE,
Chairman.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the North-west Bank of Canada.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Demers (St. Jean-Iberville).

INSOLVENCY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 53) respecting Insolvency. He said: I may say at once to the House that this is the same Bill that was introduced in 1898 by Mr. Fortin, the former member for Laval, now judge of the Superior Court. At that time I took some interest in the measure, and was a member of the committee that was struck for the purpose of studying it and making a report upon it. I think it would be a pity that the measure should fall, for the reason principally that it was submitted to all the boards of trade of this country, and was approved by them all with the exception of the board of trade of Winnipeg, which for some reason or other refrained from giving the Bill its express approbation. Under these circumstances, the Bill, as framed at that time, met the requirements of all the different provinces of the Dominion. At the present moment there is a great demand for uniform legislation throughout the Dominion on this important subject, and it is with that view that I am re-introducing the Bill. I will give further explanations when it comes up for its second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to direct the attention of the House to the present situation in Ontario ; and, in order that I may put myself within the rules of the House, I intend to conclude with a motion. In the Canada 'Gazette' of Saturday, the following announcement occurs :

Department of the Secretary of State of Canada.

His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to make the following appointments, viz.:

March 26, 1903.

The Honourable Charles Moss, Chief Justice of Ontario, to be the administrator of the province of Ontario for the purpose of assenting to such bills as may be required during the present session of the legislature of Ontario, of assenting to the Bills passed by such legislature at the close of the session ; and of proroguing the present session of the legislative assembly of Ontario.

I take this opportunity of asking the right hon. gentleman who leads the House to state to whom has been assigned the other high duties that are attached to the office of Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. The Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, like all other lieutenant governors, exercises other prerogatives of the Crown than those mentioned in the 'Gazette,' and so far as we know, they are left to some one else. Now, I believe that the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario is very ill, and somebody must be discharging those other duties. Let me point out from one of the authorities what is included in the other duties of the lieutenant governor. At page 30 of 'Confederation Law of Canada,' by Wheeler, it is stated :

The Executive Council of Ontario and of Quebec shall be composed of such persons as the Lieutenant Governor from time to time thinks fit.

and so on. A serious political crisis exists in the province of Ontario ; grave charges have been made against ministers of the Crown and are now under discussion in the Ontario legislature ; and in view of the fact that the government have confessed that the lieutenant governor is unable to discharge three of his duties, and have appointed somebody else to discharge them, I want to know who is discharging these other duties, and passing upon the fitness of the ministers of the Crown. Let me quote another authority, Mr. Goldwin Smith, who the other day made the following statement :

Mr. Ross, it has always been maintained in these columns, had much better after the general election have met without delay the legislature which he had called, taken a decisive vote, and thereupon made up his mind whether he was in a position to carry on the government. He preferred, as a matter of party tactics, to fight the battle out in the election courts, and in such by-elections as might ensue. He thereby manifestly exposed the province to a reign of intrigue and corruption, as well as to an extraordinary outburst of party rancour. He now sees the result. It is much worse for him than even a defeat upon an appeal to the legislature would have been. In that case he would at all events have retained the confidence and support of a united party. As it is, he is threatened with total wreck.

I am not raising a political question, but I want to show what Mr. Goldwin Smith's position is. He goes on to say :

The proper arbiter of the course to be taken by the ministers in such circumstances as these is the lieutenant governor. By him the ministers are appointed, and he is responsible to the province for their integrity. It is very unfortunate if, as is stated, he is incapacitated by sickness for the performance of his functions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have made out that the lieutenant governor has been considered by the Governor in Council here to be incompetent to discharge certain of his functions, and that there are other high functions which require to be discharged at this moment ; and I take this opportunity of asking the right hon. First Minister whether these other functions have been assigned to any one. I have not the slightest intention to reflect on his honour the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. I have the highest respect for him. I am rising here solely from a conception of my public duty. I think I speak for the people of Ontario, for constitutional practice, and for a majority of the members from Ontario of this House, without claiming to speak for them from a party point of view ; and I ask the Prime Minister to tell the House and the country what he is doing in connection with the present serious situation in the province of Ontario. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Some few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend sent me word that he intended to bring before the House the condition of the health of his honour the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. I would have much preferred that my hon. friend had agreed to the suggestion I made in reply, that he would defer doing so until tomorrow, on the motion to go into Committee of Supply. However, for reasons I shall not discuss, he did not see fit to accede to my request. One of the reasons which induced me to ask my hon. friend not to bring the question before the House at this moment was that if he had granted me the privilege I asked, I would have written at once to Sir Oliver Mowat for permission to read to the House a letter which I received from him, and which was the cause of the recommendation I made a few days ago to His Excellency to appoint an administrator for certain purposes. In the absence of such permission, there are in this letter some personal matters which I would

not like to bring before the House, but if I may speak of the general tenor of the letter, it was a request for the appointment by His Excellency the Governor General of an administrator, who would give the necessary sanction to certain Bills this session and who would also prorogue parliament. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) asked me who is administering the other duties of the Lieutenant Governor. It seems to me there was no need for him to put such a question. Sir Oliver Mowat is the Lieutenant Governor of the province, and is administering all the duties of the office except those which he himself has asked to be assigned to another person. The reason why Sir Oliver Mowat asks that an administrator be appointed to give the sanction of the Lieutenant Governor to the Bills passed during the session and prorogue the session, which is not expected to last very long, is that he has been incapacitated by an accident, which he met with some days ago, which confines him to his room. Otherwise he is in good health and quite able to discharge, and is now discharging, the duties of his office. My hon. friend says that Sir Oliver Mowat is not able to discharge the duties of his office, that his health has incapacitated him from doing so. That is the language which my hon. friend used a moment ago, and I suppose he still stands by it. Well, I have the word of Sir Oliver Mowat himself, for whom my hon. friend says he has very great respect, that he is quite able to discharge all the duties of his office except those I have stated, and the inability to perform which is due solely to physical incapacity. Sir Oliver says that he is otherwise in good health. My hon. friend has told us that—and in this he voiced the opinion not only of the people of Ontario but of every Canadian that he has the greatest respect for Sir Oliver Mowat. We all have the same respect and when a man of the authority of Sir Oliver Mowat, when a man who commends to such a high degree the respect, confidence and admiration of the whole community, says he is quite able to administer all the duties of the office, it seems to me my hon. friend has in that statement an answer to the doubt he has expressed, and ought not to go any further, if indeed he has the respect for Sir Oliver Mowat which he professes to have. It seems to me that my hon. friend ought not to insist that Sir Oliver Mowat is not able to discharge the duties of his office, when he has the assurance of Sir Oliver himself that he considers himself quite able in every respect to discharge all the duties of his office except those which call for such physical exercise as to require him to move from one place to another.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Might I ask the date of that letter ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I really do not recollect, but it is within the last ten days. I am sorry that I have not the privilege of bringing it to the attention of the House, but if I remember aright, it was written within the past ten days. Under the circumstances what more can be said ? Sir Oliver Mowat had a fall on the stairs which injured his leg so that he cannot walk, and is therefore not in a condition to go to the House and sanction Bills or prorogue the House. That is why we appointed an administrator. Let me go further. This is the third time this matter has been brought to the attention of the House. Sir Oliver Mowat is Lieutenant Governor by virtue of the commission issued to him on the proper authority, that of the Dominion government. He can be removed to-day at will, but until last November he could not be removed except for cause. Had we renewed his commission, he would be in the same position. My hon. friend need not go far back for a precedent to which no objection was taken. Some few years ago, we objected to lieutenant governors being kept in office year after year without any renewal of their commissions, but no fault was ever found when a lieutenant governor was kept in office for some months longer than his actual term. Some few years ago, the late Sir George Kirkpatrick was appointed Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. He was sworn in on the 13th of May, 1892, and his five years term expired on the 13th of May, 1897. But he remained in office during the term of his natural life, or some six or seven months after his commission had expired. He was in very poor health, had undergone an operation, and it was well known he could not live much longer, but we did not chose to disturb him and left him in the enjoyment of the office which he held with the concurrence and respect of everybody in the province of Ontario. I would like to know why a different rule should be applied to Sir Oliver Mowat. Does he not enjoy to as high an extent the confidence of the people of Ontario as did his predecessor ? For all these reasons it seems to me that my hon. friend is not playing the best part he could. If I judge rightly the trend of public opinion, I am warranted in saying that if there is a man in whom the people of Ontario at this moment have confidence to guide them through the political crisis there existing, it is the man who has for so many years enjoyed to the fullest extent the confidence of that province.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). This side of the House, Mr. Speaker, as well as the other side, are extremely gratified to learn that the only reason for the appointment of an administrator for the province of Ontario are those assigned in the Canada 'Gazette.' If an administrator be required on account of the physical condition of his honour the Lieutenant Governor, the government were perfectly justified in acceding to Sir Oliver Mowat's request. We are all glad to learn from the right hon. gentleman that the alarming reports as to the mental

and physical condition of his honour are incorrect and that he is only suffering at present from the physical disabilities which require the appointment of an administrator.

Mr. MONK. I have just heard my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) say that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) is playing a part in the representations he has thought fit to make to the House and the government. Well, I have listened to my hon. friend from East York each time he has referred to this matter, and I am not aware of any remark he has made that would justify the right hon leader of the House in claiming that in the language used by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) there was the slightest tinge of disrespect to the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. He took occasion to call attention to the inability of the Lieutenant Governor to fulfil the functions of his office at the present moment. On the last occasion, the Prime Minister contended that there was no such inability. But, as a matter of fact, all the remarks of my hon. friend from East York have been fully justified by the Order in Council which appeared in the Canada 'Gazette' last Saturday. What the hon. gentleman stated was absolutely true; it is impossible for the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, at this moment to fulfil some of the functions assigned to him, as shown by the fact that it has been found necessary to assign those functions to somebody else. Thus the stand taken by my hon. friend from East York is amply justified. What I wished particularly to point out, is this—that there seems to be, in my humble estimation, a mistake in this Order in Council. The government, if it had any authority for it's action, must find that authority in section 67 of the Confederation Act, which says:

> The Governor General in Council may from time to time appoint an administrator to execute the office and functions as lieutenant governor during his absence, illness, or other inability.

Now, what I submit to you, Sir, is this—that under that section, which must be construed strictly, the only thing which the Governor General of the Dominion can do is to appoint some one to fulfil the office of lieutenant governor. This gives pertinence to the remarks of my hon. friend from East York. It is within the power of this government to appoint somebody to fulfil the office of lieutenant governor entirely, and I question very much if, having complied with that section, the lieutenant governor himself can proceed in the execution of any of the duties assigned to him. Once the government of the Dominion has judged that there is in the case of a lieutenant governor, illness, absence, or other inability, this government may appoint some body to fulfil the office; but nobody, I think, will contend that it was possible for this government to appoint somebody under this section 67, which is the only one that applies, somebody, for instance, with power to dissolve the local legislature, of or somebody with power merely to give assent to Bills or to prorogue the legislature. Now, in this Order in Council, as I read it, there is an appointment made, not of somebody to fulfil the office of lieutenant governor in conformity of the terms of section 67, on account of the illness of the lieutenant governor, but there is only the appointment of somebody for the purpose of giving assent to Bills during the present session, of giving assent to Bills at the close of the session, and of proroguing of the present session. So that, really, the act of this government amounts to this—that the office of lieutenant governor is divided. There is a fragmentary authority left in the hands of the lieutenant governor and power is given to the chief justice to fulfil some of the functions of the lieutenant governor. I have not given the matter very careful consideration, but I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House that this action is ultra vires of the government of the Dominion. The only power they have is, in three specified cases mentioned in section 67, to vest, so to speak the office of lieutenant governor in some other person. But they cannot give to another person a portion of the authority of the lieutenant governor and leave him with his other attributes. I think ample authority can be found for that; and I think it is clear, at first sight, that this government has exercised a power which it has not.

The PRIME MINISTER. If I may be permitted, the point taken by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is one in which, I am bound to say there is some reason. But we were guided by the precedent created by Sir John Abbott in the case of Sir Alexander Campbell, who was incapacitated from performing certain duties. After communications between Sir John Abbott and Sir Oliver Mowat, then Prime Minister of Ontario, certain powers were given to administrators for certain limited purposes. We followed that precedent.

Mr. MONK. With the indulgence of the House, I would say that I think my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is mistaken with regard to the case of Sir Alexander Campbell. In that case a very singular thing occurred; a deputy was appointed by the provincial government. If the House will allow me, I will quote from Clement's Canadian Constitution, which says:

> During the last illness of the late Lieutenant Governor Campbell, an Order in Council was passed appointing a deputy Lieutenant Governor, and this action on the part of the provincial government gave rise to considerable discussion. It is understood that the Attorney General of Ontario prepared a 'state paper' in support of this action of his government, but this we have not seen. A lieutenant governor standing, as he does in the same relation

to the government of a province as the Governor General does in relation to the government of the Dominion—has vested in him the appointment of all subordinate executive officers throughout the province, but we do not see how this could extend to authorize the appointment of a deputy.

The action of the Ontario government in the case of Sir Alexander Campbell has been criticised by all writers on our constitution. They question—and I think with a great deal of right—the power of the provincial government to appoint a deputy to the lieutenant governor, who is an officer of this government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I think my hon. friend's information is somewhat imperfect. Clement does not go far enough. He had not the facts before him when he made that note on section 67. This debate illustrates the inconvenience of springing questions of this kind on the House without notice. Speaking from memory, I think the deputy to Sir Alexander Campbell was appointed by the local authorities. Sir Oliver Mowat expressed approval of this course. Then the authorities here proceeded as we proceeded. That is, application was made to the federal government, and they did with respect to Sir Alexander Campbell what we did with respect to Sir Oliver Mowat—they confirmed the appointment. And that confirmation was given under the advice of, and after correspondence had been exchanged with, Sir Oliver Mowat, then premier of Ontario. And that is the precedent we have followed.

Mr. MONK. May I ask if there was an official act of the federal government in that case ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, an Order in Council passed.

Mr. MONK. There was a commission issued to this person who took the place of Sir Alexander Campbell—a commission issued in the name of the local government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have sent for the papers and will have them here in a few minutes.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). Section 67 of the British North America Act taken by itself, seems to be reasonably clear :

> The Governor General in Council may from time to time appoint an administrator to execute the office and functions of lieutenant governor during his absence, illness or other inability.

Taking this section alone, I admit that it is certainly enough to raise a great doubt, at all events, as to whether the government has taken the right position in making this appointment, the meaning of the section apparently being that if the Governor General in Council appoint the lieutenant governor at all, they cannot divide his functions, but must delegate them in their entirety. But I do not think that we are driven to find the meaning of the British North America Act on this point from this section alone. If we turn to a corresponding section with reference to the Governor General, I think we will see at once the great importance and great probability of the contention of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in the arguments that he put forward being correct. This section shows just what can be done, and shows that the functions in this case can be divided ; and when you find in the 14th section governing the action of the Governor General that the functions can be divided, there is much ground for the argument that the functions in the case of a lieutenant governor cannot be so divided. Section 14 says :

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, if Her Majesty thinks fit, to authorize the Governor General from time to time to appoint any person or any persons jointly or severally, to be his deputy or deputies within any part or parts of Canada, and in that capacity to exercise during the pleasure of the Governor General such of the powers, authorities and functions of the Governor General as the Governor General deems it necessary or expedient to assign to him or them, subject to any limitations or directions expressed or given by the Queen ; but the appointment of such a deputy or deputies shall not affect the exercises by the Governor General himself of any power, authority or function.

Here we have expressly provided that the Governor General can appoint a person or persons in any part of Canada to exercise for the time being some or any of the functions of the Governor General, and in that way he reserves to himself the exercise of all the other functions, and in order that there should not be any doubt upon this important matter, it is made still clearer by the concluding part of the section, which provides :

> But the appointment of such a deputy or deputies shall not affect the exercises by the Governor General himself of any power, authority or function.

So we see in this marked distinction between the two analogous positions, the cogency of the argument put forward on this side, and I hope the government will recognize, if they have not already done so, the important step they have taken in this matter, and the significance of the position in which they are placed. It has been well said that this is not the only case in which Sir Oliver Mowat has been unable to exercise the functions of lieutenant governor. The government are aware that, speaking in the ordinary way, his term has expired. I am not one of those who are anxious to see that hon. gentleman removed from the position he occupies, and removed for the purpose of replacing him with another hon. gentleman who has long been looking forward to the position as the fruits of his labour. I think the House understands very well that I refer to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) But there has been an argument put for-

ward by the leader of the government which I think tells the other way. He says that because of a crisis in the history of the province of Ontario, the present is an inopportune time to remove from the office of lieutenant governor a gentleman who has shown such conspicuous ability as Sir Oliver Mowat. I submit that this argument is not well taken; because if it is a fact that the government has had in view another gentleman for that position for a long time, and if it be a fact that Sir Oliver Mowat still retains to a large extent the brilliant faculties which he has possessed in the past, surely it is not a great compliment, coming from the First Minister, to the hon. gentleman who aspires to succeed him, to suggest that it would be dangerous now, when there is a crisis in Ontario, to commit to him the administration of the affairs of the province. I hope I am not carried away by any undue admiration for this hon. gentleman, but I do feel that having regard to his faithful public services in the past, having regard to certain promises made to him, it is a little unkind for the First Minister to suggest that it would be dangerous to put the administration of the affairs of Ontario into his hands.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The First Minister has given us the pleasing assurance that he had a letter from Sir Oliver Mowat to the effect that he was physically and mentally in a fit condition to discharge the high functions of his office. I am not going to dispute that, but I am going to say that if the information be at all correct which has come to us from time to time, it is at variance with the statement of the right hon. gentleman. I desire to remind the House that we have a high medical opinion given with regard to the question of superannuation, that an individual is not always the best judge of his own mental and physical condition. I merely draw attention to that circumstance, without desiring to argue that there is anything incorrect in the statement of the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I understood the right hon. gentleman to say in reply to a statement made by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), referring to the case of the late Sir George Kirkpatrick, that after the Liberal party came into power they allowed Sir George Kirkpatrick to remain in office until the time of his death. I think I am correct in saying that the right hon. gentleman overlooked the fact that Sir George Kirkpatrick was not in office at the time of his death.

The PRIME MINISTER. The commission of Sir George Kirkpatrick expired in the month of May, 1897, and his successor was appointed in November, 1897.

Mr. CLARKE. Several months after Sir George died. Besides, there was no crisis in Ontario at that time, such as exists at the present time.

Motion negatived.

PRIVATE BILLS.

WINDING LEDGES POWER AND BOOM COMPANY.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 26) to incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company, and that it be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Should it go to the Private Bills Committee or to the Railway Committee ?

Mr. SPEAKER. In regard to the reference of this Bill I may say that a similar Bill was presented some years ago concerning the Grand Falls company, and it was referred to the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee. I think this is in accordance with rule 59 which provides that Bills relating to railways, canals, telegraphs, canal and railway bridges, shall be referred to the Committee on Railways and that Bills not coming under these classes to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills. The Grand Falls Bill, which came up in 1895, and again in 1901, was quite similar to this and it was referred in both instances to the Private Bills Committee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I may be mistaken, but my recollection is that these Bills were sent to the Railway Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, I have looked into the question and I find that they were referred to the Private Bills Committee.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MONK moved the second reading of Bill (No. 36) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure) moved in amendment :

That Bill No. 36 respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company be not now read the second time but that it be read the second time this day six months.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that not a very unusual course in this House ? I do not remember that we have ever refused to allow an ordinary railway bill to be read the second time and referred to the Railway Committee. We can, of course, deal with it very much better there than it is possible to do here with the limited information we have. We have no information at all in our possession in regard to this Bill.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I will admit that this is rather an usual course, but

we have to deal with a very unusual subject. I believe the House will justify me in the course I have taken after hearing the observations I have to make.

Mr. MONK. I did not know there was any objection to this Bill passing this stage. I would suggest waiting until the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ball) who is promoting the Bill is here. I am not in a position to discuss the merits of the Bill. I merely offer that as a suggestion. Allow it to stand.

Mr. SPROULE. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MONK. Would it not be better that I should withdraw my motion ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Well, the order has been called now.

Mr. INGRAM. I think we could get over the difficulty by objecting to the Bill being read at all. It has not been printed in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. I see that the objection is well taken and the motion will be declared out of order.

Order allowed to stand.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Champagne.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Great Northwest Central Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 40) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the International Railway Appliance Company.—Mr. Brock.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 47) to incorporate the Nipissing and Pontiac Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

QUESTIONS.

CAPTAINS OF FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES.

Mr. LEMIEUX—for Mr. Gauvreau—asked :

1. Has the honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received an application from the captains of the floating lighthouses of Ile-Rouge, Ile-Blanche, and of the Traverse, asking for an increase in the amount of their contract for the supplying of the said floating lighthouses ?

2. If so, is it the intention of the department to grant that which they ask, and the same during the present season of navigation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Prefontaine). I may say that applications have been received and that the matter is receiving the attention of the department.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is the government aware that the Montreal post office building is quite insufficient to properly meet the requirements of the service ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to remedy this defect ?

3. Will the building be enlarged during the present year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Mr. Speaker, I may say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) that the department is satisfied that the post office building in Montreal is inadequate. The whole subject of meeting the requirements is now undergoing consideration.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BONAVENTURE DEPOT.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the government paid any sum of money to the Grand Trunk Railway Company since the 30th June last, on account of the Intercolonial Railway, for improved terminal facilities, at Bonaventure Depot ?

2. What is the total amount of such payment ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The government has paid a sum of money to the Grand Trunk Railway Company since 30th June last, for improved facilities at Bonaventure station, subject to a final decision as to liability of the department under the agreement to make such payment.

2. Total amount of such payment is $274.67.

CITY POST OFFICES.

Mr. PUTTEE—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

Is the following statement of the revenue and expenditure of the city post offices correct :—

City.	Revenue. 1900-01.	1901-02.
Toronto	$481,479	$700,806
Montreal	374,941	491,351
Winnipeg	116,726	156,734
Hamilton	83,763	97,941
Ottawa	76,986	95,301
London	69,898	85,416
Halifax	58,433	89,443
St. John	54,893	65,382
Vancouver	52,589	57,300
Victoria	47,247	50,172
Quebec	41,903	50,904

City.	Expenditure.	Letter Carriers.	Clerks and Mess'g'rs.
Toronto	$160,300	..	..
Montreal	150,672	..	..
Ottawa	65,375	49	52
Hamilton	57,229	47	35
London	36,133	36	17
Quebec	35,864	34	23
St. John	35,841	25	26
Halifax	34,729	23	24
Winnipeg	33,243	21	22

Are there any unusual conditions that cause the Winnipeg office to stand third in revenue, and ninth in expenditure? If so, what are they?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The statement of revenue is correct except that Montreal collected $100 less than the amount mentioned for 1901.

The statement as to expenditure is found to be for the year 1901, and is correct.

The expenditure for 1902 with the number of employees is as follows:

City.	Expenditure.	Letter Carriers.	Clerks, Messengers, and Porters.
Toronto	$166,327	..	..
Montreal	153,826	..	..
Ottawa	63,789	49	60
Hamilton	58,340	44	35
London	37,022	34	21
Quebec	35,864	33	24
St. John	35,960	23	27
Halifax	34,901	24	23
Winnipeg	36,752	30	45

It will be observed that leaving out Toronto and Montreal, the Winnipeg post office has risen to third in rank as regards the number employed.

It might be explained that the Ottawa office handles all the government matter free, and that the revenue does not by any means represent the volume of business transacted.

Hamilton is the chief distributing point in western Ontario for matter from the United States, and there is a good deal of work performed which is not indicated by the revenue.

The staff at Winnipeg is much newer in point of service than in the older offices, where many have reached the maximum of the respective classes, so that the salaries paid in Winnipeg do not, on this account, aggregate as high as in the other offices.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS—MANITOBA.

Mr. PUTTEE—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

What is the total number of acres of land in the province of Manitoba, held or reserved by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and claimed to be exempt from taxation, under the contract of 1881?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). Approximately 165,000 acres.

Mr. PUTTEE.

POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY PIER, N.S.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked:

1. What is the salary of the present postmaster at Whitney Pier, in the county of Cape Breton?
2. What was the salary of the late postmaster?
3. How far did Mr. Carlin, the late postmaster, remove the post office at Whitney Pier?
4. Is the department aware whether any other business is at present carried on by the present postmaster, in the building now used as post office, at Whitney Pier?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock):

1. and 2. The ex-postmaster was in receipt of a salary at the rate of $400 per annum, with a rent allowance of $40, and the present postmaster is paid on the same basis.

3. A fourth of a mile.

4. The department has no information upon the subject except a statement contained in a petition recently received to the effect that Mrs. Gallivan is engaged in the sale of liquor.

CATTLE-GUARD COMMISSION.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Has George Robertson, Esq., M.P.P., of St. John, New Brunswick, been appointed a commissioner to investigate and report on cattle-guards?
2. If so, when was he appointed, and what remuneration will he receive for his services? Is he still engaged in the work, and how long will his duties continue?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Yes, he was appointed on August 22nd, 1902. Remuneration, $5 per day and actual reasonable travelling expenses. He is not now engaged in the work.

WELLAND CANAL—WATER POWER.

Mr. LANCASTER asked:

1. Has the report been received from the engineer in regard to the petition of the corporation and Board of Trade of the city of St. Catharines, for the grant to the said corporation, for power purposes, of six thousand cubic feet of water per minute, from the old Welland Canal, referred to by the Minister of Railways and Canals, on the 26th March, 1902, as reported in 'Hansard,' on page 1860 of that year?
2. If so, when was such report received?
3. If not, why has it not been received?
4. Has the Order in Council, granting the said water to the said corporation, been passed?
5. If so, when was it passed?
6. If not, why has it not been passed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. The report has not been received from the superintending engineer, but the chief engineer visited the locality and looked into the matter and orally reported to me that after the work on the regulating weir at

Port Colborne was completed, 6,000 cubic feet of water per minute was available for leasing without detriment to the navigation of the canal.

2. Chief engineer's oral statement was received during last summer.

3. Is answered by my reply to No. 2.

4. No, the order in council has not passed.

5. Is answered by my reply to No. 4.

6. No conclusion has as yet been arrived at.

CATTLE-GUARD COMMISSION.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has the cattle-guard commission reported to the government ?

2. If not, why not ?

3. If the commission has reported, when will the report be brought down to the House ?

4. If the commission has reported, does it appear that a suitable and efficient cattle-guard is available ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The cattle-guard commission has not yet reported to the government.

2. Because there are a number of cattle-guards yet to be tested. The testing is still going on.

3. Is answered by my reply to No. 1.

4. Is answered by my reply to No. 1.

IMPORTATION OF COAL.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What quantity of hard and soft coal, respectively, was imported into the province of Ontario, from the 30th of June, 1901, to the 1st of March, 1902 ; and from the 30th June, 1902, to the 1st of March, 1903 ; specifying the quantity, in tons of each class ; and the kind of coal imported in each period above named ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The quantities and kinds of coal imported into the province of Ontario were as follows :

	June 30, 1901 to March 1, 1902. Tons.	June 30, 1902 to March 1, 1903. Tons.
Bituminous coal.. ..	1,885,836	2,257,230
Bituminous coal dust	279,067	336,789
Anthracite coal... ..	764,701	470,946

NEW MILITIA BILL.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

When will the Minister of Militia and Defence lay on the Table the new Militia Bill ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir F. W. Borden). I hope to introduce the Bill within a few days; probably not later than next week.

REPORT OF GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. Is the statement which has appeared in the press of Canada and Great Britain true, that the Minister of Militia and Defence has declined to publish the entire report and suggestions of the general officer commanding, in full ?

2. Why has not the minister published the report of the general officer commanding, in full, as presented by that officer ?

3. Will the minister lay upon the Table of this House that portion of the report of the general officer commanding which has not yet been published, and which the minister is credited in the press with having said he would not publish ?

4. If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir F. W. Borden) :

1. It is not true that any misunderstanding exists between the general officer commanding and myself, as to the publication of the general's report, as it now appears as part of the annual Militia report for the past year.

2. The general's annual report has been published in full, as part of the Militia report.

3. As will be noticed on reference to the general's annual report published there has been a further special report by that officer to myself. It is not intended to publish this report.

4. The unpublished report is of a confidential nature, just as was the report of the Defence Committee of 1898.

ISLAND OF ORLEANS MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. How many times a week during the winter season are the mails carried to the Island of Orleans, in the county of Montmorency, from the city of Quebec ; and the latter city from the island ?

2. How many times a week during the said season are the mails distributed in the island ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to have the mails distributed more frequently on the island ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock).

1. Six times a week between Quebec and St. Jean d'Orleans and three times a week between St. Jean d'Orleans and St. François d'Orleans and between Beaulieu and St. Famille going and returning.

2. Answer to question (I) covers this.

3. A new contract was entered into on 1st of February last, providing for an improved service to and from the Island of Orleans. The former service was daily in summer and tri-weekly only in winter to all parts of the island.

SALES OF DOMINION LANDS.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. What Dominion lands have been sold during the past two years ?

2. For what purposes were such sold, i.e., mining, ranching, or farming ?

3. What are the locations of the farming and ranching lands sold ?

4. Who were the purchasers ?

5. What sums per acre were realized ?

6. Is the government now negotiating for the sale of any further areas ?

7. Is 'cash scrip' taken in payment of such lands ?

8. What conditions are attached to the sale of such lands ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock).

1. 200,151 acres.

2. Mining, 52,493 acres; farming, 135,840 acres; ranching, 11,818 acres, total 200,151 acres.

3. Generally throughout Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

4. Farming lands sold to settlers, chiefly in quarter sections.

5. Ranching lands sold at $1.25 per acre under old agreement, whereby the twenty-one year leases were surrendered and one-tenth thereof sold at above price; farming lands at $3; coal lands, with surface rights, at $10; and coal only at $7.

6. No.

7. Yes.

8. No conditions, except in lands sold for coal mining, a portion of which are subject to a royalty of 10 cents per ton of coal mined.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—TRANSCONTINENTAL LINE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is it true, as currently reported, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has concluded an agreement with the government, since the meeting of parliament, to build a transcontinental line, from North Bay to Port Simpson, for a subsidy of $20,000,000 ?

2. Is it a fact that some members of the government are urging the said Grand Trunk Company to purchase the Mann & McKenzie system ; and that the said Grand Trunk Company is asking for a large land grant, as a condition of said proposed purchase ?

3. Has the government come to an agreement in regard to the building of said transcontinental line ?

4. What is the cause of the delay in putting the measure for such new line, mentioned in the speech from the Throne, before the House ?

5. Is it a fact that divisions in the cabinet are the sole cause of such delay ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair).

1. I do not know that such a report as stated in the first question is current. If it is current it is not true.

2. It is not a fact that members of the government are urging the Grand Trunk Company to purchase the McKenzie and Mann system, nor is the Grand Trunk Company asking for a large land grant as a condition for such a purpose.

3. No.

4. There is no mention in the speech from the Throne of the Grand Trunk Transcontinental line, and there is no delay in the matter.

5. This is not a proper question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And if it were a proper question; the answer would be : There is not the slightest foundation in fact for such a statement.

WOODSTOCK, N.B., POST OFFICE.

Mr. HALE—by Mr. Borden (Halifax)—asked :

1. Were tenders called for the repairs of the post office at Woodstock, N.B., and for the building of a new retaining wall in connection therewith ?

2. Who are the tenderers, and what is the amount of each respective tender ?

3. Has the contractor finished building the retaining wall, and has he received payment from the government for the same ; and if so, how much ?

4. Are the repairs to the post office completed ? And if so, has the contractor been paid, and how much ?

5. If the repairs to the post office are not completed, when will they be completed ?

6. If the new retaining wall is not completed, when will it be completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes, for both.

2. For retaining wall, J. S. Leighton $2,280, and Mr. A. Brown $2,476.50. For repairs : Ferris Bros., drain and plumbing, $177.55; A. E. Jones, wire service, $165; A. W. Fields, repairs, flooring, &c., $652.79.

3 No, wall not yet finished.

4. Yes, as per tenders above.

5. Repairs completed.

6. Will be completed within a few weeks.

TRANS-CANADA RAILWAY.

Hon. J. ISRAEL TARTE moved for :

Copies of all petitions correspondence, reports and Orders in Council, relating to the Trans-Canada Railway project.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I may inform my hon. friend that there are no reports on the subject and no Orders in Council. We have a petition from the Trans-Canada Company. We will bring down what papers we have.

Motion agreed to.

TURNPIKE ROADS ON THE ISLAND OF MONTREAL.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moves for (Translation.) :

An order of the House for a statement showing the indebtedness of the Montreal Turnpike Trust to the government of Canada.

(*a*) On capital account.

(*b*) For interest accrued since 1896.

This is in connection with the business of the Montreal Turnpike Trust, and my object is to obtain a statement showing the total amount of the bonds or debentures held at this time by the Dominion government, and

also the amount due by that board or corporate body for interest accrued since 1896. Already on several previous occasions, I called the attention of the House to the manner in which the affairs of the Montreal Turnpike Trust were being managed. It is a question of the greatest interest not only to those who live in that populous city of Montreal, but also to the farmers, gardeners and others settled in the counties adjoining the city. Every time I brought the question before the House, the government endeavoured to shirk the responsibility, which to my mind, belongs to them, by arguing that the Montreal Turnpike Trust is a board instituted and governed by a provincial Act; that the government of the province of Quebec, in virtue of the constitution, has to do with all municipal boards and bodies placed under provincial control, and that, as a consequence, the Dominion government or the Finance Minister were not in a position to interfere as requested by me. Indeed, in bringing once more this question before the House, my object is to have the Dominion government interfere so as to correct a state of things which has become altogether unbearable. I quite agree that the Dominion government has no direct control over that body which is governed by a provincial Act, and as a consequence, is under the authority of the provincial government. But the circumstances are such, as I already had occasion to explain to the House, that the Dominion government is in a better position than any other to bring about the change that is called for in the management of the affairs of this board. The Act which governs the Montreal Turnpike Trust provides that holders of debentures will be entitled to appoint three representatives to sit on the board with two representatives appointed by the provincial government. These holders of debentures have thereby actually full control of the commission, since they have on the board a majority of one. Now, in this special case, the debentures of the commission are held by the Dominion government, who, through an officer of the Finance Department, appoints three representatives to act on the board as agents of the holders of debentures. Of course, the Dominion government who appoints three representatives to act for the holders of debentures, which debentures are held by the government, has an effective control over these three representatives. Well then, what is the outcome? I have already pointed out to the House serious defects in the Act which governs that turnpike trust. If we are to have in the vicinity of Montreal suitable roads, it is urgent that this law, enacted half a century ago, and which is altogether out of harmony with administrative notions of the day, should be changed. To obtain that, the Dominion government, holding almost all the debentures of the commission, would only have to instruct its agents on the board to see that a suitable Act be passed by the Quebec legislature amending the law which now governs the commission. If that be not done, you may rest assured that the provincial government will not pass such a law of its own accord. And even admitting that the provincial government should undertake to pass such an Act, the three men who for the time being represent the Dominion government on the board, may, I will not say absolutely, but effectively, prevent these amendments from being voted, although they are badly needed. We are anxious in the first place that the sittings of the commision be open to the public. It is a general complaint on the island of Montreal, on the part of farmers who come to market, on tne part of those who are called out of town and travel over the main arteries which lead into the city, that the meetings of the commission are not open to the public, as are those of municipal councils, of school boards, and of all bodies having to do with the administration of public affairs. Such an amendment cannot be dispensed with.

We are anxious, besides, that the Turnpike Trust be compelled to publish every year a full statement of the business carried on, in order that we may know what are the earnings of each toll-gate, and the total earnings of this corporation. We wish to know how the revenue is utilized for the improvement of the public highways under its control. We want the law amended in such a way that the contracts for these roads be let to the highest bidder after calling for tenders. That too high a price is being paid for the work, and that the contracts for the supply of stone are granted at extravagant rates is a well known fact. At all events, we want to know yearly how that amount, which exceeds $75,000, is spent. We have the right to be informed on that point, the more so as that the roads are not maintained in good order and that there is ground to believe that the revenue is not properly expended.

We are desirous, also, that the mayors of the municipalities adjoining Montreal, and that the mayor of Montreal as well, have a seat on the Turnpike Commission. We ask that there be some elective members on that board which has the control of our public highways. Aldermen are elective, and so are municipal councillors and school commissioners. How is it that on that most important body, which has in its hands the management of the roads leading into Montreal, there is no one elected by the ratepayers, to represent those who supply the large amount of money collected every year by the Turnpike Trust? Such are the changes which are required in the Act, as a preliminary step, and without which the Turnpike Commission will continue to be blamed for the bad condition of our roads. If the Dominion government is at all anxious to foster the interests of the farmers of that section, it should take action and impress on its representatives upon the board of

directors the need for obtaining from the proper authority the changes in the law which the public call for.

Now, there are in the county of Jacques Cartier a great number of dairymen, farmers and gardeners who come almost every day, and some of them twice a day, to Montreal. Exception is taken, and rightly so, to the condition of the road between Côte des Neiges and Cartierville. The earnings of the toll-gates are large. Why should this road which is travelled over by a large number of farmers and others, riding or driving on Sundays and week days, who reach Côte des Neiges by way of St. Laurent, why, I say, should this be the most neglected part of the highways under the control of the commission? Why should other roads which are not so much travelled over, be kept, I do say in perfect order—for our roads are not as a rule properly maintained—but at any rate in better order than that road which leads from Montreal to St. Laurent? If we had some effective legislation, if, for instance, the commissioners were compelled by law to lay before the public yearly a full account of the work carried on, we would find out what are the earnings of that body, and how they expend their revenue. The condition of the road is a source of great annoyance to the ratepayers who have to travel over it to reach Montreal and are obliged to pay the tolls. I call the attention of the Finance Minister more particularly to the condition of the road leading to St. Laurent, not only because farmers who live in that neighbourhood have reason to complain, but also because the people of Montreal who have to travel in that direction suffer from the impassable state of the road. I would like to give an instance of the strange way in which the affairs of this board are managed. There is in the county of Jacques Cartier, in the parish of Notre Dame de Grâces, situated close to the Lachine canal, a small village called Turcot, inhabited by working people, who, to make a living, have to go to St. Henry, Ste. Cunégonde and Montreal. As a rule, these people cannot get their living in that village. Now, Turcot village, which no doubt the hon. the Prime Minister knows, is hemmed in by turnpikes put up by the commissioners, which are in the way of the people going to their work. The inhabitants of Turcot village, to get to Montreal from the village, or to get to the village from Montreal, travel over but a very small portion of the road maintained by the commissioners. Nevertheless, they are made to pay for using that insignificant bit of road. It is impossible for them to leave their village to go to Montreal, St. Henry or Ste. Cunégonde, without paying the toll. That is a grievance which calls for redress and to which I would draw the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister. He has the right and the power to give instructions to his representatives on the board, to those who are his agents as holder of the bonds, so as to put an end to this crying evil which the people of Turcot village are subjected to. I appeal to the government, if they have any sympathy for those who have to use that road, to remedy the present state of things, and also to bring their influence to bear to have the grievance redressed, under which the people of Turcot village now labour.

The PRIME MINISTER (The Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the documents for which my hon. friend has moved, being brought down; they will be laid forthwith on the Table of the House. But let me assure the hon. gentleman that I do not think the Dominion government have all the responsibility which he would fain saddle on them. Even should they have that responsibility, I may tell the hon. member that I would not be ready to take up and discuss the grievances referred to by him. He is much more familiar than I am with the localities and well informed as to whatever objections may exist against the management of the Turnpike Trust.

The government will call the attention of the trustees or commissioners, who represent the holders of bonds, to the grievances set forth to-day. We shall endeavour to get at the facts in order to be in a position to discuss the question in its proper time and place, when the papers have been brought down and the hon. member takes the matter up again before the House.

Motion agreed to.

HAY AND OATS BOUGHT FOR THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for:

1. The total amount paid by the government of Canada for hay and oats, purchased for the imperial government, for shipment to South Africa, during the years 1900, 1901 and 1902.

2. The names of the parties from whom hay and oats were so purchased.

3. The prices at which the said hay and oats were so furnished during the said periods, from each of the said parties.

4. The total amount paid to each of the said parties, both for hay and oats.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I think I am correct in stating that my hon. friend brought this matter before the House a year ago in the form of a question. And my hon. colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, said that it concerned only the imperial government, inasmuch as it did not affect the public moneys of Canada in any way, and therefore he was unable to supply the information asked for. I think that we ought to take the same position to-day. For all ex-

penditure of the public money of Canada, the ministers are accountable to this House and the House is entitled to every information, but this is an expenditure of imperial money for which this government is not accountable to this House.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (North Victoria). It is an export of the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But we do not show the exports made by particular individuals. We bring down returns of exports generally, but if my hon. friend wants a return of the exports in this particular case, let him ask it of the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson). This motion, however, does not deal with the question of exports, but of the expenditure of public money. If this were the public money of the Dominion, my hon. friend's motion would be a proper one, and we would be bound to bring down a return showing how it was expended. As however, it was imperial money, the expenditure of which was made through the friendly offices of a Minister of the Crown, at the request of the imperial government—which request was of course very cheerfully granted—the government of Canada have nothing whatever to do with it. The matter would be a proper one to be brought forward in the parliament of Great Britain but not in this House. I hope my hon. friend will see the reasonableness of this view and not press his motion.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). By whose orders was the money dispersed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The money was provided by the imperial government and the transactions were managed largely, if not wholly, through the Minister of Agriculture. The imperial government asked for his advice and assistance and provided the money.

Mr. CLARKE. Under those circumstances, there is no valid reason why the hon. Minister of Agriculture should not bring down all the information asked for.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). This is a new doctrine of responsible government. It seems to me that a minister must be held strictly accountable for everything he does as head of a department, and I will not sit here quietly and allow a new doctrine of responsibility, or rather lack of responsibility, to be submitted without repudiating it. A reason may be given for not bringing down the information asked for, but not the reason given just now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Either the Minister of Agriculture was doing this as a Minister of the Crown or he was not. Was he doing it, as Mr. Sidney Fisher, providing his own clerks, and as a matter of private business between himself and the imperial government. If that be the case, we would not press the motion. But if he was doing this as a Minister of the Crown, and not as Mr. Sidney Fisher, but because he held the position of Minister of Agriculture we do not see any reason why all the information should not be laid on the Table. I do not think the hon. Minister of Finance has suggested any. If I understand the position of the Minister of Agriculture, he was acting as a Minister of the Crown of Canada on behalf of the imperial government, using the officers under his control, who are paid out of the revenues of this country and therefore I cannot understand what objection there can be, from any reasonable standpoint, to bringing down the papers. It is not information that can prejudice the interests of the imperial government in any way. It is information which is in the possession of this government and ought to be in the possession of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot admit for a moment that because the government has furnished the good offices of any of its officials to the British government, it is obliged to bring down all records of the transactions which may have occurred and in which only the money of the imperial government was used. As the money expended was not that of the people of Canada, there is no ground on which this government can be called to an account here for that expenditure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On what principle can the money of the Canadian people be used in paying men who are employed in that way and the people's representatives refused information. What would prevent the government acting for the government of the United States or France or Germany or any other country, and then refusing to give the slightest information as to their proceedings in that respect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To the best of my knowledge and belief there was no expense incurred by the people of Canada. No additional officials were employed, and whatever officials were required for the purpose, their expenses were charged to the British government. If we loan the good offices of any of the officials of Canada, as we should in any matter in which the imperial government desires to make use of their services, I cannot admit that we thereby are liable to account to this House for any expenditure of imperial money which may happen to be made in that connection.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The fair name of Canada is at stake. There are very serious scandals in connection, not only with these oats and hay purchases, but also the purchase of horses. I would like the hon. gentleman to understand that when our government gives instructions to its officers paid by the Canadian people, the people of

Canada are going to inquire into the actions of these men. I hope that the right hon. the Prime Minister will come off his high horse—not one of those horses which were bought for $40 and sold for $150—and give the information asked for.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) ought to be more careful than to use such language.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I take the responsibility of my language and am prepared, if the government will give me a committee, to prove what I have said.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the hon. gentleman has charges to make, he knows that there are ways and means of making them. This is not the way to make a charge.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the right hon. gentleman give a committee of the House or a commission ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman knows how to proceed if he has any charges to make, and if he has, it is his duty to make them. Although the money expended was not that of Canada, but of the imperial government, still if he has charges to make, if he thinks he can prove any scandals, it is his duty to make these charges and he should not have delayed so long. But he cannot expect the government to take notice of vain words thrown on the floor of parliament. There has been no charge, so far as I know, made, and the hon. gentleman has no warrant to speak as he has done. I believe that everything in this matter was done fairly and well. We have had no complaint from the British government, and I therefore see no reason why this House should inquire into the expenditure of money which does not concern it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to know whether the right hon. gentleman is willing or not to have these purchases ventilated in the Committee of Public Accounts, as they might be, if they were the expenditure of this country.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly not. My hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) has no reason to speak in that way. The Committee on Public Accounts are bound to investigate the expenditure of the money of the Canadian people, not the expenditure of money by the imperial government. But, if my hon. friend or any one else has any charges to make that the government has behaved in the manner suggested, he can have all the investigation he desires—not before.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It is because of the constant rumours——

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, oh.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Rumours !

Mr. SPROULE. I shall avail myself of my right, notwithstanding the Postmaster General or the Prime Minister, to express myself here as I see fit so long as I keep within the rules of parliamentary debate. I say that these constant rumours in circulation cause us to desire to get this information, in order to know whether they are or are not correct. But I rose particularly to ask the Minister of Finance one question. If this is the ground to be taken now, why was it that we had information given in this House with regard to the cost of horses sent out to supply the contingents ? That information was asked for and given.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid——

Mr. SPROULE. I am correct, for I asked the question myself, and got the information. Therefore, I know. If it were proper to give information with regard to the purchase of horses, why is it not proper to give it with regard to the purchase of oats ? And if this information is not given, how is the imperial parliament to reach a conclusion as to whether that money was properly spent or not ? It does seem to me that this is a proper thing to endeavour to ascertain, for our government was acting on behalf of somebody, and our civil servants were acting as the employees of somebody. We paid for their time; and it does seem to me very proper that we should have some information along these lines.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not recall the question to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) refers. But, if such information as he refers to was given, I am bound to believe that the horses were purchased with the money of the Canadian people. There were expenditures of that nature made with the money of the people of Canada, and a refund made by the imperial government. Where the matter passed through the hands of the government of Canada and moneys were paid out of the public treasury, it would be eminently proper that information with regard to such expenditures should be given. With regard to horses purchased, a full inquiry was made by the imperial parliament, or by a commission authorized by parliament, and I am sure that if there was cause to suspect anything wrong in the case of the purchase of Canadian horses, that would be inquired into as carefully as anything else. But we draw a distinction between the expenditure of the money of the Canadian people, for which we are responsible, and the expenditure of money by the people of Great Britain, for which the imperial government are responsible. I am sure that the members of the imperial parliament would be pleased to get information that would enable them to make proper inquiry in that direction.

Mr. SPROULE. Were not the oats paid for with the cheques of the Dominion government and the money refunded ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have only such knowledge as comes from the department. I believe the money was paid to the credit of the people engaged in this work, particularly of the Hon. Mr. Fisher. Money of the imperial government was placed to his credit. The purchases were not paid for by cheque of the department, so far as I know. The position was that the friendly offices of the minister and his assistants were given to the imperial government in that way.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Did the Department of Agriculture furnish the imperial authorities with the information in this department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot answer my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) from personal knowledge. But I have no doubt that all this information and much more was freely given. They have their auditors for the examination of these expenditures, and I have no doubt that every detail was furnished to the imperial government.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to know if certain information was furnished by the imperial officers in South Africa to the Canadian government with respect to the way the horses from Canada were starved at the port of landing at South Africa. I think the Canadian government ought to insist on the imperial authorities making a thorough investigation into the manner in which these horses were treated. If the statements circulated are true, the facts are a disgrace to the imperial authorities—to allow horses to be half starved before being set to the work they were called upon to do in South Africa. Not only that, but they endangered the lives of Canadians who were mounted on these horses. For that, if for no other reason, an investigation should be made.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). As I understand this matter, the imperial government requested this government through the Minister of Agriculture to act for them. They did not select Hon. Mr. Fisher as an individual; they selected him as the Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada. It was well understood at the time—it was announced and not denied—that the government of Canada, through the Minister of Agriculture, were acting as the agent of the imperial government at that time. It is now said that the money spent was the money of the imperial government. But was not the honour of the parliament of Canada and the honour of the people of Canada pledged to the faithful administration of this trust ? What position should we have been in if any wrong had been done in connection with the matter, if there had been any dishonesty or anything reflecting on the credit of the people of Canada ? Now, it is suggested—pretty freely suggested—that, if that has not occurred, at all events, there is ground for believing that some more light should be had upon the subject. I am afraid that the administration are about to make another mistake. They may say that we have no evidence that they have made any mistake. But I venture to say that, in treating the opposition in this House—and thus treating the people of Canada—in such a light and jaunty manner as they have done this afternoon, they are making a mistake. If there is any body of men to whom the people as a whole look to for the investigation of matters of this kind, it is necessarily the opposition of the House of Commons, which ever party that opposition may for the time being represent. It is not to be expected that the supporters of the government will be alert to ascertain the position of these matters as they arise. To whom do the people look ? They look to an alert opposition to investigate these subjects. And I submit, that the Minister of Finance—yes, and the right hon. leader of the government—have not treated the opposition here, and so have not treated the people of the country, with the courtesy that should have been shown on this occasion. I am prepared to hear—I would be very glad to hear—that there is some good reason why they should take the attitude they have taken and why this information should not be given. But, as yet, I submit, no good reason has been given why we should not have the information that has been asked for. If there is any better reason, if there is any valid reason at all, it is for the administration to give it. But, at present, I stand here on behalf of the people I represent and I say distinctly that I believe—and I intend to stand by that position—I am entitled to the information that has been asked for.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). It seems to me there is something on the very face of the government's position that shows that there is a desire on their part to conceal the facts in this case that, in ordinary course would be published, if there was no extraordinary reason against it. Now, the Prime Minister, it seems to me, has given the whole case away when he says that the government have no responsibility in connection with this expenditure, still, if charges are formulated with regard to it, then all the papers will be brought down. Now if the government's position is reasonable, how would the formulation of charges alter their position ? Their answer might as well be : We are not responsible to the Canadian parliament in regard to the expenditure of this money, we are only responsible to the British government. Now, it has been bruited about—I admit that is not a sufficient reason to call for an investigation—that Grit heelers

have enjoyed a great deal more of the money under this expenditure than they were entitled to, and that the British government, in paying that amount of money through this government, have been cheated to a large extent; and that, instead of the money going for hay and oats at a fair price, a large amount of it has gone for fodder for government support. Admitting, as I frankly do, that these rumours would not give us a right to a parliamentary inquiry in the nature of a commission, I still say that it is the right of this parliament to have these rumours set aside, and to be made acquainted with the actual facts, in broad daylight, as to how much money the government received, for what it was paid, how many bushels of oats and how many tons of hay, and so forth, were obtained for that money, so that the people can see whether the government have a clean record or a dirty record in this matter. Surely that concerns this parliament. Money distributed through the Department of Agriculture, through the officers of the Canadian government, is a matter we have to do with, whether it is our money or not. Supposing, for instance, we gave a grant of public money, as was given by some of the old parliaments before confederation, for a certain purpose, and that money was to be disbursed through the English House of Commons, such as a grant to the families of those who fell in the Crimea, and that thousands of pounds sterling were sent to the British government to be handed to these families, would it be pretended that the government of England would hesitate to give an account on the floor of the House of the way that money had been disbursed, in order that we might see whether the money going through their hands had reached the proper quarters. This is a matter affecting the fair fame of this country as well as of this government, and the very fact that the government dare not make a simple statement—that could injure no one—if everything was honest and above board—the mere fact that they seek to hide themselves behind the subterfuge that they were disbursing the money of the people of England and not our money, suggests at once that these serious rumours are not merely rumours, and that the belief that many people hold that that money was not disbursed honestly, is well founded. I say the government owe it to themselves, as well as to this parliament and to the Canadian people, to make a clear, business-like statement, one that they can easily make if there was no dishonesty, showing that they received so much money, that they bought so much hay and so much oats, then we can draw our own conclusions. If they gave double the prices that it was necessary to give, there would be a reflection on the government, but if they have given fair prices, their skirts would be clean. But it seems to me they are taking an extraordinary attitude, for which no one will thank them, for the British government have no desire to be shielded in this matter; it is extraordinary that they should say: We are not accountable to the people of this parliament because the money was not paid by this parliament. The money was expended by the servants of this country, that money was received by them because they were our servants, and we have every right to hold them to account as the servants of this House and of the Canadian people, and to know whether, called upon as they were on that occasion, they have discharged their duties, and discharged them not merely with honesty, but with business ability. It does seem to me that their position gives a great deal of force to the rumours that have been referred to, and to the suspicion that is now created, that they have an ulterior object not consistent with business-like administration, when they refuse to bring down the papers showing how much money they got, and to whom they paid it. Especially are we dissatisfied when the Prime Minister follows that up by saying: Although we are not accountable, still if you make a charge that we did not spend that money properly, then we will give you all the information. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we ought to be put in that position. If they are accountable to us when we charge fraud in regard to an expenditure of the money of the people of England, surely, as in ordinary cases, they are accountable for all the money that has gone through their hands. Surely this money—I merely mention this by way of debate, acknowledging that I have no right to enter into that question—surely this money passed through the public accounts at some time or other. It will not be pretended that when hundreds of thousands of pounds, or hundreds of thousands of dollars are remitted here to any department of the government and goes to the credit of one of the spending departments of this country, surely it will not be pretended that that money does not appear in the public accounts. That amount must appear in the public accounts of this country. I submit that the money covered by this resolution has gone through the public accounts, otherwise it would be a most extraordinary thing that the Department of Agriculture would have anything to do with it. The resolution in your hands contemplates a statement as to the moneys paid out by this government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The answer is that there are none.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then let this motion pass, let the government take the position that no moneys have been disbursed by the government. There could be no objection to that. Let this pass, and the return will show that there was none. But if my position is right that these moneys have passed through a regular department

of the government, the hon. gentleman cannot be correct in saying that there are no moneys to account for. All we argue is that the money has been paid by the government of Canada. In debate it is one thing to argue the contrary, but in a return to this House it is another thing to state that the government have paid nothing. The Minister of Finance argues that because the Minister of Agriculture was asked to do this thing for the English government, it is not a matter concerning this parliament. But if the Minister of Finance has no statement, if the Prime Minister has no statement, that these moneys did not actually go through the hands of the Department of Agriculture——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have stated so.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then if he states that in debate, let that resolution go, and we will see what the facts are when it comes to comply with the order of the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I just wish to observe that the hon. member for Pictou (Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) appears to argue this case on a wrong conception of the point in issue. After having received a statement from the Minister of Finance that a motion of this kind would be quite futile, inasmuch as the transaction never was officially recognized by the government, that it was simply an action of the Minister of Agriculture, who gave his friendly office, and after the Minister of Finance has stated that no money passed through the hands of the government, what is the use of the present motion? The hon. gentleman can take nothing out of such a motion as that. He says that perhaps the minister has done this, or has done that, which he ought not to have done, suggesting that he may have done something affecting his honour as a minister of the Crown. That is a very different matter. How far parliament should intervene to sit in judgment on one of its members, as to what he should do outside of his representative capacity, is a fair subject for discussion. If the hon. gentleman has any suggestion to make that the Minister of Agriculture, in his dealings with the imperial government, although in a semi-private capacity, has done something derogatory to his position as the adviser of His Majesty in Canada, I am sure he will have the most ample opportunity to make good his suggestion. But instead of that, he goes back and argues that these moneys passed through the Canadian treasury.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Through the public accounts?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How could anything be referred to the Public Accounts Committee if no money passed through the Canadian treasury? The accounts and vouchers would not be in our possession; there were no disbursements by the Canadian government, there was no liability by the Canadian government, no accountability to the imperial government, no legal obligation of any kind on the part of the Canadian government, or on the part of Canada.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the government let us have the request of the imperial government? We could see then whether this is a government matter or not. This correspondence should be laid on the Table.

The PRIME MINISTER. That should be the subject of another motion.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, but on this motion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would ask to be permitted to add something to what I have already said. I am informed by Professor Robertson that he practically managed all this business and that these moneys were placed to the credit of the imperial government in what was called the imperial government hay account. The method by which the transaction was handled was that the imperial government cabled a request to give the prices at which they could purchase certain goods. Prices were cabled as an estimate as to what these goods could be probably purchased for in this country. Then the money was forwarded and placed to the credit of the imperial hay account. And the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Sydney Fisher) and Professor Robertson were authorized to draw cheques against that account. I have the authority of Professor Robertson to use his name in saying that he managed the matter largely himself, and he authorizes me to say that the goods supplied were of the best quality and were furnished at reasonable prices.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why do you not bring down the papers?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because this is not a transaction which concerns the parliament of Canada. I have never heard of any such rumours affecting this transaction until I heard them here to-day. I may say that every person with the exception of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Professor Robertson, who was assigned to duty in connection with the transaction had his services paid for by the imperial government, and therefore it did not cost this country one dollar. In regard to the suggestion that there is something wrong in this transaction, I am satisfied that the statement I now make on the authority of Professor Robertson that the goods were of first quality and fair and reasonable in price, is one that the people of this country will accept.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. Minister of Finance permit me one question ? I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there has been no amount paid by the government of Canada.

If these words were added to the main motion :

And all correspondence between the imperial government and the Canadian government.

We would ascertain the position of the matter—correspondence which the hon. gentleman refers to and which he is bound under the rules of the House to lay on the Table.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not consider that I am.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the rule; at any rate, we will not stop to argue that now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If it were a state document concerning the people of Canada the rule might apply.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is a communication passing between the two governments.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not pretended that the communication was with Professor Robertson direct. The return might be made bringing down papers giving some colour to the statements made by the hon. Minister of Finance, that while the matter originally began by correspondence with the government, it ultimately assumed the personal character to which he refers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think that amendment to the motion will meet the case. If the hon. gentleman brings forward another motion we will then consider it on its merits.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the hon. Minister of Agriculture acted with the knowledge and concurrence of the government on this matter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may answer frankly by saying that the fact that the hon. Minister of Agriculture was rendering that friendly service to the imperial government was known, but the matter never came before the government, and it was never treated as government business.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did you buy hay or oats from a Conservative in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We may have made some mistake in that regard, but if the hay and oats were good, and the price fair, I do not think anybody would insist that we should inquire into the political colour of the persons from whom we bought them.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. MONK. I am very sorry that the government has not seen fit to give us the very simple and plain information asked for by this motion. There is not a country where irregularities of some kind do not occur in the furnishing of war supplies, and this is the only country I know of where an investigation into the manner of the furnishing of these supplies has been refused after the war. We have had investigations in England since the war, in France after the war of 1870, and in the United States. The reasons given by the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Postmaster General, and particularly by the hon. Postmaster General, seem to be very poor ones indeed. As a matter of fact, the public at large will not take the trouble to consider whether it was Mr. Sydney Fisher, or the hon. Minister of Agriculture, or Professor Robertson, or the government, who had to do with this transaction. Everybody knows throughout the country that it was the government that purchased these supplies for South Africa, and, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen who sit on treasury benches knew what is being said in public since the war closed, about the manner in which supplies were furnished, they would be the first to call for the motion to lay this information on the Table of the House. What is it that is being said all over the country, at any rate, down in Montreal ? They say that hay was sold to the government of Canada for shipment to South Africa at an exorbitant price, that $14 a ton was paid for it when better hay than that could have been purchased at $11 a ton, and the fact that the British government had sought the assistance of this government for the purchase of hay had been used by this government in order to allow speculators to get hold of that money, filling their own pockets with it and cheating the British government out of what was due to them. That is what was being said. I do not mean to say it is true, but it is being said very generally .

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Who is saying it ?

Mr. MONK. If the hon. Postmaster General will go down to the city of Montreal I will introduce him to a number of people who say that, and from all I hear it is being said elsewhere. At any rate it has been alleged, it has been printed, and what reasonable reason can this government have for not laying before us here, the representatives of the people, copies of the accounts which undoubtedly they have rendered to the British government and which are lying in the Department of Agriculture at the present moment. It is an outrage on the rights of this House to refuse us that information. We are here to judge of the accounts of the government. It concerns the treasury of Canada when the money of Canada has been spent and that is the reason why we should

have that information. I venture to say that the government has travelled outside true constitutional principle because we have the right to judge its work upon all of its acts. Whether the government is the agent of the British government or the agent of any other government, it is responsible to this House for all of its acts. In addition to what is said about the price paid for oats it is alleged that the horses in South Africa were supplied with bad oats, and bundles of hay in the midst of which there was nothing but rottenness, and which were paid for at an exorbitant price. The government cannot fail to have heard some of these rumours but now they refuse to give us that information under the specious plea that it is not the money of the people of Canada that has been expended. We are interested in knowing, if the Canadian government, acting for the imperial government in this important matter, has charged the British government, in a critical moment, a price for hay which was not the price at which hay was selling for, and giving them bad hay at that. We are entitled to know if they have charged the British government an unjust and unfair price for oats at a time when oats was at a lower price here, a thing which is easy to prove. I would ask the members of the government to consider whether, apart from any little petty-fogging objections, it would not be in the interest of the government itself to give us a clear statement of what was paid, so that the public may know that there is no truth in the current rumours. I venture to say that if the government refuses us this reasonable information, which we are entitled to get on constitutional ground, that rumour will receive confirmation and the public at large will believe that there have been dark and shameful dealings in regard to these matters.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I would be ready to sympathize with my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and to support his motion if he would enlarge it somewhat. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the rumours that were current in Montreal as to the cheating that the British government was subjected to, but perhaps he has heard the rumours which were quite common as to the cheating that the Canadian shippers were subjected to by officers of the British government. We were told that goods which were sent to England were refused by the British representatives of the War office, and that messages were sent to the Canadian shippers that it would be well to sell these goods at auction in England rather than bring them back; that they were sold at auction in England, purchased by officers of the War office and then resold to the British government for a very fair price. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) takes so much to heart the wrongs of the British taxpayers, he might have thought also of the wrongs inflicted on Canadian exporters by the British War office officials.

Mr. COCHRANE. What has that to do with it.

Mr. BOURASSA. It has this to do with it, that I will support the motion, if the hon. gentleman would make it apply to the interests of Canadian taxpayers as well as to those of the British taxpayers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Bring another motion yourself.

House divided on the motion (Mr. Monk).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lefurgey,
Bell,	Lennox,
Blaine,	Maclean,
Borden (Halifax),	Monk,
Boyd,	Morin,
Brock,	Northrup,
Broder,	Porter,
Cargill,	Richardson,
Clancy,	Robinson (Elgin),
Clarke,	Roche (Marquette),
Cochrane,	Rosamond,
Earle,	Sproule,
Hackett,	Tisdale,
Haggart,	Vrooman,
Hughes (Victoria),	Ward,
Kidd,	Wilmot—35.
Lancaster,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Beith,	Lewis,
Belcourt,	Logan,
Bernier,	MacKinnon,
Blair,	Maclaren (Huntingdon),
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Macpherson,
Bourassa,	McColl,
Bureau,	McCool,
Carroll,	McGugan,
Champagne,	McIsaac,
Charlton,	McLennan,
Christie,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Copp,	Matheson,
Cowan,	Mignault,
Demers (St John),	Monet,
Emmerson,	Morrison,
Ethier,	Mulock (Sir William),
Fielding,	Paterson,
Fitzpatrick,	Puttee,
Fortier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fraser,	Riley,
Gibson,	Roche (Halifax),
Girard,	Ross (Victoria),
Grant,	Russell,
Harwood,	Scott,
Holmes,	Smith (Vancouver),
Hughes (King's),	Stewart,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Sutherland (Essex),
Kendall,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Lang,	Talbot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tarte,
Lavergne,	Tolmie,
LeBlanc,	Turgeon,
Lemieux,	Wright—66.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Calvert,	Taylor,
Thompson (Haldimand and Monck),	Ingram,
Cartwright (Sir Ric'rd),	Tupper (Sir C. Hibbert),
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Archambault,	Léonard,
Béland,	Pope,
Bruneau,	McGowan,
Costigan,	Ball,
Douglas,	Wilson,
Farquharson,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Gallery,	Roddick,
Guthrie,	Clare,
Préfontaine,	Kemp,
Ross (Yukon),	Kendrey,
Tobin,	Pringle,
Wade,	Hale,
Law,	Ganong,
Mackie,	Carscallen,
Parmelee,	Casgrain,
Ross (Ontario),	Sherritt,
Gould,	Thomson (North Grey),
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Sifton,	MacLaren (Perth),
McCreary,	Henderson,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Bazinet,	Halliday,
Bickerdike,	Osler,
Campbell,	Bruce,
Davis,	Calvin,
Erb,	Tolton,
Malouin,	Avery,
German,	Seagram,
Heyd,	Smith (Wentworth),
Proulx,	Lavell,
Stephens,	Kaulbach,
Tucker,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Gourley,
Macdonald,	Culbert,
McEwen,	Bennett,
McCarthy,	Fowler,
Brown,	Birkett,
Fisher,	McIntosh,

Motion negatived.

DOMINION SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES—INCREASE.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé)—(Translation) moved for :

Copy of the correspondence exchanged between the government and the various provincial legislatures on the subject of an increase in the subsidies paid to the provinces under the British North America Act.

Mr. Speaker, the object of this motion is to call the attention of this House to the proceedings of the interprovincial conference, which was held in the city of Quebec, in December last. This question of readjusting the federal subsidies paid to the provinces under the British North America Act, is apparently coming to a crisis. The present state of affairs call for a solution ; or failing that, the provinces henceforth will have to be satisfied with a less efficient administration of certain departments, to the great detriment of public affairs. Sir, these are growing times and an era of unprecedented prosperity has been ushered in ; now, would it be fair for the provinces, I ask, to keep aloof from that general movement, when the whole world is progressing by leaps and bounds ?

The question of readjusting the Dominion subsidies to provinces is of no recent growth; and it is within the recollection of hon. gentlemen that, on several occasions, this very same question was threshed out in this House, but, I make bold to say here and now, without the least fear of contradiction, that in the province of Quebec, it is a matter which is irrespective of party affiliations.

As early as 1882, the treasurer of the Quebec government urged upon the Dominion authorities the desirability of a more liberal grant being secured by the provinces. In the year 1883, a similar demand for better terms was made by the provincial authorities. In 1884, the late Sir Adolphe Chapleau brought to bear a pretty strong pressure upon his colleagues in order to engage the then government to take action in the matter and to increase by $250,000 the Dominion grant to the province. As all the hon. gentlemen know, the increase in subsidies applied for was to indemnify the province of Quebec for the considerable outlay it had incurred in building the North Shore Railway, which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had just bought. But it was only in 1887 that the question as to the readjustment of the federal subsidies assumed a more definite shape, through the increasing efforts and the indomitable energy of the late Honoré Mercier. All the provinces of confederation, with the exception of British Columbia, then passed resolutions which will go down to history as the most remarkable statement and the most forcible plea ever made in favour of the cause of the provinces. I shall not weary the House with the extracts from the conclusions reached by the delegates to the convention of 1887 ; let it suffice to say that these resolutions constitute one of the historical documents which will ever be read with interest by those who are concerned with the question of provincial antonomy. From the many public actions with which Mr. Mercier's name remains identified, this conference will be handed down to posterity as the most important act of his political record.

For reasons which it would be idle to review at this remote period, the conference of 1887 was barren of immediate results ; but, as I said, the remoter the date of that event, the greater the importance of the resolutions then adopted.

The conference which was held in December, 1902, was but a partial revival of the proceedings of 1887 ; but, as I shall soon explain, the resolutions which were passed at that meeting of premiers are of the utmost importance.

I am happy to say that those two conventions held in 1887 and in 1902 met together,

owing to the action taken by the Quebec government. It was according to the fitness of things that my native province which was the 'constituante' of confederation, should take the lead of that movement in favour of provincial autonomy and should promote through temperate and well conducted debates, the establishment of relations, both more fair and more just, between the central power and the various provinces. The position taken by the government of the province of Quebec in December last is all the more justifiable as the two administrations which have succeeded each other in power since 1897, under the leadership of the regretted Mr. Marchand and under the present leadership of Mr. Parent, have administered public affairs with an eye to the most rigid economy. As a matter of fact, it is no idle boasting to say that, since 1897, owing to the generous cooperation of all concerned, in our province, we have succeeded in putting a stop to the era of deficits and effected an equilibrium between income and expenditure. Ever since that year, we have had surpluses to our credit, as shown by the following figures :—

1898-1899..	$22,556 22
1899-1900..	23,198 57
1900-1901..	71,339 73
1901-1902..	44,837 72
Total of surpluses	$161,933 25

But, undeniable as the economy practised in the several branches of the provincial administration is, as shown by those surpluses, it has necessarily brought about a halt which may ultimately result in checking the development of our resources. Now, is it good policy, I ask, to continue that state of things and should the provinces keep aloof from that era of progress which Canada is now enjoying ? I think it would be idle to look for a remedy to that state of things elsewhere than in a change in the federal constitution in connection with the financial question. In other words, it is absolutely necessary that the resources of the provinces should be increased, unless we want them to pine away and perish.

Under section 118 of the British North America Act, we receive grants of two different kinds : first, we get a specific grant of $70,000 ; secondly, we receive a grant of 80 cents per head of the population as fixed by the census of 1861.

I profess the greatest respect for the fathers of confederation, as we affect to call them. I say that any man who takes the trouble of perusing the debates of 1867, must come to the conclusion that the lawmakers of the time had but a very imperfect notion as to what the needs and requirements of the country would be after a growth of thirty-five years. I shall not weary the patience of the House by reading extracts from speeches, the more so as I have already, upon a former occasion, read to the House expressions of opinion given in 1867, from Sir A. T. Galt, Sir John A. Macdonald, the Hon. George Brown and Sir George Etienne Cartier. These speeches show that these statesmen had neither foreseen the rapid growth which was to take place throughout all the provinces, nor the increase in the necessary outlay for their sound administration.

To give but one instance, that of the province of Quebec, let me tell the House that its expenditure which was $1,183,238.44 in 1867-68, was $4,707,932.24 in 1900-1901, or an increase of $3,524,693.30.

The following table will show still more clearly the character of the expenditure, which, by the very force of circumstances and under the pressure of circumstances, and owing to fresh demands, have increased twofold, and in some cases threefold :

	1867-68	1900-01.
Civil government... ..$	104,096.45	$ 278,307.42
Administration of justice....	300,442.63	618,296.88
Reformatory..	26,964.40	60,000.00
Legislation....	109,144.06	235,596.09
Education, &c..	275,605.27	465,589.68
Charitable institutions, hospitals, asylums.. ..	125,256,53	397,895.75
Crown lands, public works, agriculture and colonization..	226,678,82	678,806.83
Licenses, &c..	15,050.28	72,769.65
Public debt....	.....	1,617,344,06
Inspection of manufacturing establishments	....	12,000.00
Provincial Board of Health..	.....	17,625.08
Quebec Official 'Gazette'.	.....	13,000.00
Civil Service pensions, &c...	.....	45,321.47
Municipal fund..	.....	180.00
Sale of property..	.....	286.40
Railways..	.....	123,310.10
Sundries	.....	71,592.83
	$1,183,238.44	$4,707,932.24

Let us take the administration of justice : now, on this head the expenditure has doubled. How is this fact to be accounted for if not from the increase in population in large cities like Montreal and Quebec ? Owing to their growth as seaports, these cities receive every year a large floating population, and this surplus of population necessarily involves additional expenditure in the administration of justice, and more particularly of the courts of criminal jurisdiction. It is still within the vivid recollection of old practitioners that, not so very long ago, there were only two sessions of the criminal court held in the cities of Quebec and Montreal every year. Now, men of my generation are aware that, as concerns Montreal, four sessions are actually required, and that the courts of inferior jurisdiction hold sittings from the first of January to the end of December, for the despatch of criminal cases. In both cases the courts have to enforce federal laws, and to this fact the considerable increase in the administration of justice is due.

As to asylums and hospitals, what is the reason the relative expenditure involved by their maintenance has increased threefold, but that their population has considerably increased and that the treatment of the insane and the poor should keep pace with the progress of science ?

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). Before you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was explaining the cause of the increase in some expenditures incurred for some branches of provincial administration. I wish now to call the attention of the House to the glaring disproportion between the revenue derived from the federal treasury and the revenue which the province itself has levied for the administration of public affairs. The following figures show that in that respect, the provinces have done their large share. Of course, I am referring here to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. In 1870, Quebec was drawing from the Dominion treasury a grant of $859,626. In 1901-02, that subsidy amounted to $1,279,105, or an increase of $419,479.

Let us now take the revenue which has been created by the province itself, as the revenue derived from the Crown lands. In 1870 the revenue derived from the land sales was $501,478, while in 1902, it was $1,291,111, or an increase of $788,633. The licenses which in 1870 yielded $98,050, gave $681,229 in 1902. As will be seen, the revenue from this source has increased fivefold since that time, other sources of revenue have been created in order to meet the requirements of the provincial administration. The taxation levied on commercial corporations which did not exist prior to 1870 has yielded $231,695 in 1902, and the duties on successions $222,763. In other words, whereas the Dominion grant has increased from 1870 to 1902 by $419,479, on the other hand, the revenue which the province has derived from its own resources has increased by $4,827,261.

Let us now take the case of the province of Ontario. The figures which I am giving here are borrowed from a most exhaustive memorandum recently prepared by the Hon. Mr. Ross, Prime Minister of the great sister province. The total revenue of the province of Ontario is $4,466,043. The Dominion grant is $1,339,287. The revenue derived from provincial sources reach $3,126,756.

Now, in the face of such figures, can it be denied that the provinces have done their large share outside of any aid received from the Dominion government ? Can it be denied that the provinces, by means of contributions levied upon the taxpayers, have drawn from local sources, enormous sums of money to meet the expenditure of their administration ? Have they not unmercifully taxed themselves to meet their engagements ? Of course the expenditure has considerably increased. In 1870 the grants to public education in the province of Quebec, amounted to $279,972, while in 1902, they reached $469,184. Whereas the expenditure of the Department of Agriculture amounted to $49,863 in 1870, it rose to $119,683 in 1902. For the same departments in the province of Ontario, the outlay for public education was $247,192 in 1861, and $782,193 in 1901, whereas for agriculture, the expenditure was $56,211 in 1861, and $209,258 in 1901. Now, I appeal to the hon. gentlemen who sit on both sides of the House, whether there is a single man who would dare to hold, at this stage of our history, that we should apply the brakes to such cases as public education and agriculture, instead of giving them a new impetus, and such remarkable development as is seen nowadays in other parts of the world ? Why, Sir, does it not stand to reason that these are outlays which are bound to increase in proportion to the very growth of population ? In these modern days, public education, as we all know, is becoming more and more expensive. Our institutions insist upon higher salaries being paid, and rightly so ; and competition makes it necessary for arts and manufactures to be up to the standard of modern science. Again, the new conditions of agriculture require more skill and greater technical knowledge. To recoil from an increased expenditure would be tantamount to saying that provinces must remain at a standstill.

But, Sir, whereas on the one hand, the grant which we receive from the Dominion exchequer is fixed and unalterable, on the other hand, the sources of revenue which the provinces have handed over to the Dominion have trebled in value. Let us take the customs and the excise. In 1867-68, the income from those sources was $11,580,968.25, whereas in 1901, it reached $38,245,223, or an increase of $26,664,254.75. Now, in 1867, the total subsidies received from the Dominion government by the provinces amounted to $2,753,966, or 24 per cent of the revenue of which they had divested themselves, whereas in 1901, the subsidies paid over to the provinces were $4,250,607, or 11 per cent only of the same revenue. Moreover, there is this remarkable anomaly, that the increase of population in the various provinces involves the creation of fresh sources of expenditure, which are beyond the control of the men of power, whereas from that same cause the Dominion government derives a fresh source of revenue which cannot fail to develop more and more. The question is, how is this anomalous position to be remedied, which impresses every thoughtful man who is anxious about the lawful claims of the provinces ? For my part I am of opinion

that in the demands set forth by the interprovincial conference in December last, is to be found the true and practical remedy to the existing difficulties. The wording of those resolutions is very clear and very explicit :

Instead of the amounts now paid, the sums hereafter payable yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures, to be according to population, as follows :—

(a) Where the population is under 150,000	$100,000
(b) Where the population is 150,000 but does not exceed 200,000....	150,000
(c) Where the population is 200,00, but does not exceed 400,000..	180,000
(d) Where the population is 400,000, but does not exceed 800,000..	190,000
(e) Where the population is 800,000, but does not exceed 1,500,000..	220,000
(f) Where the population exceeds 1, 500,000	240,000

Instead of an annual grant per head of population now allowed, the annual payment hereafter to be at the same rate of eighty cents per head, but on the population of the province as ascertained from time to time by the last decennial census, until such population exceeds 2,500,000 ; and at the rate of sixty cents per head for so much of said population as may exceed 2,500,000.

As I said a little while ago, such a demand seems fair and reasonable. The provinces, of their own accord, did delegate certain powers to the central government and did hand over to them the best of their revenue. Is it reasonable to believe that the idea of the fathers of confederation should have been that such a renunciation of powers and such a transfer of revenue should work to the detriment of the provinces, by placing them for ever in straitened circumstances, bordering upon poverty?

The federalists think that the remedy to that state of affairs is to be found in the power of self-taxation and in the borrowing power, which the provinces have preserved. But such an argument no longer holds, in view of the enormous burdens shouldered by the provinces since 1867. The people in the province of Quebec at least, are opposed to dircet taxation and to any further loans. Moreover, as to the parcelling out of the public domain, that is a policy which all right-minded people, all patriotic men antagonize. It is our children's patrimony and their future is intimately linked to it. It would be unfair to deprive our fellow countrymen of the public lands and the natural resources they contain, for the benefit of aliens and speculators who have no permanent interests in this country.

We do not want the provinces to be a mere geographical expression in this Dominion of ours. Any attempt to build up the central power at the expense of the provinces ought to be discountenanced. To call this demand for better terms a raid on the federal treasury is no argument at all. When the federal government grants every year to powerful corporations subsidies amounting to millions of dollars, do not they feel that the position of the provinces is growing more and more humiliating ? Why should the provinces have to play the part of paupers, when they represent in this country interests far more important than the interests of the great corporations referred to ? Do you not think it would be a better policy to settle once for all, by means of a mutual understanding, the financial status of the provincial legislatures, so as to put a stop, for the future, to repeated demands for better terms ? A sad spectacle this House has been a witness to, within the last twenty-five years. Of course, to quote a sensible saying, it is the people who pay ; but it is also the same people who contribute millions to an overflowing public exchequer. It is no use quibbling here. The taxpayers in the various provinces are also the taxpayers of the central government. The additional sums which will be paid to the provinces by the Dominion government will be expended on agriculture, colonization and public education ; and after all, it is Canada that will benefit by them. An increase in the Dominion subsidies to the provinces is necessary, I may even say, it is imperative. From the very inception of confederation, a progressive increase in the revenue of the provinces should have been provided for, on the basis of a subsidy adjustable to the increase of population. Suppose that the population of the province of Quebec should receive an increase of one million within the next twenty years ; will any man, in his sober senses, pretend that the federal subsidy should continue for all time to come, to be determined on the original basis of the population of 1861 ? The question admits of no doubt. Therefore, it is necessary that there should be a fairer redistribution of income and expenditure. Let us bear in mind that the conditions in Canada have greatly changed since 1867. From the necessity of keeping pace with modern progress, from the development of our resources and the new needs of the country as well as the requirements of competition, fresh duties have devolved upon provincial governments which it would be idle to postpone any longer. As to the charges of extravagance brought against the provinces, I may say that they are worthless ; because, it stands to reason that when the provinces have aided in the building of great railway lines, and have opened up to settlement tracts of uncultivated lands, they have thereby notably contributed to the increase of population ; they have also increased tenfold the volume of general trade, and promoted, to a large extent, the development of the whole country. It would be, indeed, a very poor policy, quite at variance with sound political economy, to add to the embarrassed circumstances of the provinces, in proportion to the general development of the

country. Take away from the provinces the assistance they are entitled to, and you thereby deprive them of the best incentive to self-development. As I said last year, the provinces exist, true enough, but they barely live under the present condition of affairs. They are entitled to something more than a bare existence; they have a right to live.

Motion agreed to.

SCUTTLING OF SCHOONER 'EUXINE.'

Mr. A. McLENNAN (Inverness) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, and other papers, in connection with the prosecution, by the Customs Department, for the scuttling of the schooner 'Euxine,' of Margaree Island, while reported on a smuggling expedition, from St. Pierre, Miquelon.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). With regard to the motion, I do not know exactly what action the department took in the matter and how the case actually stands. It seems that all the papers are not available, but whatever papers can be had will be brought down. This is a case which occurred under the late government.

Mr. McLENNAN. It did occur some years ago, under the regime of the late administration, and seems to have hung fire somewhere between the departments and the courts. For some years nothing was done and the case stood in abeyance until a repetition of this species of illicit traffic in recent years caused public opinion to become alive to the importance of stamping it down. The proximity of the island of St. Pierre, Miquelon to Cape Breton has facilitated smuggling operations between the two places, and it is therefore of great urgency that offenders should be taught to respect the law. In order to do this, it is considered advisable to start in with the original offender and have this case pushed to the end. Hence it is that I call for the papers at present. The prosecution was entered into by the Customs Department under the late government, but it would seem that a very important witness on that occasion conveniently disappeared, which for the time set the case at rest, but it appears that in recent years evidence has become available which is calculated to throw some light upon this mysterious matter, and public opinion calls for a further probing of the case. I believe that important evidence which was not available on the first occasion is available now, and I hope that the department will take the case up where it seems to have dropped. When last heard of, I believe it was in the hands of the agent of the Department of Justice at that time in Halifax. Who that gentleman is I cannot recall, but the papers are in that office now and should be available. While I agree with the hon. minister that all the papers may not be available in his department, I shall be glad, if all those which are, should be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. CHARLTON moved that Order No. 13, House again in Committee on Bill (No. 2) to amend chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1900 authorizing the grant of railway subsidies, be discharged, and that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Railways, Telegraph and Telephone Lines.

Motion agreed to.

TELEPHONE COMPANIES.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York) moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) respecting telephone companies. He said: This Bill is substantially the Bill introduced last session and it is of great public interest. I have discussed it very fully on previous occasions both in the House and in the Committee. And it is a Bill that demands passage now more than ever. It is altogether in the public interest, and will go a long way to promote commerce and communication. I do not intend, at the present time, to discuss it very fully, but I expect from the government to-night a statement of their intention with regard to the matter. Last session, when I introduced the Bill, the Minister of Justice, on behalf of the government, said it was the intention of the government to introduce a Bill dealing with the question. And he did introduce a Bill which came before the committee; and then the statement was made in the committee that the questions involved were of such a character that it would take a year to consider them fully. That year has elapsed. I have asked the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if it was the intention of the government to redeem its pledge and bring in a Bill this session. So far, I have not had an answer to that question. I am quite willing to give the leader of the House (Hon. Sir William Mulock) an opportunity to say now whether it is the intention of the government to bring in that Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I was going to make a suggestion. Whether or not the government brings in a Bill, that circumstance would not be a good reason for not inviting the attention to this question. It is a very large question. The Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines is a large committee, comprising about three-fifths or, perhaps, three-quarters of the members of the House, and perhaps a better plan would be to let this go to the committee and have a thorough discussion there. The government and the House will then be better able to give an opinion on the subject.

Mr. MACLEAN. But a government must redeem its pledges.

Mr. MONK. Oh, no.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, some of us take that view. A solemn pledge has been given to the people that we shall have a Telephone Bill this session. Deputations have been here and interviewed the government. The Minister of Justice said that he was giving all the attention he could to the constitutional question that had arisen. And I expect that Bill, and the country expects it. But the leader of the House tells us that he has no policy to announce and does not know what the intention of the government is——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, the hon. gentleman was not in a position to give any information on the matter. In all fairness, in view of the large issues that come up in connection with the question, a public statement ought to be made by the government with regard to it . But I am in the hands of the government, and I must go to the Committee with the Bill, fight it out there and then come back to the House, if necessary. There is only one change in my Bill from last session. While a number have raised the issue in this House that the Bill I introduced interfered with municipal rights, I never admitted that it did so, as at first drafted; but, to provide for that point, I have inserted a clause that any rights granted to the telephone companies under the charter of this Act are subject to the rights of municipalities. But I am not dealing with the constitutional question. I am dealing with a practical public grievance. A telephone monopoly exists in this country, and all I ask is that the telephone business be put on a competitive basis, that anybody and everbody may go into telephone business and that the well known principles of the law be applied to telephone business as to any other. So I have made the necessary provision regarding municipal rights. I intend to go on with the Bill. I am ready to go to the Committee; and, with that understanding, I move the second reading and that the Bill be sent to the Committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT—TELEPHONES.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 5) to amend the Railway Act. He said : This is a very short Bill. It deals with one phase of the telephone grievance in this country. That grievance has developed since last session. When a year's grace was given to the Bell Telephone Company they went out and made contracts with all the railway companies in Canada, and so they secured a telephone monopoly in all the railroad stations in the country. I contend that this is against public policy. The railroads of this country should be given facilities with regard to telephones, as they are compelled by the Railway Act to give equal facilities in their transportation of freight. This Bill is a very short amendment to secure that end. I should like to see the hon. member (Mr. Dyment) who represents Fort William and Port Arthur in his place to-night that he might tell us what is going on in those two progressive towns. The people in these towns have organized a municipal telephone service for the two towns. They are giving the people a better telephone service than the Bell Telephone Company gave, and charging only half its price. But they find, under this invidious agreement between the telephone companies and the railways, that the public telephone systems of these towns are debarred from entering the Canadian Pacific Railway station. And representatives of the people of Port Arthur and Fort William are here to-day in Ottawa to ask that the amendment that I now propose or some similar amendment may pass. In my riding of East York, the farmers—and I hope the farming members of the House will listen to me, and I hope the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) who comes from that county is listening to me, and I hope the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) is in his place and listening to me—the farmers of East York, and of Pickering in South Ontario, could not get telephone connection. They implored the Bell Telephone Company to give it to them. An immense price was demanded. I have to pay $180 a year for my telephone service in the township of York. I find the service useful, and I have to pay the price. A veterinary half a mile away was asked $160 for a telephone service. But he cannot pay it, and is not able to answer his calls. This, of course, is a great inconvenience. All the doctors there were held up in the same way. But the farmers had enough spirit to organize an independent telephone system. They organized it on the basis of each man paying $40 as an initial payment; and an annual contribution of $5. On this basis they made first-class telephone service which they own and control themselves. Eighteen went into the first line. But they wished to have connection with the Locust Hill station of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But when they went there, they were told: Gentlemen, we cannot let the farmers' line into the station because of the exclusive agreement we gave to the Bell Telephone Company last year. I wired to Sir Thomas Shaughnessy about it, and he was willing to give the farmers the service if he could get out of his agreement with the Bell Telephone Company. Who were

these farmers who applied to get access by telephone to the station? Every one of them was a customer of the Canadian Pacific Railway and all they wished was the privilege of being able to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway agent whether the trains were on time, whether their freight had arrived, and questions of that character which the railway people are only too pleased to answer, if you knock at their door—but if you wish to get in through a hole in the wall by a telephone wire, you have to ask the consent of the Bell Telephone Company. This is an iniquitous state of affairs, contrary to public policy. It is contrary to the political principles of both parties, and is a thing that ought to be stopped. All that my Bill does is to insist on every railway company giving equal telephone facilities to every one who asks for them. I would like to know where the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) is to-night and whether he is prepared to make a statement on this subject. Here are two Bills relating to the branch of affairs which he is supposed to administer, and he is not here to give us an answer to our questions. The hon. member for Victoria, N.S., spoke about the sessional gaieties the other evening. Apparently the sessional gaieties are taking up the time of the ministers, for they are not here to state the policy of the government on public questions. The farmers of Canada, from one end to the other are watching this little Bill, and they expect some kind of declaration with regard to it. I suppose that all the information I shall get is that I must go to the Committee. But what is the intention of the government?

Now, I would not have spoken so warmly on this point if I had not had a large experience of being jollied, as the term is, in committees in regard to these public Bills that I have introduced. I intend now to insist on some kind of fair treatment of these measures and some kind of statement from the government as to what they intend to do. They need not answer me if they don't wish to, but I will try the best way I know how to take care of these Bills and get a full discussion of them. I trust the House to-night will send this Bill on to the committee, and I trust further, in view of all the agitation in the country, and in view of the interest the farmers are taking on this question, that I will have the assistance of the government in passing both these Bills, especially this very short one. I am not exceeding my right in expecting that the ministers having charge of these important questions should be in their places and prepared to state the policy of the government in regard to them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. MACLEAN.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 15) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. He said: This is the same Bill I introduced on two former occasions. The object of the Bill is to amend the Dominion Elections Act so as to prevent what is now a most insidious and dangerous form of intimidation. I regret that I have to say it, and I say it with a feeling of shame, that in the province of Ontario we have not a secret ballot, and that is well known from one end of the province to the other. Though we have a secret ballot in the Dominion Act, it is well understood by those who know anything about these matters that when an election comes on men are intimidated and are told that the Dominion ballot is not secret, and they had better be very careful how they vote because it will be discovered. The object of this Bill is to make such a threat an offence against the Election Act, and to make it punishable and liable to the penalties that attend the usual acts of corruption. I do not think that I need spend any more time in urging the necessity of a Bill of this kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I think there is some misunderstanding. The Minister of Justice, who has these matters in charge, is not here to-night, and I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would allow his Bill to stand over. The minister had an impression that these Bills would not be reached to-night, otherwise he would have made some arrangement about them. So if the hon. gentleman has no objection to let it stand over, it will come up on the first order the next day.

Mr. CLANCY. I may inform the Minister of Finance that the Minister of Justice has already had that stand over on two occasions in order that he might take it to the block and use his hatchet. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that it is just as well that he should know my position. I do not intend that the Minister of Justice shall dispose of that Bill at this session without a vote of this House. I will accept the proposition made by the Minister of Finance on the understanding that the Bill shall not lose its place, and shall become the first order of the day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When I say the first order—there are very few orders ahead of it. I do not make the suggestion with any intention of preventing a vote. There are only two or three motions ahead of it, and as we are at the beginning of the session, there is not the least danger that the matter will not come up again at an early date.

Motion withdrawn.

INTERPRETATION ACT.

On the order for :

Second reading of Bill (No. 18) to amend the Interpretation Act.—Mr. Monk.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Does my hon. friend intend to ask that his Bill be referred to a committee ?

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). No, it is not necessary. It is a short Bill, and I do not think there can be much objection to it. Is the hon. gentleman ready to go on with it to-night ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the absence of the Minister of Justice, I would prefer that the hon. gentleman should let it stand, unless it goes to one of the main committees.

Mr. MONK. I would like to get it advanced one stage to-night. The hon. gentleman will recollect that I brought that Bill in last year, and put it off several times. It failed to become law last year. I do not think there can be any objection whatever to its taking a second reading to-night. I would like it to be advanced one stage, and when it comes to be discussed in Committee of the Whole, if there are any objections to it, they can be urged then. Otherwise I would like to go on with it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The second reading would be admitting the principle.

Mr. MONK. It does, as a general rule.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The practice is to refer such Bills to a committee where they can be threshed out. Otherwise I would prefer if the hon. gentleman would let it stand until the Minister of Justice is in his seat.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Unless he wants it to go to a committee.

Mr. MONK. There is no necessity for its going to any committee. There is no committee to send it to.

Order allowed to stand.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all plans and specifications submitted for approval by the Montreal Subway Company ; copies of the Order in Council, if any, approving of such plans. Also, of any report of the progress of the work ; statement showing the amount of money spent on the undertaking ; the amount of the deposit made by the company ; and all papers or correspondence relating to the enterprise.—Hon. Mr. Tarte.

Copies of all papers, letters, telegrams, contracts, specifications, and correspondence of every description whatever, between the Minister of Public Works, or any other member of the government, and the contractors, sub-contractors, and other parties, in connection with the repairs to the post office, and the building of a new retaining wall, in connection with the post office, in the town of Woodstock, N.B. — Mr. Hale.

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, despatches and documents, relating to the disallowance by the Governor in Council of statutes of the province of British Columbia, during the past five years.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Statement of all moneys paid by the Government, or on its behalf, to any newspapers in the Yukon District, since June 30 last, giving the names of said newspapers.—Mr. Monk.

Statement showing in detail amounts of money paid to newspapers, newspaper companies, newspaper owners, or agents of publicity, in the United Kingdom, France, or the United States, since June 30 last.—Mr. Monk.

Statement showing :—

1. The total amount paid to date by the Government to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, for a lease of line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal.

2. Total amount paid to date by the same to the same, for crossing facilities over the Victoria Bridge.

3. Total amount paid from the same to the same, as the Government's share of improved terminal facilities at Bonaventure Depot.—Mr. Monk.

Copies of all Orders in Council, and of all other documents, and correspondence, relating to the appointment of a Commission instructed to secure a site for a dry dock in the port of Montreal ; likewise of the instructions given regarding that subject, the reports that may have been made, &c.—Hon. Mr. Tarte.

Copy of the contract made with Poupore & Malone, for the construction of the wharf at the foot of St. Mary's Current, in the port of Montreal ; and of any agreements modifying the original terms of said contract.—Hon. Mr. Monk.

Copies of tenders asked for and received for Quebec Harbour improvements, during the last ten months ; of reports to Cauncil, correspondence, and plans prepared by the Department of Public Works in reference to such works.—Hon. Mr. Tarte.

Return of all sales of School Lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories since 1896, showing :—

1. Date of sale.
2. Place where the sale occurred.
3. Name of auctioneer.
4. Total amount of purchase money in each case.
5. Total amount paid at time of sale in each case.
6. Total amount paid since time of sale in each case.
7. Total amount still due for principal and interest, respectively, in each case.
8. Total amount of sale by each auctioneer.
9. Total amount paid to each auctioneer for his service.—Mr. Roche (Marquette).

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 9.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 31, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 54) respecting the Canada Permanent and Western Mortgage Corporation; and to change its name to the Canadian Permanent Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—Mr. German by Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Edmonton Street Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 59) respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Monk.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Ross (Ontario).

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Winnipeg Western Land Corporation, Limited.—Mr. McCarthy by Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—Mr. McCarthy by Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 63) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—Mr. McGuigan.

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy by Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Bruce.

REPRESENTATION OF ST. JAMES, MONTREAL.

Mr. MONK. On Friday next, when motions are called, I will move the following :

That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ for the election of a member to serve in this present parliament for the electoral division of St. James, Montreal, in the room of Joseph Brunet, whose election has been declared void.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :—

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1903, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, March 31, 1903.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the message of His Excellency and the estimates he referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 66) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons. He said : I rise, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of presenting to the House a measure for the redistribution of the representation in the House of Commons, rendered necessary by the last census. Perhaps before proceeding any further it might not be amiss if I would remind the House that in introducing this Bill, the government is not acting in any discretionary sense, but is performing an imperative constitutional duty, the constitution having provided that after each decennial census there should take place a redistribution of the representation of the different provinces in this House. Three years ago I introduced a redistribution measure, but that was very different from the one I am now submitting. That was simply a partial measure of redistribution, a discretionary measure, one which we had the option of presenting or not, and our object then was not to frame a general scheme of redistribution, but simply to correct certain errors—or to use perhaps a more severe but more appropriate term—certain injustices which had been perpetrated on the province of Ontario by the Redistribution Act of 1882, and on the province of Quebec, by the Redistribution Act of 1892. The motive therefore and the provisions of that measure were very different from those of the present one. Perhaps also it would not be amiss for me to inform the House that the distribution of population, as revealed by the census of 1901, will cause some disturbance in the proportion of the representation now held by the different provinces of the Dominion on the floor of this House.

Let me read a statement showing the increase in population in the Dominion as a whole, and in the various provinces, comparing 1891 with 1901, when the last census was taken.

	1891.	1901.
Dominion of Canada....	4,833,239	5,371,315
Prince Edward Island ..	109,078	103,289
Nova Scotia....	450,396	459,574
New Brunswick.....	321,263	331,120

	1891.	1901.
Province of Ontario.....	2,114,321	2,182,947
Manitoba....	152,206	255,211
British Columbia..	98,173	178,657
North-west Territories..	66,799	158,940
Province of Quebec	1,488,535	1,648,898

The province of Quebec, I need hardly remind the House, is the pivot of representation, on which depends the proportion of the representation to be allowed each province. The population of the province of Quebec being 1,488,535, and its representation being limited, under all circumstances to 65 members, it follows that the representation of the province of Quebec in this House is in the proportion of 25,367 for one member. This number therefore, 25,367, being the unit of representation of the province of Quebec, becomes the unit of representation for the rest of the Dominion, and according to this unit the province of Prince Edward Island will only be entitled to four members in this House, and thus lose one. The population of Nova Scotia being 459,574, the unit of representation would give it a total representation in this House of 18 instead of the 20 members it now has. New Brunswick, having a population of 321,220, the unit of representation would give it 13 instead of 14 members as at present. And the province of Ontario having a population of 2,182,947, would have a total representation of 86 instead of 92 members. All these provinces east of Lake Superior, therefore, except the province of Quebec, whose representation must remain stationary, will lose a part of their representation.

On the other hand, the population of British Columbia, which at present has six members, will be represented by an additional one, and have seven instead of six. The province of Manitoba will have its representation increased by three, and have ten instead of seven. In the case of the North-west Territories, we have made special provisions, the territories not being bound by the letter of the constitutional law, to which I will allude later on.

Upon the exact proportion of the representation allotted to the several provinces there can be no possible controversy. Everybody is aware that in those provinces which, according to the new redistribution must lose part of their representation, there has been some flurry of excitement, and well intentioned and well disposed persons have been making endeavours to convince themselves that by torturing the letter of the law, the law itself might be made to express the reverse of what it actually expresses. Unfortunately, the letter of the law is such as not to allow of any doubt. Three redistributions have already taken place in this Dominion—in 1872, 1882 and 1892. In almost every one of these redistributions, the same thing has occurred. Certain provinces have been forced to lose some part of their representation, and naturally protests were made, but the matter has been debated and discussed and determined by such able jurists and eminent men as Sir John Macdonald, the Hon. Edward Blake and Sir John Thompson, and it is not possible—for my part I am indeed sorry, and I express my sorrow very sincerely that certain provinces will have to lose part of their representation in this House—but it is not possible to avoid this. We have to abide by the law and to apply the law, and in applying the law the question is more of mathematics than of anything else. We have only to take the provisions of the constitution, section 51, and the figures of the census, and find the result. In this matter parliament is not a free agent. It has no discretion to exercise, but is simply the instrument and creature of the law, and in this particular Bill we have only to take the result of the census and make the redistribution accordingly, giving to each province the number of members to which it is entitled, some having less, others having more, but all being bound by the same rule. So far, as I say, the powers of parliament are limited; but in the creation of the constituencies which are to elect members to this House, the powers of parliament are unlimited; and those powers can be used either for good or for evil, either for very much good or for very much evil. We, on this side of the House, have always complained, that, in previous redistributions which have taken place—and which have taken place always under the same party, the Conservative party, now in opposition—the opposition of the day were unfairly treated. I grant that this is a matter in which the temptation is great to the party in office to abuse its power, to take an unfair advantage of its opponents, and to so arrange the constituencies as to secure the return to parliament of more members of its own political faith than the actual political opinion of the country at large would warrant. I would avoid, if possible, upon this occasion, which, in some respects, is a solemn one—I would avoid, as far as I can, any recrimination concerning the past. But, without any recrimination, and referring to the past only for illustration, let me call attention to a list of forty-two constituencies in Ontario created by the redistributions of 1882 and 1892, in which the total of the popular vote recorded gave a clear Liberal majority, but in which, notwithstanding, there was a clear Conservative majority of members elected. The names of these constituencies are as follows :

Brant South, Bruce West, Bruce South, Durham East, Durham West, Elgin East, Elgin West, Essex North, Essex South, Hastings North, Hastings East, Hastings West, Kent, Lambton East, Lambton West, Leeds and Grenville, Leeds South, Grenville South, Lanark North, Lanark South, Northumberland East, Northumberland West, Oxford South, Oxford North, Ontario North, Ontario South, Ontario West, Perth North, Perth South, Peterborough East, Peterborough West, Renfrew North, Renfrew South, Victoria North, Victoria South, Waterloo North, Waterloo South, Wellington

Centre, Wellington North, Wellington South, Wentworth North and Brant.

Here we have forty-two ridings. The popular vote for the Liberal candidates in the last election was 88,363; and the popular vote in favour of the Conservative candidates was 86,392, a clear Liberal majority of 1,973. The result in these counties which thus gave a clear Liberal popular majority was that twenty-five Conservatives were elected and seventeen Liberals, a clear Conservative majority for these constituencies of eight in this House. Now, I presume there is not a fair-minded man in this House who will not agree with me that such a condition of things is not fair or just. It is a condition of things not conducive to good government, and should not exist under our free parliamentary constitution. That we should desire to correct that evil goes as a matter of course. We certainly intend to undo this evil, but while that is the case, let me say at once that, though we intend to undo the injustice perpetrated at the expense of the Liberal party, it is not with the view or intention of perpetrating a similar injustice at the expense of our opponents. What we have in view and what we desire is to introduce a fair measure that will give all parties an equal measure of justice, freedom and responsibility. The Liberal party has always contended that the redistribution that must follow each decennial census should take place under certain rules, well understood, well defined, and which everybody could appreciate. These should be the unwritten law of the country, and apply wherever and whenever a redistribution takes place, and should be applied, whichever party is in power. We have always maintained that the guiding principle in this redistribution should be that county boundaries should be preserved. And we lay to-day as the basis of redistribution, which we hold ought to be accepted and adopted on this occasion, that the municipal representation of the country ought to be the basis of the parliamentary representation. The position we take is that we should take the map of the municipal organizations of the Dominion and make it the basis of the parliamentary representation. There are countries for which one man is sufficient. The unit of population—which, of course, cannot be followed with absolute exactness would not warrant any more. There are other counties in which there may be two or three members to be elected. There are certain cities in which there must be more than three or four members, whereas there are other municipalities whose population is so small relative to the unit of population that they should not be allowed to send even one member here. This, therefore, involves the work of selecting, of dividing, of uniting. And the question arises now—and, perhaps, it is the most delicate of all the questions with which we have to deal—by whom is this work to be effected? Who is to make this division of counties—if counties are to be divided; who is to direct this union of counties if counties are to be united? This is a question of great moment; and, after having given it the best consideration we are able to give it, we think that, in this, as in mostly all matters, the best policy to follow, the best and safest rule, is to follow the policy and the rule, which, under similar circumstances prevails in that country which has been the mother of all free institutions—Great Britain. We propose, therefore, on this occasion, as we did on a former occasion when the last Redistribution Bill was before us, to propose to the House to follow the British precedent. The last redistribution which took place in England took place in 1884, under the government of Mr. Gladstone. On that occasion, Mr. Gladstone, before making his Bill, adopted the policy which we intend to follow on this occasion. The Bill was prepared, at the invitation of Mr. Gladstone, by a conference of the two parties in the House of Commons, by a conference of the government and the opposition. Mr. Gladstone invited Lord Salisbury, who was then the leader of the opposition to meet with him and discuss with him the details of the Redistribution Bill which he had to introduce, following consequent upon the new Franchise Act. This conference took place, and, as a result a measure was introduced which proved satisfactory to both parties. Let me quote to the House what took place on that occasion—and I quote from a well known book, 'The Annual Register' of 1884. After having stated that Lord Salisbury had been invited by Mr. Gladstone to meet him and discuss the details of the measure with him the author goes on to say:

> During the next fortnight the process of arrangement was steadily pursued. Lord Salisbury and Sir S. Northcote attended the meetings of the cabinet, and conducted the negotiations with the specially selected delegates of that body.

So, there was a conferencee between members of the government and the leaders of the opposition in order to frame a measure which would be satisfactory to both parties. When the last Bill was introduced in this House in 1892, we were sitting in opposition, and we proposed to our opponents to adopt the same methods. When the Bill came up for its second reading I, sitting where my friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) now sits, moved the following:—

> That Bill No. 76, an Act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons be referred to a conference or committee to be composed of both political parties to agree upon the lines or principles upon which the Redistribution Bill should be drawn.

Unfortunately, this proposition was not accepted. But, though our proposition was not accepted, still, we do not intend to depart from the principle we then laid down. What we claimed for ourselves when we were in the minority, we are now ready to

grant to our opponents when they are in the minority. We intend, therefore, to have the details of this measure submitted to our opponents, if they will agree to our proposal. From some remarks which I understand fell from the lips of the hon. gentleman opposite, even that measure of justice is not acceptable to him. It is very difficult to satisfy the hon. gentleman; but whether he is satisfied or not, I doubt if anything can be more fair than what we now offer to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. If the right hon. gentleman refers to me, I beg to say that my opinion is the very reverse. I am well satisfied, and was commending the government for proposing to carry out the platform which they laid down when in opposition.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am satisfied with the spirit in which my hon. friend receives my remarks; I apologize to him, and hope to have his support for this Bill. The Bill which I have the honour to introduce will be in these words:

Act to readjust the representation of the House of Commons.

Whereas the results of the census of 1901 necessitate a readjustment of the representation in the House of Commons, pursuant to the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, and the other statutes in that behalf, and it is expedient at the same time to provide for an increased representation in the said House of the North-west Territories: Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. The House of Commons shall consist of 214 members, of whom 86 shall be elected for Ontario, 65 for Quebec, 18 for Nova Scotia, 13 for New Brunswick, 10 for Manitoba, 7 for British Columbia, 4 for Prince Edward Island, 10 for the North-west Territories and 1 for the Yukon Territory.

2. The said provinces and territories respectively shall, for the purposes of the election of members to serve in the said House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts and be represented as provided in the schedule to this Act.

3. Every town, village, township, parish or place lying within the territorial limits of any electoral district, and not specifically included in any other electoral district by the said schedule, shall be and be taken to be part of the electoral district in which it is so locally situate.

4. Wherever in the said schedule any word or expression is used to denote the name of any territorial division, such word or expression shall, unless the context otherwise requires, be construed as indicating such territorial division as it exists and is bounded at the date of the passing of this Act.

5. This Act shall take effect only upon the dissolution of the present parliament.

Now, this is the Bill which I intend to move. There is no schedule attached to it. If this Bill is accepted by our friends on the other side, we intend, after it has been debated and read the second time, to refer it to a special committee composed of seven members, on which the opposition will be represented by three, to be selected by themselves. The object of the committee will be to create the constituencies which will be allowed to elect the members of this House. In other words, we do not present to the House to-day a scheme cut and dried which has to be swallowed holus bolus by our friends and by the opposition, whether they like it or not; no, we propose to invite our friends now sitting on the opposition benches to meet us in the committee room and there discuss with us the division of the constituencies, and in fact the creation of all constituencies which shall be empowered to elect the members of this House. We propose to do what has been done in England by the government of Mr. Gladstone. We believe that if our friends opposite will meet us in this way, we can prepare a measure which will be at all events fair to all parties. We believe that we shall be able to bring into this House a measure which will be free from those blemishes which are to be found in the Redistribution Acts of 1882 and 1892. We believe that if they will agree to meet us in committee, to discuss this Bill fairly, without trying to take an undue advantage over each other, we shall be able to present to the House a measure of which every Canadian will have reason to feel proud, a measure which will be free from those contentious elements which characterized former Redistribution Acts which have been passed in the history of the Dominion of Canada. We intend to do this as a basis to be followed not only upon this occasion, but upon all occasions.

Now, I have to say one word with regard to the North-west Territories. The population of the North-west Territories was 158,940 according to the last census. According to the unit of representation, they are entitled to only six members. But we are not bound by the letter of the constitution so far as representation of the North-west Territories is concerned. Therefore, we propose to give to those Territories a representation in this House of ten members. The population of that region to-day is at least 250,000, which, at present, is no doubt sufficient to entitle them to ten members. It is increasing by leaps and bounds, and in a few years that population—

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Provided they are British subjects.

The PRIME MINISTER. They cannot vote unless they are British subjects. That is the reason why we want to give to the North-west Territories very extensive representation in this House, because we want to make it an object for all these newcomers to take the oath of allegiance, and to become British subjects, to take upon themselves the advantages and responsibilities of Canadians. These, Mr. Speaker, are the chief features of the measure which I have the

honour to propose to the House. I hope that they will commend themselves to the unbiased judgment of all the members of the House, whether on this side or the other side.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I may say in the first place that I do not think my right hon. friend has pursued his researches into the constituencies of Ontario very far. If he had done so he would easily have found twenty-five Liberal constituencies and seventeen Conservative constituencies in that province which would have presented, not only an equal, but a greater anomaly of an exactly opposite character to that to which he drew the attention of the House. I hardly think that an argument of that kind was worthy of my right hon. friend unless he is prepared to look at the question from all possible aspects. Before he charges injustice against the Conservatives in respect to the Bill of 1892, it would have been proper for him to examine more closely all the constituencies, in that province, the results in all the constituencies, to ascertain whether as great an anomaly might not be found in the opposite direction as that which he presented to the House to-day. We all know that under any possible system it is necessary for these things to be. We cannot devise any system under which anomalies of that kind cannot be discovered; and the mere fact that you can find twenty-five constituencies and seventeen constituencies presenting the condition of affairs which the hon gentleman speaks of, is no legitimate argument whatever in favour of the contention that he has made unless he goes further and examines the results in the constituencies from every possible standpoint.

Now, I do not know that I have fully apprehended all the details of the Bill which my right hon. friend has presented, but, when it is printed, and before it comes up for the second reading we shall have an opportunity of considering what its provisions really are. Speaking offhand, I may say that the proposal for a conference for the purpose of determining the boundaries of the different constituencies would impress one as having the merit of fairness although we recognize that by means of the committee holding a majority from the other side of the House, that fairness might not in the end be so real as suggested by my hon. friend. However, I am bound to assume that my right hon. friend means what he says when he declares that the proposal is to make a fair Redistribution Bill. It will be, of course, open to us to bring the results of the committee's work before the House and have such a discussion as we may think necessary in case we do not conclude that the action of the committee partakes of the fairness which my right hon. friend promises.

There is one point, however, upon which I would like to say a word or two and upon which I would like to have some information from my right hon. friend before this Bill goes to its second reading, and that is whether or not there have been any representations made by the governments of any of the provinces in regard to the proposed reduction in the representation of the provinces of Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and whether or not the opinion of the law officers of the Crown has been given in respect to the contention made by these provinces. My right hon. friend has suggested to-day that there is no possible question upon this subject. I understand that the law officers of the province of New Brunswick have given an exactly opposite opinion to that which my right hon. friend expresses to-day. I have not seen their opinion, I do not know of it except by mere report, but this is what I understand. I do not propose to-day, to make any argument upon the question but merely to bring to the attention of the House and of my right hon. friend what I understand the question is which has been presented from certain quarters in regard to the reduction in the representation of the provinces I have named. Section three of the British North America Act of 1867 provides:

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, to declare by proclamation that, on and after a day therein appointed, not being more than six months after the passing of this Act, the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall form and be one Dominion under the name of Canada; and on and after that day those three provinces shall form and be one Dominion under that name accordingly.

Section four of the Act is as follows:

> The subsequent provisions of this Act shall, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, commence and have effect on and after the union, that is to say, on and after the day appointed for the union taking effect in the Queen's proclamation; and in the same provisions, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, the name Canada shall be taken to mean Canada as constituted under this Act.

Now, take the case of the section that immediately follows by way of illustration and what do you have? Section five provides:

> Canada shall be divided into four provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

It is perfectly obvious that the word 'Canada, as used in teat section, implies and includes only the four provinces that have already been named. The next section to which I would invite the attention of my right hon. friend and of the House, is section thirty-seven, which declares as follows:

> The House of Commons shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, consist of one hundred and eighty-one members, of whom eighty-two shall be elected for Ontario, sixty-five for Quebec, nineteen for Nova Scotia and fifteen for New Brunswick.

Then, the next section to which I would invite the attention of the House is section fifty-one, which reads as follows :

On the completion of the census in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules :—

(1) Quebec shall have the fixed number of sixty-five members ;

(2) There shall be assigned to each of the other provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number sixty-five bears to the number of the population of Quebec (so ascertained);

(3) In the computation of the number of members for a province a fractional part not exceeding one-half of the whole number requisite for entitling the province to a member shall be disregarded ; but a fractional part exceeding one-half of that number shall be equivalent to the whole number.

Fourth, and this is the important subsection :

(4) On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province as ascertained at the then latest census be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards ;

(5) Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing parliament.

There is another section which is important to be considered in this connection. It is section 146, which provides as follows :

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of the parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the union, and on address from the Houses of the parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North-western territory, or either of them, into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act ; and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Now, it is important to observe in construing this Act, in the first place that it contemplates the incorporation of other colonies and provinces into the Dominion which are referred to in section 146 of the Act and it is important to pay particular attention to the language of section fifty-one, because section fifty-one says that :

Representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority——

And it uses the word 'Canada,' in subsection 4. What the word 'Canada' means has been defined by section four of the Act. Canada in all the subsequent provisions of the Act means 'Canada as constituted under this Act.'

What is the meaning of the expression 'as constituted under this Act'? Certainly it means, in section five, simply the four provinces of Canada, because that section provides that :

Canada shall be divided into four provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

The suggestion is that section fifty-one constituted a compact between the four provinces which was not to be disturbed by the admission of any other colonies, that it constituted a compact under which the province of Quebec should never at any time have less than sixty-five members and under which the other provinces should never have a smaller number of members than the proportion they were entitled to according to the population of Quebec, and there was the further provision that their representation should at no time be reduced unless the population had been diminished by one-twentieth part as compared with the total population of Canada.

I know that there are important provisions affecting this question in the shape of the addresses which were subsequently passed by the legislatures of the different provinces afterwards admitted, and which were passed by the parliament of Canada. And also I do not put out of my mind the legislation passed by this parliament and ratified—if that is the proper expression—by the imperial parliament, with regard to the admission of Manitoba and Rupert's Land. But the argument which I think may be fairly made is this : That if you once regard section 51 as a contract between these provinces, fixing as between themselves the terms upon which their representation shall be had in future, then you must find very clear language indeed within the addresses or within subsequent legislation such as I have spoken of, if you are to depart from that contract so established between the four provinces which constituted Canada in the first instance. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a fair subject for inquiry at the present time, as to whether or not any representations have been made with regard to this by any of the provinces; and whether the opinion of the law officers of the Crown has been had with regard to it. I think it is also right, that the opinion of the law officers here, if any has been obtained, should be laid on the Table of the House and should be printed for the information of all hon. members who may desire to address themselves to that subject.

I may only say further in dealing with the matter at the present time, that my right hon. friend in introducing the measure which was brought before this House in 1899 laid down the principle that any division of counties should take place by means

of a judicial commission. I will quote to my right hon. friend the language which he then used and I may say that I did not gather from his remarks to-day any special reason why the principle which was laid down then should be departed from now. The right hon. gentleman said :

Whenever a county is to be divided into ridings ; whenever a county which up to that time is entitled to one member becomes entitled to two or three members; the division should take place by judicial decision and authority. This is the second principle upon which we base the Bill that we introduce to the House now.

I suppose it is in view of the departure from that principle, that my right hon. friend speaks of the measure now introduced as a measure of a different character from that which he then laid down before the House. I do not know in what respect it differs. This measure is of course wider reaching in so far as, being based upon the results of the last census it gives a very much increased representation to Manitoba and the North-west Territories; but apart from that, the principle which is proper for one Act would seem proper for the other, although I do not wish in saying this to qualify in any respect what I have already said with regard to the proposal which the right hon. gentleman has made. I therefore will not take up the time of the House further at present, but I will ask my right hon. friend or the Minister of Justice to inform the House upon the matters which I thus briefly bring to their notice in order that we may be able to more intelligently discuss this Bill when it comes for its second reading.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I do not rise for the purpose of entering into any lengthy discussion of the measure now before the House, but merely for the purpose of asking my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, if he commits himself definitely to the opinion which has been expressed, to the effect that the word 'Canada' in subsection 4 of section 51, means not the Canada of to-day but the four original provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario, and that the proportion referred to under this section is to be estimated with regard to the aggregate population of these provinces, and not with regard to the population of the Dominion as it now exists ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I expressly said when I rose to speak that I did not propose to argue the question at the present time; that I proposed to state for the information of the House the point as I understood it which had been made by the law officers of the province of New Brunswick, and to inquire whether the executive of Canada had obtained the opinion of its law officers, and to ask that we might be favoured with a perusal of that opinion in case it had been obtained.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I may say for the information of my hon. friend and of the House, that an opinion was expressed by the law officers of the crown in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, somewhat on the lines suggested by the hon. gentleman. I think it would be proper to have the representations made by these governments to the federal government, and also the answer which I made thereto. Possibly after my hon. friend has seen—because after all to discuss these representations one has to see the words in which they were made—after my hon. friend has seen the representations and the answer, he may possibly think that there is considerable opinion in favour of the position heretofore taken at the time each Representation Act was introduced.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, what boundaries it is intended to adopt ? Under the Bill they appear to refer to the electoral districts. It says : The boundaries may be the electoral districts, as described by this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is to be determined by the committee or the conference.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood from the Prime Minister that there were going to be some fixed boundaries.

The PRIME MINISTER. No boundaries are fixed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. County boundaries.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is what we propose the conference for. We intend that municipal boundaries should be observed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman used the words 'municipal boundaries.' That does not mean county boundaries.

The PRIME MINISTER. Municipal county boundaries.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then that is not in the Act. The hon. gentleman spoke of a schedule. Has he laid the schedule on the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. No; I stated that the schedule was in blank.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is to be made at the conference.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All right.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

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

Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.) I rise, Sir, for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the motion that you leave the Chair to go into Committee of Supply. I believe it is unnecessary for me to say

that in proposing this amendment I am not proposing it as an amendment of want of confidence, or as an unfriendly motion against the government. But, I avail of this opportunity to bring before the parliament of Canada a subject, in which I may be pardoned for saying, that I have always taken a very deep interest, and I think I am justified in stating that I intend to discuss a subject which is of great importance not only to this House and to this parliament; and not only to the people of Canada, but a subject which is to-day engaging the serious attention of the best minds of the empire. I beg to place in your hands, Mr. Speaker, the following amendment which I move, seconded by my hon. friend Mr. Hackett, of Prince County, P.E.I. :

That an humble address be presented to His Majesty as follows :—

We, Your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, desire most earnestly in our own name and on behalf of the people whom we represent to renew the expressions of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and government.

We would respectfully represent to Your Majesty that in 1882 the parliament of Canada adopted an humble address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen expressing the hope that a just measure of home rule would be granted to the people of Ireland, and that in the year 1886 by resolution of the House of Commons the sentiments of the said address to Her Most Gracious Majesty were earnestly reiterated and the hope again expressed that such a measure of home rule would be passed by the imperial parliament.

That the years that have elapsed since the adoption of the aforesaid address and resolution to Your Most Gracious Majesty's illustrious and ever-to-be-lamented predecessor have but served to emphasize the blessings which accrue to this Dominion from the federal system under which the people live, the benefits of which the Commons of Canada rejoice to see are about to be shared in by their fellow-subjects of the Australian Commonwealth, and therefore this extended experience which Your Most Gracious Majesty's subjects have had of the inestimable benefits resulting from the said government bestowed on the whole of British North America but intensifies their desire to affirm through their representatives in parliament the sentiments expressed in the said address and resolution with regard to the bestowal of self-government on Your Majesty's subjects in Ireland.

We have observed, may it please your Majesty, with feelings of profound satisfaction, the evidence afforded in the debate in the House of Commons of the United Kingdom on the Speech from the Throne, of a sincere desire on all sides to usher in a new era of lasting peace and good will in Ireland; and this House congratulates the people of the mother country on the legislation just and equitable, which it is believed will follow the recent conference on the land question and hopes for an early and lasting settlement fair to all of that long vexed and troublesome problem, the solution of which has for so long taxed the powers of British statesmen.

Mr. Speaker, twenty years is a considerable period in the life of a man. It is a considerable period in the life of a parliament ; and if we look back over the last twenty years since, on an occasion similar to this, I had the honour of moving a resolution, the first of its kind, inviting the parliament of Canada to express its sympathy with the people who ask for the blessings which are so highly appreciated by ourselves here, we can see the changes which have taken place and the progress which has been made in that time. We can see that the Canada which we were all so proud of then has made giant strides in the path of progress and prosperity ; we can see the advantages of that wise policy which has extended to this country, that measure of liberty which makes every Canadian proud to boast of his Canadianship ; and we can see that, to my mind, greater change of feeling which has taken place in Great Britain itself. We are all, I am sure, proud of that feeling, and I hope that to-day no word will escape my lips that might arouse recrimination or anything but the kindest spirit of harmony in this parliament as it is now maintained in the parliament of Great Britain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh. Rats.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Oh, I know where that comes from.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I merely notice those cries and slurs. If they please the hon. gentlemen who utter them, they do not hurt me ; I rise above them, I stand above them, and the Canadian people stand above them. The people of the empire stand above them. These old slurs, which did service in the years gone by, have no more power to-day. The intelligence of the people is what sways the people to-day, not these bugbears that are raised. What is there, Sir, to bring forth the cries of some hon. gentlemen who interrupt me when I make an honest appeal ?—and I have never made any but an honest appeal. What is there to justify the insinuation implied by these sneers, that I am not speaking the honest sentiments of my mind, from my own light and judgment ? I have never given any indication of anything else. Is it because twenty years ago I entertained the same warm feelings on this subject that I do to-day ? I am proud to say that those feelings, which were not then shared in so largely by the people, are to-day shared in by nearly the whole people. In all that time have I or have the men behind me, those descendants from the land of my forefathers shown any lack in the proper discharge of their duties as citizens of this country ? I say no. We have expressed our sympathy with the mother land ; but in expressing that sympathy from 1882 up to the present day, the men who sneer cannot point to an act on our part indicating any want of loyalty to the land in which we live or to the empire to which we belong. Then, let them sneer.

For one, I hope we shall have no more of that. I hope I may appeal to this House for a fair, calm hearing on a subject which I think well deserves the serious attention of the people of Canada to-day.

I may say, in advance, Mr. Speaker, that if I should drop one word that might fairly be construed to be offensive to any member of this House, or unworthy of the dignity of this parliament, I would feel that I was doing my cause an injury and committing an offence against the rules of propriety and the rules of this parliament. Sir, what is the object of the resolution which I have just placed in your hands ? Its object is that this parliament should give expression to the feelings of satisfaction which I know pervades every mind and heart at the bright prospects of the pacification of the empire, and the pacification of Ireland, which has had cause of complaint, as is admitted frankly and honestly by the British government to-day. But I understand, though it has not yet been said, that I am to be attacked because I couple the subject of home rule with that expression. It is said, Oh, these Irish will never be satisfied ; the government of Great Britain proposes to pledge $500,000,000 of its credit and to make a direct grant of $60,000,000 more, and still the people of Ireland are not content ; this member for Victoria is not willing to accept the settlement, but must rise and obtrude this question of home rule.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I suppose you do not mean me when you say the member for Victoria ?

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria, Ont.) Nor do I suppose the hon. member means the member for North Victoria, Ont. ?

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I mean the member for Victoria, N.B., I stand corrected. My reference to the former action of this parliament seems to me to be quite legitimate and easily understood. In 1882 a resolution not only suggesting that home rule might properly be extended to Ireland, but covering the release of the prisoners at that time, was introduced into this parliament. Evidently none of the gentlemen who appear to be unfriendly to my position to-day were in parliament at that time, or if they were, they did not vote against that proposition. The proposition was carried by the unanimous vote of the House of Commons and in the Senate it was carried with only six dissenting votes. In 1886 and 1887 similar resolutions were again introduced and received the generous support of this House. Let me say that I think it is unfair to jump at a conclusion and take such a different tone here from what is taken in England on this question. Why should it be any great offence to make in this parliament a reference to its action in past years, in 1882, 1886 and 1887, in favour of home rule ? At)these different periods parliament was asked to express its sympathy with home rule, and asked on what ground ? On the ground that we were a portion of the British Empire and had been given the privilege of self-government, and having had the experience of its happy operation and good effects in this country, we thought that we might very reasonably ask this House to express its opinion that what worked so well in this country might well be tried as an experiment in Ireland, and this House generously responded to the appeal. Parliament took that view—a very fair and moderate view—and so expressed itself on several occasions. I am simply asking the House to reiterate the expression of parliament on those occasions. With reference to the land question and the bright prospects of the settlement of that question, had I the eloquence of a Gratton or a McGee, I would use it to praise the generous spirit in which the British government have come forward to-day to grapple with this problem and settle it. I have no desire to cavil or to minimize the liberality of the British government as shown in this broad measure which, as far as can be seen at present, involves $500,000,000 of its credit and $60,000,000 of a bonus to bring about a peaceful settlement of the land question in Ireland. I am moved by as deep gratitude to the government which has introduced that measure of reconciliation as any man in or out of this parliament.

Why should the mention of home rule be a bugbear ? Has it grown so obnoxious in this country or the motherland as to justify any hostility or opposition to the mention of or any reference to it here to-day ? Certainly not. Why, the question of home rule is to-day an imperial question. It has assumed broader proportions than ever before. The best English minds to-day are engaged on it. They say that they are not going to confine their attention to Ireland alone but will give home rule to Scotland, England and Wales as well, and I am proud to know that the experience of Canada is the great object lesson cited to show the desirability of granting local self government to the different portions of the United Kingdom. I shall quote in a few minutes the words of a prominent English statesman who is in favour of home rule all around. Our parliament, the British parliament, he says, is overburdened with legislation that should not belong to it. Its time is so much taken up with local affairs, that it is unable to properly deal with matters of imperial concern. What is the remedy ? There is but one and that will be found on Canadian lines. Just think of it, Mr. Speaker, the men in the empire to-day who are conducting the business of the United Kingdom, who are considering the changes that require to be made in the British government system—these men say you must provide for Scotch affairs being settled in Scotland by a local parliament, for Irish affairs being settled in Ireland by a local parliament, and English affairs by an English local parliament, and

Welsh business, if necessary, by a Welsh parliament, thus relieving the great imperial parliament of those burdensome subjects which could be much better passed upon and disposed of by local bodies, thus enabling the great central body to deal with the problems that affect the empire at large. Just imagine in what a position this Dominion of Canada—a young giant, surprising the world by its rapid progress—would be if all our local legislatures were swept away and if all the local questions now dealt with by these bodies had to be settled by this parliament? Why, we would then find it impossible to deal with Dominion matters at all. If such a condition of things would be the result here, what must be the condition of that parliament which has to regulate the affairs of the greatest empire in the world? Let me just read a note which I received a few days ago and which justifies me in saying that the question of home rule is not a bugbear any longer either here or in England, Ireland, Scotland or Wales. I have a letter dated March 15, 1903, and written by the Hon. T. S. Brassey:

> Dear Sir,—I observe in to-day's paper, the Daily 'Chronicle,' that you intend to raise the question of home rule in the Canadian parliament. You may, therefore, be interested to hear that there is a movement on this side going forward, the object of which is to educate public opinion to the view that the settlement of the great question of home rule is to be found on Canadian lines. I inclose a leaflet giving an article and speeches on the subject and an account of the work done.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> T. S. BRASSEY.

What is the work done over there? Let me quote from a sheet published by a regularly organized committee in England:

> At present the English, Irish and Welsh members have all to be consulted on Scottish affairs, about which they know and care nothing.
>
> If Scotland wishes a reform of the land laws or the liquor laws, or any other laws, it must be submitted to the English voter, who knows little and cares less about the people and condition of affairs about which he is voting.
>
> If Edinburgh wants to get a new water supply; if Glasgow wants to license its newspaper boys; if a little railway is going to be constructed in the Highlands, the matter cannot be settled in Scotland. It has to be decided on by the parliament in London, at tremendous cost of money and trouble to the Scottish people, and the frightful waste of time of parliament.
>
> There is so much to be done that very little is done. Many laws which every one agrees should be passed are not passed because there is no time to consider them. How can we get out of this mess? There is only one way, and that is the way proposed by the Liberals: Scottish affairs should be managed in Scotland; English affairs should be managed in England; Irish affairs should be managed in Ireland; Welsh affairs should be managed in Wales.

I could give other quotations if I were not afraid of taking up too much of the time of the House, from the speeches of Mr. Brassey made at several meetings under the auspices of this committee, which was organized for the purpose of educating public opinion in the mother country in favour of the policy of giving home rule all around. And they pay us the compliment of saying that the system of government for the old country must be upon Canadian lines. I say that that is a great compliment to the Canadian people; it is an acknowledgment of the freedom of Canada, than which no country in the world enjoys more. It is a justification of our pride in our system that the leading men of the imperial parliament from which we take example, declare: We have reached the stage when imperial legislation is blocked, when the hands of the British parliament are tied, when it is impossible to do justice to great questions of imperial policy, when a solution must be found and we believe that that solution lies in following the precedent set by Canada.

I dare say it will be said by some: We all hold up our hands in favour of the settlement of the land question, but you should not couple home rule with that question. I believe that a time will come when the parliament of Great Britain will give its sanction to home rule. But even after home rule has become the law of the land, when it has been enacted by parliament and assented to by His Majesty, when it is put forward as the law of the empire, there will still be found croakers to question its expediency and justice. That is but natural. I have no fault to find with any gentleman who expresses an opinion simply because his opinion does not agree with mine. But, while I take that position, I believe that the arguments of those who hold views against home rule should not prevail against the reception of this resolution which I hold to be a very moderate one. It cannot be condemned on the ground that it calls upon the British parliament to suspend its action upon the Land Bill and press forward at once a home rule Bill. There is no such demand here. There is no command in this to the British parliament. There is simply a reiteration of the declaration made by this House in favour of home rule as approved by Canadian experience. I hope to see the land question settled and settled this session. But Ireland, through its leading men, through its press, through its sons all over the world, is showing to-day its appreciation of the olive branch that is held out. The people of Ireland show their appreciation of the change of policy from coercion to conciliation. And we also delight in the changed attitude of the British government upon that subject. We believe—all free men believe—that legitimate conciliation is more powerful than coercion can be. Therefore, when I say that I rise in sympathy with the movement in favour of a measure of relief for Ireland and the settlement of the land question, I am moved by the belief not only that that movement is best in the interest of Ireland,

but that it is best in the interest of the empire. While we view with admiration the generosity, the wise generosity, of England towards the conquered people of South Africa in voting money and doing everything else to establish peace and harmony there, to reconcile those people to English rule and make them loyal citizens of the empire, do you think we can feel less sympathy for that generous policy when it is extended to the people of Ireland? No people in the world can be more grateful than the Irish people can be, and will be for this new policy in Ireland; but not even Ireland will reap more benefit from that conciliation than will the empire itself broadly considered. I do not minimize the importance of gaining the good will of the people of South Africa now that they have been conquered, but I do say—and I hope I am not saying too much or going too far—that to reconcile the Irish people and satisfy their reasonable aspirations is as greatly in the interest of the empire as is the conciliation of the people of South Africa. I do not criticise that liberal policy or haggle over its details as applied to any other country, when I say that I am delighted to see the extension of a liberal policy to the people of Ireland.

I think I ought to mention here that, as it has been known generally that I would move a resolution on this subject during this session, I have received communications from different parts of Canada all in favour of the attitude I have taken. Not one single letter, not one word of advice have I received to the contrary. I may be permitted to read the list of the most prominent bodies that have sent forward resolutions:

No. 1 Division, A. O. H., Hochelaga.
County Board, A. O. H., Hochelaga.
County Board, A. O. H., Elgin County, Ont.
Quebec Branch United Irish League, Quebec.
Division No. 1, A. O. H., Quebec.
Division No. 1, A. O. H., Ottawa.
Division No. 6, A. O. H., Douglastown, N.B.
Division No. 2, A. O. H., Carleton County, Ont.
County Board, A. O. H., Carleton, Ont.
Ottawa Branch United Irish League, Ottawa.
No. 1 Division, A. O. H., Toronto.
Central Branch United Irish League, Montreal.
St. Patrick's T. A. & B. Society, Montreal.
Arnprior Branch U. I. L., Arnprior.
St. Bridget's Court, C. O. F., Ottawa.
St. Patrick's Society, Montreal.
Young Irishmen's L. & B. Ass., Montreal.

There are many others, and I have also received letters innumerable upon this subject.

I hope that, in view of the fact that I seldom claim much of the time of the House, allowance will be made, even by those hon. gentlemen who do not feel as I do upon this subject, and that I shall be excused for taking up the time of the House upon this occasion. For, as one of the oldest members here, I think hon. members will bear me out in saying that I have not imposed myself unduly upon the attention of the House. I may add this too, as an old man, that if I have any feeling of pride or consolation at this time of life, it is that I can look around upon both sides of the House and say to hon. gentlemen: Whatever our differences have been, can you point out a single instance when I intentionally showed discourtesy to any member of this House? It is a great satisfaction to me that I can claim that position. I do not seek honour or promotion; I am not so selfish as many people sometimes think I am. I have been accused a good deal in that way, but I think that I can satisfy any hon. gentleman who will sit down to a quiet conversation with me, that I am about as disinterested a person as can be found in this parliament. But I have pretty strong convictions, I am firm in my convictions; still, I can appeal to the House whether I have ever been offensive in the proper discharge of my duties and the proper support of the principles in which I believe. I think I have always shown a readiness to meet my fellow members on equal terms, and accord them the same rights which I claim for myself.

We all know what the position of the poor Irish has been for years, indeed I may say for centuries, but to-day that term no longer applies. To-day, to repeat a saying which may sometimes be heard in convivial gatherings, 'there is nothing too good for the Irish.' I think that sentiment is becoming true. But that was not always the case, and I am sure that no one in this Chamber will regret that the contrary condition is passing away. It is a great gratification to every man of Irish origin that this great change has come about. We know that for a long time the prejudices of the whole world were against our race. The policy was to educate the world in prejudice against us. History slandered the Irish, the theatres slandered the Irish character. We know that it has always been admitted that the Irish excel in natural wit; but how often has that feature of the Irish character been misrepresented in vulgar and unworthy caricatures, instead of reproducing the genuine brilliant wit that every man admits is natural to the Irishman.

Ireland was never a land of ignorance. Ireland can claim a history in progress and civilization second to no other nation. Let me quote a few words on this point from the Honourable Colin Lindsay, a leading English historian, who, in well measured words, bears testimony to the high degree of civilization in Ireland. Speaking of the period when the Normans came there he said:

Before England was born into the family of nations, Ireland was an autonomy, recognized as such by contemporary races. When Albion was inhabited by a barbarous and savage people, Ireland was in the height of prosperity. When Anglo-Saxons were tearing each other to pieces, Ireland was possessed of a settled government, and administered by wise laws, so ancient that no one knew precisely the period of their first promulgation. When this country

(England) was remarkable for its ignorance, Ireland was celebrated for her culture and civilization. When St. Augustine was preaching to the heathen, when Ethelbert was receiving baptism, when Alfred was a wanderer, Ireland was sending forth her missionaries all over the world, spreading everywhere the gospel and civilization. When the foundations of the universities of Cambridge and Oxford were laid, the colleges of Ireland had long been flourishing seats of learning, imparting to all who came to her schools knowledge and truth. Ireland can assert what no other existing kingdom or state can say: That the history is lost in the mazes of antiquity and that her era of barbarism belongs to pre-historic times.

Therefore I say that we feel a great relief in viewing present conditions ; we have reason to feel a great deal of consolation in finding that public opinion, not only in Canada, but throughout the empire, has changed. We see to-day in that great parliament of Great Britain, men who, a few days ago, were sneered at, as some hon. gentlemen would sneer at me because of my sympathy with this question—we see the Irish parliamentary party, once represented as a set of demagogues living upon the charity and subscriptions of poor people, to-day taking their rightful place in the esteem and consideration of that great parliament. There is one thing that the Canadian people ought not to forget. They ought to all feel proud of the system of government established in this free country, they ought to feel proud that the doors of this parliament are open to any man who possesses the confidence of his fellow citizens, even though he has not a dollar in his pocket. The condition of things in the old country was different. On account of the great wealth of that country, the representation fell naturally into the hands of wealthy men who could afford to give their entire time without any remuneration to meet even their current expenses. It was felt that the men who were going there to fight the battles of their country ought to receive some aid to enable them to meet their expenses. The money they received for that purpose was a free donation. Well, I say these men were slandered. By whom? They were slandered the world over by those who did not agree with their views. What do we find to-day ? We find the government of Great Britain holding out the hand of conciliation, of peace and welcome to those very men who were formerly regarded with aversion. To-day we find the Irish parliamentary representatives treated as they ought to be treated, as men standing on an equal footing with every other member of that great parliament. This change shows the present tendency of public opinion in the empire towards that great reform which recognizes the people at their true worth, that reform which proposes to extend to the people the fullest measure of control of their own public affairs and their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I could quote other authorities besides the one I have given, besides that letter of Mr. Brassey and the extract from the historian Lindsay. Let me refer to a Canadian paper, the Toronto 'News,' and in its issue of the 28th of March what does it say ? It does not seem to be scared about the bugbear of mentioning home rule. One would imagine that there had been a secret compact made some where that there has been some hole and corner understanding. If you Irish only keep quiet we are going to do a big thing with the land question, but you must keep quiet and not say a word about home rule at all. We will blind the other fellows and they will not know what is going on. If you do not say anything about home rule at all the other fellows will be willing to support the deal. I do not believe there is any such hole and corner business about the question at all. I thing this is a broad policy and that it should be treated in that light. This article, published in the Toronto 'News,' says :

HOME RULE IS COMING.

The second and salient fact—

In speaking about the Land Bill—

—is that even Mr. Wyndham, though expressly declaring that he spoke only for himself, foreshadows Irish self-government, and sees the desirability of the creation of an Irish representative authority with real responsibility for and the permanent interest in a successful working of the measure.

Mr. CLARKE. That is an Irish Committee for the administration of the land law.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not differ with that at all. I do not think it is necessary to make any argument in favour of home rule. This is not the time. My argument has not been one in which I thought it necessary to establish the claim of the people of Ireland to home rule. I have been trying to give reasons why I was justified in bringing this resolution forward and congratulating the English people upon the evidence of progress towards the settlement of the land question, and still keeping consistent with our expressions of opinion heretofore in favour of a measure of home rule. We do not dictate that measure; we do not say what the extent of it shall be. That is a thing to be worked out practically by the people of England with the approval of the people of Ireland. The question of home rule is not dropped at all. As to the extent of the measure we do not attempt to decide that any more than we attempt to deal with the financial aspect of the land bill itself. They are dealing with that and we hope satisfactorily. The prospect looks bright and I am sure that every Canadian, whatever his feelings may be in regard to Ireland itself and home rule, will

rejoice at a settlement which will be in the interests of the empire. Now, I will not trespass upon the time of the House any longer. There are other hon. gentlemen who will follow me on both sides. I would have expressed the hope that there might have been a unanimous vote upon this question but I may not be justified in anticipating that favourable result. However, I will conclude by asking the House to give this matter, fair, honest consideration, not to allow any side issues, not to allow any unreasonable arguments to sway hon. gentlemen in expressing their opinions upon this, what I call, reasonable proposition that they are asked to give their opinion on. Mr. Speaker, I leave the question in the hands of the House feeling confident that the Canadian parliament will not go back upon the record it made in 1882, in 1886 and in 1887.

Mr. E. HACKETT (Prince West). Mr. Speaker, about one hour ago I was told that I would be called upon to second the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Victoria, N. B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan). I regret that I did not know this at an earlier date, in order that I might have been prepared to speak upon such an important question. However, I will do the best I possibly can under the circumstances. I am in favour of home rule for Ireland. I believe that constitutionally the parliament of Canada has the right to pass a resolution of this kind advising the imperial government as to the wishes of the people of Canada and thereby strengthening the hands of the statesmen in the mother country. Last year, in my opinion, a resolution of this kind should have been introduced into this House. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution this evening informed me at an early period of last session that he intended to introduce a resolution similar to those he introduced in former years, but the session passed and nothing was done in that connection. I believe that last year, when the conference of the premiers of the empire met in London to discuss matters affecting the different colonies, was the time when the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should have had in his hands a resolution passed by this House in favour of home rule for Ireland, but the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Costigan) for some reason known to himself, did not think proper to bring forward this resolution. On this occasion he says that he brings it forward in no unfriendly spirit to the government. I say that is not the proper manner in which to approach an important question like this which affects the people of the whole empire. The question of home rule for Ireland is above all considerations of whether the government be friendly or unfriendly. If the government to-day desire to vote this resolution down let them vote it down; but Sir, I challenge the government to-day to vote against this resolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HACKETT. Has it come to this point at last: That this great question; this cause of home rule so dear to the hearts of Irishmen all over the world, is to be made a football to be kicked at by designing politicians for their own personal advantages and for party purposes. Sir, I have been a member of this House of Commons for a number of years. In 1882 when the home rule resolution was introduced by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Costigan) it received the support of the Liberal-Conservative party in the House, and the resolution was forwarded through the proper channels to the authorities in Great Britain. Again in 1884 I had the honour of voting for a similar resolution, and Sir John Macdonald, who was the highest constitutional authority, said that the parliament of Canada had a right to pass such a resolution and he again forwarded the resolution to England. In 1886 and 1887 the same thing was done. I am a Conservative now; I was a Conservative in 1882; I have not changed like some other people; I am a Conservative still and I stand here thankful to the old Conservative party that forwarded this resolution in favour of home rule for Ireland to England in 1882, 1884, 1886 and 1887, and had it placed at the foot of the Throne.

Sir, this question is too dear to the hearts of the Irish people to be bandied about in any way. What does it mean? It means autonomy for Ireland, and when in 1886 Mr. Gladstone received this resolution from the Canadian parliament, that great statesman declared in the imperial House of Commons:

> The most important declaration, the most important message that ever crossed the Atlantic is the voice of the Canadian parliament in favour of home rule for Ireland.

Mr. Gladstone therefore constitutionally favoured the passage of this resolution. Home rule means self-government for Ireland. We in Canada who enjoy every freedom; we who have perfect autonomy in our government; we above all others should wish to see the same measure of liberty accorded to our fellow-citizens in that other portion of the British empire, which is the native land of the forefathers of many of us. Home rule means self-government; it means autonomy; it means a parliament selected by the Irish people sitting in Dublin to legislate on and administer Irish affairs. I claim, Sir, that we in this parliament have a right to pass this resolution in order to strengthen the hands of the men who are fighting the battle of home rule for Ireland. Now, Sir, there were three essential points in the Home Rule Bill introduced by Mr. Gladstone—there were five that he claimed to be essential, but there were three which I believe to be absolutely essential. The first was the unity of the empire. I believe, Sir, that the granting

of home rule to Ireland would mean a closer union of the empire and greater unity and greater strength in the empire. We know that when any part of the empire suffers under a grievance and is in distress and trouble, and is discontented with its political condition, there cannot be the same sympathy or the same support from that part of the empire as there would be if the people were happy and contented. As my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Costigan) has said, the Irishman is denied that liberty at home which he enjoys in other parts of the empire. That seems illogical, but it is nevertheless the fact. We know, Sir, that the Irishman is always ready at the sound of the bugle to take up arms and fight valiantly under the old flag for the advancement of imperial interests. All over the world wherever the British flag waves may be found the bleached bones of Irishmen who died in defence of the British empire. To have a really united empire, and in order to have the sympathy and support of the people of Ireland, this measure of home rule is absolutely necessary. When home rule is conceded there will be added to the strength of Britain the noblest force that can be rallied to the support of any empire.

Another point that Mr. Gladstone spoke about was political equality, and he contended that if home rule were granted political equality would follow. That is a very important point. What is the meaning of political equality ? There is no man who can speak more feelingly on that question than an Irish Roman Catholic. It means that the Protestant of the North and the Catholic of the South shall have the same political rights under the constitution. For centuries the Catholics of Ireland were denied the right of the franchise. Through the efforts of Daniel O'Connell, ably supported by Canning, Wilberforce, Macaulay and other great statesmen of that date, the manacles were stricken from the wrists of the Catholics and to-day Catholics have the same franchise as their Protestant fellow-countrymen. That was the political equality for which O'Connell fought and won. Although it takes people of different classes and different religions to make up a great nation, we must remember that although we are Catholics and Protestants and do not kneel at the same altar, yet we adore the same God and we should have the same feelings of charity and respect for each other. Another point which Mr. Gladstone emphasized was that home rule would be a measure of protection for minorities. There is no doubt that some of our friends in this House, coming from the north of Ireland, do feel that the province of Ulster might not be properly protected under home rule. But let me point out to them that the Catholics of Ireland have never abused their privilege of equality of franchise and have never deprived their Protestant fellow-citizens of one iota of the rights which they enjoyed before Catholic Emancipation. In our discussion of Irish home rule to-day we should not forget the important land measure recently introduced in the imperial House of Commons by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. For many centuries the Irish people have suffered from the oppression of absentee landlords and extortionate agents. To-day there is a measure before the imperial parliament with the object of doing justice to the tenantry of Ireland. Coming as I do from a province of Canada where for a hundred years or more the people suffered as the Irish people did, from absentee landlords, I can speak feelingly on this question. At the time of confederation a measure was introduced in the Prince Edward Island legislature which afterwards received the assent of the Dominion government, allowing the tenantry of my province to buy from the landlords their right in the land. That measure proved to be a most successful one, and the men who fifty years ago were tenants in Prince Edward Island, are to-day enjoying the blessings of free men and are contented owners of their own holdings. When Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister he sent to the government of Prince Edward Island for a copy of the Act passed at that time, and from what I can gather from recent despatches, it would seem that the land measure introduced by Mr. Wyndham is based on the lines of the Prince Edward Island Act. Well, Sir, if the Irish Land Bill is properly carried into effect, I believe that it will be as great a relief to the people of Ireland as our Land Act was to the people of Prince Edward Island.

As I said at the outset, Sir, I was not prepared to make a speech on this occasion. These few ideas occurred to me as I went along. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Costigan) has gone so fully into the question, that it is unnecessary for me to take up further the time of the House. The descendant of an Irishman, as I am, who learned the traditions of the old land in my very youth, although I have never viewed her green fields or rippling streams, I still have a reverence and respect for that old land; that land of heroes and martyrs; that land that has struggled so long for liberty. Her sons and daughters, the sturdy race of Erin, are scattered the world over like autumn leaves before the winter's blast ; strangers in the land of their nativity but princes and lords in every other land where merit is the measure of the man. I hope, Sir, that this resolution will pass unanimously, or if not unanimously, as near to unanimity as is possible in a parliament constituted such as this is.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of combatting the views presented by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) in moving this motion or the views presented by the hon. member for West Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Hackett) in seconding it. I can concur

most heartily with many of the statements made by both of these hon. gentlemen. I believe, and I have no doubt that belief is shared in by every member of this House, that the Irish people are a noble and a generous race. I believe there have been in Ireland in the past abuses which required to be remedied, that there have been grievances of which the Irish people had just cause to complain. I have the warmest feelings and the best good wishes towards the Irish people; I wish them prosperity and the removal of all the grievances and burdens which rest upon them. But, Sir, I am impressed with the belief also that the removal of those grievances, so far as political action is concerned, must come from the government that exercises sway and control over Ireland. My hon. friend from Victoria, in the course of his speech, informed us that this is an imperial question. I quite concur with him in that statement; and as it is an imperial question, it is not one in my opinion for colonial interference; and for that reason, admitting all that may be claimed for home rule, admitting, as I do, that some system of home rule and local self-government for the four Kingdoms might be advantageous, I still take the position that this is a question with which we have nothing to do, and which this Canadian House of Commons ought not to pass upon. The resolution passed in 1882, to which my hon. friend from Victoria refers, was in due course transmitted to the imperial authorities. In due course also we received a reply to that address. It is unnecessary to recount the terms of that address, or to take up the time of the House by reading it. It was simply an expression of the opinion of the Canadian House of Commons that Ireland was entitled to a just measure of home rule. It passed the House on the 20th April, 1882, and was transmitted early in May to the imperial authorities. On the 12th of June of the same year the following reply was transmitted by the Earl of Kimberley to the Marquis of Lorne, Governor General of Canada:

> My Lord,—I have received and laid before the Queen the address to Her Majesty from the Senate and House of Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, which was transmitted in your Lordship's dispatch of the 16th May. I am commanded by Her Majesty to request that you will convey to the Senate and House of Commons her appreciation of the renewed expression of their unswerving loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty's person and government. Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs; but with respect to the question referred to in the address, Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the imperial parliament and ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain.

Now, this was an answer which we would be entitled to receive again if the resolution which my hon. friend has tabled should pass this House. It was an answer amounting to an intimation to the parliament of Canada that we had been guilty of an impertinence and had meddled with matters that were not within our province, and did not belong to us to express an opinion upon in an official manner, that opinion being for transmission to the imperial government. A similar motion passed again in 1886, and again in 1887. The motion passed in 1886 was transmitted in a somewhat different form from that passed in 1882. It was sent to the Canadian High Commissioner for the information of the members of the British House of Commons. Whether the members of the British House of Commons profited materially from that source of information I have not been informed. In 1887 the Curran motion was passed. In 1889, Mr. Cook, then a member of this House, who had given notice of a motion upon going into Supply, on the 11th of April moved that motion, and it was lost. In 1892 we had a motion introduced by Mr. Devlin substantially on the lines of the present motion of my hon. friend. We had an amendment to that motion, moved by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. D. Tisdale), the purport of which was that the motion was not called for. We had an amendment to the amendment, introduced by Mr. McCarthy, which asserted that the motion was undesirable, that the wisdom of our course in 1882 and in 1886 was doubtful, and that the motion should not pass. A debate arose on these amendments; the debate was adjourned; it was never resumed; and that closed the action of the House of Commons on the question of home rule up to the present date, from 1882 to 1903. Now, the renewal of the question after the lapse of eleven years I think it would be difficult to show cause for. In the meantime the condition of Ireland has improved; great exertions have been made by the imperial government, not only to remove causes of complaint, but to go beyond that, and to deal with the utmost generosity with the Irish people. In the meantime, the sensitiveness of the British government about colonial interference has remained; and while there is infinitely less cause for this expression of opinion on the part of this House of Commons to-day than there was in 1886, there is the same objection to impertinent interference with something that does not belong to us. Since then we had the Gladstone Bill, a Bill framed for the benefit of the tenant, a Bill which gave Ireland exceptional treatment, which gave its peasant class favours which were not enjoyed by that class in any other of the four Kingdoms. We have now pending the Wyndham Bill, a measure so comprehensive, so far-reaching, and involving such an extent of self-sacrifice on the part of the British taxpayer, that one stands astounded at the courage and the generosity of the government that has introduced it.

That Bill proposes to give a bonus of from $60,000,000, to $75,000,000 for the settlement of the land question, and admits to participation in the benefits which it will confer on the tenant class, even evicted tenants, comprising all who have been tenants in the past twenty-five years. It puts upon the British government the assumption of liabilities amounting to more than $500,000,000. All this is done to pacify Ireland by removing causes of complaint. All this is done in a spirit of the utmost generosity and good will. Under these circumstances, what reason exists for the introduction of this motion? What reason exists for demanding in addition home rule for Ireland? Are we convinced that home rule would be a blessing? Is there any reason for giving to Ireland exceptional treatment as regards the institutions of the country? Is Ireland entitled to home rule and Scotland, Wales and England not entitled to it? Is there any reason for presenting in this House a motion asking exceptional treatment for the one country and leaving out the three others from participation in any of the benefits to accrue from the adoption of the federal principle? The time may come when home rule may be adopted in Great Britain. If that time ever does comes, it will be home rule, impartial in its application and applicable to the three other divisions, and not to Ireland alone.

Now, the home rule agitation has been looked upon, I apprehend, by the British authorities with some degree of suspicion. The agitators for home rule could with difficulty, I believe, give conclusive proof of their entire loyalty and devotion to British institutions. The British authorities were justified in entertaining some doubt as to whether a portion of the kingdom, with an autonomy of its own, with power of its own, the leaders and population of which express disloyalty to the nation which granted these privileges, would not be a source of danger, and so naturally there was some hesitation, and Ireland has been herself to blame, to a large extent, perhaps for the withholding of some concessions which were demanded. But whether that were the case or not, and whether it was wise, whether it would be wise for England to give to Ireland the home rule demanded or not, is a question on which we can exercise our individual opinions, but on which we are not entitled to thrust our opinions, as a government or as a parliament, on the British government, because that is beyond our province. I have the same sympathy for Ireland that I have always had, and that is a warm active degree of sympathy. This degree of sympathy led me to vote for the Curran resolution in 1887. Perhaps I had no reflection—I know I had not reflected at that time upon the constitutional significance of the Act—and I was governed by my feelings with regard to a generous people who had my thorough and entire sympathy then as they have to-day. Anything that can be done for Ireland I am willing to do. Anything that lies within the control of this House to do, I hold up my hand for. But I cannot on this occasion repeat the mistake of 1887 and vote for a resolution which is beyond the province and powers of this parliament, which can do no good and which would be received by the imperial government as an impertinence. It is not proper to refer to a past debate, but I have the right to refer to past actions of the government, and I refer to its action yesterday which bears out my contention in this regard, when papers were refused upon a motion by an hon. member of this House bearing upon imperial actions and interests, upon the ground that they concerned matters which were beyond the jurisdiction of this parliament. I think that the position taken was a correct one, and that the same position should debar us from accepting the motion of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan).

There are a good many phases to this Irish question. There is a large Irish population in this country and in the United States. In the United States, almost as long ago as I can remember, the prejudices of Irishmen against Great Britain were the stalking horse of unscrupulous politicians, and the Yankee demagogue twisted the tail of the British lion in order to secure the sympathy and support of Irish voters. In ninety-nine out of one hundred cases, the most effective of all appeals were these appeals concerning the wrongs which Ireland had suffered at the hands of the British government. I do not know whether the same spirit exists in Canada. I do not know whether the same methods and motives would have the same force here. I do not know whether appeals to the Irish vote may happen to be concealed beneath the assumed reasons which induced the hon. gentleman to take the course he has taken in introducing this resolution. Perhaps it may be possible that on rare occasions the idea may flash through his mind incidentally that there are a number of Irish voters in his riding and that he will stand better with them by taking this course. I do not know but that might be the case with myself. I have a good many Irish voters in my constituency—several hundred of them—but I think as a rule they are men with sufficient degree of intelligence to accept the situation and to realize that the passing of this motion for home rule is an act which exceeds our power as a parliament, and is a course of conduct which is not advisable, and I am confident that it will not receive their sanction and support.

We have a good deal of business here to attend to and we do not need to attend to the business of our neighbours, especially when they inform us that they do not want us to attend to it and will resent our inter-

ference. We have half a continent to lick into shape. We have almost unmeasured resources which, when developed to their full capacity, will provide ample scope for a population of one hundred million souls. We have transportation to provide for the great region of the North-west—one of the most gigantic problems that ever confronted any government. We have a great immigration pouring into the country from the United States and from Europe. We have heard the low wash of the waves for years past, which will soon be followed by the rushing in of a vast human sea. All these problems have to be met, emergencies have to be provided against, the foundations of an empire have to be laid and the superstructure erected. This enormous task is on our hands, and we can afford to let Great Britain do her own business without our interference. If England chooses to give home rule to Ireland or to refuse to grant Ireland home rule, we are not in a position to discuss her policy. It is not our business to do so. Besides if we take the course which my hon. friend proposes, we shall establish a precedent that may re-act upon us. If we are entitled to formulate and solemnly pass a resolution advising and informing Great Britain what in certain cases and under certain circumstances she should do, what is there to prevent the parliament of Great Britain acting upon that precedent and passing resolutions informing us what we had better do? What is to prevent the parliament of Great Britain acting upon the precedent that we have created passing resolutions informing us what we had better do?—telling us that we had better get ready to come into an imperial federation, for instance, and have an organic union and a parliament at Westminster to control the affairs of the British colonies? Such a resolution could be passed by the parliament of Great Britain with just as much propriety, with just as much reason, with just as good a foundation of sound constitutional principle as the motion proposed by my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Costigan). Suppose that the British parliament should pass a resolution with regard to an imperial Zollverein, and inform us that, in their opinion the time had come for us to fall into line and have universal free trade and a Zollverein for the British empire? Suppose they should undertake to inform us of our duty in regard to an imperial preference, its limits and the scope of its operation? Suppose they should inform us that they have taken care of us long enough, that we have profited by their generosity and fostering care, that they have given us naval protection and military protection, and that now we must become partners and participants in a scheme of imperial defence, paying our quota of taxation? Suppose they should take it into their heads, as we are in danger of taking it into ours, that they could give advice outside their sphere with regard to the political, social, and ethnic conditions in this country? Suppose they should tell us: You have had the dual language in your deliberations and in the publication of your laws about long enough; it is time that you had a more thorough system of assimilation, time that the French race was absorbed? They have as much right to make that suggestion as we have to make suggestions about home rule for Ireland. And we would resent it in the same way that they will resent the suggestion that my hon. friend proposes to make. Suppose they should make a suggestion about any question of our domestic policy? In these things we have, and expect to maintain, autonomy, as all the self-governing independent colonies do. We do not expect to permit any interference with that autonomy, and we will resent any such interference. That being so, we had better refrain from a precedent that may give colour to the assumption on the part of British statesmen that they have right to interfere with us.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we must carefully preserve our autonomy. We are building up a nation, we have the material to build it with, and we must have a free hand in the job. And, as I said before, it is business enough for us, without attending to England's business in Ireland. We must scrupulously respect the rights of Great Britain to manage her imperial affairs in any of her colonies and in all the realms of Ireland, Scotland, England and Wales. This resolution enters upon a field of action where we have no place, where we are interlopers, where we are not welcome and had better not intrude. As I have said, it would furnish a precedent for interference with us; and the prudent and proper course, I would say in conclusion, is to refuse our concurrence with this resolution.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Before recess I rose to say a few words on the motion now before the Chair. I understand that the question introduced by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) is not new to this House, although it is new to me. I think it is to be regretted that every session of this parliament resolutions are introduced into this House that do not concern the people of Canada. It is my opinion that the people of Canada have enough trouble and difficulties of their own to settle, without dragging the affairs of Great Britain and Ireland into this House. The people of Ireland have less grievances than the people in many other places. The English church has been disestablished, courts of arbitration have been formed for the settlement of all disputes between land-

lords and tenants. Now a land purchase Bill is before the British parliament which, if it is carried, it is estimated will cost the British people over $400,000,000. Still, we have hon. gentlemen getting up in this House and saying that the British government is doing nothing for the Irish people, and asking this government to pass resolutions in their favour. Perhaps hon. gentlemen are not aware, when pressing these buncombe resolutions, how much they cost this country, or how much they cost the Dominion treasury. I do not think they realize, nor do their constituents realize, that every minute of time wasted in this House costs the country the sum of $28. The hon. member for Victoria is not the only sinner in this respect. If I remember right, last session the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) introduced a resolution that the House took all day to discuss, and it was just about as relevant as the one we heard this afternoon ; consequently you see the sinners are not all on this side of the House. Now if it costs $28 a minute, some of you can reckon how much that resolution was worth. Now I have not one word to say against the Irish people, nor against what the English people are doing for the Irish. I know they are a warm-hearted, industrious people. Many of them are my neighbours, and there are no better people under heaven than some of the Irish people. At the same time, when they want to get justice they must go the right way about it ; and every Irishman in Canada will get justice, no doubt about that. I told a story once in this House, I do not know whether it would be advisable to tell one now or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Well, some months ago I happened to be in the neighbouring state of Maine. I went into a post office to buy some stamps and envelopes, as I wanted to send some letters and papers to Canada, and the young lady from whom I was purchasing was as handsome as any of the Canadian girls. I suppose she was an American. She was surprised when she learned that my letters and papers were going to Canada. She said 'Surely you are not a Canadian ?' I said, 'Oui, mademoiselle.' and she rather doubted it then, she could not believe that I was a Canadian. She said, 'You don't speak like a Canadian.' 'Well,' I said, 'you must not say too much about the Canadian people, perhaps some of you young ladies will want to form alliances with the Canadian people.' 'Oh, for pity's sake don't say that, we don't want to marry any of those Canadians, we don't like them.' 'Why,' she says, 'I would rather a thousand times marry an Irishman.' 'Well,' I said, 'I am not surprised at that.' 'You are not surprised at it ?' 'No, indeed,' I said. 'You remember Samuel Lover said that an Irishman is always in one of three things. He is always either in love, in liquor or in a row. But in this state of Maine it is not possible, under the law, for an Irishman to get liquor, and if he cannot get liquor he is not likely to get into a row ; consequently he must always be in love. So you young American ladies can never resist the advances made by a warm-hearted and enthusiastic Irishman.' So I come to the conclusion that is the reason why there are so many O'Donohue's and O'Flaherty's and so on in that country. You know statistics say that one half of the people of the state of Maine were born in Canada. Now, Sir, I just want to say that the Irish people can take care of themselves, I think, both in Ireland and in this country ; and I am sure that the English people are doing everything possible for them at the present time.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Naturally, I had some curiosity before speaking to know what position the government would take on this question, because, it being an amendment to a motion to go into Supply, it would be regarded under ordinary circumstances as a motion of want of confidence. But the government have not given any intimation of what they are going to do about it. If it was a motion regarding the embargo on cattle, of course they would regard is as a motion of want of confidence as they did a day or two ago. Are they going to place the Irish in the same position ? So far they have not given us any intimation of what they will do. I do not propose to talk at great length on this question, because I imagine no good purpose would be served by so doing. I wish to say a few words with regard to the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Costigan), who introduced this question. He told the House that twenty years ago he had introduced a similar resolution, and had supported such resolutions at various times since, and had not changed his mind. Well, evidently twenty year's experience in this House has taught him nothing with regard to the wisdom or unwisdom of frittering away the time of this House to no good purpose. The hon. member said, when some evidence of dissent was given regarding his resolution, that he recognized it came from both sides of the house, that he did not regard with favour such sneers against the Irish people. I was watching very attentively at the time, and that was not the interpretation that I put upon the dissent that was offered from both sides of the House regarding this motion. There was no intention to sneer at the Irish people, nor to offer any insult to them, but the dissent was rather an expression of opinion of the unwisdom of the hon. member in introducing such a resolution into this House. The hon. member stated that parliament had expressed itself on several occasions regarding this question. It did, that is true ; but not always in the same direction. The

history contained in the 'Hansard' shows that the question was before this House at different times, and was dealt with in various ways. It is true that the hon. member brought it up twenty years ago, and then, out of the generosity and kindness of heart of members on both sides of the House, they allowed the resolution to pass without much comment. At the same time many of them, doubting the wisdom of that action, came to the conclusion that if it did no good it would do no harm. But the reproof that was given to the Canadian parliament then, and which I will read later on, gave parliament a lesson which I am sure many of us have profited by ever since.

The hon. member went on to say: 'Has home rule become so unpopular in this House that the mention of it provokes dissent from the people?' It was not the question of home rule, or the wisdom or unwisdom of giving home rule to Ireland, that provoked dissent on the part of some members of this House; it was rather the unwisdom of introducing such a question into the Canadian parliament. The hon. member said later on: 'Gladstone said that the most important message that ever crossed the Atlantic was the resolution of the Canadian parliament regarding home rule.' I thought at the time it would be interesting if the hon. gentleman had read the reply given by one of Mr. Gladstone's colleagues in the cabinet, Earl Kimberly to the resolutions sent home in 1882, and if he had done so, it would have been a fitting answer to the allegations that the hon. gentleman made.

I have only to say that home rule, and analagous questions have been introduced into this House at various times and they have been discussed—I think unwisely introduced and unwisely discussed, because I have always regarded it as entirely out of the line of our duty, or of our right, or even of the part of wisdom that we should introduce and discuss these questions. It is neither our duty nor our right to advise the imperial parliament regarding the government of any portion of Great Britain or Ireland. That is the duty of the imperial parliament. We are not charged with that responsibility, we are not charged with that duty; we are here to legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada and not for Ireland, and therefore I have always regarded it as very much out of place that we should deal with such questions here. I have a high authority, the authority of a very eminent man in England for saying so. I have the authority of the Earl of Kimberley for saying so in the answer which he gave to the resolutions which were sent home in 1882. But, before dealing with that I want to speak of other questions, because I put all of these vexed questions on a par, all these analagous resolutions which are of an inflamatory character and which tend to arouse animosity and discord between two classes of people in this country, between Roman Catholics and Protestants. What is the history of these resolutions? Let me refer to them for a short time. In 1869 the first resolution introduced into the Canadian parliament was in regard to the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish church. That was a question which, like the home rule question belonged only to the imperial parliament and the imperial parliament was charged with the responsibility and duty of settling it and was endeavouring to settle it at that time. I notice that some of the present hon. members of this House took part in that debate. Looking back over 'Hansard' I see that some very pertinent remarks were made in reference to that discussion which I intend to refer to very briefly. I shall take those of the late Sir John Macdonald who was a very high authority. He went on to say that it was imprudent to introduce these questions and that it was wrong and proceeded:

> Now, surely, it was an extraordinary course on the part of the hon. member who had introduced the resolution——

That was the Hon. Mr. Holton who had introduced the resolution.

> —to ask the House to deal with a matter with which it had no concern, and render itself amenable to the answer that 'it should mind its own business.' The hon. member acknowledged that our parliament should not deal with such a matter, except in a case of supreme necessity.

And Sir John Macdonald said:

> There was no supreme necessity for the motion.

Then we have a statement by the Hon. Joseph Howe, a statesman whom I have always regarded as one of the very ablest men that Canada has produced. I shall read his remarks. He said:

> This House had lately been increasing its sphere of labours enormously, and its responsibility was now greater than ever rested upon any other one hundred and eighty men since representative institutions began to exist. When he looked at the work before them, at the responsibility they were about to assume he thought that if they did not want to make themselves a laughing stock before the world they should at least mind their own business. He did not hesitate to say that as an individual he favoured the measure now before the imperial parliament——

That was the measure for the disestablishment of the Irish church.

> —and in his own province he had always stood up for equal rights to all sects and all nationalities. If they, with all the responsibility resting upon them, with all the work before them, were to meddle with affairs across the Atlantic, they would exhibit a spectacle to the world that he would be very sorry to see. He did not doubt that the hon. gentleman from Chateauguay was actuated with a good motive in offering this resolution, but he believed the effect of the motion would be bad. He found

in this country Protestants and Catholics dwelling together in accord, and he believed this motion was calculated to cast a fire brand among them.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON. Explain why; I deny that.

Mr. COWAN. What is the date of that?

Mr. SPROULE. That was in 1869. These words of wisdom are from one of the ablest men, I think, who ever occupied a seat in the Canadian parliament.

Mr. FRASER. The ablest.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of that and in view of the answer that we got to our resolution in 1882, I am inclined to the opinion that we do an improper thing to introduce these questions. When the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) made a statement that Mr. Gladstone said the most important question that had ever crossed the Atlantic was the Canadian home rule resolution, I said I would like then to have the reply of Mr. Gladstone's minister—no doubt concurred in by Mr. Gladstone himself—to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Victoria in 1882 when the House was—I was almost going to say—cajoled into passing it almost unanimously out of good nature so that it might not become a political question. In 1882 the reply sent to the Marquis of Lorne, the Governor General of that day, by the Earl of Kimberley reads as follows:—

My Lord,—I received and laid before the Queen the address to Her Majesty from the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, which was transmitted in your lordship's despatch of the 16th of May.

I am commanded by Her Majesty to request that you will convey to the Senate and the House of Commons, Her appreciation of the renewed expressions of their unswerving loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty's person and government.

Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the parliament of Canada in all matters relating to the Dominion, and the administration of its affairs, but with respect to the questions referred to in the address, Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the imperial parliament, and ministers, to which all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain.

These questions exclusively appertain to the imperial parliament and we are numbered amongst those who are excluded from dealing with them. That was the answer that came from Mr. Gladstone's cabinet to the resolutions that were sent home in 1882. Ever since that I regarded the rebuff which we got as well merited and I have ever since that opposed the introduction of such questions into the House of Commons because I thought that—

Mr. COWAN. Where could that statement be found?

Mr. SPROULE. That can be found in 'Hansard' in the debate on the home rule resolution in 1886. The impropriety of this will be apparent if we think for a moment that England ought to have as good a right, yes, even a better right, to give advice to us than we have to give advice to her. Let us suppose that England was to interfere in our business with her advice. There are a number of people in the province of Quebec, and outside of it too, who think that there are existing conditions in that province which do not tend for the welfare of the country. Suppose the English parliament should say: We think in the interest of the country that you should amend your system of government in Quebec. Let that advice from England refer to the church, and I merely mention this by way of illustration. I understand that there is a great deal of land and property belonging to the church in Quebec—I speak of the Roman Catholic Church and with no disrespect to it—that church has the right to take a tithe out of its own people and apply it to the wants of the church, and in other ways they have control over the people which a great many think is not for the best interest of the people of the province. Suppose that the imperial parliament should ask the Canadian parliament to amend that condition of things by legislation, how would the people of Quebec like it, or for that matter how would the people of Ontario like it. Would we not regard it as an unreasonable interference with the rights of the Canadian parliament? I might quote other examples but that will suffice. If we have a right to advise England with regard to what legislation she shall pass on Irish affairs and as to what form of government she should have, then I say that England has as good a right to advise us as to what particular form of government we should have in the province of Quebec, the province of Ontario, or any other province of the Dominion. Let us apply the same rule to England that we would like England to apply to Canada. And, could we not with equal propriety advise the government of Great Britain as to what form of government she should establish in the South African colonies. We do not interfere in that case because we know that it is the right of the imperial parliament and of the imperial parliament alone to be charged with that responsibility. So it is in the case of the government of Ireland. If we have the right to advise England as to her policy, then we have equally the right to advise the government of any other British colony as to what they should do, and I suppose that no one in this House would think it the part of wisdom to interfere in such a direction. I have always held the belief that we in this Canadian parliament should address ourselves to the duties for which we were elected, and which appertain to the government of the Canadian people. On different occasions this parliament has wasted its time

debating questions analogous to the one before us. In 1869 Mr. Holton introduced a motion here with regard to the disestablishment and disendownment of the Irish church. That was to no good purpose for the imperial parliament dealt with the question and dealt with it satisfactorily quite regardless of anything which we did in the Canadian parliament. The wisest of our statesmen thought in 1869 that it was an impropriety for Mr. Holton to introduce that question here. In 1882 we had a home rule resolution introduced by the Hon. John Costigan and it was debated at great length. In the generosity of our hearts we allowed him to carry that resolution, and I am sorry to believe that it created the false impression on the mind of the imperial parliament that the Canadian parliament was unanimous on the question. I know as a fact that it was no such a thing, but out of generosity for the Irish people and the hon. member, and so as to prevent it being made a political question the motion was allowed to be carried almost unanimously. I do not regard this as a political question, Sir; I never did, never shall or never will. In 1884 another home rule resolution was introduced. In 1886 a similar resolution was introduced by the Hon. Edward Blake. I was glad to know that Mr. Blake has gone to that arena where his great powers and his great ability might be used to better purpose in advocating Ireland's wants than in the Canadian parliament, but I noticed that he has made few of the long speeches over there on that question that he treated us to in the Canadian parliament. There are some people who are uncharitable enough to suggest that at times this question has been introduced in the Canadian parliament for political purposes. I will not say that is the case, but I will say that it is most unfortunate that for that or some other reason it is constantly cropping up here. Again in 1887 we had a home rule motion introduced by the Hon. Mr. Curran who is now a respected judge. It was debated by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) and there was a vote on it. After 1882 when we got that reply from Mr. Gladstone's cabinet there was always a dissent in this House to the discussion of such a question, and so in 1887, forty-seven members voted against it, and a great many more would have voted against it but for the fact that they thought a wrong construction might have been put upon their vote. This resolution in 1887 was sent to the High Commissioner in London, but whether it ever got to the imperial government we do not know, because it has never been resurrected out of the archives since. In 1889 the home rule question was introduced and debated here. The motion was defeated by an amendment, and it was not carried. In 1891 we had another proposal to debate such a resolution in this House, but accidently or for some unknown reason it was dropped, and very suddenly dropped at the time. That motion was introduced by Mr. Cook. Now for the sixth time we have it introduced again. Surely in the light of the experience of the past, we have reached that period in the history of the Canadian parliament when we should keep such questions out of the arena of this House. The rule was laid down in 1869 by Sir John Macdonald and by the Hon. Mr. Howe, that such questions as this ought never be imported into the House of Commons of Canada except on two grounds. One of these was, the supreme necessity at the time being, and as he declared there was no supreme necessity for it then. The other ground was the question of supreme importance to the empire, and in his judgment he thought it came within neither of these justifiable reasons. It was neither of supreme necessity nor of supreme importance.

In my judgment, such a resolution is especially inopportune just now, and why? Because at the present time the imperial parliament is dealing with the Irish question in a way that is commanding the respect and admiration of the world. The imperial parliament is prepared, in order to relieve Ireland of her embarrassment and settle her troubles, to grant $60,000,000 as a free gift to help one class of the Irish tenantry, and in addition to that is prepared to pledge the credit of Great Britain to the extent of $750,000,000 as an evidence of her good will and her desire to settle this vexed question in a way to make Ireland contented, loyal and happy. Great Britain is doing this at the expense of the British taxpayer, and she is doing it of her own free will and accord, without any pressure being brought to bear upon her from any quarter of the world. In view of that fact, am I not justified in saying that the hon. member for Victoria might well have let this question rest at the present time, and have waited to see whether this great measure which Great Britain is adopting would not result in satisfying the Irish people and making them loyal, contented, peaceable and happy, as she desires to have all her subjects in every part of the world.

I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the question whether or not home rule would be a blessing or otherwise for Ireland. I do not think it is germane to the purpose of this resolution. I am not here to debate that question. But I may say, in passing, that it is a debateable question; and the very fact that there are two sections of the community who hold views diametrically opposed to each other with regard to that question, ought to be sufficient to restrain this House from adopting any resolution of this kind. While one portion of the people of Ireland think home rule would be a blessing—and I am free to say that I think they are the majority—still I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that a very large and respectable minority hold that it

would not be a blessing for Ireland to have home rule and prefer that it should be governed from Downing street. While a majority may say yes, a large and respectable minority will undoubtedly say no, and they hold this view because of what past history has taught them. Whether they are right or wrong, their conviction in this respect is very strong, and we ought to respect their conviction. The injustices which they claim were done to them when Ireland had home rule were such as to make them look with disfavour on a renewal of the conditions which then existed. They dread the return of those conditions, and can you blame them? I say we cannot. Each of these divisions of the Irish people have their adherents and sympathizers in this country. If I hold the view that home rule would not be in the best interest of Ireland, that is my right. If, on the other hand, my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen hold that home rule would be in the best interest of Ireland, that is their right. I have no quarrel with them. But so long as these divergent views are held, and we are not charged with the duty of settling this troublesome question, we should not allow it to interfere with our work here. It is said that the minority are so small in numbers that their views should not be taken into account. What is the relative strength of these two sections of the people of Ireland? According to the returns of the last election, they are about 65 per cent to 35 per cent. About 65 per cent hold that home rule would be good for Ireland, and about 35 per cent hold that it would not, and these people have sent members to the imperial parliament to represent their respective views. It is not my purpose to inquire whether, in view of the seditious and disloyal utterances of many advocates of home rule, it would be right to entrust to them the power of governing Ireland. I refer to such men as Dillon, Redmond, O'Brien and Devlin. I do not refer to the Devlin who was once a member of the Canadian parliament, because I am bound to say that I never heard very much from him along that line; but I refer to the disloyal and seditious utterances of these other men when travelling in the United States. Whether it would be right to permit a class of men holding such seditious and disloyal views to govern Ireland, I am not going to say, but it is the view of some that it would not be right.

I say it is not the part of wisdom to import questions of this kind into this parliament. On the contrary, I hold that it would be the part of unwisdom, because they are disturbing questions which tend to divide the people instead of helping them to live in peace and harmony together. We desire to live in peace and harmony with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, and to see them work out the problems of life with their families in happiness and prosperity. We wish them success in all the pursuits of life; but it does not tend to promote that feeling of amity, friendship and goodwill between the two creeds in this country to be constantly introducing these vexed questions. Suppose that a member of this House were to be constantly introducing here certain questions in the interest of his friends in Ireland that were not agreeable to the Roman Catholics in Ireland or in Canada, what would our Roman Catholic friends say? They would say he was doing a very improper thing, and I am bound to say that their conclusion would be correct. Then, I ask them to apply the same rule to themselves that they apply to me. I say that if any Protestant in this House were disposed to introduce such a question, I would be inclined to tell him at once that he was doing a very improper and unwise thing. As far as my influence would go, I would endeavour to prevent his doing it, because I do not think it would tend to increase the harmony and good will which ought to exist between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Holding that belief, I am justified in condemning any man who is constantly importing these troublesome and vexatious questions into the House of Commons, questions which tend to excite acrimonious debate and weaken those feelings of amity and love which we are all anxious to see prevail. There are many people in Canada who share these views with me. I shall not say that the hon. member who introduced this motion was actuated by any political motive, because the rules of the House do not allow us to impute motives, but there are many people in Canada who, when they consider the circumstances and the manner in which this agitation is introduced from time to time, will be uncharitable enough to believe that there are political motives behind it, and will have consequently the less respect for the party who introduces such resolutions, no matter to what side of the House he may belong.

Some hon. members may ask me what does the minority see in home rule to be afraid of? I have already given my opinion on that point. They are afraid that it would not be home rule they would have to contend with, but rule from some other quarter of the world, which would not be the best kind of rule for the people of Ireland. Our desire is to live in peace and harmony with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens and to see them enjoy to the fullest extent the blessings of a free country and a responsible government. May we not hope that they will join us in that ambition? We ought to have good ground for the hope, but I regret to say that all do not share with us in those opinions, and among them is the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution. I am opposed to this resolution, and shall vote against it, and I ask those who oppose it for the same reasons that I do to give expression to their dissent. I am not asking any man to give a vote on the merits or demerits of home rule, but on the unwisdom of bringing that question into the House of

Commons. If the imperial parliament should see fit to give home rule, that is their concern, and we have no complaint to make or advice to give, but I am opposed to this resolution because the introduction into this House of such vexed questions, with which we have nothing to do, disturbs the harmony and good fellowship which would otherwise exist between Protestants and Roman Catholics. I am opposed to this resolution because it is no part of our duty to advise the mother country as to what kind of government she should give Ireland or any other portion of the empire, nor have we any mandate from our constituents to fritter away the time of this House and spend the money of the country discussing such questions, with which practically we have no concern.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). I quite agree, Mr. Speaker, with the last speaker (Mr. Sproule) in his remark that he would regret the introduction into this House of any question which would be of a nature to disturb the good feelings and relations that exist between Protestants and Roman Catholics in this country. Far be it from my intention now, in speaking in support of this resolution, to say one word which would tend to creating ill-feeling between the various elements of this country. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) seems to fear that because England has at last undertaken to mete out a measure of justice to one of the three countries constituting the union, there is danger that the good feeling which exists in this country among its various communities may be disturbed. I have no such fear, Mr. Speaker. The last census of Canada shows that there are in the Dominion at present 998,000 people of Irish origin, close upon one million, constituting almost one-quarter of our population. There is not a county, there is hardly a village in this Dominion in which you will not find citizens hailing from the old country or whose fathers came from Ireland. Our Canadian parliament represents that million of people. I have the honour in my own constituency of having 1,500 people who look to Ireland as their mother country, and in their name I know that I am fulfilling my duty when I raise my humble voice in support of this motion, and to congratulate the statesmen of the British empire on their having undertaken at last to carry out a measure of justice and fair play to the Irish race. Canada, Sir, owes a great deal to Ireland. It owes a great deal to the hundreds of thousands of Irish immigrants who came to this country. This confederation was largely brought about by the efforts of one of the greatest men Ireland ever sent to Canada. If our Canadian provinces are represented here to-night, we all know that that is largely due to the labours of the late Hon. Thomas D'Arcy McGee, who devoted his powerful and eloquent influence, energy and ability to bringing about union on this side of the water, and that union which exists in Canada we, as citizens of the British empire, wish to see established on the other side. We are, Sir, loyal subjects, we are loyal to the empire, we are interested in its progress and prosperity, matters are daily brought before us which tend to increase the prosperity and the strength of the empire. We have voted money in this House to send troops to South Africa in order to maintain the integrity of the empire. We have voted money to lay cables beneath the Pacific Ocean and are subsidizing steamers on the Atlantic—all for the purpose of strengthening and consolidating the empire. I claim that we have equally the right at this moment to congratulate the government of His Majesty King Edward VII. upon the measure of justice which that government has now submitted to the British parliament, and which has certainly commanded the approval of the whole civilized world. We are told that in 1882 the Earl of Kimberley informed the Canadian parliament that home rule was not a matter of our concern. Well, those views may have prevailed in England at that time, but twenty years have since elapsed. Barely three years after the Earl of Kimberley had written this famous despatch, the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone rose in the House of Commons to propose home rule for Ireland. And upon what did he rest his chief argument? Upon the resolution adopted in this House. Twenty years have passed since then, and in that time we have heard often in this House—I think I have heard it myself—that it is the admitted right of the colony to give an opinion upon any question which concerns the interests of the empire at large. And surely this question of the settlement of Irish grievances concerns the empire, concerns every subject of the King who takes an interest in the empire's welfare. Surely, this question which has been discussed for the last one hundred years should now be settled. And, if any action we can take can bring about a settlement, I believe there is no man in this House who will regret that he has done something toward so desirable an end. Events have advanced rapidly during the last two or three years. During the last two months we have seen taking place events undreamed of but a few years ago. The land conference which met in Dublin in December last was composed of landlords and of representatives of the Irish tenants. Such a conference would have seemed almost impossible twenty years ago. These men met, they discussed the land question and they arrived at a conclusion. That conclusion is known to the world to-day. Allow me to read a few words concluding the report, showing how a settlement of the land question can be brought about:—

We wish to place on record our belief that an unexampled opportunity is at the present moment afforded His Majesty's government of effecting a reconciliation of all classes in Ireland upon terms which, as we believe, involve no permament increase of imperial expenditure in Ireland; and that there will be found on all sides an earnest desire to co-operate with the government in securing the success of a Land Purchase Bill, which, by rapidly and effectively carrying out the principles above indicated, would bring peace and prosperity to the country.

Mr. Speaker, we as British subjects co-operate with the efforts the British government is making to bring about an amicable settlement of this question. We believe that this land question in Ireland once settled, the granting of local autonomy, as we have it in our own provinces, would follow as a matter of course. Canada has often been quoted as an example for British statesmen to imitiate in their dealings to Ireland. We had, in former years, a land question in the old Seigniorial Tenure. Fifty or sixty years ago that was settled very easily by a tribunal, much more easily than the Irish land question can be settled. The autonomy which was granted to us has certainly proved the wisdom of the British statesmen who granted it. So long as England follows towards her colonies the broad-minded policy she has followed towards Canada, she will have no reason to regret it. But danger will come if British statesmen revert to the policy which brought about the loss of the thirteen colonies to the south of us. So long as the broad-minded policy adopted toward Canada is carried out toward the Irish people, I am satisfied that the reign of King Edward VII. will be quoted in history as having brought about a consolidation of the empire which will add glory to his reign for all time to come.

Mr. Speaker, this question is now before the parliament of Great Britain. The Irish people have honoured us by electing some of our own men as some of their representatives. The former leader of the Liberal party now occupies a distinguished place in the ranks of the home rule party ; and the late member for Ottawa has been elected for Galway, being truly 'The man for Galway.' This is an honour that is done to the people of Canada, and I am sure that the majority of the Canadian people would be both satisfied and delighted if this question should be at last settled. I have no intention of entering into the merits of the case more than to state that a settlement of the land question would probably bring about the settlement of the political question by the granting to Ireland of a provincial parliament, and then the work which has been done during the last few years will have brought forth fruit, for Ireland will occupy in the empire the place to which she is entitled. I ask to be allowed to quote the last words of Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone in introducing his Home Rule Bill barely sixteen years ago, to show how prophetic that grand old man was when he took the stand he took in asking for Ireland the autonomy to which she is entitled :—

You have power, you have wealth, you have rank, you have station, you have organization. What have we ? We think that we have the people's heart: we believe and we know we have the promise of the harvest of the future. The ebbing tide is with you, the flowing tide is with us. Ireland stands at your bar, expectant, hopeful, almost suppliant. Her words are the words of truth and soberness. She asks a blessed oblivion of the past and in that oblivion our interest is deeper than even hers. We are asked to abide by the traditions of which we are the heirs. What traditions ? Why the Irish traditions ? Go into the length and breadth of the world, ransack the literature of all countries, find, if you can, a single voice, a single book—find, I would almost say, as much as a single newspaper article, unless the product of the day, in which the conduct of England towards Ireland is anywhere treated except with profound and bitter condemnation. Are these the traditions by which we are exhorted to stand ? No, they are a sad exception to the glory of our country. They are a broad and black blot upon the pages of its history : and what we want to do is to stand by the relations with Ireland, and make our relations with Ireland to conform to the other traditions of our country. So we treat our traditions—so we hail the demand of Ireland for what I called a blessed oblivion of the past. She asks also a boon for the future; and that boon for the future, unless we are much mistaken, will be a boon to us, in respect of honour, no less than a boon to her in respect of happiness, prosperity and peace. Such, Sir, is her prayer.

That, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is also the prayer of the majority of the people of this country. We ask for no disturbing scheme ; we ask only for justice for our fellow citizens. We remember what the generous Irish nation has done for the empire at large. We remember what she has done for Canada, to whom she has sent illustrious Governor Generals, great statesmen, men eminent in all ranks and walks of life ; and we hope that, at last, the boon which has been given to Canada will be extended to her, and that Irishmen, who have been so illustrious in the Senate, at the bar, and in the liberal professions, who have fought in the armies of Great Britain and have led her soldiers to victory in the dark days of trial, will at last attain the share of justice for which they have so long, so consistently and so patriotically laboured.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House long upon this question. I think the present is rather a time for moderation than for agitation on the Irish question. In reviewing the past, in looking over the debate of 1882, I find that the Hon. Edward Blake, for instance, who made one of the strongest appeals in this House on the subject of home rule for Ireland, based his main argument in favour of home rule on the idea

that it would settle the land question. Home rule is identified in the Irishman's mind with the settlement of the land question. Now the land question has been settled without home rule, and my hon. friend who is good enough to interject this vexed question into the arena of political discussion to-night, is not, in my judgment, working in the interests of Ireland. When we find the English people sitting down in council with the Irish people and coming to a conclusion as to what should be done to settle the difficulties that exist, it ill becomes this House to interject any question of discord into that attempted settlement in Ireland. What does this motion mean? It means that that is not what we want, we want something else. The hon. gentleman reminds me of a story I heard of a countryman of mine and his, who went to a prominent public man and said: 'I have a very serious grievance.' 'Oh,' says the public man, 'we can settle that, there is no trouble in settling your grievance.' 'But, says the man, 'I don't want a settlement, I want a grievance.' And I think my hon. friend from Victoria is more anxious to have a grievance than a settlement. We cannot look upon this action in any other light. Do we find the prominent men in Ireland, the leaders of the Irish people in regard to these questions, standing up there and saying: We want home rule first? If the hon. gentleman wanted to have a unanimous vote in this House and get a moral weight attached to that vote, he should have moved a resolution congratulating the authorities in England on the attempt to settle this vexed question. But what the hon. gentleman is doing is not in the interest of harmony, what the hon. gentleman is doing is in the interest of agitation. Sir, I hope the day will come when some man on the Irish horizon, either in Ireland or in Canada, will rise up with a view large enough to reach across the chasm that divides these people and bring them together on some common ground. That man would do more for Ireland and for the Irish people than all the home rule resolutions that can be concocted by the hon. gentleman. The Englishman has his St. George's day, the Scotchman has his St. Andrew's day, the Frenchman has his St. Jean Baptiste, and the Irishman has his saint as well. Now, why cannot they all get together on some common platform? But our hon. friend does not seem to want that.

Now, Sir, I wish to draw your attention to a very significant omission in the resolution, which the hon. gentleman moves to-night, in comparison with the one he moved in 1882. Let me say that when any hon. gentleman moves a resolution in the abstract which may involve legislation which we cannot possibly have before us, he ought to guard every interest that is affected by his proposition. I wish to refer to a very significant difference between the two resolutions. In the resolution of 1882, on page 1,034 of the 'Hansard,' we find this language—I will only read what is pertinent to the question:

> We venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well being of the empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman's resolution to-night has no reference to the interests and status of the minority. I have always stood up in this House and fought the battle of what I consider the interests and rights of the minority, when it was frequently against my political interest to do so; and I will not for an abstract resolution which might involve home rule, unless I am satisfied that imbedded in that resolution was a safeguard to the status and integrity of that large and respectable minority of Ireland. Sir, the hon. gentleman has not the interest of Ireland at heart when he omits that very important minority in Ireland. There is no attempt to say to these people that we wish to guard their interests that are sacred to the Irishmen of that country. There are interests other than those of home rule which should be guarded in Ireland.

Another thing I want to say is that the Irishman is able to work out his own problems if he is put in a proper position to do so. When you refer back to the Acts of parliament placed upon the English Statute Book in the interest of Ireland, the Land Purchase Act of 1885 and the Land Purchase Act of 1888, what do we find? That of 24,900 purchasers there were but twenty-two defaulters who did not pay what they agreed to pay. Under these two Acts the British parliament set apart over £1,900,000 as a guarantee that any debts which were not recoverable, should be satisfied by this amount, and in the Act of 1896 she took the money that had not been spent for that purpose and distributed it under the Act of 1896 for the purchase of the land instead of holding for guarantee purposes. Those people are able to take care of themselves under proper conditions—no danger about an Irishman, if you give him a fair chance.

Now, they talk about Gladstone, and you can go clear back to Fox's time, and you will find that the Liberals of England have professed to do a great deal for Ireland but they never have done much. Gladstone brought in a Bill that he knew could not pass the House of Lords, was satisfied it could not. What about Lord Rosebery? He said to the Irish: You have got to satisfy the dominant partner, you have got to convert him before you can get anything. And what does the present Conservative government say? They came into power on the ruins of home rule, committed to nothing so far as Ireland was concerned, and they have done more for Ireland than any other government for fifty years. They have given Ireland the Local Government Act of 1898, similar to the Act given in

England in 1888. Then in 1896 there was the improved Land Purchase Act.

And what are they doing now—without agitation, without being committed to anything ? Our hon. friend is fond of agitation. Without agitation the English government of the present day has propounded this momentous proposition that startles the world, that could not be dealt with by any other people under the sun than the English and the Irish together. Now, Sir, let our hon. friend remember that the bird never flies to the top of the mountain with one wing. But that is the position he is in, trying to fly with one wing, nothing less than an agitation for home rule after the land question is settled. He is playing his harp—not the Irish harp. He is on the barn while the procession is passing by, playing his harp, but not the Irish harp. The Irish harp is being played over in the British parliament. I say that when people sit down to talk over their differences in a common sense, business-like way, that is what ought to commend itself to our favour instead of this resolution that the hon. gentleman has interjected into this parliament.

Now, Sir, I want to say that no man has a higher respect for Irishmen than I have. My ancestors for hundreds of years lived in Ireland. But if there is anything that I do not like to hear it is an Irishman referred to as a Scotch-Irishman. What kind of a product is that ? They will tell you about the Earl of Dufferin, for instance, whose ancestors lived for 200 years in Ireland ; fourteen of his ancestors were Irish, one Scotch and one English, yet they call him a Scotch-Irishman. It is time that Irishmen resented that. It is time that they proclaimed themselves Irishmen, whether they come from the north or the south of Ireland. Our hon. friend ought to work along that line ; if he did, he would do more good to Ireland, and to Canada too. Yes, that is a hint to every man as to what he ought to do, working along those lines.

Three-quarters—I was going to say—of the Irish element that our friends speak of are in the province of Ontario, Protestant and Catholic, and no man has a right to be prouder of what is done to work out the problems of this country than the Irishmen of Canada. The less of these questions we interject into the Canadian parliament that are foreign, so far as our being called upon to deal with them is concerned, the better for Canada and for Canadians. I believe that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Costigan) would have done his country a service, and not only Canada but Ireland, if he had moved a resolution of commendation of what is being done in England and Ireland—$600,000,000 proposed to be spent to settle the vexed land question in Ireland. I want to say further, before I sit down, that the English people, considering the burden they are already bearing of the tax imposed on them by reason of the South African war, in meeting this proposition, ought to have the commendation of everybody in the Canadian parliament. Sir, I have never been an intolerant man. It matters very little to this country or to the world whether I represent the county of Dundas or not, but it matters a great deal to Canada and the world whether the Canadian parliament stands upon the tolerant or intolerant side of any question. This resolution cannot have unanimous support. That feature of it is already significant in this House. The hon. gentleman has lost that opportunity of sending across the water a unanimous resolution which he would have had if he had moved the resolution he should have moved instead of the one he has moved. We knew very well that the proposition was looming up last session. We have a pretty good idea why it was not brought up, we have pretty good reason for believing that it was for political reasons. There was a particular election looming up in the province of Ontario then and it was considered inopportune. Now, we have this question raised just on the eve of this tremendous effort on the part of the English people to settle the land question in Ireland interjecting this side issue so to speak into the political arena and it can have no other effect than to that of producing discord instead of harmony.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, discussing the Land Purchase Bill which then engaged the attention of the British House of Commons and of the British people, expressed himself in these words :

> Perhaps I may be allowed to add a word or two as to my present position. I am afraid that the opposition which I feel to the proposals contained in the Land Purchase Bill cannot be met. I think the Bill is a bad one. I would sooner go out of politics altogether than give my vote to pledge the capital of the country, and the future earnings of every man and women in the United Kingdom, in order to modify the opposition of a small class of Irish proprietors to a scheme which, if it remains in its present form, will, I believe, infallibly lead to the separation of Ireland from England. I object in this case to the risk which we are asked to incur. I object also to the object for which we are asked to incur that risk. But as regards the Home Rule Bill, the Bill for the better government of Ireland, my opposition is only conditional.

Such was, a few years ago, the language of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, who, to-day, is probably the most prominent and most aggressive member of the Unionist government which has introduced into the imperial parliament the Land Bill and of the government, which, I have no doubt, will secure its adoption. The Land Purchase Bill which was the subject of discussion in the words I have quoted was a Bill in many respects similar to the present Land Bill. It was dissimilar in this that it did not afford anything like the large measure of relief

that the Land Bill now proposes to accord to the Irish tenant. The change of opinion on the part of the right hon. gentleman, is indicative of the change of opinion that has taken place on this question throughout the whole of the British empire. No wonder then that the cherished hopes and legitimate aspirations of the Irish people have been revived and stimulated, and that those who for such a long time have so energetically, so heroically continued the struggle, begun shortly after the abolition of the Irish parliament in 1880, have seen their hopes renewed, and when this long cherished aim of the champions of home rule for Ireland shall have been accomplished, it will be found that outside of the granting of household suffrage to the inhabitants of the green isle, nothing will have contributed so much to its accomplishment as the present Land Bill, the adoption of which now seems very close at hand. The granting of the household suffrage, the recognition and sanction of the principle by which, to use the apt and expressive language of the Irish tenantry, a vote was conferred 'on every smoke' which has rendered the people supreme in parliament, and in the country alone has rendered permissible and possible the long continuous constitutional agitation, perhaps at times violent and offensive, but on the whole brilliant and legitimate, which has brought about the introduction of the Land Bill and which makes possible at a future date the settlement of the question of autonomy for Ireland. This constitutional agitation renders possible the settlement of the land question, which as I have said, is so close at hand and it will pave the way for a permanent and satisfactory measure of self-government for Ireland. The settlement of the agrarian question on the broad, just, humane and generous basis by the Land Bill which is now engaging the attention of the British House of Commons, will I am sure, produce the complete regeneration of Ireland. It will replace the unwholesome and unsound system of dual ownership by a just and true system of private ownership ; it will inspire thrift, it will promote a spirit of individual enterprise, it will stimulate improvement and produce contentment and prosperity, but most important of all, it will restore peace and harmony among all classes in Ireland. Distrust and hatred will give place to mutual confidence and a spirit of common pride and common interest in all that concerns the Irish people. Factions, feuds, the dissentions of centuries shall disappear and we shall see inaugurated in Ireland a reign of peace, contentment and prosperity. To some this may seem to be altogether too optimistic a view to take of the future, and it may be that I shall be taxed in some quarters with exaggeration. But, have we not in our own country the most conclusive proof that such will and must be the result of the settlement of these two great questions. Fifty years ago Canada was disrupted with racial dissensions; her people were discontented, disloyal, and in fact in open rebellion. To-day, Canada is contented, her people happy and prosperous from ocean to ocean. And why this change ? It is simply because the people of the Dominion of Canada and the provinces which compose it, have been granted that measure of home rule which has been so long, and so heroically demanded by the Irish people. What an encouragement, what a lesson, what an inspiration does not the introduction of this measure of justice and of generosity afford to the world, and more particularly to those who have practised and preached the principles of constitutional democracy, that to-day we see introduced into the English parliament a Land Bill which gives to the industrious peasantry who till the soil, the right to reap the full fruit of their labours. To the Liberal party of Canada this spectacle is especially gratifying, and does it offer an inspiration and an encouragement, because it has ever believed in, ever practiced and ever preached the efficacy, the virtue, the eternal right of self-government, and the encouragement of national sentiment and solidarity. For no pinciple has the Liberal struggled more resolutely and more constantly than for the recognition of the popular will constitutionally expressed and urged. No class of His Majesty's subjects will rejoice more sincerely and more thoroughly, Mr. Speaker, than the gentlemen who sit to your right, and with them the whole Liberal party of Canada ; that the day has at last come, when with the settlement of the agricultural question in Ireland, we soon shall see adopted a measure of self-government in respect to all matters of special concern to the Irish people. I have ventured into this debate, not with the delusion that I could add anything of value to what has been said in support of the resolution, but merely for the purpose of affirming and of emphasizing the incontrovertible truth, that the introduction of the Irish Land Bill and the hope of its speedy adoption, is the immediate result of Liberal policy. Although that measure has been introduced by a Liberal-Unionist government composed largely of Conservatives, yet Sir, the credit for the changed opinion of British statesmen and the British public, is due first and above all to the greatest of great Liberals, the illustrious Gladstone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELCOURT. What a pity that Gladstone is not to-day alive to witness the triumph of the cause which he so courageously espoused and which he so brilliantly and so enthusiastically advocated and defended on every occasion. What a pity that Gladstone is not alive to see the Liberal vindication and triumph of the great Liberal policy which he enunciated on these

questions. But, Sir, I have no fear that history, which is not always just, will do full justice to that great statesman. But while we claim that the greatest share of praise is due to Mr. Gladstone and his followers for what we now see, yet we on this side of the House do not for a moment wish to minimise or to withhold from His Majesty's present advisers that share of credit to which they are entitled. We all recognize the spirit of generosity which has inspired the Land Bill, and the courage which was required on the part of the British cabinet to submit it to the imperial parliament. We accord to them full praise for this very wise, this very humane, this very just and very generous measure, and I take it, that is, the object, the very raison d'etre of the resolution now before us. This resolution is not a resolution of demand ; it is not even a resolution of advice, but it is a resolution of hearty congratulation and thankfulness that at last some measure of justice to the Irish people has been submitted for the approval of the British parliament. We express the hope that such a measure will be followed by one granting self-government to Ireland in all matters of special concern to the Irish people, and, Sir, our experience in Canada teaches us that such a measure will not only tend to the prosperity and contentment of the Irish people themselves, but that it will add to the peace and happiness of His Majesty's subjects throughout his wide Dominions.

Nor must it be assumed, Sir, that we on this side of the House are unaware or oblivious of the share of credit which it is generally believed is due to His Gracious Majesty personally. We on this side, by supporting the resolution, extend our congratulations to His Majesty's advisers, and while doing that, if it is permitted to do so, we also extend to the person of His Majesty humble and respectful thanks and congratulations that he has taken such a personal interest in the preparation and promotion of this great and generous measure of relief to the Irish people.

Such being my view of this resolution, and since we have on a recent and solemn occasion created a clear precedent for such an expression of opinion on the part of this parliament, I shall give it my cordial support.

Mr. M. K. RICHARDSON (South Grey). If the resolution were such as has been described by the last speaker, namely, to tender the congratulations of this House to the British government for introducing a measure with the object of allaying all disaffection in Ireland, I would have found myself in the fullest accord with it. I approve of some of the sentiments expressed in the resolution, but inasmuch as it affirms and endorses the language of former resolutions, from which I dissent, I cannot support the resolution now before the House. Much time has been spent to-night in expressing the pleasure which I believe is general throughout the House, that the Irish Land Bill has been submitted to the British parliament. I am sure that every lover of Ireland rejoices that such a generous and magnanimous step has been taken with a view of removing the disabilities which may exist in Ireland. We congratulate our brethren across the Atlantic that they have met this issue in such a noble spirit, but we naturally asked ourselves, what is the object of this resolution ? Can it in any way facilitate the legislation which is now before the British House. Can it in any way strengthen the hands of the true friends of Ireland in the imperial parliament. From our experience of resolutions of this kind in the past, I am of opinion that it is mischievous in its character, and that it may come back to us with a rebound as it did before. I yield to no one in this House in my admiration and appreciation of all that is great and noble and brave and chivalrous in the Irish character. We have seen it not only in Great Britain and in Canada, but all the world over ; we have seen Irishmen attain for themselves a name for everything that is great and noble. It is a pitiful thing that in the home of Irishmen, a land so dear to Irishmen and to others that are not Irishmen, things have been in such an unhappy condition in the past. But, Sir, I hold that the worst enemies of Ireland have been those of her own household. An unfortunate reference was made to that grand patriot, D'Arcy McGee, a Canadian Irishman.

When mention is made of his name, we naturally ask how did D'Arcy McGee meet with his tragic end ? From what source did it come, by what means, and through what organization ? I will not refer to that further than to say that it was an unfortunate reference. We have seen the sad spectacle in years past of men revelling in luxury at the expense of the peace and happiness and prosperity of Ireland. Not many years ago, when the Fenian organization was strong in the old country, I recollect a man of the name of Stephens, called the Head Centre Stephens, being sent over to this country. When he landed in New York, a reporter of one of the city dailies had an interview with him which went somewhat as follows : 'We found Head Centre Stephens at Delmonico's fashionable restaurant suffering the wrongs of Ireland on canvas-back duck and other delicacies.' It is sad to think that there have been too many of that class of men, not caring much for Ireland, the happiness of Ireland, the peace of Ireland or the prosperity of Ireland, but simply exploiting all these things for their own personal benefit and luxury. I will not impute any sinister motives to the hon. gentleman who has introduced this motion in the House to-day. I am bound

to believe that it is the result of an exuberance of love to Ireland, for Irishmen and the Irish institutions. But I am also bound to say that the hon. gentleman has not a monopoly of that. Many of us who will be compelled to vote against his resolution have as much love for Irishmen and Ireland as he has, and we feel that the spectacle which is presented in the old country to-day is one of the most magnificent that has ever been presented in any British parliament anywhere in the world. We find our brethren across the sea, with all the heavy burdens resting upon them, with the enormous debt left by the South African war, facing this great problem, not in any niggardly spirit, or in fear or truculency, but boldly and generously, in the face of British securities dropping down from day to day. Under these circumstances, far from our taking any action in this parliament that will tend in the least to embarrass the mother country in the step she has taken, we should stand aside, and let her manage her own affairs in her own way as she is well capable of doing. I do not intend to occupy the time of this House at any length; but I will say that we find Englishmen everywhere turning to Irishmen and reaching out their fraternal hand and saying: 'We are your brothers, and there is not a cause of dissatisfaction, real or imaginary, in Ireland to-day that we are not prepared to meet in a generous, kind, and brotherly spirit'; and in the face of that, we in this parliament of Canada would stultify ourselves if we were to send across to the British parliament such a resolution as that which has been proposed. I hope the resolution will not be adopted, but will receive the fate it deserves at the hands of this parliament.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking part in this debate; but I feel that it is the duty of other representatives of the French Canadian element to express their views on this question, and their thorough sympathy with the motion that has been introduced by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan). If there is an element in the British empire which is especially entitled to speak in favour of self-government, which is able to present examples taken from its own history of the benefits of self-government and to prove what it is for a free people in the British empire. I think the French Canadian element is especially entitled to do so. Throughout the British empire there were, so to speak, three alien groups: the French Canadian element, the Boer element in South Africa, and the Irish element in the United Kingdom; and what is the common history of these three elements? Taking first French Canada, we find that the principles which have unfortunately obtained for too many years in Ireland obtained also in Canada, and what was the result? As my hon. friend the member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has eloquently said, so long as the principle of home rule was denied to Canada, there was discontent and rebellion. The consequence was not only the crushing down of a brave people, but a state of paralysis throughout the whole empire; for though the nation at stake was very small indeed if counted by numbers, yet in a free empire like the British empire, when freedom is at stake in any part of it, all the elements of good government are disturbed. I agree entirely with the gentlemen who have expressed their satisfaction with the measure now occupying the attention of the British parliament; but the resolution introduced today by my hon. friend from Victoria, N.S., is only the logical consequence of that measure, and by giving our support to the resolution we shall be giving our most practical support to the British government in the position they are now taking.

In South Africa the same state of things has existed for a long time that formerly existed in French Canada; and what do we find to-day? The hon. member for Ottawa has quoted the words of the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain on the first Land Purchase Bill. Mr. Chamberlain has just returned from South Africa, where he became thoroughly convinced that British rule was impossible unless home rule were granted to that country and due regard was given to the love of liberty on the part of the people living there. Therefore, I say that as the British government has found by its experience in Canada that self-government is the only way of ruling this part of the empire, and as the strongest man in the British cabinet to-day has found that the only way of ruling South Africa is to grant it self-government, so it will find before long that the only way of ruling Ireland and making it free, happy and prosperous, and keeping that noble people on their own soil instead of sending them all over the world, undoubtedly to gain for themselves renown and glory, but at the same time depriving the empire of a worthy part of her population, is to grant Ireland also self-government. Undoubtedly the present Land Bill is a happy move in British politics and will do much to settle the Irish question; but no country can enjoy the real benefits of self-government unless it has the direct control of the taxation taken from its own people and the direct control of the judiciary which administers its laws. Some years ago there were numbers of people who believed that the grievances of Ireland were kept up by the representatives of the Irish nation, but were not seriously felt by the Irish people themselves; but what do we see now? The Conservative party in England, the parliament of England, public opinion in England, have acknowledged that the Irish grievances are real, so far as the land question is concerned, and before long English public opinion will find out also that the grievances of the Irish

people are equally real in so far as regards the administration of justice in Ireland and the taxation of the Irish people.

Some hon. members may perhaps say that my position is not quite logical in advocating an expression of the opinion of this House on a question which is not a Canadian one. Well, if it were my habit to use personal arguments, I might say that I was rather astonished to hear some gentlemen in this House arguing that we ought to confine our attention exclusively to Canadian affairs and who yet were most favourable to the intervention of Canada in South Africa. But hon. members will find that even when I was urging in the parliament of Canada not to interfere in South Africa, not to interfere in a quarrel between Great Britain and a foreign government, I at the same time declared what I here repeat, that as British citizens, as members of a free community, we in the parliament of Canada had the right to express our opinion concerning anything which affected the empire as a whole. In the sense that we are part of the British empire and are interested in everything concerning it, I am just as sincere an imperialist as any of those gentlemen who oppose this motion, and who voted for our intervention in South Africa.

I quite agree in many of the remarks that fell from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). If this were simply a question of British administration or British politics, I would say that it was no business of ours and would vote against the motion of my hon. friend ; but this motion is based upon the very principle of self-government and autonomy, and I hold that every time we affirm the principle of self-government and autonomy for any part of the British empire, we assert the right of Canada to autonomy and self-government. In this I am consistent with the stand I took on the South African question. As a Canadian and a British citizen, I am glad to vote for the present motion. I need not refer to some of the remarks made by the hon. member for North Norfolk regarding the self interest which some hon. members may have in flattering this or that vote in their constituencies. There are some Irish votes in my constituency but not sufficient to affect my position in this House. But I hold that we ought not to go to the extreme of trying to discover sinister or low motives for the attitude of any public man who rises in this House to discuss any public matter. If we were to act on that principle, we would find in the records of the speeches of many members of this House words pretty hard to explain unless they were intended for the sole purpose of catching votes. But I have no desire to introduce into this debate any spirit of animosity or excite any ill feeling between hon. members. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Richardson) has expressed his love and admiration for Ireland and the Irish people. I have no doubt as to his sincerity, but it seems to me that the most practical way in which the parliament of any free country can express its love and admiration for any other country is by giving expression to the wish that that country may enjoy the same rights, privileges and liberties that we do.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I shall take up but very few minutes, Mr. Speaker, in continuing this debate. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) referred to the fact that according to the recent census there appeared to be about one million of Irish in this Dominion, and that suggested to me the conclusion that our census returns seem to have been taken from a very wrong standpoint in this respect. I cannot understand how in this country there can be one million of Irish people. If there be, there must also be a considerable number of English and Scotch. Where are the Canadians to come in ? It seems to me that the time has come when we should call ourselves Canadians and be prepared to be considered as such and not as Irish, Scotch, English, French or anything else. The hon. member for Labelle who has just taken his seat made a reference which I very much regretted. He referred to alien elements—the French Canadians in Canada, the Boers in South Africa and the Irish in the United Kingdom. I wish to resent that sentiment on behalf of my French Canadian fellow countrymen of English origin.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. When I spoke of alien elements I meant that at the time of their original entrance they were certainly aliens.

Mr. KEMP. I must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman and accept his explanation. At any rate I consider my countrymen of French origin just as much Canadians and just as much on a level with me and other Canadians as I do my fellow countrymen of English or any other origin.

Mr. BELCOURT. Thank you.

Mr. KEMP. It is not necessary for me to express my respect for the Irish or my loyalty to the British Crown to which this resolution refers. But it seems to me this resolution is inopportune, more especially because it comes in at this time when a Bill dealing with the Irish land question which is intended to settle the agitation for home rule is before the British parliament. This question of home rule has been debated many years, and there have been in the past great differences of opinions regarding it, and its discussion invariably gives rise to great divergence of sentiment. I am not going to discuss home rule on its merits at all. I think that we should not allow this question to be introduced into this House, and I think that I am expressing the sentiment of the rising

generation in this country when I say that they are not in sympathy with this kind of thing. We have differences of our own to contend with without importing others, and we would resent very much the interference of Great Britain with regard to any of our local matters. But if we pretend that we can interfere in a question, which has to do entirely with the internal domestic economy of Great Britain, how could we resent any tendency on the part of British statesmen and parliamentarians to interfere and advise us regarding matters which particularly affect us and concerning which they are not in a position to know as much as we do? It seems to me that the British parliament has given the greatest evidence of a sincere desire to treat Ireland generously by bringing down this Land Bill, and it seems to me that we would be interfering in a most unwarrantable manner if we were to pass this resolution advocating home rule. Are we prepared to vote one dollar towards retaking the land and putting it again into the hands of the tenants of Ireland, and thus in a practical way show our sympathy with the Irish cause. This resolution does not state exactly what we are required to pass upon. It refers to resolutions which were passed as far back as 1882, to something which took place in this House twenty-one years ago. It seems to me that the hon. member who introduced the resolution should have been more explicit, and should have stated in the resolution exactly what he wanted. We cannot give Ireland home rule as they wanted it in 1882. It seems to me we should not look lightly upon this question. If we were empowered in this House to give Ireland home rule by our votes, I venture to say, there would be many who will cast their votes in favour of the resolution who, with power to actually give home rule, would give their votes the other way. That is why I say we are insincere in the course we are taking. I think the parliament of Great Britain will resent our action if we carry this resolution. We have great questions at issue between this country and Great Britain, and it is our interest to cultivate their good feeling and good will. I trust that this resolution will be withdrawn, that it will not come to a division. I feel satisfied that if it is passed it will be looked upon by the British people as a hollow mockery and will be treated by them with scorn as other matters of a similar kind have been treated by them in the past. I protest against the introduction into this House of these questions with which we have nothing to do, and I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS MURRAY (Pontiac). I only desire to say a few words, and to declare myself in sympathy with the resolution. I should be very sorry to see the resolution introduced, if it would create a spirit of religious acrimony or any feeling of that kind. I do not consider that the resolution is an absolute necessity. I am pleased to see the state of things now existing with regard to a settlement of Irish grievances. But I consider the resolution quite simple. I do not think it has the features it has been represented to have, or that it will be regarded as offensive by the English authorities. We merely express a conviction that a state of things exists in relation to the settlement of this vexed land question which never existed before. The hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Costigan) who introduced this resolution, has thought it consistent on his part to embody also the question of home rule, and so his resolution expresses a hope that home rule will follow the settlement of the land question. Well, we know how the question of home rule has occupied the parliament of Great Britain. We know the part that Mr. Gladstone took on that question; we know the part that Edward Blake is taking now that he is a member of the imperial parliament. We know that it is a question that enlists the sympathy of every Irishman in Canada, of every Irishman on the globe, or, at the very least a great percentage of them. The hon. member for East Grey appears to lay great stress on the minority. He has a fear that the interests of the minority will not be sufficiently protected. I think, if a measure of home rule is adopted by the English parliament, surely they will protect the minority. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) appears to ignore the majority. It is the great majority who are asking the attention of the English parliament to the question of home rule. I say I do not think that there should be dissension. I am sorry to see it. I approve of this resolution in all good faith, thinking, in fact, that it would receive the unanimous approval of the House. I am sorry to see there is such opposition. The gentlemen who oppose it are those who tell us that there should be unity; but I say that the stand they take is not consistent with their statements. Too many representatives of the people would rather cater to their constituents than look at these questions in a broad light. As I have already said, I would be very sorry to feel that a feeling of religious acrimony was raised in this House, and I trust this resolution will not have that effect. I was not prepared to make a speech, but simply give you a few of my ideas on the question before the House. I trust the discussion will go on in a proper spirit, with a view, not of creating disunion among ourselves, but of establishing a better condition of things in Ireland and in Canada. I am a Canadian of Irish descent, and I repeat would be very sorry to see anything arise in this House that would create disunion among us as Canadians. But I think I shall be borne out by others when I say that a great many of the Irish people who would have been in Canada to-day have been driven to the United States on account of

the unhappy condition of affairs in Ireland. It is manifest that the Irish people have a grievance and have good reason to complain. But the land question once settled with a system of local self-government such as we have in Canada, the Irish will be a grateful, happy and prosperous people adding lustre to their race.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (Victoria). I have listened with a good deal of interest to the addresses on this subject, especially to those in favour of the passing of this amendment, and I have yet to hear one solitary word, either by the mover of the resolution (Hon. Mr. Costigan), or my friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), or my friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Murray), or any other hon. member, attempting to point to a solitary grievance under which the Irish people labour. That has not been attempted, and could not be attempted successfully. The hon. member for Labelle said that they were aliens. I wish to say to my hon. friend that they are the same race, people of the same blood as are the people of England and Scotland. In the western part of Ireland we have the Celtic, in the northern, eastern and southern parts the people are Saxon or Scandinavian, except where the blood has undergone a mixture with the Celtic. It is the same blood that flows in the veins of the people of England and Scotland. I speak ethnologically. Hon. members opposite may wag their heads, but I am ready to prove before a committee of this House, or before a commission, that the blood flowing through the veins of the people of Ireland is the blood of the people of the other British islands. In discussing this question, we are apt to regard the British islands as a unit, and not as we regard the Dominion of Canada, as a series of disintegrated provinces. We hear a great deal about the Dominion of Canada being held up as a model for the people. A great many people living in Canada, regard the federal union of the provinces as a very serious mistake. What have we in the provinces to-day? There are no great issues dividing the people, and history tells us that where there are no great issues dividing the people oligarchies arise, corruptionists obtain control. And we find the people of the provinces debased from one end of the Dominion to the other, through the fact that we have federal union, instead of a legislative union with great county powers.

Now, I am ready to endorse any principle in this House or elsewhere—I do not take exception to the resolution on the ground that we have no right to discuss these things—I would endorse my principle by which the British government gave greater county powers, or what you may call provincial powers, to the various parts of the British empire, including Ireland. I think the time of the British parliament is taken up with a great deal of business that should be relegated to town councils and county councils. Had we in Canada given our counties or districts larger powers, and had no provincial parliaments at all, I believe that it would have been better for Canada. This Dominion would have been better off had we had, instead of a federal union, a legislative union with more powers for the counties. I again ask any hon. gentleman who may rise to defend this resolution to point out where are the Irish grievances.

I want to tell my hon. friends how this agitation in Ireland commenced. We find in looking over history, that the agitation against landlords in Ireland began years before the time when the landlords were Protestants and the tenants were Catholics; it began when all were Roman Catholics, it began away back in the twelfth century, when landlords were placed in that country in the time of Henry the Second. The consequence was that the tenantry then took a very strong stand against the landlords, and that agitation was continued all through the centuries until the period that all north-western Europe joined in the Reformation, and Ireland was the only country that stood out. Undoubtedly the great reason why Ireland did not follow the movement that spread over north-western Europe was largely on account of the influence, political and social, of the landlords, that is the reason Ireland did not swing in with the general movement. The landlords sided with the Sovereign and became Protestants, and from that time onward, as before, agitation in Ireland has been so-called religious as well as a landlord and tenant grievance.

But is the Irish tenant under any disability that the English tenant is not under? I beg to point out that in the city of New York alone, rich landlords, men who left the bogs of Ireland and came to America, have turned out on the streets of New York for nonpayment of rent, 29,000 people in one year. Under the law in that city, if the rent is not paid on the first of the month, the next morning the tenant is bundled out on to the streets with all his goods. That number of 29,000 in one year is ten times as many as have been evicted from Ireland in any five years of its history. In Ireland no tenant can be evicted from his property short of a year's notice, and even then he has to be paid for every improvement he has made upon the land. The Irish tenant is the most nursed man in the world. England has listened to agitators of this kind too long. The Canadian parliament has listened to agitators of this kind too long, men who have no other recommendation to bring themselves before the public than that they cater and bow to some Irish home rule Pope, or some Orange Pope, or some Roman Catholic Pope. We have had too much of that in this country and in other countries. It is time that we settled down and attended to our own business. I ask

my hon. friends on either side to rise up and point out any grievance the Irish tenant has that the Scotch tenant, the English tenant and the Canadian tenant has not to a tenfold greater degree.

The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) says that Mr. Chamberlain had admitted that the trouble in South Africa was brought about by British tyranny over the Boers. Sir, Mr. Chamberlain has never given expression to any such idea. The trouble in South Africa was brought about by the determination of the British government to give British subjects in Africa the same rights as the Boers, to give every man in the Transvaal equal rights. That is the reason that war was begun. The policy of Great Britain was on the side of liberty and opposed to tyranny. I want to tell my hon. friend for Labelle, who seems to take pleasure in toying with race cries, all over the British empire, I want to tell him, and this House, and this country, that had Britain taken a firm stand with the Boers at the time of the emancipation of the slaves instead of pandering to the Boer people in her own dominions, in her own colonies, in Natal and other parts of South Africa, there would have been no Boer war. But she pandered to them, she truckled to them; and when she sent 5,000 Scotch colonists to South Africa, and the Boers resented their coming, in place of sending another 5,000 the next year, and another 5,000 the year following, she yielded to them, as she has done in all parts of her dominions. She has done too much yielding to fanatical cries. Britain has too often forgotten that five grasshoppers in a field will make more noise than 100 fat oxen that are peaceably grazing. That is the reason why we have so many agitations of this kind. I would be pleased to see a more extended principle of county home rule extended to Ireland as well as to England and to Scotland. I would be pleased to see Britain divest her present cumbersome parliament of a great deal of the details of business that properly belong to village, city and county councils. Then we might look forward to the day when representatives from all the colonies might assemble in one great imperial council, one great imperial parliament, where the whole British empire would stand united before the world.

I do not agree with the remarks made by one speaker who said that the election of the present member for Galway was a great compliment to Canada. I do not take it as a compliment to Canada that a county which elected Colonel Lynch, the late member, has elected a Canadian in his place. It is no compliment to Canada to have one of her sons returned from Galway at the present time. I had not intended speaking on this subject, but I wish to ask any hon. gentleman present to point out one solitary grievance under which the Irish tenant is suffering to-day which the English and the Scotch tenants are not equally suffering from.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). I recognize the fact that it is about time that this little prayer meeting came to an end, therefore I shall not detain the House more than a few minutes. I think it is only right that a Canadian born, sitting on the colonial side in this House, should have his say, and what I am about to say comes from a disinterested source. I have no interest whatever in the Irish race except that I wish to see every nationality which lives under the British flag enjoying freedom and justice. Now we should recognize the fact that there was a time when we in Canada laboured under the same difficulties under which they now labour in Ireland, and as soon as we had home rule granted to us those grievances vanished entirely away. I believe it is only right and just that we should take this opportunity of expressing our wishes and views to the home government in order that they may, if possible, endeavour to relieve Ireland from that load which she has been carrying for so many years. Now we are told that this is a matter which does not concern us, that we are in fact acting impertinently in bringing our views before the home government.

Now I wish to say emphatically that this is a matter which concerns the Dominion of Canada in a most material way. You have heard it said that it is our business to try and bring immigrants over here and to settle them in the unoccupied regions of Canada and principally in the North-west Territories. I may say that had this difficulty not existed in Ireland which did exist, thousands and thousands of Irish immigrants that went to the United States would be living in the North-west Territories and living happy and contented lives. They had all these troubles in Ireland, they were discontented with the British government and the consequence was that they went to the United States. Politicians in that country, taking advantage of their presence, used every opportunity to secure their vote and maintain themselves in power there. It was owing to this fact very largely that we lost our trade relations with the United States. And I believe that if we had that difficulty removed the trade relations between Canada and the United States would be greatly improved. It would bring about harmony and good will between the two peoples and our interests would be promoted thereby. I just wish to say that I am heartily in sympathy with the resolution moved by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., and I am pleased that I shall be able to support it and give it all the assistance I can.

Hon. Wm. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that I dislike the practice of rising before six o'clock. I

was in this House in 1867, in 1872 and in 1874, and I never knew a single instance where the House has risen before the Speaker saw that it was six o'clock. This practice of rising before six o'clock is an objectionable one. Perhaps we will go back to half an hour before six and I think that instead of continuing this practice it is better to adhere strictly to the rule. When I was a boy, which, I regret to say, was very long ago, the pensioners that fought on the continent used to come to my father's house and with my father, who spent eight or nine years in Ireland during the troublesome time up to '98, would be running over their troubles and sufferings and I concluded as a child that the Irish people were everything that is bad. I happened to spend a winter in Newfoundland, or the part of a winter, and I came across a book called 'State Trials of Forty-eight.' I read that book with a great deal of interest. I read it with an admiration of the beautiful language that was used by those men in their own defence and I could only wish that I was capable of expressing my own ideas in as beautiful language as these men did in those days. If any person will take the trouble to read these state papers he would not dare say in this House that Ireland had no grievances. Ireland had grievances and has grievances to this day. Let me say a word to our young men in this House. It would be well for them to study the life and character of the great men who gave to Canada the freedom that they now enjoy. I have endeavoured to follow the history of these great men to some extent. I read the life of Daniel O'Connell the first session I came here. I am now reading his correspondence consisting of three most interesting volumes which are to be found in the public library here. I may be called, and I claim the right of being called, a blue blooded Presbyterian. I yield to no man in my respect for the Irish character and the Irish people and I yield to no man in my desire to see the grievances of Ireland removed as they will be gradually. I regret sincerely that this question has not been approached in a proper spirit, because, if it had it would have received the unanimous vote it deserves in this House. It was introduced by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) in language displaying all the eloquence that is characteristic of his countrymen and without a single expression calculated to give offence to any one. Therefore, I had every desire that it would have been received in a different spirit. We may vaunt ourselves and praise ourselves for our love of the Irish people and our desire to do justice to the Irish people, but when we express dissent from giving Ireland home rule and from voting for this resolution I have some doubts as to the sincerity of these sentiments. There are a great many people who are saying we are taking up too much precious time. Why, there is more time occupied in committee over a paltry custom house, or a post office that is built in any part of the country, than is taken up with a question of such vast importance as is under discussion now. Then, we are told that we have not been sent here to take up subjects of this kind. We have been sent here to deal with every subject that comes properly before parliament and to exercise our own judgment upon it. I claim that freedom from my own constituency and I intend to exercise it as long as I have the privilege of being a member of this House. I thought Mr. Speaker, that having beside me my hon. friend from the riding of North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I had brought him within the traces so that he would think and act as I had done myself, but he steps out sometimes, and I cannot control him. I do not pretend to that high standard of Christianity professed by my hon. friend. If I honoured myself so much as to go to teach children at a Sabbath school I think I would have selected a very different subject from that relating to the corruption that takes place in high places in Canada on both sides of politics.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I doubt much whether the intelligence of the Sunday school scholars could be brought up to the point of understanding that question thoroughly, but I would expect that my practical Christianity would lead me to teach the children how to conduct themselves properly at home in obedience to their parents and how to receive the instructions they would get from their parents supplemented by what they would be taught in the Sunday school. I hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) is not offended at this expression of my sentiment towards him, but I thought that the House was getting a little weary, and I thought that I might perhaps be allowed to create a laugh at his expense.

Mr. CHARLTON. I might correct my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) by informing him that it was Parents' day on the occasion that I made these remarks, and they were not made to children but to adults.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). Very good. I hope that the parents and the children will profit by the instruction they received.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope so.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) We must be all gratified at the prospect of the land question being settled by the Bill now before the imperial parliament. That is a step in the right direction, and it shows us that it is only now that the seeds that Gladstone planted are beginning to bring forth fruit. It is very often that the reforms propounded by great men come in to being only when their authors are dead. Our Saviour ascended into Heaven before the Apostles understood their mission. Wilber-

force was on his death bed when the emancipation of the slaves became law in England, an object for which he had worked to attain for thirty-five years. Gladstone is dead and Ireland is to-day reaping the blessings of the policy he proposed for her. We may say what we like here, home rule for Ireland is going to come, and it will come whether or not we raise objections to it in this House or in this country. The settling of the land question is bound to bring home rule for Ireland within a shorter time than we perhaps expect. Why should we in this country deny the Irish people, or the people of Wales or of Scotland, the blessings that we ourselves enjoy. I have been a Liberal all my life and during the short time that Providence will permit me to live, I shall continue to be a Liberal and intend to die a Liberal, and being a Liberal I want to see extended to Ireland the same amount of justice and the same blessings of home rule that we enjoy in this Dominion. I might point out that the parliament of Nova Scotia was in advance of England when the great Daniel O'Connell forced them to admit Catholics to the Imperial House of Commons. Years before that, we had admitted a Roman Catholic from Cape Breton into the House of Assembly in Nova Scotia and it would do some of the men who are opposed to giving justice to Ireland, a great deal of good if they were to read the speeches that were made by Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen, when, the Nova Scotia parliament declared that Cavanagh the Catholic from Cape Breton should take his seat in the Nova Scotia parliament. I said the other day that we in the lower provinces were in advance of Canada in many things, and this is one of the things that might be mentioned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I am afraid Mr. Speaker, that I have occupied the time of the House at too great length, and I know that great fault is found with those who trespass too much on your patience, but I think in justice to myself that I should express my opinions on this subject, and I will regret exceedingly if this House should forget itself so much as not to give a unanimous vote for the resolution that has been submitted.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). Perhaps all has been said on this motion that can be said with advantage to the House, and I venture to think that more has already been said in favour of this resolution than will be of profit to Canada. At the risk of not being able to contribute much that might be useful in the discussion, I yet desire to put myself on record and to advance some reasons why I shall vote upon this resolution as I intend to vote. The resolution as I have heard it read and as I understood it, is divisable into two parts. Part one of the resolution declares the unswerving loyalty of this parliament and of the people of Canada to Great Britain. I would like to know when it became necessary for the Canadian people to put in writing and transmit that writing to the British parliament, to convince the British people of the loyalty of Canadians. Have not the Canadian people within the last two or three years, by their acts which speak louder than words, convinced the British empire that at all times Canadians may be relied upon to show their loyalty to the mother country. It struck me when the resolution was being read that there was no necessity for that part of the resolution, and that the reason why it was introduced was simply as an apology for the latter part of the motion regarding home rule. And Sir, I do not think this parliament is called upon to support any resolution that requires an apology for its introduction. Now, I do not recognize any man as having a greater regard, respect, or admiration for the Irish people than I myself possess. I have the proud right to claim descent from Irish parents, and I have today living in that country some of my nearest relatives, who are I think in a position to judge fairly of the condition of things in Ireland.

I have had some personal experience with those people, having visited them on more than one occasion, and I am bound to say that on my last visit I could see, what is perfectly apparent to any one visiting the country, that a very great improvement has taken place in the condition of Ireland within the last ten years. I say I do not recognize any man as having a greater admiration for Ireland and the Irish people, than I have. Ireland is a country acknowledged to have great possibilities both from an agricultural and an industrial standpoint. The Irish people as a race are patriotic, hardy and intelligent, and possessed of a large-heartedness and a sympathetic nature which I regret to think are sometimes taken advantage of by agitators, not for the purpose of benefiting the Irish people, but for the purpose of advancing their own political or personal interests. Sir, at this distance and with the opportunities which we have at our command, it occurs to me that we are not in a position to view this question with such a degree of certainty that it is impossible for us to form a conclusion that may not be erroneous. We are liable, from a want of knowledge of the inner workings of this question, to make mistakes in our judgment. Many of the ablest statesmen in the British parliament have differed on this great question—parliamentarians who have given the matter most earnest and careful consideration, men who have been willing at all times to grant such relief as might be fair to Ireland or to any other portion of the empire; and is it any wonder that a difference of opinion should exist here where we have not the same opportunities of studying the question that these men have ?

A difference of opinion not as to the justice of redressing any real grievance but a difference of opinion as to the best mode of accomplishing it. The whole question is to my mind beset with such difficulties that it would be impossible for us at this distance to form a correct judgment upon it. There is the right of the landlord, and the right of the tenant; there is the right of the government and the right of those who are governed; there is the right of the native-born Irishman and the right of the people who have gone into the country and by their capital and industry have assisted in bringing about the better condition of Ireland that we see to-day; there is the right of the employer and the right of the employee; and there is also the differences among the people in religious sentiment. I hope this resolution has not been introduced and will not be discussed in a spirit that would be likely to widen the breach that now exists between those two religious bodies. Happily for this country and for the whole British nation, those two religious bodies have been approaching nearer together, and I would be very sorry to say one word or to hear one word uttered in this parliament that might have the effect of widening in the slightest degree that breach which is happily growing less. But apart altogether from that consideration, it strikes me that the question we are discussing is one with which we ought not to deal in this parliament. We are undertaking to accomplish something which we have no assurance that we shall be able to accomplish; we are voluntarily undertaking a responsibility that we have not the power or the authority of carrying out. While we may be most anxious, as I have no doubt every Canadian is, to see every real grievance in Ireland redressed, let us hesitate before taking this step for fear we may injure the cause which we most wish to advance. I am very glad to know that a flood-light of hope has been cast over Ireland and the Irish people to-day by the legislation emanating from the Conservative party in the British parliament. It is to my mind only one more evidence of the willingness, the readiness and the ability of the Conservative party, not only in England but in Canada, to stretch forth the hand of help to any of our people who may require assistance; and, Sir, it is the one element to which we, as Canadians, can point with pride as having built up this country and made our people happy and prosperous. I know, from my reading of some of the debates which have taken place in this House on similar occasions, that the right hon. First Minister has before now pointed out that resolutions of this kind carried on former occasions have been kindly received by the British parliament; but notwithstanding that fact, I think it is well for us to stop and consider before sending on another resolution. It is natural for the British race to grant pardon for a first offence; but a repetition of that offence is often visited with the severest punishment, and this may possibly be the time, when, if we interfere with something with which we have nothing to do, we may receive a rebuke from the British parliament. We have duties enough to perform in regard to our own country. We have a great and growing country with a diversity of interests; we are here representing the people of this country and supposed to devote ourselves to the business of this country, and if we discharge our duty in that respect, we shall have performed our duty well, without travelling outside of that duty and interfering with something with which we have nothing whatever to do. There is plenty of work affecting the interests of this country to engage the attention of this parliament for all the time it can afford, and it strikes me that we would be better fulfilling the duties cast upon us if we were to direct our energies into that channel and that channel alone. Let it not be said of us that we do those things which we ought not to do and leave undone those things which we ought to do. For these among other considerations I feel bound to pass my vote against the resolution, but I do so in no spirit of ill-feeling against the Irish people or Ireland. On the contrary, I entertain the warmest feeling for that nation and its people, and while I cast my vote against the resolution I at the same time say 'God bless Ireland.'

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Whether this motion be opportune or not, whether it be conducive or not to beneficial results, whether the time chosen be propitious—all these are questions which must have engaged the serious attention of my hon. friend the mover of this resolution, who has been in this House one of the oldest champions of the cause of home rule for Ireland. But whatever may be our views upon the opportunity of this motion it is now before us and for my part, convinced as I have been for a great many years that the settlement of the Irish problem would be a blessing not only to Ireland but to Great Britain, to Canada, to Australia, and to all parts of the British empire in which Irishmen are to be found, I feel called upon on this occasion to give this motion my most hearty sympathy, as I have done similar resolutions on former occasions. We are reminded that once, when the parliament of Canada passed a motion similar somewhat to that now before us, we were told in language polite but unequivocal that it would be far better and preferable for the parliament of Canada to apply itself to questions over which it has jurisdiction. But, Sir, time moves, new ideas germinate and bear fruit, and there is to-day, I am sure, a greater cordiality and solidarity among all the nations of the earth than there has been

at any previous period of its history. It is fitting and proper that this feeling should exist in a larger degree within the communities which are members of the same empire, and every one must be glad to bear testimony to this fact, that at present the relations between Great Britain and her colonies are certainly closer than they were twenty-two years ago. So close have become our relations that now we can offer our own opinions and views to the British people upon questions of policy, which affect not only imperial affairs, but also domestic affairs, without any rebuke. It is scarcely more than three years ago when, on the 31st of July, 1899, the following resolution was moved in this House and adopted unanimously :

1. Resolved, that this House has viewed with regret the complications which have arisen in the Transvaal Republic, of which Her Majesty is suzerain, from the refusal to accord to Her Majesty's subjects now settled in that region any adequate participation in its government.

2. Resolved, that this House has learned with still greater regret that the condition of things there existing has resulted in intolerable oppression, and has produced great and dangerous excitement among several classes of Her Majesty's subjects in her South African possessions.

3. Resolved, that this House, representing a people which has largely succeeded, by the adoption of the principle of conceding equal political rights to every portion of the population, in harmonising estrangements and in producing general content with the existing system of government, desires to express its sympathy with the efforts of Her Majesty's imperial authorities to obtain for the subjects of Her Majesty who have taken up their abode in the Transvaal such measure of justice and political recognition as may be found necessary to secure them in the full possession of equal rights and liberties.

This motion was transmitted by the Speaker of the House of Commons, to the Colonial Secretary of State, and for this motion we were not rebuked. To this there came no rebuff. On the contrary it was quoted with approval all over the British empire. On the contrary the British people expressed their thanks and gratitude to the parliament of Canada for the action we had then taken. And if we could take that course with reference to the Transvaal, if we could do that for the people of the Transvaal, surely we are warranted ten times over in taking the same course for the benefit of our fellow subjects in Ireland. Now, Sir, it is a pleasant fact that at present there is peace in every part of the British empire, there is contentment in almost every part of the of the British empire, with one exception only, and that is Ireland. If we analyze the condition of things which exists in all these parts of the British empire where general contentment prevails, we must come to the conclusion that the one cause which has brought about this beneficial result is the fact that in every one of those communities the people have been granted a full measure of local autonomy and local self-government. Why should not the same measure be meted out to the people of Ireland ? Why should they not be granted the same measure of self-government which has been granted Australia and Canada ? Why should we not expect that what has made Canada prosperous and loyal would also make Ireland prosperous and loyal ? Why is it this course is not followed with regard to Ireland ? If we go to the root of things, we will find that the only cause can be summarized in the word 'distrust'—the distrust of the British people against the Irish people—that distrust which impels them to the conclusion that the Irish people, if they were granted home rule, if they were given the right to administer their own affairs, would abuse that power in order to work out the separation of Ireland from Great Britain. It is this distrust which has just been expressed by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), when he said that if the people of Ireland were granted the power to govern themselves, they would be ruled by a foreign authority. Let me say to my hon. friend this : He and I do not worship at the same altar, but let me tell him that the Roman Catholics to-day, while they acknowledge obedience in spiritual matters to that foreign authority which he had in his mind, in temporal matters they recognize no authority but that of their own civil government. If the people of England be satisfied that the Roman Catholics in Ireland, as the Roman Catholics in Canada, will be true to the civil authority of the land, I am sure the next day home rule will be granted to Ireland. But, at the same time, this distrust exists. I may say—and I must say to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Costigan), the mover of this resolution—that some of the Irish leaders have acted very unwisely and have, unfortunately given cause of distrust against them. If I had the privilege of a seat in the House of Commons, I would say to my friends the home rulers : While I sympathise with you, while I am, as much as you are, in favour of home rule for Ireland, I want it to be understood, and I want to say here and now, that home rule does not mean separation; you should and you must be loyal to the Crown.

Mr. KEMP. They won't say that.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, they would say that ; for, other home rulers have said it before. Let me quote the words of one of the most distinguished home rulers of his day, Sir Charles Russell, afterwards Lord Russell of Killowen. In addressing his electors, the electors of Hackney, in November, 1885, he made use of this language, running as a home rule candidate :

The question of Ireland still remains unsolved. Its wise solution cannot fail to strengthen the position of the empire, and leave to the legislature here greater opportunity of dealing adequately with an increasing arrear of necessary legislation. I am absolutely opposed to separation; but, reserving imperial control in all imperial questions, I think Irishmen on Irish soil should have the power of dealing in the way that seems to them best with all questions that concern them.

This is the language of a home ruler. This is the view of the question which I am sure will prevail. But you will tell me that language has been used, which is very nearly, if not actually treason. We all know that the embittered heart will be made ungenerous. But if there is a way of making men, even with the intention of disloyalty in their hearts, loyal, that way is to trust them and give them the liberties which have been denied them. Look at the history of Canada here, when that great man, one of the greatest men of the last century, Lord Elgin, did not hesitate to put the fullest powers of self-government into the hands of a people who, a few years before had been in actual rebellion. Sir, this is the way that great men deal with such questions; and this is the thing I would speak for, if I had the privilege of a seat in the House of Commons. Nay, more, if I had that privilege, having spoken as I have just indicated to the home rulers, I would address myself also to the government of the day, and I would tell them that it was not sufficient to have a tentative policy upon this question. I would say: You have done a great deal for Ireland; you have sacrificed a great amount of money; you are to-day bringing in a measure which is a credit to the statesmanship of your government, which must involve the expenditure of a great deal of money, though I hope that, in the end it will be paid by the Irish people themselves, but it is not sufficient to deal out parsimoniously—I do not say in the matter of money, but in the matter of reform—measures of improvement. You must appeal to the heart and the imagination of a highly impulsive and generous people. Mr. Gladstone has done more by his attempt, by his abortive attempt, for home rule, than all the reforms, substantial as they have been, which have been worked by the present government. I have always been impressed by the words spoken something over ten years ago, by Mr. John Dillon. The occasion was a demonstration in favour of Mr. Dillon by the people of Cork, where he had just been released from jail, having been confined for violation of one of the numerous Coercion Acts which were the disgrace of the British government in the last century. This is the way Mr. Dillon spoke—and I appeal to the attention of my hon. friends, especially of my hon. friends on the other side who do not believe in home rule for Ireland—to consider these words:

But it is impossible for me to be blind to the facts that are forced upon my notice as regards the mighty changes which have come over the minds of the masses of the people of England, and remembering this, I think it is not wise to be impatient, because the delivery of Ireland is not to be accomplished in a day. I can see no cause for impatience, but cause rather for hope and even exultation. Coming now, as I do, from what was meant to be an insult and a degradation to me, and, as I hope, an honourable man, I can find within my heart not the slightest trace of bitterness against the people of England. I can recollect the day when the power and the name of Englishmen were hateful to my heart. It may be that I am demoralized by the countless acts of kindness I have received at the hands of Englishmen. But the feeling has now changed, and I cannot find it in my heart to regret that it is now passing away.

Let us pause and reflect a little on these words. 'I recollect the day when the power and the name of Englishmen were hateful to my heart.' Here is the accumulated bitterness of ages and centuries of oppression. That was the condition of John Dillon, that was the condition of the Irish people—bitterness of heart caused by the odious manner in which they had been treated for ages and centuries. But the fact that at that time a great party was ready to come to the relief of Ireland was enough to take away the bitterness from the heart of John Dillon. He was applauded by the people of Ireland. Therefore, I say, trust the people of Ireland, let them be treated kindly, let them be treated fairly, let them be treated justly, and the bitterness will pass away and they will become the most loyal subjects in the British empire. I am not taking too sanguine a view. There is example and justification of my words in the language I have just quoted from John Dillon. But, so long as you continue to give to the people of Ireland, from time to time, simply a scanty measure of what they would expect, you will not make them contented and happy. If there is on the face of the earth, a generous people, a warm-hearted people, never slow to resent an injury, but never slow to be grateful for a favour received, it is the Irish people; and, for my part—I do not wish to speak at length on the subject, for it has been well threshed out—I do not believe that if this question is to be solved, it can only be by giving the Irish people the measure of liberty that we have in Canada, and to give them, not the powers we have in the parliament of the confederation, but the powers we give to the provinces. Let there be a parliament on College Green. Let the heart and mind of the Irish people be appealed to, and Ireland, instead of being, as in the past, a thorn in the flesh of England, will become a tower of strength to the British empire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken, I desire

to say a few words. I regret that I was not able to hear the whole of the debate. It did seem to me that when my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) gave notice of his resolution that this was a somewhat inopportune time to introduce it. What is regarded as a very liberal measure of relief with respect to one question which has agitated Ireland for some time, has been introduced by the English government. For that reason, possibly, the occasion for the introduction of this resolution is not of the happiest. Also, I think that the resolution is not very happily worded. I should have thought that my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B., might perhaps have couched his thoughts in the concluding clauses of the resolution in some happier terms. I think all of us in this House desire that every possible measure of relief be given to Ireland in respect of any grievance which she has sustained in the past or from what she now suffers; but at the same time we do not desire to place ourselves in a position which is not a dignified one. I would like to call the attention of my right hon. friend to the concluding words of this resolution:

> We have observed, may it please your Majesty, with feelings of profound satisfaction the evidence afforded in the debate of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom, and in the speech from the Throne, of a sincere desire on all sides to usher in a new era of lasting peace and good will.

I would like to submit to my right hon. friend whether after all it is a very dignified, not to say a pertinent, thing for us to discuss the tone of a debate in the imperial House of Commons. It does not seem to me that the resolution is worded in the best way in that regard. We might have it followed by a proposed resolution of this House with regard to the eloquence of some speech of a British cabinet minister, or of a member of the House of Commons, and we would not be going very much beyond the length to which we are asked to go in this resolution. However, that is a matter of form more than a matter of substance; and I would have been inclined, if I had been favoured to any extent with the confidence of the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, to suggest to him, as well as to my right hon. friend who is responsible for the dignity as well as the proceedings of this House, that the resolution might have been amended in that respect and yet be just as serviceable to the cause of home rule.

Now the resolution seems to be somewhat unhappily worded in another regard. It refers to a measure which is about to be introduced into the British House of Commons. Well, since the notice was given, since the address was drawn up, that resolution has been introduced, and criticism might fairly be made I think on the terms of the resolution that it hardly does justice to the present circumstances.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

But apart from this, Mr. Speaker, I listened with a good deal of attention to the very able speech of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and I thought there was a good deal in it worthy of consideration by all of us in this House. At the same time we cannot disguise from ourselves the fact that not only with regard to home rule in Ireland, but with regard to other matters of imperial concern, we have in the past taken upon ourselves to make suggestions to the imperial government. As to the wisdom of that course, there may be more than one opinion, as to the service or value of it, there may be more than one opinion. I really do not know whether the cause of home rule in Ireland, the redress of grievances under which Ireland has suffered in the past, has been materially aided by any resolution or by any action of the Canadian House of Commons. It is quite true that we passed a resolution unanimously some three years ago with regard to the cause of our fellow subjects in South Africa. But I think the House should not forget that that resolution was followed up by active and material assistance when the cause of our fellow subjects there came to be decided by the force of arms. It is a fair question for hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House as to what extent we should take upon ourselves to tender advice in imperial matters where we are not prepared to supplement that advice by some active and material assistance.

Now I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend the mover of this resolution to the fact that there are communities in Canada at the present time which are demanding that same measure of home rule which he is demanding for Ireland. I am referring to the people of the North-west Territories of Canada, who, by the unanimous resolution of their representatives in the territorial legislature, have called upon this government, nearly two years ago, to grant to them exactly the same rights which are possessed by the people of all the provinces of Canada. Perhaps it might be a fair matter of consideration as to whether those claims and those demands should not engage our attention during this session, and whether our time might not at least be equally devoted to them as well as to the claims of our fellow countrymen in Ireland.

With regard to what my right hon. friend has said respecting the cause of home rule in Ireland, I am happy to say that a great deal of it commends itself to my judgment, but I do not altogether think that the cause of home rule, or the success of home rule, will be reached in the way he appears to believe. I think that home rule, not only to the Irish people but to the people of all the British islands, will come in the future, and come perhaps in the very near future, from the very necessity of things. We know how utterly inadequate is the time at the command of the imperial House of Commons

for consideration of the great subjects which come before that House. I myself have sat in the gallery of the House of Commons at Westminster and seen the affairs of India, a country of 300,000,000, disposed of in a single evening, and with not more than one-fifth of the membership of the House present. We know that during the past two or three years estimates, items amounting to $25,000,000, have been passed through the imperial House with a discussion of only an hour or two, for the reason that the time of the House was so taken up with a multitude of other matters that it was absolutely impossible to devote to these subjects the time they really demanded. Now, whether by an extension of the power of county councils in the mother country, whether by the establishment of district councils, or by the establishment of local parliaments of some kind, I believe that that condition of affairs must be relieved, and will be relieved in the very near future.

In the meantime, however, a very great measure has been proposed to the imperial House of Commons, a measure which is an object lesson to the whole world. A country that has spent hundreds of millions in asserting the rights of her subjects in South Africa, now presents to the world the spectacle of granting as a loan in the first instance $500,000,000 or $600,000,000, accompanied with a vote of $60,000,000 to $70,000,000 for the purpose of relieving a portion of the United Kingdom from a grievance which has existed for a great many years past. That is a great measure, it is a measure that is worthy of the parliament of a great country. Whether or not it will have all the success which most of us believe and hope it will have, certainly we must all recognize that it is an intelligent and sincere step in the direction of ameliorating the grievances from which Ireland has suffered in the past. Therefore, I say that all of us join with our fellow countrymen on the other side of the water in trusting that that measure may pass, and that it may have the result which we all hope for. That Ireland is worthy of an effort of this kind none of us will deny. My right hon. friend has said that he believes that Ireland will be loyal. I go beyond that; I say that I believe Ireland is and has been loyal to the British Crown, notwithstanding these grievances from which she has suffered in the past. When I speak of Ireland I speak of the great mass of the people of Ireland, and I have the battlefields of the empire to justify me in saying that Ireland has been loyal and devoted to the Crown of the United Kingdom in all of the years past. Go to the thousand battlefields of the empire, look where the charge has been fiercest in the hour of victory, or where the foe has pressed nearest in the hour of retreat, on every one of these battlefields Ireland may claim and has claimed her glorious dead, the dead who have fought and bled for the welfare of the empire. Not only has Ireland done this, but Ireland has given to the empire men in every rank of life who have contributed much to the upbuilding of the empire and to the cause of civilization. Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not accept the suggestion that Ireland will be loyal in the future; I say that the mass of the Irish people, the great body of the Irish people have been loyal in the past to the empire, and are loyal at present to the empire, and this I say to their credit, because, during all these years they have been oppressed with a sense of wrong and injustice, and they have felt that they have not been fairly treated. Notwithstanding that, they have stood side by side and shoulder to shoulder with their brethren in Scotland and England, and they have been devoted and loyal to the cause of the empire in every walk and department of life.

Now, there is another striking circumstance in connection with the present measure that has been brought forward in the House of Commons, and that is the fact, from which I draw a good omen for the future, that Irishmen throughout Canada, and I believe Irishmen throughout the United Kingdom, are impressed with the belief that the present attitude of the British government is to a large extent, to a considerable extent, at least, due to the personal influence of our most gracious Sovereign. I draw from that a very happy omen for the future, because the tie which binds Ireland, as well as Canada, to the empire, the tie of allegiance to the Crown, is only a technical tie, and while it is only a technical tie it has no very great strength. It requires something stronger and deeper than that. The belief that Irishmen entertain throughout Canada and throughout the mother country as to the effect of the personal influence of our Sovereign will, I believe, strengthen that tie so that it will become enduring and imperishable so that Ireland not only will remain loyal but will become the most loyal portion of His Majesty's dominion throughout the world. That, Sir, is a very happy circumstance indeed. That is a circumstance which we welcome on this side of the Atlantic, and a circumstance which, I am sure, will render the future of the United Kingdom of much happier omen than the conditions of the past might have justified us in expecting a few years ago. Now, I do not know that I have anything to add. As I said before, I think that the precedents that we have had introduced in regard to Ireland herself, and the precedent which we established in 1900 in regard to our fellow countrymen in South Africa, justify us in voting for this resolution, although I am bound to say that I would have preferred that it should have been introduced at some more opportune moment, and that it should have been

couched in some happier terms. Therefore, for these reasons, by reason of the precedents of the past, in the hope that this may in some measure strengthen those in the United Kingdom who brought forward this measure, and in the belief that, acting upon these precedents of the past, we have no other course to follow at the present time, I, speaking for myself, now declare my intention of voting for this resolution.

Mr. J. SHERRITT (North Middlesex). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to give a silent vote, nor do I wish to delay the House by the remarks which I have to make. I shall endeavour not to detain the House for more than a minute or two. I am not here to discuss the question of home rule for Ireland; neither am I here to say the Irish people have not a grievance, nor will I take up the time of the House in establishing the fact that I am in sympathy with Ireland. I am an Irishman myself, and it would not be a very difficult matter for me to establish the fact that I am in sympathy with Ireland, but when we consider that in 1882 we met with a rebuff at the hands of the imperial government, when a motion similar to that now proposed was sent to Great Britain, it does seem to me that we cannot, except that the conditions there have changed so materially in the twenty-one years which have elapsed since that time, that we will not leave ourselves open to receiving another such rebuff as we got at that time. I do not wish to put myself on record as being willing to invite a rebuff of that kind. Under these circumstances I intend to vote against the motion. It is not that I have any feeling against the Irish people, nor is it that I do not represent that class of people. I have the honour to represent a very large number of people of Irish parentage resident in my riding. I am glad to say that the people I represent are intelligent enough to know that any action we may take here will not accomplish very much in their behalf, remembering, as they do, the reception given to the resolution which was sent over twenty-one years ago. For that reason, and that reason only, I intend to vote against this motion if the mover and seconder insist upon the matter being brought to a vote.

Mr. JOHN D. REID (South Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I do not care to give a vote on this question without explaining my position. I remember that a few years ago I gave a vote in favour of the motion moved by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan). At that time, I was in favour of anything that could be done in the interest of Ireland, and I am in favour of it now. I am of Irish descent and I would like everything done that would assist that portion of the empire. But, Sir, at the present time I intend to vote against this resolution and I will give my reasons. It surprises me that I have not seen any agitation in this country by the Irish people either Protestants or Catholics asking for any resolution to be introduced in this House in favour of home rule for Ireland, and what is still more surprising to me is that the Irish people of this country of the same religion as the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan), could not find some leading member of this House, a member of the government, who would introduce it and who would in my opinion add to the credit of the resolution. We have in this House the hon. Minister of Justice, a creditable Irishman, and if the Minister of Justice would introduce a resolution of this kind and explain it, I conceive that a great many more would support it. But here is the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., who has been travelling on this resolution since he was first a member of this House thirty or forty years ago. I believe that this resolution was introduced by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) each and every time for the purpose of booming himself in the House and so far as I am concerned I do not intend to boom him any more. I believe that a great many men in this House have been speaking here to-night simply for their constituents; simply for the purpose of trying to put themselves in such a position that they may come back to the House again. I care not whether I come back or not, I intend to express my feelings as I am doing now. I do not believe that it is in the interest of the Irish people of Canada, I believe it was introduced in the interest of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., and I shall not support any motion which is submitted here for the purpose of serving the ends of any one member. Under these circumstances I feel that I would not be doing myself or my constituents justice if I sat here without explaining the reasons why I shall vote against the resolution. I am sincere in what I say. Is it not a strange thing, Mr. Speaker, that in this House, where we have so many prominent Irishmen, men who are respected from one end of this Dominion to the other, that there is not one of them that will get up here and move the resolution except the hon. gentleman who has been playing with it so long. For that reason I shall vote against it now and every time so long as it is moved in the spirit in which it has been moved to-day.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I venture to intrude in this debate, expressing the hope that nothing which I may say, will mar the effect produced by the very eloquent and statesmanlike utterance we have heard from the Prime Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In corroboration of what the right hon. gentleman has said, if I may call it corroboration, I would like to read to the House the words

used by the Hon. George E. Foster at the time the Transvaal resolution was introduced here, and I think these words have a very close application to the subject now before us. Mr. Foster said :

These resolutions, I think, are timely, then, because they say to our own British fellow-citizens, who are Uitlanders in the republic, that they have the sympathy and the good will of the British empire as a whole, in all its parts, in their struggle for equal rights. No taxation without representation is a cry to which the world rises, and it will rise in the Dutch republic just as surely as the sun rises. Outside of that, I think, great good will come from the introduction and passage of a resolution like this in that it is another proof of the solidarity of the British empire throughout the world, that to-day, in these times of telegraph wires, and steamships, and quick transmission of intelligence, evokes a lively and sympathetic and deep interest in every part of the British empire in the local fortunes of every other part of the British empire.

It seems to me that this language may very well be taken to heart by hon. gentlemen opposite who are opposed to this resolution. I would ask them to realize that all we ask is that there may be extended to our fellow-countrymen in Ireland, that measure of sympathy and support that two years ago we were asked to extend to the Uitlanders in South Africa. Beyond that we do not go; beyond that, so far as I am concerned, I would not venture to go.

Some hon. gentlemen have taken it upon themselves to discuss the motives and the objects which my hon. friend (Mr. Costigan) had when he moved this resolution. I would be remiss in my duty, if, speaking here to-night, I did not say a word in support of that hon. gentleman, and give expression to the sentiments that I entertain for him. Let me say in this connection that I do not affect to speak for the Irish Catholics of the Dominion of Canada. I have no mandate; no authority to speak for them. I speak to-night, as has been my habit in the past, in the capacity of a Canadian representative of a Canadian constituency, but at the same time I cannot forget that I am an Irish Catholic, and I speak as one of that class (if not for them) when I say that no man in Canada deserves better of the Irish Catholics than the Hon. Mr. Costigan.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Hon. Mr. Costigan enjoys the exceptional advantage of having occupied a seat in this House continuously since confederation, and during that long record he has not done anything that we need blush for. On the contrary, we give our sanction and our approval to all that he has done in so far as Irish Catholic interests are concerned.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria, Ont.) It is Irish interests he is looking after, not Irish Catholic interests.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not quite catch what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria, Ont.) He is looking after Irish interests, not after Irish Catholic interests.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, he is looking after Irish interests, and that is what we are dealing with now. The attack made upon the Hon. Mr. Costigan was under the suggestion that his object here was merely to catch votes, and I am referring to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) with the object of refuting the statement that such is his object. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) was good enough to suggest that he would like to challenge any man in this House to say that there was such a thing in existence as an Irish grievance. Well, the answer to that challenge of his was given by the leader of the political party to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) belongs; but if further answer be required, I could read from the speeches delivered by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Chamberlain as far back as 1885 and 1886. Here is one of the declarations that Mr. Chamberlain had to make on that subject :

It is not a new problem, this Irish question. Once in ten years ; once in twenty years it may be ; sometimes with sufficient warning, sometimes without the slightest preparation like a bolt from the blue sky, the Irish question is upon us. Every generation in turn for 400 years has had to deal with it. Each has disposed of it for a time according to its fashion, and each has had to bequeath it still unsettled to its successor. . . . . Force has been tried during all this period, and has failed. Nothing is more certain than that force, although it may temporarily have produced order and tranquillity, has left Ireland always as discontented as before, has left the problem still unsolved. . . . . The majority of the farmers of Ireland and their families are at the mercy of the ten thousand landlords in the country, and they have suffered much in the past. Well, I have nothing to say, and will not say one single word against the Irish landlords as a class. The proof that they have been, on the whole, just and even generous is to be found in the fact that they continue to exist. The occasional enforcement of their rights by an unjust and harsh landlord here and there was enough to cause alarm and indignation throughout the whole district, and was a constant and fruitful source of disaffection in the country ; and when the bad times came—when famine stared these people in the face, and when to every man was brought the possibility of eviction and expatriation—I say it is no wonder that under such circumstances a common danger united the people, induced them to listen to baleful counsels, and occasionally impelled them to criminal deeds.

Now, the question of Irish grievances, it seems to me, is not one that should be discussed here. We all know that Irish grievances have existed, and we know that some exist still. At the same time, I would not be true to my duty if I did not bear testimony to the fact that an honest effort has been made by the English people to remedy those grievances, and I am satisfied that the day is not far distant when the last

of them will have disappeared. In the meantime, what are we called on to do? To express our continued belief in the advantages of the principle of self-government; to say, as the Canadian parliament said in 1882 and again in 1887, that in the light of the experience we have had in Canada, we believe that the principle of self-government when applied to Ireland will have the same result that it has had when applied to Canada. It is not necessary for me to go over the record and point out the advantages which we have enjoyed in Canada as a result of the application of the principle of self-government. It is not necessary for me to go over the records since 1837 and point out to this House, the majority of whom are more familiar with the details than I can profess to be, how a change has come over the spirit of our dream in Canada; how from a country in open revolt, we have come to be a country whose loyalty is unquestioned, and which is looked on to-day as one of the finest countries in the world. We have developed along the lines of self-government, and can it be pretended for one moment that, as the ties have lessened until to-day we have become a nation within a nation, the bonds have in any respect been weakened? On the contrary, as the ties have been lessened, as the principle of self-government has been developed, the bonds have become firmer; because we now realize what British constitutional liberty means; because we now realize that the British flag stands to us in Canada for liberty, self-government and justice—in a word, for all those things which in the past have been denied to the Irishmen in Ireland.

Now, a large and important portion of this country is interested in this question. It is all very fine for some hon. gentlemen to rise up in this House and say that they love the Irish, they admire the Irish, they recognize the services the Irish have rendered to the empire and to Canada; but that which is more important, it seems to me, than all that is that these hon. gentlemen should show their good will, not by words, but by deeds.

And I cannot agree with those who say that they vote against this resolution, not because of its intrinsic merits, but because it happens to be proposed by an hon. member who does not meet favour in their eyes. It has been suggested, I think by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder), that this resolution does not cover the same ground as the resolution of 1882—that it does not contain within it the same restrictions with respect to the rights of the minority in Ireland. My hon. friend never read the resolution, or he would understand that it is a mere reaffirming of the principles of the resolution of 1882, nothing more, nothing less.

On the other hand, some hon. gentleman has said: We do not wish to obtrude our opinions on the British House of Commons, because in 1882, when we ventured to offer some suggestions in this respect, we were told by the Earl of Kimberley practically to mind our own business. Well, so far as I am concerned, I deny to any British statesman, however eminent his position may be, the right to dictate to the Canadian parliament whether or not it has the right to pass a resolution or to petition. That is a right inherent in the Canadian parliament; and, as Sir John Thompson said, and as Mr. Edward Blake said in 1887, our duty is to deny the right of any English statesman to lay down such a doctrine. But independent altogether of this observation, I would like to say that I appeal to Mr. Gladstone, better informed in 1887 than he appears to have been in 1882. In 1882 he was the head of the government, and of course was responsible for what the Earl of Kimberley said when he wrote the letter that has been referred to in the course of the present debate. But Mr. Gladstone in 1887 received a resolution passed by the provincial legislature at Quebec in favour of his Home Rule Bill, and publicly thanked the legislature for having passed the resolution. We were told that we ought not to obtrude our views on the imperial parliament, because, forsooth, it might occur to the imperial parliament to give us advice—to say, for instance, that the tithe system existing in the province of Quebec should not be tolerated any longer, but should be altered. My hon. friends need not trouble themselves about that. The imperial parliament, if it desired to make any observations in that respect, would not limit itself to observations; it might to-morrow pass an Act to wipe out the whole of those restrictions. The British parliament has the inherent power to amend every line of the British North America Act, and to-morrow the whole British North America Act might be wiped out. But is it likely to occur? Is it likely, after England has had the experience which she has had of the development of local institutions in Canada, that the imperial parliament would venture to do anything of the sort? There is no use of creating bugbears for the purpose of putting an argument of that sort before this House.

Now, I would like to say one word as to the other branch of the resolution, that is, the branch that has reference to the question of land tenure in Ireland. I agree, and I am glad to bear testimony to the fact, that there is probably but one people in the world generous enough to deal with a question of this sort, as the English people are attempting to deal with it at the present time. But what are we asked to do? We are asked to congratulate them practically on what they are doing, to wish them success in their efforts, and bid them God-speed on the road on which they have

entered. Now, is it not right that we should do so? Never has there been in the history of Ireland anything approaching the conditions that exist to-day. You have, on the one hand, Mr. Redmond, who represents the Nationalist party, rising in his place in the English House of Commons and saying:

> The situation in Ireland was very strange. It was so full of hope that it contained a menace of danger. Crime was unknown, coercion had been suspended, class animosities for the moment were at an end, and united Ireland stood at the bar of that House and asked for the concession of this great measure of justice and appeasement. To raise up the hopes of a whole people to the highest pitch of expectation and then dash them to the ground would be neither a safe nor a sane proceeding. Never in the history of that House had a government had a more blessed opportunity of carrying to fruition a great and blessed policy.

These are the words that fell from the lips of the leader of the Irish Nationalist party. What do we find on the other side? We find Col. Saunderson, who represents the north and who speaks for the landlord element, saying on the same subject:

> Ireland was ready to accept this gift, not only for its own benefits, but for the good of the state; and to disappoint the country in the matter would be, in his judgment a crime. He had always held that the purchasing out of the landlords of Ireland was not so much for the good of the tenants or the landlords themselves as for the good of the state in contributing to the general security of the British Empire, by restoring peace, prosperity and contentment to Ireland.

That is the measure we ask you to approve of. That is the measure to which this House is asked to wish Godspeed. It is a measure which has united all parties in Ireland as they never have been since the repeal of the Union. In the words of my right hon. leader, a unique opportunity has come to have this difficulty settled. If it was important for us to interfere in the South African matter, it is doubly important that we should interfere at the present juncture in connection with the affairs of Ireland. It is important that we should do so, not only from the standpoint of Canada, but of Ireland and England. Is it not important to have a contented and peaceful Ireland at the doors of England, is it not better to have that country a bulwark and a rampart of the empire, instead of having it as heretofore a hot-bed of revolution and rebellion? Any expenditure which will bring about that condition of things, will be an expenditure made in the interests of the empire. As the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill said, it is an expenditure by which the English exchequer will be enriched, and which will effect a benefit, in so far as the external relations of the empire are concerned, that will have a far more reaching effect than any shadowy attempt to increase the militia or the army in England.

My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke of the demagogues in the United States who played on the sentiments of the Irish people there. There again we find an additional reason for having this matter settled, because the demagogue would soon be out of business if there were no Irish grievances. He would soon cease to be able to twist the tail of the British lion if Irishmen in America were satisfied that England had done justice to their fellow countrymen at home. I shall not speak about the qualities of my race. Testimony has been borne to their good qualities to-night. But since the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) has been good enough to say that my countrymen have shown their valour on many a well fought field, I may claim that this should dispel any ill-will against Ireland aroused by its unfortunate manifestations of sympathy with the Boers. If you have this sympathy on the one hand, on the other hand you have the valour and the cheers of the Irish soldiers on the veldt in South Africa, which more than once turned the scale when victory trembled in the balance, and gave courage, sympathy and support to the English and Scotch soldiers on the same field. After all the law of compensation must tell, and it seems to me the time is opportune for us to set aside personal feelings, and not stop to consider whether the resolution has been introduced by one hon. gentleman or another, but simply look at the question from the standpoint of Canadians. We should only ask ourselves this question: Is it good for Canada that this resolution should be introduced and adopted? Is it good for the empire? Is it for the best interests of Canada and the empire that Ireland should be made peaceful, happy and contented? The descendants of Irishmen form an important element in this country. Whether our fathers or our grandfathers were born on the old soil, whether we belong to the second or third generation—and I speak as one of the latter—we feel as sincerely and earnestly for the cause of Ireland to-day as ever did our ancestors in the old land. Surely it is a remarkable and significant fact that men should carry through three successive generations the insatiable desire to have justice done the land from which they hail. We may have never seen the old land, our fathers may never have seen it, but still we hope for the day when all the grievances of Ireland may be settled, and when Irishmen at home will do for England what the Irishmen of Canada are doing for England in this Dominion.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I shall not occupy the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, many minutes in the few remarks I have to offer on the amendment placed in your hands by the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Costigan). But in view of what has been presented to the House on both sides of the question to-

night, I feel that before a vote is taken I should give some reason why I am constrained to vote against the resolution. I listened with a great deal of attention to all that the hon. gentleman had to say, as well as to what fell from the lips of the hon. gentleman who seconded the resolution (Mr. Hackett), and I must sincerely congratulate both those hon. gentlemen on the moderation which characterized their arguments in its support. I am not one of those who find fault with the mover of the resolution for the course he has taken. In view of the diploma he has just received from the hon. the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick), according to which he is looked upon as the representative leader of the Irish people in Canada, he had the right to take the course he did. But I may be permitted to express an opinion, as an Irishman, not representing anybody but myself on this occasion, and an Irishman who belongs to the minority, or at any rate who comes from the stock of the minority in that country. And my opinion is that at this particular time, when a great effort is being made by Protestants and Catholics to solve one of the burning questions which has kept them apart in the motherland, it is highly inexpedient to introduce a resolution dragging this home rule business into the arena. The hon. gentleman knows that the minority in Ireland to-day are as strongly and as irrevocably opposed to home rule, as defined by those authorized to speak for the home rule party in the imperial parliament, as they were ten or even twenty years ago. I repeat, as an Irishman, earnest in his desire to see every grievance existing in the old land removed, this resolution is inexpedient. It will not promote the cause of home rule. It will not redound to the advantage of those who desire to see Ireland, north and south, east and west, united, happy, prosperous and contented. I regret exceedingly that this resolution has been moved and I regret it for these reasons. I regret it because, as the hon. Minister of Justice has pointed out, there is to-day a coming together, there is a meeting of the extremes upon the great measure which a Unionist government—a government which is the result of the attempt of Mr. Gladstone to pass a home rule measure through the imperial parliament—has had the courage, the temerity to bring forward as a solution of a much vexed question. I say I regret very deeply that, at this particular juncture, this unfortunate resolution should be brought in, because the representatives of the north have been shown by the hon. Minister of Justice as agreeing with the representatives of the south—Col. Saunderson agreeing with some other gentleman whose opinion was quoted —that everything should be done to secure the passage of that measure through the House of Commons. Now, let me say one word more with regard to the introduction of this resolution. Those who differ from the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Costigan) have no right to complain of want of courtesy. They do not expect to receive more than a reasonable measure of courtesy or consideration from the hon. gentleman when he introduces his resolution. But we think, and we have a right to think from what has been said by the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett), that, though he is certainly as enthusiastic as the hon. member for Victoria in his advocacy of home rule for Ireland, he was treated with scant courtesy by the mover of this resolution. The hon. member for West Prince declared on the floor of the House that only one hour before he rose to move the resolution did the hon. member for Victoria intimate to him that he was expected to second it. Does not that give some force and effect to the suggestion offered here to-night that, probably—and I would not like to make the statement believing it to be true, but it has been made here —some other consideration than that of the best interests of Ireland moved the hon. gentleman in bringing in his resolution at this time and under these peculiar circumstances ?

It has been pointed out that resolutions were passed by this House dealing with this matter in 1882, 1886, 1897 and 1901. But it has not been stated that since these resolutions were passed, since the parliament of Canada first placed itself on record respecting the granting of a measure of home rule to Ireland, the matter has been dealt with by the imperial parliament, the parliament whose duty it is to legislate for England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, the parliament best capable of dealing with the interests of the people of the United Kingdom. That parliament has dealt with this question of home rule on two occasions since 1882. The first occasion was in 1886, when the late Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone introduced a Bill. He was defeated, and he succeeded in breaking the Liberal party in two, and the pieces have not been brought together to this day. That right hon. gentleman introduced the measure again in 1893, carried it through the popular assembly, but it was defeated in the House of Lords. So, on the two occasions when the question of home rule came within the field of practical politics, when the representatives of the estates were given an opportunity to speak upon it, they declared against it. And I say—and I think I say it advisedly—that it ill-becomes us to offer an opinion and give advice when those whose duty it is to deal with this matter have, on two occasions, expressed their opinion and given advice to the Sovereign as to what is best to be done in the interests of the people of the United Kingdom. Sir, the present Unionist government owes its existence to the attempt on the part of the Liberal party, headed by that great statesman, the late Mr. Gladstone, to give home rule to Ireland. The Liberal party was smashed and the Liberal-Unionists withdrew because of their disagreement with

their leader upon this question. But since this Unionist government came into power, whose members were pledged against home rule, they have given the strongest and best proofs that could be given to the Irish people, as well as to the Irish race all over the world, that they do not desire to see any real grievance in Ireland remain unredressed. They have given abundant proofs of their desire to remove every real grievance. They have passed two Land Acts since they came into power. They have passed a local government Bill which has practically revolutionized the social conditions of Ireland and given local control in local matters such as had not been known in a hundred years. There are three great questions before the Irish people, and this Unionist government—called into existence, as I repeat, because the Liberal party tried to pass home rule for Ireland—has dealt with two of them. First there was the question of the Irish university. The government appointed a commission of eminent educationists to inquire into the question and report. That report has been presented and, in due time, no doubt will be crystallized into law. They also passed a measure of local municipal government which will work out to the advantage of the people of Ireland and of the people of Great Britain. And to-day that government has presented a Bill in the Commons of Great Britain which will, for all time, redound to the credit of all those who are responsible for it, and which proves beyond peradventure the desire of the Unionist government, if there is a grievance in Ireland respecting land tenure, to remove that grievance and give the tenantry of Ireland, who have such an intense love for the native land that they desire to cling to its soil and to eke out an existence even on small holdings, an opportunity of becoming landlords, which no government in ancient or modern times ever attempted to give to a people in a position similar to that of the Irish tenant farmers. These are proofs of the patriotism and desire to do justice to Ireland presented to the world by the Unionist government of Great Britain. These are proofs that the interests of Ireland are not being neglected, that the Unionist government have the interest of Ireland at heart and are giving practical proofs of their sympathy with Ireland by passing legislation which will undoubtedly redound to the peace and prosperity of that part of His Majesty's empire.

Sir, the Minister of Justice, just before he took his seat, made an admission which, I think, will not be questioned by any hon. gentleman who knows the facts and occupies a seat in this House. He said that up to the present time Ireland has been a hot bed of rebellion, a hot-bed of revolution. I would ask the hon. gentleman, would he think it the part of wisdom, if such a state of things existed in such an important, such an integral part of the United Kingdom, to pass a measure of local self-government that would satisfy the aspirations of the majority of the people among whom such a state of feeling exists ? The admission he has made is satisfactory proof to me that the action, up to the present time, of the government of the United Kingdom, has been wise, judicious and patriotic in the extreme. The Minister of Justice has not told us nor has any hon. gentleman who has spoken in this debate—the right hon. premier himself (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has not told us—of one disability, one grievance under which the Irish labour that the English and the Scotch and Welsh do not labour under as well. No hon. gentleman has pointed out a single disability existing in the south of Ireland that does not exist in the north as well. No hon. gentleman has pointed out one grievance that exists in Ulster that does not exist in Lancashire or in the counties north of the Tweed. There are no grievances in Ireland that are not common to the people of the United Kingdom. And where there are real grievances and they can be pointed out, the imperial parliament has proved its willingness and its desire to remove those grievances and to make the people united, contented, and prosperous, if it is possible to do so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman says that there are no grievances. Will he permit me to interrupt him ?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Here is what Hon. T. W. Russell said a few days ago :

> Conditions in Ireland are : Coercion revived, constitution suspended, public men in prison, landlordism supreme in Dublin castle, higher education hung up, parliament hamstrung, legislation impossible, people rushing from the country in tens of thousands to seek bread in foreign lands.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman endorse that statement ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman says there are no grievances. Against his authority I put that of the Hon. T. W. Russell. That is all.

Mr. CLARKE. I should be very sorry indeed to set myself up as an authority against the gentleman whose opinion has been quoted. I do not know when that statement was made, or where it was made, but I will take the opportunity of reading a few lines from an official statement made by Mr. Russell before I take my seat. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have passed resolutions favouring home rule for Ireland on two or three occasions. I am not going to argue that matter now, because it has been argued in this parliament, which has passed these resolutions. I think, though, I might reiterate what has been said so well and so frequently during this debate, that we have quite a number of problems to solve ourselves, that we have a great deal to do in

this parliament, and we ought to occupy our time as far as available in the discharge of our duties in representing the Canadian people. We have no mandate from our constituents to express an opinion upon this abstract question of home rule for Ireland. What do they know about it? They do not know any more about it than we do ourselves. Is it not rank impertinence, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that 600 men, the chosen representatives of all parts of the United Kingdom meet from year to year, who have Ireland's condition and Ireland's grievances under their eyes all the time—is it not rank impertinence on our part to be intruding and protruding ourselves into the affairs of the United Kingdom and asking these 600 men to pass a measure of home rule for Ireland? Don't you think they know their own business better than we do? It strikes me that it is reasonable to say they do. But let me go on. What have we done in parliament to aid Ireland by the passing of these resolutions, these empty, meaningless, impertinent resolutions? We got snubbed for the first one we passed, and very properly so, snubbed by the Secretary for Colonial Affairs in the administration of the late Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, when we were told politely to mind our own business.

But, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of satisfaction has been taken in pointing out that since then we passed another resolution, practically unanimously, in 1899, I think, endorsing the imperial government respecting its action in the Transvaal and Orange River colonies. Is there no difference between passing this resolution favouring home rule for Ireland and our action in passing a resolution endorsing and approving the stand of the imperial government in demanding for British subjects in the Transvaal and Orange River colonies the rights that Irishmen enjoy in Ireland, and Scotchmen enjoy in Scotland? Is there not a marked difference between the two resolutions? In the one case we were re-echoing the sentiments which found a place in the breasts of 999,000 out of every million people of the British empire; we said to the mother land: We endorse your action, because you are demanding equal rights and fair play for the Uitlanders, which they do not get in a part of the world which is under the suzerainty of the British empire. Were we not right in taking that stand? Is there any parallel, under the circumstances, in protruding ourselves upon the British parliament and demanding that Irish aspirations should be gratified by giving an independent legislature to that country, and say nothing about England, Scotland and Wales—or Ulster, for that matter, at the same time? We have contented ourselves with passing these empty resolutions, while the imperial government has been at work, mitigating any wrong that exists, alleviating anything untoward that works harshly against the Irish people. What have we been doing? Passing a resolution about once every seven years. About once in seven years the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) bobs up serenely and moves a resolution in favour of home rule for Ireland; then we have a division on it, and prove that even the parliament of Canada is not a unit on this question, and he goes to sleep again for seven years. In the meantime the British government, this government that has been tyrannizing over Ireland for so many years, has been at work and we have been doing nothing.

Yes, Mr, Speaker, we have been doing something, and let me try to point out what we have done. We found that some time ago the imperial government placed an embargo on Canadian cattle, to the detriment of the Canadian producer and exporter. We did not stop to consider whether that embargo resulted advantageously to the Irish tenant farmer or not. We were so anxious to promote our own interests that we have been making representations to the imperial government asking that that embargo should be removed, asking that that keen competition, that fierce competition which the Irish tenant farmer has to encounter, encounter under great difficulties, encounter as a small holder of land, cultivating it under primitive methods—we are asking that that moderate measure of incidental protection which the embargo has given to the Irish tenant farmer should be removed, and that he should be obliged to meet us in open market in Liverpool, and compete with us for the sale of his store and fat cattle. If the hon. gentleman from Victoria had the interest of the Irish tenant farmer at heart, surely, Mr. Speaker, he would have raised his voice in favour of the maintenance of that embargo, and crown his life work in the promotion of Ireland's interests by securing for Ireland a measure of protection. I suppose that we will not hear the voice of the hon. gentleman raised in favour of the maintenance of that embargo during this session. I should hope that if he desired to secure for all time a record for consistency, he would insist that this embargo should remain where it is.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the hon. gentleman has been both consistent and persistent. Through evil report and good report, for twenty years he has brought up this home rule resolution. I merely point to the fact that it has been an empty thing, and that while something for the practical advantage of the tenant farmer might have been procured in this House, the hon. gentleman has not taken advantage of the occasion to do it. If he would use his great influence with his new found political allies, perhaps he might be able to get a genuine measure of preference for the poplins, for the laces, for the linens, in the manufacture of which the Irish people

excel. We have given them a so-called preference, and what does it amount to? We have only to read the record of the colonial conference to see what they think about the preference; and if we have any doubt after reading the interpretation which the imperial officials put upon the value of that preference, we have only to read the instructions which have been issued by the Minister of Customs to the various collectors throughout this country to see what a sham that preference is, so far as advantage to the green isle is concerned. Might I ask my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, after we have disposed of this resolution dealing with home rule, to turn his attention to that question of the preference? Might I ask him again to use his influence, and I am sure he will have the co-operation of all Irishmen, whether they agree with him in regard to this resolution or not, in securing for the industrious workers of the Green Isle a real advantage, a real preference for their products in this fair land of Canada? He can do something practical for the Irish people by giving them a real and genuine preference for their products in the markets of the Dominion.

There is another way too, by which we might be of advantage to the Irish people. If we desire to show that we sympathize with them, if we desire to relieve them of a portion of the burden which rests heavily upon their shoulders, surely it would not be out of place in the day of our prosperity, in the day of our advancement, in this growing time for the hon. gentleman to propose that the time has come when it is expedient that this great young country of ours, full of boundless resources and having a future only limited by our appreciation of what we can make it should do something of substantial benefit for the Irish people. Surely we might expect from this hon. gentleman and those who sympathize with him that if they desire to be of real benefit to the Irish people, to the people of the north as well as to the people of the south, they would propose now that our coffers are overflowing, now that the money is pouring into the treasury of this Dominion of Canada—and we will support them in asking it—that a portion of that money should be sent to supplement the funds in the imperial exchequer for the maintenance of that peerless organization, the British navy, which protects our commerce in every nook and corner of the seven seas, that we might give a contribution towards the maintenance of the imperial navy which is to be found everywhere, and by such means we might relieve the Irish people of a portion of the burden which they are called upon to bear for the maintenance of that navy. I make these suggestions with all respect to the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., because these are practical ways in which he can benefit the Irish people, the minority as well as the majority, and he will find that if he makes a motion of this kind he will have the cordial support and sympathy of those who regret that they cannot concur with him in the amendment which he has placed, Mr. Speaker, in your hands. I am afraid that I have taken up altogether too much of the time of the House and must apologize for having done so. During this afternoon we had the statement from the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., that the feeling in favour of home rule was growing steadily. I, with my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), believe that there is a great congestion of business in the imperial parliament. I often wonder how the imperial parliament discharges its duty as well as it does. I often wonder why it is that matters of detail, municipal matters, purely local matters are permitted to take up the time of the imperial parliament from day to day and year to year, and I hope to live to see the day come when some scheme will be adopted to relegate to the local authorities the right of dealing with these purely local matters. I want to see the Irish people given an opportunity, if they can agree upon the conditions, to govern, to a great extent, their local affairs, and I am satisfied that the people who are best qualified to bring about such a condition of things are the people of Ireland, of England and Scotland, represented in the imperial parliament, and I look upon our action in passing resolutions of this kind as rather a detriment than an advantage.

Just one or two words more before I sit down. I will only refer, very briefly, to what the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Costigan) has said. I dissent from his proposition that the feeling in favour of home rule, as it is understood by those who speak for the majority, is growing in England. Lord Rosebery represented Mr. Gladstone's government in the House of Lords when the Home Rule Bills were before the imperial parliament. Speaking on the 14th of February, 1902, at Liverpool, Lord Rosebery said:

> The Irish leaders have demanded not what Mr. Gladstone was willing to give them, but an independent parliament in Dublin.

Hon. gentlemen talk about giving to Ireland the same measure of self-government as we have in Canada. Those who profess to speak for the majority of the Irish people do not want provincial autonomy such as we enjoy in the provinces of Canada; they want complete autonomy, they want legislative independence, they want that and they will not be satisfied with anything else. That is the opinion of Lord Rosebery, one of the members of Mr. Gladstone's cabinet who supported his leader in advocating and presenting that measure of home rule that met with disaster on two occasions in the imperial parliament. Let me repeat again what Lord Rosebery says:

The Irish leaders have demanded not what Mr. Gladstone was willing to give them, but an independent parliament in Dublin. Now, when you get there, I say, 'Halt'! I am not prepared at any time or under any circumstances to grant an independent parliament in Dublin.

I need not point out to hon. members on both sides of the House the prominent position which Lord Rosebery occupies in the public eye of the United Kingdom. He is a keen observer of current events and I think his opinion of the attitude, the demands and the requirements of the leaders of the home rule party is entitled to some consideration at the hands of the Canadian parliament; and I say that his statement that the home rule leaders have changed their position is a statement that cannot be successfully controverted by any hon. member of this House, if the leaders of the home rule party are held responsible for the public utterances they have made, or for what they say from day to day, from week to week and from year to year in addressing their constituents and the people of the United Kingdom. But, Sir, let me read the opinion of another hon. gentleman, a gentleman who is highly thought of and deservedly so, who is acclaimed by Irish Catholics and Protestants alike, a gentleman who speaks for the government of which he is a member, whose heroism, whose courage and whose patriotism in preparing and presenting the measure of land reform which is now before the imperial parliament has challenged the admiration of the British people. I refer to the Right Hon. Geo. Wyndham. In a speech made in March last, in Liverpool, I think it was, although I am not sure, he made this statement:

What are the facts that stand out from the midst of the constitutional problem involved in the Irish question? They are these: Mr. Gladstone's bills are dead—dead on their merits. They never had been accepted by England. They would have brought Ireland to bankruptcy within a very few years. In the second place, an independent parliament for Ireland is an impossibility; and in the third place, the common exchequer of the two countries will never be divided. . . . .

These are strong utterances from a responsible minister and a member of a powerful government that is proving its desire to help Ireland by the legislation which it has enacted and which it is enacting.

To sum up this constitutional argument which has recently been reopened, these two islands, by the inflexible ordinance of geography, of history and of finance are bound, and must ever be bound together by ties even closer than those which bind our colonies to the mother country.

These are the expressions of two men occupying prominent positions in the public life of the United Kingdom, and I take it that their utterances are worthy of some consideration and should have some value attached to them in the parliament of Canada. I promised the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) that I would read three or four words from the statement of a gentleman whom he quoted—Mr. T. W. Russell. I quote from the 'Daily Mail' Year-book. He says:

There is, first of all, what I may call the national demand for the restoration of rights taken away by the Act of Union. Historically, the demand has its origin in the fact that the Act of Union was carried by means which could not be adopted to-day. And the overwhelming majority of the Irish people take Lord Plunkett's view that the Act and the whole proceedings connected with it were ultra vires.

The British people, however, have had an opportunity of reconsidering the question. All the facts—thanks to Mr. Gladstone—were put before the public mind, and Ireland's demand for the restoration of a native legislature was refused. This refusal does not alter feeling in Ireland. It probably renders it more bitter.

I desire to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to this particular part of the statement:

But it does remove the question somewhat out of the region of practical politics in Great Britain. Still the home rule question is far from being dead. And the people who imagine a vain thing may some day or other have a sudden and rude awakening.

This is the statement Mr. T. W. Russell makes with regard to the position which the home rule question occupies in imperial politics to-day. The right hon. leader of the House in his eloquent address to-night, pledging his support to the resolution, touched the crucial point when he observed that mistrust and lack of confidence was one of the main causes for the refusal of the minority in Ireland to agree to the establishment of a native parliament. Are the minority justified in holding that view? Are they justified in withholding their assent from such a measure? They are, Mr. Speaker, amply justified because the history of the past twenty-five years teems with evidence of the disloyalty of those who have been advocating home rule, and declaration after declaration has been made by these men; declarations that cannot be misconstrued; that the goal they are reaching for is not provincial autonomy such as we enjoy in Canada, but absolute separation and the establishment of a separate parliament for Ireland. Sir, I need not say to you or to any gentleman in this House, that that separate parliament cannot be granted. Certainly it never can be granted, as long as one-fourth of the people of the Green Isle, the minority—whose very existence, whose attainment of prosperity gives the lie to the statement that Ireland labours under disabilities and disadvantages—I say that this measure for a native parliament can never become an accomplished fact until the majority by their actions prove to the minority, that they have been saying what they do not mean; that they desire to live in peace and amity and concord with the minority and to give that minority absolute equality and every measure of protection

that the majority desire for themselves. The right hon. the premier quoted from utterances given expression to by Mr. Dillon some years ago. Let me quote for the right hon. gentleman some of the language which Mr. John Dillon has used within the past twelve months. Speaking at Liverpool on March 12th, 1902, Mr. John Dillon said :

He promised Lord Rosebery and Lord Salisbury that as long as Ireland was denied that God-given right of freedom—a right for which men ought to fight if they could—they would never be loyal.

At Greenock on March 14th, 1902, Mr. Dillon said :

If they had the power to-morrow they would be the greatest cowards in the world to submit to English government if they were able to overthrow it with physicial force.

Does my right hon. friend wonder that the prosperous, the contented, the progressive minority in Ireland object to have their affairs administered by men who give utterance to such expressions ? Does the right hon. gentleman wonder that under these circumstances there is a sharp line of distinction drawn between those who are prosperous and loyal and those who are disaffected and discontented; and will not my right hon. friend admit that every vestige of suspicion, every vestige of mistrust that exists in the mind of the minority must be removed before any local government can be granted that will be workable in Ireland? I have quoted from the statements made by Mr. John Dillon. Let me quote from the statement of a gentleman occupying a still more prominent position in the home rule party. I refer to Mr. John Redmond, M.P. On the 20th of October, 1901, at Maryborough, Queen's county, on a Sunday, Mr. John Redmond made this statement :

I point to what is going on in Connaught as an example to the rest of Ireland. If only all over Ireland to-day we had as vigorous and—I won't mince words—as dangerous a movement as there exists at this moment in Connaught, we would make short work of the land question and short work, as I believe, of the English government of our country (cheers).

My one principle in public life is—in every department of the government, from the highest to the lowest—from the chief secretary in his back room in Dublin castle down to the landgrabber and the bailiff in the country town—to make every department of government in this country difficult and dangerous (cheers). That has always been my principle in public life. I have made no disguise of it. I have said it over and over again in the House of Commons.—' Freeman's ' Journal, October 21, 1901.

Does the right hon. leader of this House wonder, when the leader of the home rule movement within the last fifteen months gave expressions to such views as this, that he does not enjoy to the extent he ought to enjoy it, if home rule is to be a success, the sympathy and confidence of the minority of the people of the Green Isle ? Mr. Redmond came to America on a mission. Before he sailed on the evening of October 22, 1901, he arrived in Cork, accompanied by Mr. P. A. McHugh, M.P., and Mr. Thomas O'Donnell, M.P. Addressing a large gathering in front of the Victoria hotel, Mr. Redmond explained his mission to America. He said :

It means that the reunion which has taken place in Ireland has taken place also in America ; it means that those English statesmen—shallow, short-sighted men, who imagined that because we were torn with dissention here for the last ten years that the cause of Ireland was dead and buried—it means that these men will understand when they see this mission to America that they have to fight against a united Irish race who are simply united by one consideration to use whatever means are honourable and just in the sight of God, and who care nothing for English law (cheers), and who are prepared to say before the world that, rather than be held by force, as we are to-day, under the British empire, we would prefer to be linked with the meanest free country on the face of the earth.

I am going to our race in America to ask them for their sympathy, to ask them for their support, and to tell them that, in my honest belief, we are near the day when England will be weak and degraded (cheers), when oppressed nationalities will be strong, and when Ireland's support may be a matter of vital consequence to English statesmen and English parties (renewed cheering). But this mission to America has another meaning that I would commend to the minds of those English newspapers that are curious and anxious upon the subject. To-day England stands alone in the world ; to-day the public opinion of every civilized nation is against England ; and one of my objects in going to America is to prove to English statesmen that the public opinion of the world is against England and is upon the side of Ireland (cheers), that the whole public opinion of the American nation, of the leading statesmen, and of all political parties is in complete sympathy with Ireland's demand for freedom ; and that is another meaning of this mission. It will show to England that she will have to count in the future on a united Irish race of twenty millions throughout the world, backed by the public opinion, the sympathy, and the support of over seventy millions.—' Freeman's Journal,' October 23, 1901.

That extract is from the ' Freeman's Journal ' of October 23, 1901. But Mr. Redmond said something more, and I would not trespass on the time of the House at such length except for the prominent position he occupies in the home rule party. Several addresses including those from the Cork Eviction Tenants' Association and the Cork Trades Council were presented to Mr. Redmond just on the eve of his departure and in reply he said :

I have no hesitation in saying that the United Irish League stands to-day precisely on the same foundation as stood the Land League when Parnell declared he would never take off his coat in the movement if there was not behind the agrarian movement the national question (applause). This United Irish League is not merely an agrarian movement. It is first, last, and all the time a national movement (applause); and those of us who are endeavour-

ing to rouse the farmers of Ireland, as we endeavoured twenty years ago in the days of the Land League to rouse them, are doing so not merely to obtain the removal of their particular grievances, but because we believe by rousing them we will be strengthening the national movement and helping us to obtain our end, which is, after all, the national independence of Ireland.

That is the statement of this gentleman, and he adds :

I desire to say to the tradesmen of Ireland that I hope they will not be led away by these enemies of the Irish movement who are endeavouring to induce them to think that this is a purely agrarian movement. It is nothing of the kind. It is a national movement, having for its first and last object the emancipation of Ireland as a nation.—'Freeman's Journal,' October 24, 1901.

I do not know whether the hon. gentleman meant what he said or not ; but if he meant what he said, do you wonder that those who desire for themselves and for those who come after them, a continuance of privileges which they now enjoy as British subjects, shall not have their interests confided to men who hold such sentiments as those I have read ? Do you wonder that a minority of the people of Ireland, who are contented and prosperous, desire that the status quo shall be maintained, rather than that they should be led into an enterprise that would bring them into opposition to England and Scotland, and to their sons and brothers across the channel ? Mr. Redmond was the principal speaker at a large meeting in the Rotunda in Dublin, when a letter from Mr. Wm. O'Brien was read, in which he said :

In thanking you for your kind invitation, allow me to express the hope that, if the English King carries out his threatened visit to Ireland next year, the United Irish League in Dublin will succeed in rousing such a spirit as will convince His Majesty from the hour he lands that he comes amongst a people discontented and disaffected to the core, who only need the arms and training of the Boers to testify their hatred of England's rule, with an eloquence equal to that of the unconquered South African Republics.

I leave these extracts from the speeches and letters of the men who are the leaders of this home rule movement, with hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and I ask them how they can wonder that the minority who have done their full share in maintaining the prestige and extending the influence and the power of the British empire, and whose sons have held their own in Ireland and everywhere else throughout the world, protest emphatically against the passage of any measure by the imperial parliament that would lessen or weaken the ties which now happily unite the people of Ireland with the people of England and Scotland. The minority in Ireland are able to take care of themselves ; they have always done so ; and the condition of the north of Ireland to-day proves conclusively that people may live in Ireland in contentment and prosperity under the rule that now exists. The prosperous condition of the city of Belfast and the districts surrounding it, teeming with an industrial population, employed at good wages, is a proof that there is nothing incompatible with progress and prosperity in Ireland for those who are industrious and willing to work and who will put their shoulders to the wheel to promote the best material interests of their native land. This minority have sent to Canada as their contribution to the public life of this country since confederation such men as Monck, Lisgar, Dufferin and Lansdowne. They have given to the empire their share of the empire's soldiers and sailors, and they have been proud to fight side by side and shoulder to shoulder with their fellow-countrymen who worship at a different altar. They desire to live on terms of peace, amity and concord with those who comprise the majority. They desire to unite with them cordially and heartily in promoting every measure which shall be for the advancement of their native land. They have the right to speak for Ireland as well as the majority. They comprise 1,150,000 in a population of 4,458,000 in Ireland. These people have a right to have their views considered by hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House. If time permitted, I could read resolutions passed in the chambers of commerce of Dublin and Belfast by the men who are foremost in promoting the industrial interests of Ireland, denouncing home rule and expressing their desire to continue to enjoy their full measure of citizenship in the British empire. I could read the memorials submitted to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland by the representatives of the Church of England in Ireland, numbering 600,000, the Presbyterians, Methodists and other nonconformist bodies, aggregating 1,100,000 people, in the same sense ; but I do not wish to take up the time of the House. Putting the question on the lowest ground, I say that if these people who live under such happy conditions in Ireland thought that their personal and material welfare would be promoted by such a measure of home rule as is proposed, they certainly would be amongst the foremost to demand it. But they believe that they enjoy greater privileges, immunities and blessings, and have greater opportunities for preferment, by remaining an integral part of the empire ; and for that reason, and also because they have no confidence in those who represent the majority in Ireland, they have set their faces as steel against home rule. Have we in this parliament any right to pass this resolution without considering the position that minority occupy ? The difficulty and the dilemma which the minority may find themselves in to-day or to-morrow in Ireland because of the passing of such resolutions as that proposed by the hon. member for Victoria, may be the difficulty and the dil-

emma of the minority in Canada to-morrow. That minority only ask to be left alone. They live under less favourable conditions than the people of the southern and eastern parts of Ireland; yet they have proved their capacity to advance and prosper; and all we ask on their behalf is that their views shall be heard, and that this House shall not pass any resolution which will place the people of Canada and the people of Ireland in a false position. There are other ways in which we can give substantial assistance to the heavily-burdened taxpayers of England, Ireland and Scotland. Let us do something practical. Resolutions of this kind practically amount to nothing. They will not influence a vote in the parliament of the United Kingdom. The people in that parliament know their duty and are always prepared to do it; and instead of promoting the welfare and peace and integrity of Ireland, and the influence which Canada ought to possess in the councils of the empire, the passage of this resolution will place the people of Ireland and the people of Canada in a false light. I feel it my duty to record my vote against the resolution, because I think it is ill-timed and will serve no good purpose.

Mr. ANDREW B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I would not have said anything on this question, Mr. Speaker, had it not been for a remark that was dropped by the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) to the effect that those who vote against this resolution have no sympathy for Ireland. I wish to say that like the hon. gentleman I belong to a third generation of Irishmen. My forefathers, as far back as I can remember, have all been Irishmen, and I want to say that they have been loyal Irishmen. They have done in their day fighting enough, I think, to satisfy the next twenty generations of Ingrams in this country. One of my forefathers resided in the city of Quebec many years ago. He was sent to Canada by the British government with other soldiers to defend the flag at Quebec. Therefore, I do not take any back seat in regard for the interests of Ireland. Before coming to attend this session of parliament I was requested to support a home rule resolution that was to be introduced into this House. I asked by whom the resolution would be introduced. I was told by the Hon. John Costigan. I said immediately that I would neither support such a resolution nor any other piece of legislation which the Hon. John Costigan might introduce. I would oppose this motion or any other piece of legislation introduced by the Hon. John Costigan into this House. That may not be a very convincing answer, but I assure my hon. friend that it is eminently in fitting with the motives which prompted the mover of this resolution. I know that nothing would delight the hon. gentleman more than for hon. members of this House to heap on his head a great amount of abuse, but I want to point to a fact by which we can gauge the honesty of the hon. gentleman. He took occasion to take up a considerable time of the House in proclaiming his own honesty. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a well known maxim that whenever a man boasts of his honesty, you should keep your hand very tightly on your pocket. This hon. gentleman has told us to-day that his honesty has been exceedingly great within the last twenty years. But he failed to dwell on a little incident to which I shall recall to the attention of the House. A few years ago, when the Conservative party were in power, there was a very live issue agitating the people and provoking considerable discussion in this House and country. I refer to the Manitoba school question. The hon. gentleman professed then, as he does now, to be the great advocate of the interests of the Roman Catholics of this country. He was a member of the Conservative government of that day, and then as now he was more useful once every seven years or so promoting a resolution of this kind than in doing anything else. What did he then do? He was then advocating remedial legislation. Some difficulty arose in the Conservative administration, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the Prime Minister, resigned, and Sir Charles Tupper was called on to assume the leadership of the party. What did we find the hon. gentleman doing? When asked to take a seat in the cabinet under Sir Charles Tupper, he wrote a letter to Sir Charles, in which he used these words :—

In view, however, of the principle involved in remedial legislation, to which Sir Mackenzie Bowell's government was pledged——

Mr. BOURASSA. I rise to a point of order. On a motion in favour of home rule the hon. gentleman is not warranted in discussing the Manitoba school question.

Mr. INGRAM. I presume that I am as much in order as the hon. gentleman was when he brought us to South Africa. I am dealing with a question affecting Canada, which is more than the hon. gentleman did.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call attention to the fact that we are now discussing the question of home rule, and would invite the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks to this question.

Mr. INGRAM. I shall try and do so. I was going on to quote this letter, and if you have no objection, Mr. Speaker, I will finish the quotation :—

——and in view of the fact that your government is to be formed to carry out the same policy, especially as regards the Manitoba school policy, I feel it my duty to say to you at once that you may count upon my assistance and services if you require them, as a member of your government, always presuming that the policy to reintroduce a remedial Bill at the first session of the new parliament will be clearly announced by you on behalf of your government.

What I wish to point out is that if the hon. gentleman had been honest then, he would not, after Sir Charles Tupper had gone to the country and been defeated on this very question, have turned his back on his leader and been the means of wrecking his government. Why, when a man for eighteen long years has been a member of the cabinet—I care not whether a Liberal or a Conservative government—and then takes the stand which the hon. gentleman did, I say that he can have no pretense to honesty or decency.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression.

Mr. INGRAM. I of course shall bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman spoke of his unselfishness and his strong convictions, but it occurred to me that these convictions could not have been very strong at the time to which I refer. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman to-night whether it is not a fact that last session he was going to introduce his home rule resolution, and that the right hon. the First Minister persuaded him not to do so.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not a fact.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman say who did ? If he wishes to be honest, I pause to give him an opportunity to reply. He does not choose to avail himself of that opportunity. Let me repeat that the hon. gentleman fully intended to introduce this resolution last session, but failed to do so. Why ? Because there was a likelihood of an election in the province of Ontario, and the introduction of that resolution last session would have been the means perhaps of defeating the government. My hon. friend was quite ready to kick this resolution around like a football so long as he could serve party purposes. Reference has been made to the cattle embargo. Well, not long ago on the motion to go into supply, an hon. member introduced a resolution respecting the cattle embargo in England. But he had hardly moved his motion when the hon. Minister of Finance called upon his majority to vote it down as a motion of want of confidence. Does not that prove conclusively that the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Costigan) and the government have been in collusion on this question for the purpose of making political capital and nothing else. There is another question on which I desire to speak, because it is one that has some relation to home rule. A few years ago when in this House the question of provincial autonomy for the North-west Territories was being discussed, not one of the government supporters rose to assist the members of the opposition in their advocacy of provincial autonomy in the North-west. Not one of them rose to take an active part in that discussion. I am therefore justified in saying to them that if they would pay a little more attention to our own affairs in Canada instead of taking up this home rule question for the sole purpose of gaining political notoriety and support, they would be giving more evidence of sincerity and honesty than they are now doing. I do not intend taking up any more time. I simply rose to say that although I have in my time supported home rule resolutions and would support them again to-day, I will never support any resolution in favour of home rule so long as it is introduced by a gentleman whom I despise for his conduct in this House, and for the motives which actuate his present course. I am using strong language, Mr. Speaker, but not any stronger than the occasion warrants and demands, and I think the sooner the people of this country understand it the better. I should have been glad to support the resolution had it been moved by the Minister of Justice or some other Irishman in this country who is not trading in this class of goods for political purposes.

House divided on amendment (Hon. Mr. Costigan).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Angers,	Lavergne,
Archambault,	LeBlanc,
Ball,	Lemieux,
Béland,	Léonard,
Belcourt,	Logan,
Bernier,	Loy,
Bickerdike,	Macdonald,
Borden (Halifax),	Mackie,
Borden (Sir Frederick)	McColl,
Bourassa.	McCool,
Bourbonnais,	McEwen,
Brown,	McGowan,
Bureau,	McGugan,
Calvert,	McIntosh,
Carbonneau,	McIsaac,
Carroll,	McLennan,
Casgrain,	Malouin,
Clancy,	Marcil (Bagot),
Copp,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Costigan,	Mayrand,
Cowan,	Meigs,
Demers (Lévis),	Mignault,
Demers (St. John),	Monet,
Desjardins,	Monk,
Dugas,	Morin,
Emmerson,	Morrison,
Erb,	Mulock (Sir William),
Ethier,	Murray,
Fielding,	Paterson,
Fitzpatrick,	Pope,
Fortier,	Préfontaine,
Fraser,	Proulx,
Gallery,	Puttee,
Gibson,	Reid (Restigouche),
Gould,	Riley,
Grant,	Ross (Ontario),
Guthrie,	Ross (Victoria),
Hackett,	Rousseau,
Harty,	Scott,
Harwood,	Stephens,
Heyd,	Stewart,
Holmes,	Sutherland (Essex),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hyman,	Talbot,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tarte,

Johnston (Lambton), Tobin,
Kaulbach, Tolmie,
Kendall, Tucker,
Lang, Turcot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Turgeon,
Laurier (L'Assomption), Wright.—102.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn, Kidd,
Avery, Lancaster,
Barker, Lavell,
Bell, Lennox,
Bennett, MacLaren (Huntingdon)
Blain, MacLaren (Perth),
Boyd, Northrup,
Brock, Porter,
Broder, Reid (Grenville),
Bruce, Richardson,
Cargill, Robinson (Elgin),
Charlton, Roche (Marquette),
Clarke, Rosamond,
Cochrane, Sherritt,
Earle, Sproule,
Fowler, Taylor,
Henderson, Tisdale,
Hughes (Victoria), Vrooman,
Ingram, Ward,
Johnston (Cardwell), Wilmot.—41.
Kemp,

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Thompson (Haldimand and Monck), Carscallen,
Blair, Osler,
Birkett, Wilson.
Lefurgey, Halliday,
Davis, Thomson (Grey),
Dyment, McCormick,

Amendment (Hon. Mr. Costigan) agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do not suppose the House would have any desire to go on with further business to-night, so I move that the House will, at its next sitting, go into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 1.20 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 1, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Brockville and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill (No. 68) to incorporate the Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Charlton.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Northwest Coal and Coke Railway Company.——Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Imperial Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Bank of Montreal.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Power Company.—Mr. Talbot.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. Champagne (Wright) moved :

That this House doth concur in the first report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman kindly explain the nature of the Bill ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. This is a Bill the main provisions of which were incorporated in a Bill which I introduced last session, but which, owing to the lateness of the date when it was introduced, was not read a second time. It is a measure for the purpose of safe guarding the interests of workmen and employees of railway companies which under existing legislation are somewhat jeopardized. During the recess I have received considerable information on the subject and have incorporated some new provisions in the Bill which I introduced last session. The grievances which the Bill seeks to remedy may be classed under three heads. Railway employees object that they are now, in many instances, compelled to become members of insurance and benefit societies merely as a condition or an incident of their engagement. They complain also that having regard to the amount charged against them by these societies, the amount of insurance which they receive in case of accident or death is entirely inadequate. I believe, however, that the main cause of their complaint is that on becoming members of such societies, they forfeit their common law rights in the case of injury resulting to them through the negligence of the company or their fellow-servants. I am free to admit that the law is not very clear upon the question of the liability arising out of the relations of a railway company to its employees in cases where particular contracts have been entered into between them. In the case of the Grand Trunk Railway, which employs something like 25,000 members, the company has formed, under the authority of special Acts of parliament, a benefit society to which their employees are

bound to subscribe. On entering the employment of the Grand Trunk Railway, they are bound to join that society. One of its by-laws or rules, to which objection is taken, is by-law No. 15, which provides that in the event of accident from whatever cause the railway company shall be exonerated from all liability. Last year I understood that the Grand Trunk Railway was the only company which imposed such a condition on its employees. A good deal of litigation has arisen over that provision, both in Ontario and in Quebec, and probably also in other provinces. In the case of Holton versus the Grand Trunk Railway, tried in Hamilton, it was decided by the court of first instance that by-law No. 15 was an absolute bar to recovery by the employees. That case went to the Court of Appeal, but no decision was reached upon that particular point, as the decision of the first court was maintained upon the question of contributory negligence. In the province of Quebec the question was also brought into court in a case against the Intercolonial, which has a similar insurance or provident society and a similar by-law. The Exchequer Court held that the widow of a deceased employee could recover, but on appeal to the Supreme Court this finding was reversed. The Supreme Court of Canada held that a similar condition to that imposed by the Grand Trunk Railway was effective and protected the government of Canada from liability in case of accident. I admit that such findings, while they may be strictly in accord with the statute law of the country, are entirely opposed to the trend of all modern legislation, which is to give greater protection to the employees, and in the case of accident give him or his representatives proper redress where the accident occurred through the negligence, either of the company itself or his fellow-servants. The Bill that I have now introduced provides, not that there shall be any bar to the contracting out of liability, but that if any attempt be made by an employee to contract out of his common law liability, that contract shall be subject to the supervision of the court and shall not stand unless it can be shown that it was made upon proper consideration and is, in the mind of the judge, a reasonable contract. The Bill secondly provides that it shall be optional with an employee whether he become a member of such benevolent or insurance society or not. The Bill further provides that those workmen or employees, who are at present members of such societies, may upon reasonable notice withdraw from them. Fourthly, it provides that the provisions of this Bill shall apply to government railways. I make this provision because in the new Railway Bill introduced this session, there is a provision that it shall not apply to government railways.

Mr. GUTHRIE.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

LIGHTING OF CHAMBER.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. For what reason was the artificial lighting of this chamber changed or altered since last session ?
2. Were any complaints received last session against the artificial lighting of this chamber ? And if so, by whom ?
3. What was the cost of making the change in the lighting of this chamber, and who did the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. Jas. Sutherland) :

1. To give the Canada General Electric Company, an opportunity to demonstrate, as they claimed, that their arc lamps were superior to the incandescent.
2. No complaints were made.
3. No expense attached, the same wiring was used and the company installed the lamps on trial.

DOMINION LANDS.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. On what principle are Dominion lands sold in Manitoba and North-west Territories ?
2. On what principle are prices fixed ?
3. Who has authority to fix prices and terms?
4. What is the average price received for lands sold since July 1, 1902 ?
5. Have any blocks of 10,000 acres or over been sold ? If so, in what district, to whom, and at what price, since July 1, 1902 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) :

1. Generally speaking no agricultural lands are being sold, such lands at the disposal of the department being now held for homestead entry by actual settlers. In exceptional cases, however, where a settler is not entitled to homestead, or where he has missed the right of second entry by a technicality or a few days shortage in residence, or where first homestead is of such poor quality that he cannot make a living on it, land is sold to him subject to homestead conditions.

2. The regulations fix the price of coal at $7 (bituminous) per acre ; and $17 (anthracite); minerals (other than coal) $1 per acre; and surface rights on coal and farming lands $3 per acre. The regulations governing the disposal of Dominion lands give the Minister of the Interior authority under certain conditions to dispose of lands at not less than the minimum price of $1 per acre.

3. The Minister of the Interior.

4. $3.60 per acre.

5. Since 1st July, 1902, no blocks of 10,000 acres or over have been sold. An

agreement, however, has been entered into with the Canadian North-west Irrigation Company by which, upon their fulfilling certain irrigation conditions, they will have permission to purchase a block of 500,000 acres. Price $3 per acre subject to a rebate for expenditure in irrigation not exceeding $2 per acre. The land is situated south-east of Lethbridge in the semi-arid district.

FREE LIST OR LOWERED DUTY.

Mr. CLARE asked :

Have there been any changes made in the tariff, by Order in Council, since January 1st, 1902 ? If so:

1. What articles have been put on the free list ?

2. What articles have been reduced in duty ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) :

1. The following articles used as materials in Canadian manufactures have been transferred to the free list by Orders in Council since 1st January, 1902 :

Materials which enter into the construction and form part of cream separators when imported by manufacturers of cream separators to be used in their own factories for the manufacture of cream separators, until otherwise ordered.

Hemp bleaching compound when imported by manufacturers of rope, to be used in their own factories for the manufacture of rope, until otherwise provided.

Silver tubing, when imported by manufacturers of silverware to be used in their own factories in the manufacture of silverware.

Steel for the manufacture of cutlery when imported by manufacturers of cutlery to be used in their own factories in the manufacture of such articles.

Yarn of jute, flax or hemp for the manufacture of towels when imported by the manufacturers of jute, linen or union towels, to be used in their own factories in the manufacture of such articles.

Malleable iron or steel castings, in the rough, for the manufacture of scissors and hand shears, when imported by manufacturers of scissors and hand shears to be used in making such articles in their own factories.

Refined cotton seed oil (edible) for canning fish, until otherwise provided.

Bleached palm oil shea butter when for use as materials in Canadian manufactures.

2. His Excellency the Governor General, by and with the advice of the King's Privy Council for Canada, has been pleased, under the provisions of subsection 3, of section 16 of the Customs Tariff, 1897, to reduce the customs duty on news printing paper in sheets and rolls, including all printing paper valued at not more than two and one-quarter cents per pound, from twenty-five per centum ad valorem to fifteen per centum ad valorem.

INSOLVENT ACT.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to introduce an Insolvent Act at the present session of parliament ?

2. Has it been represented to the government that the enactment of a Dominion Insolvent Act would promote trade between Canada and the other parts of the empire ?

3. Has it been brought to the notice of the government that at a conference of all the boards of trade of the Dominion of Canada, held in Toronto, on the fourth, fifth and sixth of June, 1902, the following resolution was unanimously passed. viz.:—'Whereas trade is seriously handicapped by the difference of the provisions of the law in the different provinces, applying to assignments for the benefits of creditors, by insolvent debtors, and the uncertainty as to the security offered in business transactions, by the absence of an insolvency law in the Dominion. And whereas it is important that the Dominion parliament should enact an insolvency law at the earliest possible date, whereby that confidence which is necessary for the promotion of commerce between the different provinces, and with the outside world, be established;—Resolved, that the Dominion government be requested to assemble one or more commercial representatives of the various provinces and the territories, say in Ottawa, for the purpose of assisting in framing an Act, having for its basis the control and management of insolvent estates by the interested creditors, with the legal expenses reduced to a minimum.'

4. Have the government availed themselves of the assistance of such commercial representatives of the various provinces ? And if not, why not ?

5. Have the government replied to the proposal of said resolution ; and if so, in what way, and to what effect ?

6. What action, if any, have the government taken in the matter ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is not the intention of the government to introduce an insolvency bill during the present session of parliament. Numerous representations have been made in the direction indicated in the question, but the government does not consider the time opportune, this session, to introduce such a measure.

POSTMASTER, BLOOMFIELD, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

Has any change of postmaster been made at the post office at Bloomfield station, King's County, N.B., or is any change now in comtemplation ? If so, who is to be the new incumbent ; and by whose recommendation is the change made, or to be made ? What, if any, charge has been preferred against the postmaster who has lately been removed, or who is to be removed, if the removal is not yet accomplished ? By whom has such charge, if any, been preferred ? Has any investigation been held respecting the said Bloomfield post office ? Was there any petition, signed by residents of

Bloomfield, asking for such changes ? If so, by how many persons was said petition signed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The answer to the first question is, a change has been made. To the first part of the second question, B. C. Williams. To the latter part of the second question, I would say that it is not usual to state on whose recommendation appointments are made. In answer to the fourth question, there was no charge preferred. This answers the fifth and sixth. There was no petition.

INDIAN AGENTS AS GUARDIANS.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE asked :

Are the government agents in charge of Indian reservations, in the province of Ontario, appointed guardians or agents by the government of individual Indians, living on such reservations: or of the money, property or effects of such Indians ? Are such government agents permitted to act as such guardians or agents ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). Under the provisions of the Indian Act, Indian agents may be appointed by the Superintendent General, guardians of the persons and property of minor Indians ; but such agents are not ex-officio the guardians or agents of individual Indians.

BANKERS ASSOCIATION'S INSPECTION OF BANKS.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. What is the nature of the inspection of Canadian chartered banks, by the Canadian Bankers Association ?

2. At what dates do such inspections take place ?

3. Does the inspection involve a thorough examination of the assets and liabilities of the various banks, as well as of the securities upon which their loans are held ?

4. Is the report of the inspector communicated from time to time to the government ?

5. Do such reports indicate whether the loans are made to Canadian borrowers, or to persons residing or carrying on business in other countries ?

6. Has the government any information as to the amounts loaned by Canadian banks in the cities of New York and Boston, upon the security of stocks of incorporated companies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Replying to questions 1 to 4, whatever inspection takes place is a matter of voluntary arrangement among the members of the Bankers Association, and the government have nothing to do with it. Replying to questions 5 and 6, the government have no information respecting the loans of Canadian banks beyond what is published in the usual returns in the Canada 'Gazette.'

Mr. FOWLER.

MANITOBA AND NORTH-WEST VOLUNTEERS—LAND SCRIP.

Mr. SCOTT asked :

Does the government intend to ask parliament to make a grant of land scrip to Manitoba and North-west volunteers who served under arms in South Africa ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). The government does not intend to ask parliament to make a grant of land to the North-west volunteers who served under arms.

PROHIBITION OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (St. Lawrence, Montreal) moved :

That the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes for the public good ; and by equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.

That the smoking of cigarettes has been proved by overwhelming testimony to be productive of serious physical and moral injury to young people; imparing health, arresting development, weakening intellectual power, and thus constituting a social and national evil.

The legislation licensing and restricting the sale of cigarettes has not proven sufficient to prevent these evils, which will continue while the public sale of the cause of the mischief is permitted to go on.

That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons hereinbefore set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of cigarettes.

He said : In rising to move this resolution, which is seconded by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes), I cannot but feel that the motion would have been much better taken care of if placed in the hands of one of the eloquent members of this House. I shall only lay before the House a few of the many facts that have come into my possession to show the baneful effect of cigarette smoking upon the boys of this country. I believe that if the injury that is being done were known, there would be a unanimous vote of this House in favour of this resolution or of some similar measure. I hope I shall have the majority of this House at my back, for there are very few men who are fathers of boys but have had more or less cause to know the bad effects of this cigarette habit upon boys.

There is no young man or boy but wishes to succeed in life. All want to get along ; all want to better their position. Success in life, in these days of strong competition, means honesty, industry, temperance and economy. A boy or young man who has these, with good health, must succeed ; while, if he lacks them even moderate suc-

cess will be impossible. I think, Sir, we are all agreed that the boy who is addicted to the cigarette habit cannot succeed in this country unless he has a very strong 'pull' somewhere, while the boy who is not addicted to that habit does not require any 'pull,'—all he wants is the push, and he succeeds in getting to the front. I have with me certificates from most eminent physicians, throughout the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and all these documents go to prove that the cigarette habit, with the boys at least, is very, very injurious. I think there is no hon. member in this House who will say nay to that proposition. I would be the last man on the floor to attempt to interfere in any way with the rights of the subject. Once a boy has come to the age of maturity, he has a right to do as he pleases. All I wish to do is to introduce some measure that will protect the boys from this very bad habit of recent years—for, Mr. Speaker, it is only of recent years that it has taken such a hold on the country. The most eminent physicians pronounce cigarettes worse for boys than pipes or cigars, and paper cigarettes worse than all tobacco cigarettes—I suppose because it absorbs more nicotine. This pernicious habit leads to nervousness, and if continued long enough, results in insanity. Scores of boys, Mr. Speaker, are in the insane asylum in consequence of this habit, and even a greater number have been killed outright.

I would like to draw the attention of this House to what is being done in the United States. The plague invaded that land many years ago, but it is only recently that it has attained a strong hold in the Dominion. In forty-two states of the Union they have enacted anti-cigarette laws. Many states have passed prohibitory or restrictive laws. In 1899 a wave of education produced by attempts to secure legislation passed over the whole United States, and as a result more than one billion less cigarettes were sold in 1899 than in 1898. That was due not only to the legislation but to the fact that a great many prominent business houses in the United States, and a number of large railways, absolutely refused and still refuse to employ a boy under eighteen years of age who smokes cigarettes. They all recognize that a cigarette fiend is no use in any business establishment. To show what methods have been employed let me read the following:

Two states, Nevada and Montana, have cigarette license laws; the first is with, and the second without an age limit. One state forbids sale of cigarettes to those under 14 years of age; another to those under 15. Sixteen states forbid sale under 16 years of age; one under 17. The Indiana, Iowa, Georgia, North Dakota, South Carolina and Wyoming laws prohibit sale to 'minors'; while Maine, Nebraska, Nevada and Wisconsin put the prohibited limit at 21. Florida rules out the sale altogether, except under certain specified circumstances. Massachusets prohibits sale and manufacture, and Tennessee, which has no manufactories within its borders, caps the legislative climax by putting its bar upon sale and importation.

Now, Sir, if it has been found necessary in the United States to enact laws in so many states to protect their boys, why should not the Dominion of Canada enact a similar law? Not only are the legislatures all over the union moving in this matter, but as I said before, a great many large business houses refuse to employ boys who use cigarettes. The cigarette habit is a recent form of intemperance that is proving itself so destructive to bodily strength, mental keenness and moral character, that our educators, our business men, and our public officials, are declaring that their doors must be closed against cigarette boys.

Now, I would like to read to this House a few of the names of institutions, factories and railroads in the United States who will not employ boys who smoke cigarettes. I have several hundred names, but I will only read a few, for I am well aware that a good many hon. members desire to speak on this subject, and I do not wish to take up too much time.

The athletic clubs of the United States; several business colleges; the Union Pacific Railroad; the Omaha schools; Swift & Co., the largest packing house in the world will not employ a boy now who smokes cigarettes; Marshall Field, dry goods, Chicago; several life insurance companies; the Lehigh Valley Railroad. Boys who use cigarettes are debarred from the United States army and naval schools. Carson, Pirie & Scott, Chicago, close their doors against cigarette users; so do the Chicago Rock Island and Pacific Railroad, the Central Railroad, Georgia; three high schools in Chicago; Ayer's Sarsparilla Co., Chicago; Wanamaker's, Philadelphia, one of the largest stores in the United States will not allow a single boy to be engaged in their employment if he smokes cigarettes; Morgan & Wright Tire Co., Chicago; The Western Union Telegraph Co., the messenger service; the Burlington Railroad; the United States Weather Bureau; Heath & Milligan; Montgomery Ward & Co., Academy of Northwestern University, Chicago; Telephone Co., Cumberland; the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; the Pittsburg and Western Railroad, the West Superior Railroad, Wisconsin.

All these railroads have found it necessary to instruct their managers that they must no longer employ cigarette smokers. The same may be said of school inspectors. I have letters here from most of the prominent medical men in the Dominion, all condemning the use of cigarettes by boys. I will mention a few of the names. Dr. Isaac Wood of Kingston, Dr. Lambly of Cookshire, Quebec, Dr. Stewart of Prescott, Dr. Macpherson of Prescott, Dr. James Stewart, lecturer in McGill University and head of the medical staff of the Royal Victoria hospital, Dr. Blackadar, head of the staff of the general hospital. All these medical gentlemen are unanimous in con-

demning the use of cigarettes. I have letters from nearly one hundred of them to that effect. Last, but not least, I had a communication from the late Dr. Christie, during his lifetime, who was for twenty years an honoured member of this House, and was one of the strongest opponents of the use of cigarettes by boys.

I do not know of any argument that can be urged in favour of this habit, although I presume a number will be urged here this afternoon. The great danger is that the editors of newspapers may take a wrong course on this matter. Heretofore many of the papers have been very generous in commenting editorially in favour of the movement against cigarettes. But now I notice that in some of them are appearing long articles stating that cigarettes are quite harmless, and really nourishing and beneficial. Of course there is no hint that these articles are advertisements, and that the space is paid for, probably by some one interested in the tobacco trust. One of the editors being asked about it, answered: Well, we get higher rates than we do for ordinary advertising matter. I would say also that school inspectors have done much to discourage the cigarette habit among school children. I must not forget to mention that Sir Wm. Hingston, of Montreal, Senator, is one of those who have come out very strongly in favour of this measure. I might mention other distinguished names, but I do not wish to take up too much time.

Now, I will give a few figures taken from the Blue-books of the Department of Inland Revenue. In 1898 there were 80,562,817 cigarettes manufactured in Canada and taken out of bond for consumption; in 1899, there were 101,143,328; in 1900, there were 116,061,522.

Now, I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General to what is being done by the post office authorities in Chicago:

> At a conference of the Chicago post office authorities it was decided to hereafter employ no boy who smokes cigarettes or who is known to have been addicted to the habit.
>
> Heretofore there has been a rule in force that boys employed by the office could not smoke while working, but, believing that smoking has a demoralizing effect, and because of the need of the most intelligent and active boys, it is thought wise to make closer restrictions.
>
> An examination is soon to be held, when 700 youths will enter into competition for position in the post office, and the new order will have no small effect upon so large a number of applicants.
>
> The clause relating to cigarettes says: 'No small boys will be allowed to participate in the examination, since only the best-equipped boys, mentally and physically, are wanted in this service, and under no circumstances will a boy who smokes cigarettes be employed.' The service referred to is that of special delivery messengers, for which appointments are made from this examination.

There is just one more fact that I would like to lay before the House before taking my seat and it is this: It is a very startling statement and one that perhaps a great many hon. members will have doubt about but it is from a good authority. When I give the name of my authority I am sure that hon. gentlemen will all be satisfied that the statement is a bona fide one. A very startling suggestion was made in the English parliament as to why the United States beat Spain.

> Why did the United States beat Spain? It has been left, says the 'Westminster Gazette,' for Sir Brampton Gurdon, in his speech on the finance Bill, to supply the answer: 'The evil effect of the growing habit among boys of smoking filthy cigarettes could scarcely be exaggerated. Without doubt it was a habit which left the rising generation deteriorated in physique, and the result of such indulgence could be found in the miserable failure of the Spanish forces in their war with the United States.'

I do not think it is necessary to say anything more. I have laid the facts before the House and I am sure that a great many hon. members on both sides will stand up for this Bill, and I am sure that all will be proud of their action who cast a vote to exterminate the cigarette habit amongst our young boys. I will now leave the matter in the hands of my seconder, the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes).

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). In seconding this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of yourself and through you the attention of the House to certain facts as bearing upon the question and to supplement, as far as lies in my power, the information that has been given to the House by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike). I think it will be conceded at once that we are endeavouring to deal with an evil that is of growing proportions. We hear the argument advanced everywhere that this is an evil that should be stopped if possible, but the problem of dealing with or restricting the evil is apparently one that seems insurmountable. The various provincial legislatures have recognized the evil to the extent that they have placed restrictions upon the sale of cigarettes or the use of cigarettes up to a certain age, and while that legislation is restrictive to the extent of its powers it does not go far enough in order to cope with the evil because it does not prohibit the actual use of the cigarette. Therefore, we realize the necessity of some more stringent legislation that will put a stop to the evil that is assuming very large and very serious proportions. The mover of the resolution states clearly at the outset that the intention is to reach the young, so far as it is possible to reach those who are of immature years, those who have not attained their full physical development, those upon whom the evil effects of cigarette smoking are perhaps more apparent than they are on people of more mature years. In this

connection a point to be borne in mind is that while we are endeavouring to reach the young we can only reach the young by reaching the old. We have no quarrel with those of mature years who smoke cigarettes or use tobacco under other circumstances, but when we are trying to reach the young we must also have legislation in connection with the old. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence, has quoted some figures from the Inland Revenue Department to show the increased consumption of cigarettes. Let me go a little farther than he went in that connection and show you that there are a great many more cigarettes smoked at present than there were a few years ago. He quoted the figures of 1900, which showed that 116,000,000 cigarettes were taken out for consumption in the Dominion of Canada. In 1901 the quantity had gone up to 121,000,000, while in 1902, the last year, it had increased to the enormous number of 134,000,000. In addition to that we find by the trade and navigation returns that the importation of cigarettes from other countries in 1901 amounted to 4,000,000, while, in 1902, the importation had increased to nearly 8,000,000, which is quite sufficient proof that the use of cigarettes is going on at a very alarming rate.

An hon. MEMBER. There has been an increase in population.

Mr. HOLMES. Yes, but the increase in the consumption of cigarettes is greater than the increase in population. It is impossible to say what proportion are consumed by children and what proportion are consumed by adults, but, it must be evident to the most casual observer, to all who use their powers of discernment, even on the streets of Ottawa, if nowhere else, that there is a large number used by children who are below the age limit, and I believe that what is true of Ottawa is true of almost all the towns and cities of the Dominion of Canada, that a large number of children beneath the age limit are making use of cigarettes. To supplement further the information produced by my hon. friend, so far as the evil effects of cigarettes are concerned, I want to quote also a number of authorities overlooked apparently by my hon. friend in his remarks. I contend that the use of cigarettes by children is injurious. We have not only to quote the opinions, as I will give them later on, of a number of medical authorities thereon, but I have taken the trouble to ask medical men myself since I have been in Ottawa and elsewhere as to the effect of cigarettes on children, and they assure me that their use is very detrimental indeed, detrimental both from the moral and physical standpoint, that it destroys the intellect and prevents the development of their physical nature. If we succeed in establishing the claim that the use of cigarettes is injurious, I contend that it is within the right and the duty of this House to provide in some form a remedy, because this House is the custodian of the people's welfare, and is called upon to provide remedies in various forms for evils when they are found to exist. This evil is one that is increasing and to my mind is an evil that is continuing. I want to quote the opinion of a medical man in connection therewith. Dr. Clinton, of San Francisco Board of Education, who has made a special study of the effects of cigarette smoking on the school children of that city, says :—

A good deal has been said about the evils of this habit, but one-half the truth has never been told; I say calmly and deliberately that I believe cigarette smoking is as bad a habit for boys as opium smoking. It sends boys into consumption, it gives them enlargement of the heart, and drives them to the insane asylum. I am not exaggerating, but speaking the truth that every teacher and physician knows.

My hon. friend referred to the opinion of the late Dr. Christie, who was for many years an honoured member of this House, and whose son, I am glad to say, has now succeeded to his seat. The opinion of the late Dr. Christie on this point is as follows :

I believe it is the almost universal opinion of medical men that the cigarette habit is most deleterious to the young, producing physical degredation, and the habit should be denounced in trumpet tones by all who have the welfare of humanity at heart.

Dr. Stewart, who is at the head of McGill College, Montreal, and Dr. Blackader, of the Montreal general hospital, both condemn the use of cigarettes by boys.

Dr. Broughton, of the Leslie E. Keely Institute, says :

More young men are led to the opium habit by cigarette smoking than by patent medicines. sixty per cent of all males treated at Dwight for opium, morphine or cocaine using, had been smokers of cigarettes.

Dr. Torrence, superintendent of the Illinois State Reformatory, says :

I am sure cigarettes are destroying and making criminals of more boys than are the saloons. Out of 278 boys confined there, 256 are cigarette users.

Mr. Samuel Grigg, a gentleman well known to the members of this House who comes from Western Ontario, as the former proprietor of the Grigg House in London, and who is now engaged in evangelistic work, makes this statement in a letter to the press, which has been published within the last few days :

I have lived to see many boys who were addicted to the cigarette habit, serving terms in the penitentiary ; they have gone from bad boyhood to worse manhood, and crimes of various kinds have been associated with their names. I can honestly say, after a varied experience of 32 years in the liquor business, that the cigarette habit bids fair to become a scourge greater than that for which the drink traffic is responsible.

I presume that those who know Mr. Grigg will admit that he is in a position to speak

with authority upon a question of this kind. Mr. Ferrier, superintendent of the Mimico Industrial School, considers the use of cigarettes by boys the most pernicious habit of the day, and that it is responsible for many criminal acts. He says that boys who habitually indulge in the habit are treading the path that leads to a criminal life. Sir Brampton Gurdon, in a recent speech in the English House of Commons, went so far as to say that the deterioration of the French and Spanish soldier, as evidenced in recent wars, was easily traceable to the habit of cigarette smoking.

The Chicago 'News' says:

> Scores of boys are in the insane asylum from the cigarette habit, and an even greater number are killed outright annually.

Many leading business houses in Canada and the United States announce that they will not employ any youth under the age of 21 who uses cigarettes. I understand that the city council of the city of London, Ont., and the school board of that city have passed resolutions at recent meetings favouring the prohibition of cigarettes. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence we have quoted is sufficient to show that the cigarette habit is a very injurious one to the youth of the country. We may have differences of opinion on political questions; we may have differences of opinions on religious questions, and we may have differences of opinion on a variety of other questions, but it seems to me that there should be no difference of opinion as to the evil effects of cigarette smoking on the youth of our land. We are not arguing from the standpoint of those of mature years, but from the standpoint of the bearing of this question on the youth of Canada. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) also anticipated me in quoting the various States of the American Union which have passed laws of a very restrictive character in regard to cigarettes; laws that do not allow of their importation or use; laws that if properly enforced will produce a good effect in limiting the use of cigarettes. I have here the copy of a Bill introduced a short time ago in the Illinois State legislature dealing with this matter, but as I do not know whether the Bill became law or not, I shall not refer to it further.

We are sometimes told, Mr. Speaker, that it is not within the duty of the state to legislate in this direction, but to prove the contrary to be the fact, I shall quote you the action of our friends to the south with regard to legislation of an equally restrictive character to the legislation which we now propose. The United States congress at its recent session passed what is known as the Gillet-Lodge Act, which forbids citizens of the United States to sell either liquor or opium to people in any of the Pacific Islands, having no civilized form of government. We spent a good deal of time yesterday—and I think the time was profitably spent, because it developed a great many eloquent speeches—we spent a good deal of time yesterday in considering a resolution having for its object the alleviation of the wrongs of Ireland, and to-day we can properly spend some time in trying to remedy some of the wrongs of Canada. It may be argued by some, that a law of this kind interferes with personal liberty. That, I admit at once. But I do not consider an argument of that kind worth discussing because the quotations that I have cited with regard to the United States prove that personal liberty is interfered with by legislation. It is not necessary for me to do more than to allude to certain acts which are already on our own statute-books, and which are a direct interference with the personal liberty of some, as indeed all restrictive legislation must necessarily be. We have on the statute-book at the present time laws of a prohibitive character relating to sanitation and the preservation of the public health. They interfere with the personal liberty of the subject in that they do not allow a man to do as he likes with his own property. For the general good and the public well being, restrictive laws of that kind are enacted, and no one thinks of raising the objection that it is an interference with personal liberty. We have a law prohibiting the importation into Canada and the manufacture in Canada of oleomargarine. Some may say that is an interference with the liberty of the subject, and so it is; but it interferes with individual liberty in order that the great majority of mankind may be benefited by it. We have a law prohibiting the carrying of fire arms. A man may say that he has a perfect right to carry fire arms for his own protection, but in the interest of the public at large the law says that he shall not carry fire arms except under very stringent conditions. And so we have a law on the statute-book prohibiting, except under certain circumstances, the landing of the industrious and economical Chinee, and we have seen recent legislation introduced here raising the tariff against the Chinaman. It is therefore apparent that we interfere in a variety of ways with the individual liberty of the citizen. If undesirable immigrants come to our shores we have a restrictive enactment by which we turn them back, often with great hardship to them, and send them to their own land again. And yet, Sir, we tolerate with our eyes open, and we tolerate to a certain extent with our own consent, an evil that is doing more to sap the foundations of and to destroy and to injure the youth of our land than, perhaps, anything else I could mention. We may be told, and possibly we will be told in this connection, that in order to provide an effectual remedy against the use of cigarettes, we would also have to prohibit the use of tobacco, because boys will make their own cigarettes, and the evil will continue as great as at present under

the free importation and manufacture. I contend, Sir, in the words of an honoured statesman : That we ought make it as easy as possible to do right and as hard as possible to do wrong. We know well that if we remove as far as possible the source of the temptation, there is not likely to be the same extended use of cigarettes that there is under the present condition. I am free to admit that the enforcement of the law will be somewhat difficult, and that boys may still be able to manufacture their own cigarettes, but I do not believe that under the circumstances the evil will be at all comparable in extent to the evil as it exists now. Now, Mr. Speaker, without taking up too much of the time of the House on this question, I want to allude to a matter that is perhaps a little personal. Since the attention of this House of Commons has been called to this question, it has been remarked to myself among others, that if some of the ladies who are behind this legislation were at home attending to their duties, they would be better engaged than they are in promoting this legislation.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HOLMES. Some hon. gentleman says 'hear, hear,' but I presume that he means that expression to be taken in a jocular sense. It may be true or it may be untrue, that these estimable ladies would be better engaged at home, but I think, Sir, it will be conceded that when the women of our land are willing to sacrifice their own comfort in trying to save the boys of Canada; when they are willing to do what they can to put a stop to the debasing, demoralizing and destructive habit of cigarette smoking by the youth ; when they are willing to forsake their own interests and undergo various forms of rebuff in order that they may place the youth of our land on a higher moral footing than at present ; it will be conceded, I say, that they are worthy of all commendation, and I for one shall very gladly accord them my commendation. Our effort in this direction is :

> To bless, not blight
> Our fellows who shall follow
> In earth's strife.
> The standard we shall raise
> Of wrong or right.

For the reasons I have briefly given, and a good many others which I might advance, I have very much pleasure in seconding the resolution before the House. I am not sufficiently sanguine to hope that all the members of this House will be so far convinced either by my eloquence or by the arguments of my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) as to give it their unanimous support; but I do hope there are sufficient independent members of this House to stand up for the protection of the youth of our land and to do their utmost to secure a law that will prevent the perpetuation of an evil that is doing so much to undermine the foundations of society for the days that are to come. We are frequently told that we are legislating in this House, not for to-day but for to-morrow, not for the present, but for the future ; that we are aiming to secure enactments which will be in the best interests of mankind, not alone for to-day, but for years to come; and I believe that if I were to ask for a personal expression of opinion from the members of this House, they would admit with me that this evil is one that ought to be grappled with in order that society in the future may be protected. We are undertaking to grapple with it in this form. It may be insufficient to reach as far as some think it ought to reach; but I am satisfied that if it is placed on the statute-book and a fair attempt is made to carry it out, it will produce a revolution in the habits of the rising generation, and be of great benefit to the world at large in the years to come. I have very much pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House in going over the various matters referred to by the mover and seconder of the resolution; but I perfectly agree with every statement contained in the first three paragraphs of the resolution. I do not think any language can too strongly picture the evil that is attempted to be struck at by this resolution. Those of us who live in cities or towns in Ontario cannot have failed to see boys not over ten years of age smoking cigarettes, and doing it habitually. I have no doubt that this evil exists to a great extent, and that it is increasing. There can be no question that this evil is largely due to the fact that tobacco in the form of cigarettes can be got very cheaply, which enables these youths to purchase cigarettes when perhaps they could not get cigars or tobacco in some other shape. For this reason it seems to me that the cigarette evil, particularly as it affects boys, is a thing to be especially considered and dealt with. I confess I have some doubt whether the method proposed in this motion will be effective ; but when we consider that for some years other means have been tried in the province of Ontario, such as prohibiting the sale of cigarettes to youths under a certain age, and that these have failed, we are driven to the conclusion that either some such remedy as is now proposed must be adopted, or that we must sit down and let the evil increase. For my part, I do not wish to interfere with the freedom of any person who enjoys a smoke. I do not use tobacco in any form, and I would be very sorry indeed to attempt to interfere with the freedom of those who do. But in view of the great evil that undoubtedly exists as regards boys, and I am told even young girls sometimes use cigarettes, the question is whether the grown-up men should not be willing to confine them-

selves to the use of tobacco in other forms, and give up the use of cigarettes for the benefit of the youths of the country. While I say I have some doubts about the effectiveness of the remedy proposed, still, when I consider that all the provincial efforts have failed, I am prepared to support the motion of the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike), until some remedy more likely to be effective is presented to the House.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the habit of smoking cigarettes has not been in existence in Ontario or in the Dominion of Canada for very many years. I think twenty years will cover the period since it began to be a habit in this country, and the extent to which it is likely to increase can be measured pretty fairly by the gigantic proportions which it has attained up to the present time. I am one of those who do not like, unless it is absolutely necessary, to invoke that drastic measure shown as prohibition; but seeing the proportions to which this evil has already increased, and seeing that the measures hitherto adopted have proven to be totally ineffectual, we are face to face with this proposition: If we are opposed to prohibition in this matter, what other effective remedy can we suggest? Now, after having given the matter some little consideration, though I admit I have not gone very fully into it, and bringing to that consideration a desire to do what is for the best interests of the youth of this country, I see no other alternative for us, if we really desire to put a stop to this great evil, than to adopt the resolution proposed to-day. Usually in this House we represent the free and independent electorate of this Dominion; but to-day I feel that we are representing something better still. In our advocacy of this measure, we are representing the homes of this country, and we are representing a band of devoted and noble women who, though having no direct voice in this House, are endeavouring to do something for the protection of the young men and in some cases the young women of our land. So we may be said on this question to be representing those who are understood individually, and therefore I suppose collectively, to be the 'better half' of the community. I am glad that the attitude of the House appears to be unanimously favourable to the resolution. I do not know whether we shall have the good fortune to pass it by a unanimous vote; but seeing that we are to-day dealing with a great moral question, and that these great moral questions will determine, even more than ordinary financial and political questions, what this country shall attain to in the future.

I should be glad indeed, regardless of all those matters which sometimes divide us, if on this great question we should by a unanimous voice give not only the sanction of the law to this great measure, but the weight of the representative opinion of this House in a strong and unequivocal way.

Mr. T. G. RODDICK (Montreal, St. Antoine). It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to make any lengthy speech on this occasion because I was not aware that the matter was coming up to-day. Otherwise I should have been prepared with some statistics and other information that might have been of service to the House. We are all indebted to my hon. colleague from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) for having brought this matter so ably before the House. I quite concur in all that he and the hon. gentleman who seconds this resolution, my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Holmes), but I am a little afraid that they are expecting too much. I am a little afraid when they ask for the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes that they are going too far. I think that we would do better to follow the example set us in the English House of Commons, where a measure has been introduced, but not yet discussed, dealing with this question. I have in my hand the last edition of the British Medical Journal, which treats of this very Bill, and it may interest this House to know what the British House of Commons contemplate doing in this matter:—

> The anti-tobacco and anti-nicotine league of England proposes the following Bill:
>
> No person under the age of 16 years shall smoke or use tobacco in any form and any such person so doing shall be liable to conviction and to a penalty not exceeding ten shillings for each offence. No person shall sell give or supply tobacco in any form to or for the use of any person under the age of 16 years, and any person so doing shall be liable, on a first offence, to a penalty not exceeding 20 shillings, and on a second or subsequent conviction to a penalty not exceeding 40 shillings. And in addition to the foregoing penalty the license, if any, held by such person for the sale of tobacco shall, in the case of a third conviction, become void and such person shall become disqualified for a term of five years from the date of such conviction from holding any such license.

Such a measure would be a very sensible one for us to adopt, but I would make the age limit seventeen instead of sixteen. Up to that age the human frame is being developed and it is in that period that the damage is done by tobacco. After that age we cannot declare, as medical men, that very much harm follows, and we know that if a boy does not smoke up to seventeen or eighteen he will probably not smoke at all. In that way therefore the end we all desire might be reached. I quite agree with all that has fallen from my hon. friend on this subject. Up to the age of seventeen or eighteen, the harm cannot be computed which is done by tobacco, especially to the nervous system. But that great harm is

done has been demonstrated time and again in large schools for boys. In Yale university—and I give this as a single illustration—comparisons were made during eight years between smokers and non-smokers. As compared with the smokers the non-smokers gained twenty-four per cent in weight, thirty-seven per cent in height, forty-two per cent in girth, and 8·36 cubic inches in lung expansion. Other well known investigations have proved that the effect on the mind in the case of boys is very marked. During several months, twenty boys who were known not to use tobacco in any form and twenty known to be cigarette fiends, were closely observed by their teacher. The ages of the boys were from ten to seventeen, the average age being a little over fourteen. Of the twenty smokers, twelve have smoked more than a year and some several years. All the twenty used cigarettes and some also used pipes and cigars occasionally. The following effects were noticed in the smokers. Twelve of them had poor memories, and in ten out of the twelve the memory was reported as very poor. Only four had fair memories, and not one of the twenty had a good memory. Twelve were in poor physical condition, six being subject to sick spells and comparatively already physical wrecks. Eight were reported as being in fair condition, but in none was the condition excellent. These are remarkable facts, which have been proved conclusively by medical men and others who observed the boys. I quite agree that if the age limit could be made seventeen or eighteen we would be doing as much as it is possible to do. It is known that a cigarette properly made is not so injurious after all to grown persons. Properly made, it is the purest form in which to use tobacco. That is a statement I am obliged to make because it is well known and established. I have nothing further to say. I shall support the measure with great pleasure but hope that when this resolution be given effect to in form of a Bill, the modifications I suggest will be made.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I agree with the hon. member for St. Antoine Division of Montreal (Mr. Roddick) that if we could modify this motion, it could be so amended as to meet with the unanimous acceptance. In many of the statements made in support of this motion, I entirely agree. No one can deny that the smoking of cigarettes has been proven by overwhelming evidence to be a productive source of serious physical and moral injury. Every one knows that it impairs the health, arrests the development, weakens the intellectual power and thus constitutes a social and national evil. That is, I think, the unanimous opinion of this House. But I desire to call to your attention, Sir, that we cannot amend this motion as the hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Roddick) has suggested we should do. We must adopt it in its entirety, and vote in favour of the prohibition of the manufacture, sale and importation of cigarettes. To those of us who have boys this is a serious matter. I do not think that any one can exaggerate the evil effects of cigarettes upon a growing boy. We see every day boy cigarette smokers with that deathly cigarette look. Cigarettes have been aptly termed the coffin nails for boys. But although I agree in all that has been said regarding the evil effects of cigarette smoking and although I desire as much as any one else to stop the smoking of cigarettes by the boys and girls of this country, yet I am of the opinion that this is not the proper place in which to deal with the question but that it should more properly be dealt with by a local legislature. In Nova Scotia, chapter 119 of the revised statutes of that province, provides as follows (and I would like to call the attention of the House to the great stringency of this law :

1. Any person who sells, gives or causes to be sold or given, any cigars, cigarettes, smoking or chewing tobacco, snuff, or any other form or preparation of tobacco or opium for smoking, to any person, having reasonable cause to believe such person to be under the age of sixteen years, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty dollars ; and in default of payment of such penalty, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding thirty days.

2. Any person who,—

(a) Accepts any money or other valuable consideration to act as the agent of any person under sixteen years of age, in procuring for such person any cigars, cigarettes, smoking or chewing tobacco or snuff, or any other form or preparation of tobacco or opium for smoking or chewing, or

(b) Supplies to any person under sixteen years of age any cigars, cigarettes, smoking or chewing tobacco or any other form or preparation of tobacco or opium, for smoking or chewing, on the promise of any money or other valuable consideration, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty dollars, and in default of payment of such penalty, to be imprisoned for any term not exceding thirty days.

And our statute goes even further than that, for it applies even to the boy himself, the buyer of the cigarette. By sec. 3 it is enacted :

Any person under sixteen years of age who has in his possession, or smokes or in any way uses cigars, cigarettes, smoking or chewing tobacco or snuff, or any other form or preparation of tobacco or opium, shall be liable to a penalty not exceding five dollars, or to imprisonment for any period not exceeding seven days, and in default of payment of the money penalty to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding seven days.

That is the law upon the statute-book of that province. Yet, we ought to be ashamed to say that law is almost a dead letter at the present day.

Mr. HOLMES. Will my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes.

Mr. HOLMES. Has the province of Nova Scotia or any other province the power to prohibit the manufacture or importation ?

Mr. LOGAN. It has no power to prohibit the sale of cigarettes completely. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Holmes) says that he wishes this to apply only to the boys. The mover of the resolution (Mr. Bickerdike) tells us that at maturity a man can do as he likes, but this resolution is not intended to apply to those who have reached maturity; what he seeks is a regulation of the traffic. If it is not to apply to those who have reached maturity the most we can do in order to accomplish the good end sought is to regulate the sale of cigarettes. But this is already done by the province of Nova Scotia. Yet, although this law has been upon the statute-books for ten years, it is almost a dead letter law at this day. I would rather a son of mine should smoke cigarettes than that he should lose respect for the laws of our country. By multiplying these legal enactments, we are likely to increase the number of laws that are not respected, that are broken every day and every hour of the day. I am told that in the province of Quebec also they have stringent legislation on this subject. I come now to the province of Ontario. By chapter 261 of the statutes of this province, it is enacted :

> Any person who either directly or indirectly sells or gives or furnishes to a minor under eighteen years of age, cigarettes, cigars, or tobacco in any form, shall on summary conviction thereof before a justice of the peace be subject to a penalty of not less than $10 nor more than $50 with or without costs of prosecution or to be imprisoned, with or without hard labour, for any term not exceeding thirty days, or to both fine with or without costs, and imprisonment to the said amount and for the said term, in the discretion of the convicting magistrate.

What more legislation do we need for the province of Ontario, what more stringent law could my hon. friend from West Huron desire than chapter 261 of the statutes of his own province, which imposes not only a fine, but imprisonment, and not only that but a fine and imprisonment with hard labour. It further provides :

> And in case of a fine, or a fine and costs being awarded and of the same not being upon conviction forthwith paid, the justice may commit the offender to the common jail, there to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding thirty days unless the fine and costs are sooner paid.

And one of the sections, which provides for the easier working of the law, says :

> A person who appears to the magistrate to be under eighteen years of age, shall be presumed to be under that age, unless it is shown by evidence that he is in fact over that age.

—giving the burden of proof in favour of the prosecutor of the law. Now, I believe, with others who have spoken this afternoon, that we owe a great debt of gratitude to the noble band of women who are endeavouring to purify the morals of the boys and girls of our land. I am not opposing the work of these ladies at all. But I speak in my own private capacity, when I say, that while they and I are working towards the same end, in my humble opinion they are upon the wrong track. We should endeavour to restrict the sale by prohibiting the sales to minors. By endeavouring to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes in Canada we are endeavouring to put upon the statute-book a law that will be a dead letter and that will increase disrespect for the law throughout the length and breadth of the land. I do not desire to take up further time. I repeat that I think cigarettes are poisonous and dangerous to boys and should not be allowed to be sold to boys, and we have on the statute-books of the provinces laws which prohibit that sale, under penalty of fine or even imprisonment with hard labour against any man or woman who sells cigarettes to the boys of our land.

Mr. SPROULE. On what ground does the hon. gentleman contend that this motion cannot be amended ?

Mr. LOGAN. I think it is a matter for the provincial legislatures and does not come within the purview of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. But the provinces have not the right to prohibit the manufacture or importation. It is only this parliament that can control the importation.

Mr. LOGAN. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) desires to substitute another motion, he can count on my support, if he seeks to prevent the sale to boys.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Unlike my hon. friend (Mr. Logan), who has just resumed his seat, I have no boys. Therefore, it might be said that I have not much interest in the question. But I have a great interest in the boys of our country, because from the ranks of these boys must soon be filled the places in this House and all the places now held by men in this country in the professions, the pulpit, and everywhere else. Therefore, I think every person should take a lively interest in the boys of to-day, whether they have boys of their own or not. It seems to me that the logic of my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) is very bad. He said he would rather see his boys smoke cigarettes than lose respect for the laws of our country, and he quotes and advocates the statute of his own province of Nova Scotia, which, he says, has been on the statute-book for ten years and is practically a dead letter. The same is true in the province of Ontario—though the law is on the statute-book it is not respected by the boy.

But the resolution of my hon. friend is not like the law of the province. I am not a lawyer, of course, but I understand that to this parliament is relegated the power of dealing with matters affecting trade and commerce. And so it is this parliament and this parliament only that can pass a law to prohibit the manufacture and importation of cigarettes. If a law is passed by this parliament it has to be respected, because it will be enforced by the customs and excise departments. There will be no more importation and no more manufacture, then the boys of this country will have to quit smoking cigarettes. My hon. friend refers to the prohibition of tobacco. The resolution does not call for the prohibition of tobacco at all, but it calls for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale, which is in my opinion the only effective way of dealing with this evil. I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, in the interests of the boys of this country, should unite in placing upon our statute-book a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes in Canada. In doing so we will render to the boys of this country one of the greatest benefits that we can bestow upon them.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the resolution moved by the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) is not acceptable. Such as it stands, it is undoubtedly within the purview of this parliament, but it is not logical. It is first stated in the resolution that the fact of smoking cigarettes is injurious to the health of children—and in the same breath it asks this House to enact a law prohibiting the use of cigarettes, not only by children, but by grown up men.

This is clearly shown by the resolution which concludes as follows :

> That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons hereinbefore set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

For many years past, anti-cigarette laws have been passed by several legislatures, prohibiting the sale of cigarettes to minors. I think it is quite evident that this House cannot be called upon to enact a similar law. On the other hand, we have heard it stated that those laws are a dead letter today. That such laws should have remained a dead letter, is no wonder, seeing that any legislature which interferes with the liberty of the subject never meets with popular favour.

We have proof of what I say in the many restrictive laws put on the statute-books of legislatures, which are not enforced.

Those laws are almost always evaded. A similar agitation arose a few years ago over the question of the prohibition of intoxicating liquors. Because a few people are addicted to the habit of drinking, attempts were then made to prohibit the general use of liquors. In this case again, we are asked to enact a law which would result in depriving the immense majority of the community of the use of anything which is undoubtedly lawful.

Mr. J. BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice). I think this resolution is rather sweeping. We all admit that the smoking of cigarettes by boys in our country is a great evil. But for my part I am not sure whether the evil exists only in the manufactured cigarette or in the cigarette that the boy makes for himself. I understand that the resolution of my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) aims at preventing the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes. Now if we want to do away with the evil of cigarette smoking by boys, it seems to me that we ought to adopt a suggestion which has just been made of prohibiting the use of cigarettes by boys under 17 years of age. Is this the right way to proceed ? I am inclined to think that the boys will smoke fewer cigarettes when they have to go to a tobacco store and give a dime or a nickle to buy a package of cigarettes, than they will when they are in the habit of rolling up the tobacco in paper and making the cigarettes themselves. I think under the circumstances it would be better, as stated by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan), to introduce into the Criminal Code, or somewhere else, a law making it a crime for boys under 17 years of age to smoke cigarettes. I do not believe that the proposed prohibition of the importation and manufacture of cigarettes will attain the object sought. Of what use will it be to prevent the importation of cigarettes ? The cigarette that the boy makes himself is not imported, is not manufactured, and it is not sold by any merchant. I think the resolution ought to be amended so that we can attain the object sought by some other means than a sweeping prohibition, which in my opinion, would make matters worse than before. We have seen the results of a prohibitory law in respect to liquor. We have laws now forbidding the sale of liquor to boys under 18 in our province, and it is a crime for a hotel keeper to sell liquor to a minor. Why not make a similar law in respect to cigarettes, if we desire to stop cigarette smoking by boys ?

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). I would like to ask some one who has made a study of this question whether the deleterious effects of cigarette smoking are brought about by the tobacco itself that is used in their manufacture, or by the drugs that are introduced to make the cigarettes more enticing. Now if these effects are brought

about by the drugs and not by the tobacco, could not the object we are trying to attain be secured by preventing the importation, manufacture and use of cigarettes in which a drug is used either in the tobacco or in the paper ?

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). This matter is all in a nut shell. We do not want to have an analyst in every village to find out whether a cigarette is made with pure or adulterated tobacco. It is no matter to an old smoker whether cigarettes are prohibited or not, because as a rule he does not use them. I think there is no question but that boys are injured by the use of cigarettes. I doubt if there is a man in this House who has not observed in every village small boys on the street smoking cigarettes in the evening, boys from 10 up to 14 years of age. Now we have a law on the statute-book in Ontario that is evaded by the older boy over 18 years of age buying cigarettes and giving them to the younger boy. The trader sells them to the older boy to whom the law permits him to sell, and the latter goes out on the street and divides up with the younger boy, who has perhaps helped him to the cash to buy the cigarettes. Then there is the boy who is under better home influences, whose father and mother try to keep him away from the evil ; he meets a boy on the street who is not under good influences, and the latter gives him a cigarette. That is going on all over this country. Now the question is, if there is any hardship at all suffered by the older portion of the community, whether it is not worth their while to suffer that inconvenience in the interest of the boys of the country. No one who observes what is going on but must have noticed the effect of smoking cigarettes upon young lads who are using them. Now, perhaps there is no part of the community which will suffer from a prohibition of the importation than those frontier towns along the line of the United States where, if such a law is put upon the statute-book, cigarettes will be brought in from the villages on the other side of the line, and our own frontier villages will continue to suffer more or less in that respect. It seems to me that it is the sense of this House that it is an evil that should be dealt with, and if so the sooner it is dealt with the less hardship there will be to all concerned. I am not a constitutional lawyer, and I hope I never will be, in the interest of the country, but, I think most common sense men cannot fail to come to the conclusion that this parliament has the right to deal with this subject. We can prohibit the manufacture, we can prohibit the importation and we can prohibit the sale of what we consider detrimental to the public generally.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that a great deal of credit is due to the hon. mover and seconder of this motion in bringing forward a matter which is so important to the welfare of the young of this Dominion. The habit of cigarette smoking has been a growing evil for a number of years. It is a painful sight to see the youth of our country under the age of twenty-one years smoking cigarettes ; nay, tobacco in any form. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, (Mr. Roddick) when he suggests that we should make the age limit seventeen. I say make the age limit twenty-one. A young man has not arrived at the age of ripe young manhood until he reaches the age of twenty-one. Why it should be seventeen, I cannot understand. If a youth is affected by use of tobacco at the age of seventeen by the impurities that arise from the tobacco imbued or infused into the system, I conceive, that the same evil exists, perhaps not to the same extent, until he arrives at the age of twenty-one, and I still go farther and say that it even continues beyond the age of twenty-one. In fact, a young man does not possess strong moral courage until he arrives at the age of twenty-one.

That the smoking of cigarettes has been proved by overwhelming testimony to be productive of serious physical and moral injury to young people; impairing health, arresting development, weakening intellectual power, and thus constituting a social and national evil——

As this is indisputable, legislation should be enacted to prohibit the importation, sale and use of cigarettes is a suggestion which I heartily endorse. I conceive, Mr. Speaker, that it is within the purview of this Dominion to enact prohibitive measures and not for the legislatures of the respective provinces to assume this action. We have an Act upon the statute-books of the province of Nova Scotia, as has been shown by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), we have another in the province of Ontario and another in the province of Quebec. But, these Acts are completely ignored. In my own town may be seen boys who have scarcely arrived at the age of ten years smoking cigarettes. Nay, I will go farther and say that I have seen them smoking vile pipes and as such are offenders, and open to the most stringent measures that the law can possibly enact. I believe that the remark which fell from the lips of the last speaker (Mr. Broder) in respect to the manufacture of cigarettes, should be carefully considered. The intention of the mover and seconder of this motion is that the manufacture of cigarettes should be prohibited in this country, but a youth may purchase his tobacco in any form he pleases, use any kind of paper he pleases and manufacture his own cigarette. The motion should go further and say that it should be part of the Criminal Code of this country that any youth who is caught in the act of smoking a cigarette, whether made by himself or otherwise, should suffer the penalty of

the law, and I would urge this amendment upon the mover and seconder of this motion. Perhaps I take a stronger view than many hon. gentlemen here when I say that the use of cigarettes is only an introduction to many other evils that human nature is heir to, and that if the suppression of the use of the cigarette was strictly carried out I believe that the other vices to which youths are liable and that human nature is subject to would be very quickly removed. I would strongly support the age limit of twenty-one instead of seventeen as my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick) suggests.

Mr. G. STEPHENS (Kent, Ontario). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this question, but in view of the great importance which it is to the people of this country, not only at the present time but in the future to our young men who are growing up, I felt that I would not be doing my duty to the riding I have the honour to represent did I not stand up and say something in favour of this resolution. I am sure that any hon. member of this House who goes up and down the streets in any town or city in this country can see the evil effect which cigarette smoking has upon our boys, and I believe that there is no other way of stopping the evil unless the importation, sale and manufacture of cigarettes are prohibited. I therefore shall have much pleasure in supporting this resolution and I will conclude by expressing the hope that the government may find some way of stopping what is becoming a great evil amongst the boys of this country.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I think, Mr. Speaker, that all the representatives of the people in this House agree that this is a growing evil. It is an evil that was unknown in my early days, and I know from personal observation in Halifax that it is an evil that is increasing more and more every year. Now, the question is this: Are the parents showing the best example to their children in the use of tobacco in any shape or form? I give myself the credit of saying that I never used tobacco and if I had my way there would not be any person in this world that would use it. But, however, I am not vain enough to think that that reform will be carried out in this age. Now, we have this evil. This evil is increasing and this House is the only body that can deal with the question according to the resolution in its present shape. Therefore, let us not shirk the responsibility of doing what we can in the interest of the children that are going to be the men of Canada in a short time. If this evil is allowed to continue there will be very few that will grow to the age of manhood. They will not be men either in mind or in body, if they continue the practice of using tobacco in any shape or form under a certain age, because we cannot confine the evil of tobacco to cigarettes alone. The use of tobacco by our young boys must be injurious. Therefore I heartily endorse the resolution that has been submitted to this House and I would like that the House should assume the responsibility of dealing with it in a strong and vigorous manner. I do not intend to say more, only that when I was young I used to repeat something like this:

Tobacco is a stinking weed; it was the devil that sowed the seed
It drains your purse; it stains your clothes
And makes a chimney of your nose.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (St. Mary's, Montreal). There is no doubt whatever that tobacco and liquor have caused a great deal of evil. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross) that we should start by giving good example ourselves. If grown up people, like members of parliament, would smoke a little less than they do, perhaps our young people would not smoke so much. Be that as it may, I have never believed in coercion. I do not think that coercion has ever cured any moral evil. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) asks us to prevent the smoking of cigarettes, but only a week ago I read in the 'Lancet,' one of the most important and influential medical newspapers in the world, that cigarettes are not quite as harmful as cigars. It would follow then, that if we ask that cigarettes be not manufactured or sold, cigars should be prohibited at the same time, and tobacco in all shapes and forms. This resolution would not go far enough, so far as I am personally concerned, but I shall not deal with that aspect of the case at all. I do not believe in prohibition of that kind. Let us regulate the smoking of cigarettes and of cigars and of tobacco and let us regulate the sale of liquor. Prohibition has not been very popular with us in Quebec. Not because we drink more than the people of the other provinces, but because we believe in freedom.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If better education were given in the schools, if on the walls of the schools there were photographs showing the young generation the great evils of liquor and tobacco, it would go a great deal further to remedy the evil than any law we can pass here. Let us educate our young generation in the proper way, but don't let us enact laws which have proved a failure elsewhere. The prohibition of liquor has proved to be a failure almost everywhere it has been enacted, and the prohibition of the manufacture and importation of cigarettes would prove a failure and a dead failure. Any man of experience will agree with me on that. I do not speak from any interested motives on this question. I have never smoked, thank God; I am trying to give good example, and I hope to die without smoking.

Mr. CASGRAIN. You'll smoke when you die.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, it will not make me less immortal than I hope to be. These are the views which I entertain on questions of this kind. It seems to me that a law prohibiting the importation and manufacture of cigarettes would be a failure and if such a law be enacted, then it should be extended to tobacco of all kinds ; a thing which I believe, is out of the question.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I am heartily in accord with the resolution, although I am forced to believe that such legislation does not always accomplish the end aimed at. I can well believe that it is injurious both morally and physically that either boys or adults should smoke cigarettes. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) told us that he read in the 'Lancet' that cigars were worse than cigarettes. From the information I have that is not correct, because the cigarettes are saturated with stramonium and other narcotics which makes them more injurious in their effect than if they were made from tobacco alone, and cigars are usually manufactured out of tobacco alone. I hold, that provided you are able to prevent boys from smoking cigarettes up to the time of their majority, the danger would not be so great, and the best way to insure that is to make it more difficult to purchase cigarettes. If men take to the use of cigarettes in their mature years they are responsible for it and the evil will be confined to themselves alone. But when boys acquire the habit in their youth, it gets fixed and they are not able to give it up afterwards. I think it would be in the interest of the rising generation that we should prevent this evil from contaminating them. As that can only be done through this parliament, which controls importation and manufacture, I am in favour of the resolution. Although the provincial parliaments may pass laws to make it illegal to sell to a minor, still while it is easy for young boys to obtain cigarettes because of the freedom with which they are distributed throughout the country, the provincial law cannot be very well enforced. I am in favour of this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Peter Macdonald, East Huron). I am in favour of this resolution. I believe that if it is adopted by this House, and if a law is founded upon it, it will be one of the best laws that can possibly be conceived for the preservation of the young. I do not think that the tobacco contained in the cigarettes is more injurious than tobacco used in the pipe or the cigar, but I am informed upon good authority, that the paper in which the tobacco is rolled, contains ingredients which are injurious to the smoker. I have been informed that the cigarette paper is immersed in some solution of morphine which gives to the smoker a delightful sensation, and leads him from point to point until he becomes addicted to the cigarette habit. I am told also that the inhalation of the smoke creates a sensation such as opium would create, and therefore that it engenders in the young a desire to use it which it is almost impossible to restrain. Therefore, I think it would be wisdom on the part of the House first to pass the resolution, and then pass a law founded on that resolution. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says that he believes in freedom. So do I ; but as the poet says :

> Freedom properly understood ; is a universal license to do good.

Too much freedom is almost as bad as tyranny. What we want to do is to keep our boys free from the temptations which are now thrown in their way, and if we do that there will be no tyranny about it. I trust that this motion will result in a Bill prohibiting the importation and manufacture of cigarettes.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Centre Toronto). I merely rise to call the attention of the House to what is going on in this country, and in many other countries at the present time. That is, we are removing from the proper sphere the care of our children and the care of the morals of this country. I contend that the proper places in which to inculcate right principles into the minds of our children are the homes of the country.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear ; and the schools.

Mr. BROCK. More and more we have of late been throwing upon the legislatures and the courts those duties that should be attended to in our own homes. We are educating the children of this country free ; we are supplying them with books free ; we are throwing largely upon our churches the primary teaching of religion which it is the duty of every father and mother to give to their children. How often, when children go astray, do we find fathers and mothers looking to the laws to have them kept in the proper paths, instead of impressing upon their children in their own homes what their duties are. Why, Sir, in this country it is quite the exception to find religious instruction given to children in their homes. That is left entirely either to the churches or the Sunday schools. Fathers and mothers are neglecting it, because other means are provided ; and if you are going to pass laws of the kind proposed, the result will be that the children will be left entirely to the law, and parents will not exercise any influence over them. I would strongly urge that more attention be paid to the morals of children in their own homes, and that in the event of children going astray, their parents should be fined. As it is at present, children who smoke cigarettes are brought before a police magistrate and he punishes them, as well as the person who has sold the cigarettes if he can be got at ; but the sale is usually done

in such a way that it is almost impossible to get at these people. I think this discussion will have done good if it directs the attention of parents to the importance of looking after the religious and moral instruction of their children in their own homes.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion that has taken place on this somewhat important question. I would have preferred that the discussion had been even more general than it has been, because this is a question upon which the government itself has no policy to offer to the House, but desires to be guided by the sense of the House representing the community. In view of the discussion which has taken place, in view especially of the opinion which has been given to us by some gentlemen who are authorities on this subject, it seems to be undeniable that the use of cigarettes by young boys is very injurious. The same remark would apply, so far as I can see, to the use of tobacco in any form ; and for my part I am ready to believe that the use of tobacco, whether in the form of cigarettes or cigars or the pipe, is extremely injurious to young children and to youths in adolescence, whereas in the case of grown-up people, it seems to be a very innocent pleasure, if indeed it is a pleasure—it is not so to everybody. If the use of tobacco is an innocent amusement to grown-up people, I do not think they should be debarred from indulging in it by those who do not relish it. The point taken by the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) seems to me to be conclusive. The object of this resolution is simply to make it impossible for young boys to use cigarettes ; and a very drastic remedy is proposed, that is, that we should prevent the manufacture and sale of cigarettes. Of course, that would be a very effective way of protecting the youth of the country from a dangerous amusement ; but at the same time it would prevent men who derive no injury from it from indulging in that amusement. I agree with a great deal that has been said, and I agree with everything that has been said by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) to the effect that the best way to cure these evils is to attend more to domestic education and less to legislation. If we attempt, by way of restrictive legislation, to prohibit things which in themselves are not harmful, we may place upon the statute-book a class of legislation which will not be respected by the community. There are at present on the statute-books of the several provinces laws which, if observed, are sufficient to meet the evil in question ; but we are told that these laws are not observed. Well, if these laws are not observed, is it to be expected that a more drastic law will be observed ? I see boys smoking cigarettes in the streets every day, and it is always painful to me to see young children of ten or twelve years of age violating the law in this way, injuring their constitutions and impairing their mental powers ; but I do not turn informer and have them prosecuted. If I saw a boy committing a theft, I would not hesitate to call in a policeman to arrest him, and everybody would do the same. But if we put on the statute-book a more drastic measure on this subject than we have at present, I do not think we shall be doing any more to cure the evil, but we shall have simply added one more to those offensive laws which are enacted but not enforced. This is an open question, and everybody can vote upon the resolution as he likes ; but in my opinion the best way to cure the evil in question is the way indicated by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock).

House divided on the resolution.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lewis,
Avery,	Lovell,
Barker,	Loy,
Beith,	Macdonald,
Bell,	MacKinnon,
Bennett,	Maclaren (Huntingdon),
Bickerdike,	MacLaren (Perth),
Blain,	Macpherson,
Boyd,	McColl,
Broder,	McCormick,
Brown,	McEwen,
Bruce,	McGowan,
Calvert,	McGugan,
Calvin,	McIntosh,
Campbell,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Cargill,	Matheson,
Charlton,	Meigs,
Christie,	Monk,
Clancy,	Morin,
Clare,	Morrison,
Clarke,	Mulock (Sir William),
Cochrane,	Pope,
Copp,	Proulx,
Costigan,	Reid (Grenville),
Douglas,	Reid (Restigouche),
Earle,	Richardson,
Emmerson,	Robinson (Elgin),
Erb,	Roche (Halifax),
Fielding,	Roche (Marquette),
Fitzpatrick,	Roddick,
Fowler,	Rosamond,
Fraser,	Ross (Ontario),
Gibson,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Gould,	Russell,
Grant,	Scott,
Hackett,	Sherritt,
Holmes,	Smith (Vancouver),
Hughes (Victoria),	Sproule,
Hyman,	Stephens,
Ingram,	Stewart,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Sutherland (Essex),
Johnston (Lambton),	Talbot,
Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Kemp,	Thompson (Haldimand and Monck),
Kidd,	Tobin,
Lancaster,	Tolton,
Lang,	Turcot,
LaRivière,	Turgeon,
Lavell,	Vrooman,
LeBlanc,	Wilmot,
Lefurgey,	Wright.—103.
Lennox,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Léonard,
Archambault,	Logan,
Bazinet,	McCool,
Béland,	McIsaac,
Belcourt,	McLennan,
Bernier,	Malouin,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Marcil (Bagot),
Brock,	Martineau,
Bureau,	Mayrand,
Carbonneau,	Mignault,
Carroll,	Monet,
Casgrain,	Murray,
Champagne,	Parmelee,
Cowan,	Porter,
Demers (Lévis),	Préfontaine,
Demers (St. John),	Puttee,
Dugas,	Riley,
Ethier,	Ross (Yukon),
Fortier,	Rousseau,
Haggart,	Seagram,
Harwood,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Heyd,	Tarte,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tisdale,
Lavergne,	Ward.—48.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the right hon. the First Minister when he intends to carry out these instructions from the House?

The PRIME MINISTER. I shall have to give up smoking.

AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. D. A. STEWART (Lisgar) moved for :

Return showing all correspondence between the Inland Revenue Department and manufacturers of automatic grain-weighers, used on threshing machines, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Between the Inland Revenue Department and inventors of automatic grain-weighers for threshing machines. Between the Inland Revenue Department and thresher men using automatic grain-weighers, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Also, copy of report of chief inspector and scale architect *re* the standard grain-weigher manufactured by the Globe Manufacturing Company of Winnipeg.

He said : I rise to move this motion in the interests of the threshermen of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, who are suffering under this great hardship of not being able to collect in the courts any account which they may have against a customer for work done. The present system of meeting the conditions of the west has been the result of gradual evolution. The thresherman began with a bushel measure which he emptied into his bags. The low bagger was then invented, to which the thresherman attached his bags, and these bags were filled automatically. From the low bagger, the high bagger was developed. The grain is elevated to a height of about 18 feet from the ground, weighed at the top of his high bagger, and thence loaded into wagons or bags. In Manitoba and the Territories the thresherman is paid according to the result of his day's threshing, but in Ontario I believe he is still paid, as was the system 24 years ago when I was in that province, by the day. In the province the charges per day run from $3 to $10, according to the size of this outfit, and it makes no difference whether the thresherman threshes 500 or 1,000 bushels in a day, his pay is the same. The Ontario thresherman only furnishes a crew of three men whereas the Manitoba thresherman finds all the hands necessary for the engine and threshing. His expenses per day will run from $32 to $41, and if he engages the necessary teams for stook threshing, his expenses will run from $68 to $81. This amount of wages he has to lose if he is dealing with a dishonest customer who refuses to pay. In Ontario, the threshing accounts are small compared with those in Manitoba. In Manitoba and the Territories anything below $150 is a small account, $200 is a fair account, and the accounts run as high as $700, $800 and $1,000. A threshing outfit costs from $2,000 to $4,000, and is usually payable in three instalments. You can, therefore, see that it is a very serious matter for a western thresherman, if he be unable to collect two or three of his accounts. The standard grain weigher manufactured by the Globe Company of Winnipeg gives satisfactory results, and the fact that there is a demand for that kind of a machine all through the west shows that they are a necessity for the handling of the crop. In all cases, where I have made inquiries, the farmers have invariably told me that they were satisfied with the weights they receive from these machines. It has a device for estimating the value of the job and is not used for buying or selling grain. To show you the amount of money invested in threshing machines in Manitoba and the Territories, let me give you a few figures. In 1902, there were 800 used in the Territories and 2,000 in Manitoba. These outfits would run in value from $2,000 to $4,000. Take an average of $3,000 as the value of an outfit, and you will find that the large sum of $8,400,000 is invested in this machinery in our North-west. The threshing accounts in Manitoba in 1901 were made on the following basis : 4½ cents per bushel for wheat; 3 cents for oats, and 3 cents for barley; and the total amounted to $3,116,875. In 1902, the threshing account for the crop, based on the last revised returns, would amount to $4,292,383. In the Territories, for 1902, the amount would be $1,051,521, or over $5,000,000 in both cases, not one dollar of which can be collected in court. I have brought this question before the House and the government in the hopes that they will advance with the times and that this government will devise some legislation which will give the thresherman, who is doing his best to bring the grain from the great fields of the west into the bins of the granary of the empire, the justice to which he is entitled and of which he stands greatly in need.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). I would just remind the House that this is not a new question here. Last session, and, I think, the session preceding it, this matter was brought to the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier). It was pointed out to that hon. gentleman that this was a matter of very great importance to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. And, as has been shown by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Stewart) it is a matter of great moment indeed that men may refuse, legally, under an Act of the government, to pay bills ranging from $100 to $1,000—and all because the department seem to think the matter so small as to be unworthy the attention which some of us hold that it should receive. We were promised last year by the Minister of Inland Revenue that something should be done. He took a number of members of Manitoba and the North-west Territories to his department and exhibited a machine which we believed, and which he seemed to think would meet the emergencies of the case. I understand that a report has been handed in to the minister by an officer of the Crown to the effect that this machine met the conditions imposed by the department and that it was accepted for verification. Since that time, a gentleman has been brought into the department, from Montreal, taken out of some scale factory there, part blacksmith, part scale manufacturer, and placed over the heads of five or six other men equally as good as he, and better prepared scientifically, better experienced in many ways. That gentleman has been placed over the heads of others, and, for reasons not yet explained to any person who has made inquiries, he has seen fit to discard this weighing machine that had been accepted by an officer of the Crown before. And so the matter stands at the present time. But, of course, it is a trifling matter, a matter of very little importance—to the minister who sits quietly by and permits his officers to do as they please. But it is a most important matter to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territory. I read to the House last session, a case in which a man came to court and refused to pay. If we do not resort to the old busheller, with which twenty men would not take away the grain from the machines of the present day, a man cannot collect his accounts. Not a dollar can be legally collected for all the threshing done in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to-day. If there were not a special weighing machine already in use, if it were not a fact that an Order in Council could be passed any day to procure the same, there might be some reason for allowing this inconvenience to continue. If the minister would bestir himself sufficiently to go to Council with an order—which I am sure would be passed at once—authorizing these special weighing machines, as has been done in the matter of weighing coal, measuring syrup and in other things, the matter could be settled at once. I have seen the machine working to which I refer, and it is as near perfect as any machine that can be found. It comes nearer to being correct than the system by which grain is being weighed and measured in Manitoba to-day. As it is now, they use bags, or, in some cases, they have weighing machines accepted by both parties interested, who feel that they can trust each other's honesty. This machine is much better than any I have seen yet. But to humor the whim of an officer who, only a few months ago was brought in from outside and placed over the heads of men who, by their experience, are better qualified to give an opinion, this enormous trade throughout Manitoba and the North-west Territories must be left at the mercy of any dishonest men. I speak with some warmth, Mr. Speaker, but I do so because nothing else seems to stir the Minister of Inland Revenue to a sense of what is due to the public. If we were satisfied with flails and reaping hooks and cradles, I suppose we would come up to his ideas of how farming ought to be conducted. I call the attention of the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to this matter, and I expect him to see to it that things shall not be left in such a position that members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories must rise and complain, as we justly complain, of this gross neglect on the part of the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). This is a question that affects a very large portion of the community of the North-west who are engaged in threshing, and have a very great deal of money invested in this line of business. And when I refer to threshers, I do not wish to leave the impression that I refer to only a class of people who follow the avocation of threshing. There is a very large class of farmers who are interested in threshing and own threshing machines, and to whom the settlement of this question is as important as to those who own threshing machines and are not farmers. I believe you cannot purchase a modern machine for less than $2,500 or $3,000. This suggests the greatness of the amount invested in all the machines necessary to do the threshing in that great western country, which grew over one hundred millions of bushels of grain last year. Now many of the farmers have to mortgage their farms in order to purchase these machines, those of them who are owners of land. They have interest to pay on this money which they borrow, they have many risks to run, such as the drawbacks incident to bad weather; they have to pay their hands oftentimes during this bad weather. They meet with accidents sometimes and have to pay out a good deal of money for repairs. Therefore the interest of the threshers is a very material interest, and is well worthy of consideration

at the hands of the head of the department under whose care such matters as this may come. They have to wait for months, and sometimes a year or more for the money which is coming to them for the grain which they thresh. When we take into consideration the drawbacks incident to their vocation, I say it is an impossibility for the Minister of Inland revenue to do too much towards meeting their wishes, insofar as no dissatisfaction is created in the other party to the contract.

Now, when we look at this Act as it reads at the present time, we find it says :

> Every person who uses or who has in his possession for use in trade any weight, measure, scale, balance, steel-yard or weighing machine which is false or unjust——

That is which has not the government stamp on it.

> —shall incur a penalty not exceeding $25 and not less than $10 ; and in the case of a subsequent offence, of $50. And any contract, bargain, sale or dealing made by the same shall be void, and the weight, measure, scale, balance, steel-yard or weighing machine shall be forfeited and shall be forthwith seized as being so forfeited.

Now, here we have a machine insisted on by the department which at the present time the threshers cannot use, they could not get through with their threshing and comply with the Act if they had such a machine. It would be impossible to do it in the one season of the year. Therefore the threshers who are engaged in that occupation at the present time, are doing so illegally, so far as the standard measure is concerned. As a matter of fact they use a weighing machine or a bagger, which, in the majority of cases is agreed upon by both parties. But there are a class of people who may object to it, and take advantage of that Act and beat the thresher out of his just dues, and it is to meet this class that legislation is desired from the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Last year I referred to the fact that decisions had been given by the courts wherein the farmers have been allowed to go scot free in refusing to pay their threshers. That is the class I have just referred to, and it is to protect them from that class that the threshers desire this legislation. This machine that has been referred to by my hon. friend from Macdonald would be, I think, mutually agreeable both to the farmer and to the thresher. The Minister of Inland Revenue said last year that some one had invented a machine and would bring it to the department, and he thought it would be acceptable and would be adopted universally. I am not aware that that machine has been universally adopted, I do not think it has been. But the machine that has been brought to the department, the machine which the hon. member has referred to, is one that I think would satisfy the farmer as well as the thresher. It has been accepted by an officer of the department, and then refused by the head of the department. I attended a meeting of the Thresher's Union in my town last fall, at which this matter was discussed, and where their grievances were laid before the farmers. Every person there, farmer as well as thresher, was convinced that there was just cause of complaint on the part of the threshers, and a grievance existed which ought to be remedied by the Department of Inland Revenue. I do not know that it is necessary for me to go into the discussion at any length just now, before these papers are brought down. But I would urge upon the Minister of Inland Revenue the necessity for adopting some machine that would be mutually agreeable to the farmer and the thresher, in compliance with the promise he made last session.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Order for :

> Second reading of Bill (No. 36) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. —Mr. Ball.

Mr. G. BALL (Nicolet). Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to allow this Bill to stand, for the reason which I will give. The parties interested in this Bill are absent. They were not aware that the rule of the House has been changed, and that the Bill would be discussed upon the second reading instead of in the Railway Committee. My hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) took the opportunity the other day of proposing an amendment to the second reading of the Bill. He has just told me that he has a speech prepared.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Ball) is not quite in order. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. BALL. I would ask the House to allow the Bill to stand on account of the interested parties not being present. They were preparing to be at the committee, and they just got the news that the Bill would be discussed in this House instead of before the Railway Commitee.

Order allowed to stand.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the North-west Bank of Canada.—Mr. McCreary.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to remind the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that there are certain papers which were asked for some time ago and which have not been brought down yet. There are the papers relating to the colonial conference which have been promised to be laid on the Table and which have not been laid on the Table yet. There are the papers relating to the Bond-Hay treaty which have been promised. I believe the order was issued for these papers and they have not been brought down yet. There are the papers relating to the Alaskan boundary. I will send a memorandum over to the hon. Minister of Finance if he will allow me. I think it would be desirable that we should have these papers as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Some of the papers are in course of preparation, but whether all are covered by the arrangements I am not quite sure. I will see that the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is called to it.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND TARIFF INQUIRY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day. I would like to ask the government if we may take as authoritative the statements which have been reproduced in the Montreal papers of the announcements in the city of Montreal by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine). At a meeting held in the city of Montreal a day or two ago my hon. friend announced as follows. I am quoting from the Montreal 'Herald':—

> Minister of Marine speaks of the government's plans.
>
> Hon. Raymond Préfontaine announces the make-up of the Railway Commission and outlines work of the cabinet.
>
> Railway Commision to be composed of Sir Wm. Van Horne, president; Messrs Geo. Bertram, Toronto, H. Kennedy of Quebec, Transporation Commissioners; and Messrs. J. X. Perrault and Bell, secretaries.
>
> Possibility of a committee on tariff revision.
>
> The Atlantic port of the Grand Trunk Pacific to be on Canadian soil.
>
> St. James election to be held in May.
>
> End of session in July.

These are the announcements summarized, as the government organ has them summarized in its issue of yesterday. The announcement in regard to the composition of the railway commission is of some importance, Mr. Speaker, and I feel justified in asking the government if the announcement is really the pronunciamento of the government upon the composition of the commission? Speaking of a matter, perhaps of more importance, that is the revision of the tariff, the hon. Minister said thus:—

> Passing for a few moments to the tariff the minister said that the government was determined to do justice to all, and to give due consideration to all interests, industrial, commercial and agricultural. If it found that a revision of the tariff was necessary or that legitimate industries required protection, the right thing would be done.
>
> If it appeared that full justice could not be done during the session, the government might name a committee from the cabinet to secure the opinion of the country, as was done by the present ministry in 1897. . . It was proposed to have a second transcontinental line from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and entirely on Canadian soil. To this enterprise the government would no doubt grant a measure of assistance, in keeping with prudence and wisdom.

I think it is right and proper, Mr. Speaker, that we should ask the government, if these announcements which are of very great importance are really a declaration of the government's policy. If they be, then this House would be entitled to have known it at an earlier date. We should like to know if it is determined upon that the composition of this commission is as was stated by the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine). We should be informed also as to whether it is certain that the Grand Trunk Pacific will have its Atlantic port on Canadian soil; if the St. James election is to be held in May next, and if the prophetic vision of the minister as to the end of the session in July has any real foundation. We should know whether or not all these things form part of the government programme.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I am afraid I shall have to repeat the observation I made on a previous occasion: That announcements not made in that valuable publication known as the 'Canada Gazette' are not to be taken as entirely authorized. I am unable to accept responsibility for statements appearing in a newspaper however worthy and reputable that newspaper may be. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that when announcements of an official character are to be made on these important subjects it will be proper that they should be made in the House of Commons, and I am quite satisfied that they will be so made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). At the same time, I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who is at present in the House, ought be in a position to state to the House whether or not these remarks as reported in a reputable journal supporting the government have really been made by

the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I do not think it is asking too much from this side of the House to request some statement as to whether or not these views have been expressed by a minister of the Crown, and whether the report is correct. It is quite true that various announcements of a certain character are made in the 'Canada Gazette,' but still announcements are sometimes made by ministers of the Crown at public gatherings and it would be very interesting indeed to know whether this announcement has been made or whether it is a complete forgery and misstatement which is contained in this journal. If these announcements have been made by a minister of the Crown, then it is right for us to know whether or not the government undertakes the responsibility for them—I do not see how it could avoid taking responsibility for them. If it does take responsibility for them, how does it happen that announcements of this character during a session of parliament are made by a minister of the Crown, not from his place in the House of Commons but are made by him at a gathering of this sort. I do not think that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has quite discharged his duty towards the House and the country in stating what he has stated in regard to this matter.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the Minister of Finance: Whether the statements which were credited by the premier to the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) appeared in the 'Canada Gazette' or in the newspapers ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I really do not remember, I was absent from the country at the time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). I have no hesitation whatever in giving the explanations that are required. I must state first, that the newspaper which has been cited has drawn conclusions from ordinary expressions that any public man would make under the circumstances. I was present at that meeting of the Laurier club in Maisonneuve division last Monday night and as a public man I said there, that from reviewing the political situation, I said that the program of the government as laid down in the speech from the Throne was a programme which attracted the attention of the people not only of Maisonneuve but all over the Dominion. Commenting on the different items mentioned in the speech from the Throne, I made allusion of course to the question of transportation and I said, this question having been referred to, that it having been decided that the question would be referred to a commission this proposition seemed to have received the approbation not only of the friends of the government, but of the opposition; that the question deserved to be studied and that in face of the names that had been suggested there was every guarantee that this question would be studied with due care and due consideration. I mentioned the names that had been published in the papers as having been suggested to be members of that commission. I never went any further than that. I added that it might be found necessary to have the commission composed of five instead of three. I never mentioned and it could not be inferred, that the commission had been appointed; that the names of the commissioners had been considered by the cabinet. I never said anything of the sort, and people who listened to me understood what I said perfectly well.

Now as regards the tariff, what did I say? I repeated exactly what I said during my election : That the government was disposed to do justice to every class of the community—I never said anything else—that if there were remedies to be applied, or if certain things had to be done towards certain industries I had no doubt that the government of the country would do what was right towards these industries. I never went any further than that.

Mr. MONK. Then, if my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) will allow me, he did not state that a committee of the cabinet would be named to investigate the just claims of those who asked for a revision of the tariff.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said that whatever remedy would be applied, if it was not found satisfactory, it might be found possible for the government to proceed in the same way as they proceeded in 1897, and I said that without making any announcement on my responsibility or on the responsibility of the government. I was not authorized to do so. It could not be inferred from what I said that it was the laid down programme of the government to do one thing or the other. I was very guarded in everything I said and I do not understand how my hon. friend on the other side should take offence at anything I have said or the way I have said it.

Mr. MONK. I take no offence at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As regards the trans-continental line, I repeated generalities. I said that everybody admitted that a second transcontinental line was necessary. Everybody seemed to have that opinion and of course if a transcontinental line was built it stood to reason the government would have to consider the claims of any company that would construct that line in the same liberal way as other lines had been constructed in the past. I did not go any further than these announcements, and these announcements were no secrets. They were known all over the country since the speech from the Throne was delivered at the opening of this session, and I do not see that there is any reason for making such a fuss about them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The announcement in the Montreal 'Herald' is, that the hon. gentleman made a ringing speech.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman's speech to-night does not seem to have very much ring about it. Perhaps he can suggest to the House what portion of his explanation may be regarded as ringing; I did not notice it. This paper is either stating a fact or it is not. It states that it was announced by the hon. gentleman that Sir William Van Horne, president, and Messrs. John Bertram of Toronto and H. Kennedy of Quebec were to form this commission. The hon. gentleman either announced that or he did not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. leader of the opposition will allow me, I did not state anything else than what I have stated just now. I stated that from the reports in the papers the following names had been mentioned, and that if these gentlemen were to be the commission, I supposed they would offer a guarantee to the people of Canada so as to inspire confidence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The report is not that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course, I was not the reporter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is a newspaper which is supporting the hon. gentleman—at least, it is supporting him now, and I thought probably it would have a correct version of what he said. It does not put it as the hon. gentleman does. It says that the commission is to be composed of these gentlemen. I gather from the hon. gentleman that he made no such statement—that the version given by this newspaper is incorrect in that regard.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may be an error in translation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). An error in translation—yes. The hon. gentleman does, however, make one very important announcement to-night which I think might well have been made to parliament in the speech from the Throne. He not only announced in Montreal, but he announces here to-night, that the government does propose to give assistance to another transcontinental railway. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that distinctly to-night.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I must say it in French.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman referred to other railways that have been built across the continent, and he stated in my hearing, as 'Hansard' tomorrow will show, that a transcontinental road is to receive the same assistance as other railways have received in the past.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Due consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, the same assistance. Whatever the hon. gentleman intended to say, I know what he did say, and that is that the government had come to a conclusion with regard to that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Due consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Postmaster General is coming to the assistance of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and is interpolating a phrase which was not used by that hon. gentleman at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I think the hon. gentleman is in error. He is using an expression which I did not hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries use. I did not hear him say that the government intended to extend the same liberal consideration to the new road as had been extended to other roads. I heard him make no such statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I regret that the hearing of the hon. Postmaster General is so defective.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I regret that my hon. friend's understanding is so defective.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That may be, but my hearing is better than the Postmaster General's evidently.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I prefer understanding.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is a somewhat serious matter, that an announcement of this kind should have been made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in Montreal, and repeated here to-night, as it has been in the presence of this House, while no announcement in the usual form has been made to parliament by the government. I would ask the Minister of Finance, in view of what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has stated, whether or not the government is able to announce to the House any policy with regard to assistance to a transcontinental line. I think the House is entitled to that after the statement which has appeared in the public press, and after that statement has been corroborated as it has been to-night in the presence of the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am unable to agree with my hon. friend that this is the precise moment for announcing policies on great questions, which are not at the moment before the House. The question is one of great importance, and when the government have prepared a policy on

that question, they will not fail to communicate it to the House in the proper way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The fact that it is important is a very good reason why it should not be announced to the country in this indirect manner.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says it was not announced.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We will not quarrel about the words. I certainly understood them as stated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that he announced to this great gathering in Montreal that a transcontinental line now proposed to be built would receive assistance of the same character as that which had been extended to similar enterprises in the past. You cannot get anything more nor less out of the announcement than that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When my hon. friend reads to-morrow's 'Hansard,' I think he will find—and I know he desires to be fair—that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not use the word he says he did. He has twice said that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries alleged that the government would extend assistance. I say that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not, in my hearing use the word assistance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will not quarrel with my hon. friend the Postmaster General about the exact word—whether it is aid or assistance or some synonymous word; but the impression which the hon. gentleman gave to my mind—and I am sure he gave the same impression to every man in this House—was that he had announced at this meeting in Montreal that the government had determined on some measure of assistance to a transcontinental line. I do not pretend to be able to quote the exact language he used, but I am perfectly sure of the exact impression he conveyed to my mind and to the mind of every hon. gentleman in this House who heard him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). As the hon. gentleman challenges every member of this House, I may say that I was listening most attentively to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and they made no such impression on my mind, nor do I think they did on the minds of the majority of this House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What did the hon. Minister of Public Works understand the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS I understood him to say that he thought a transcontinental line was desirable and that it was receiving the consideration of the government. That was all I understood him to say. I do not believe he used the word assistance or aid. However, it is a matter of impression. I am not particular as to the words, but, as the hon. leader of the opposition has challenged the House, I beg to state most candidly that the words made no such impression on my mind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Public Works heard the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he compared the merits of this transcontinental line with the merits of the lines built across the continent in the past, and I do not know whether he gathered from that portion of his remarks the impression that the government intended to give assistance. For my part, I could not construe his language in any other way. I could only construe it in the same sense as the words of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as reported in this paper.

> To this enterprise the government would no doubt grant a measure of assistance in keeping with prudence and wisdom.

Now, I do not understand the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in making his statement here to-night, to depart in any way from his statement in Montreal, as reported in that paper.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. J. Raymond Préfontaine). (Translation.) I am going to speak French, and in that way, I may possibly succeed in making my statement clearer and more explicit.

Let me read from 'La Patrie' of March 31, a report of the statement I made at the meeting referred to. Here are the very words I used upon that occasion, according to that report, and I am going to read them to the House in order to avoid any further misunderstanding on the matter, because, after all, it is only a tempest in a tea-pot. Referring to the new transcontinental line, I spoke as follows :—

> A new transcontinental line running from the Pacific to the Atlantic, for the forwarding of the grain and other products of the west through all-Canadian channels, and by the shortest way, under Canadian control. Under such circumstances, the duty of the government is plain. They should aid in the carrying out of that undertaking to the best of their ability, with prudence and caution.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Is that a correct report ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. (Translation.) Pretty nearly so.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) That is just what we wished to ascertain.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. (Translation.) So much the better, then, if the hon. gentlemen opposite are satisfied with my explanation. These

are the very words I used on that occasion and I do not see there was much wrong in speaking as I did. As to the question of establishing a Commission—not a company, as 'Le Journal' styles it—but a Commission on transportation, let me quote again from 'La Patrie.'

The name of Sir William Van Horne has been spoken of——

Now, Mr. Chairman, allow me to call your attention to the words 'spoken of.' As you see, I am not responsible for that piece of news, and I was merely repeating a current rumour in the country.

—the name of Sir William Van Horne has been mentioned as president of that commission, together with the names of Mr. John Bertram, of Toronto, and Mr. H. Kennedy, of Quebec, as assistants, and those of Mr. J. X. Perrault, of Montreal, and Ball, of Winnipeg, as secretaries.

Mr. MONET. (Translation.) Is that the opinion of the government?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. (Translation.) That is altogether out of the question, and I once more draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the words 'spoken of' clearly. I was repeating what had been reported by the newspapers which had referred to the gentlemen I just referred to as about to be appointed members of that Commission. I do not see the use of quibbling in such matters.

As to what I said in connection with the prorogation as going to take place about the end of July, I take the liberty of quoting again from the report of 'La Patrie.'

(Translation.) All the forecasts point to an era of prosperity and progress. In the House of Commons, they are railroading parliamentary business. The opposition members, so far, have hardly indulged in any criticism worth mentioning and we are in hopes that, before the month of July next, the whole programme, as announced in the speech from the Throne, will have been disposed of.

This is, no doubt, the statement to which the hon. gentlemen opposite have taken exception, and yet, I had no more idea of wounding their feelings than the man in the moon. I am, indeed, very sorry to have offended my hon. friends opposite, when stating that, so far, they had not yet addressed themselves seriously to the task of criticising the government programme.

At all events, what I said in Montreal, I stated with a full knowledge of the facts, after having carefully weighed my words.

There is, then, in a nutshell, the whole matter; and the House now may realize that there is nothing in what I said that was calculated to be offensive to anybody.

Mr. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Let the hon. gentleman, I pray, keep cool and be serious in such matters. I want the minister to inform us whether it is a fact, as reported by the press, that he stated at the meeting referred to that there would be a readjustment of the tariff, if necessary, and that such readjustment would be made by a committee of the government, as was done in 1897. I want him to tell us whether that report is correct. We have, surely, the right to be informed whether the statement made by a member of the government is correct, chiefly in view of the fact that such statement was reported in the same way by all the French and English papers of Montreal. And when we ask the hon. gentleman to tell us whether in making that statement he was the echo of the government, he shelters himself behind the French language and refuses to give us a direct answer, but resorts to quibbles and jokes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. (Translation.) Let the hon. gentlemen opposite also keep cool. Here is the statement referred to, as reported in 'La Patrie':

Should we find it impossible to do justice to all concerned, during this session, some means might be devised, as in 1897, whereby a subcommittee of the Privy Council would be appointed to hold an investigation into the complaints of manufacturers and workingmen.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Is that a correct report?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. (Translation.) It is absolutely correct, but, I ask again, is there anything objectionable in that statement?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) That is not the question; all we want to know is whether that report is correct or not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. (Translation.) Absolutely correct. What do you find as being objectionable in that statement?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) That is not in question; the question is this: is the report correct?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. (Translation.) I repeat again, the statement is absolutely correct. I said that we could proceed in the same way as in 1897. If the hon. gentlemen are not satisfied that I have told the truth and that I have said something unreasonable, I cannot help it. I quite understand that the hon. gentlemen feel rather disappointed, but, again, I cannot help it.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). A short time ago, the attention of the House was called to the fact that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals had committed the government, by an official utterance, to the policy of aiding the construction of a transcontinental line. It is quite true that when the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) read the interview attributed to the Minister of Railways and Canals, that hon. gentleman promptly repudiated it. What

then happened ? No sooner was the denial of the hon. minister published than the correspondent who had written up that interview, declared over his own name in the newspaper in which it appeared, that the Minister of Railways and Canals had given him the interview reported. From that day until this, the hon. minister has not dared to rise in his place and deny the statement of the reporter. What followed ? The right hon. the First Minister simply ignored the action of the Minister of Railways and Canals, although the statement made by him was one of an official nature and of great moment to the country. But that was not the only case of the kind. The hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) went to Toronto a week ago and there made a strong statement which is reported in the Toronto 'Globe' of March the 24th, with reference to the same matter as that concerning which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) gave an interview in Montreal. It is true, if we are to judge by the report of the latter interview, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was more explicit, frank and plain-speaking than the Postmaster General. But none the less the Postmaster General led his audience in Toronto to believe this government stood pledged to aid some railway—he did not particularize it by its name—that was to be built from one ocean to the other. Let me read what the hon. Postmaster General is reported to have said :

> We have other railways built partly with public and partly with private moneys, but owned by private corporations, not by the state. Public opinion to-day appears to be more or less against subsidizing railways. Is there any prospect of capitalists out of their own capital alone building a line over the thousand miles of country to which I have alluded, which for many a year will fail to supply any reasonable return on the capital invested ? Capitalists are not philanthropists, but expect a return upon their investments. Shall we proceed to subsidize the various railways that are now proposing to extend their lines to Manitoba. . . . .
>
> Or shall we fold our arms, shrink from discharging our proper responsibilities and let the country drift ?
>
> There is the third, a more broad minded, progressive, enterprising and patriotic section of the people, and 'Onward Canada' party in effect, who, recognizing the unparalleled progress our country is making to-day, demand that instead of checking the movement by inaction we should take occasion by the hand and wisely and masterfully grapple with, and if possible successfully solve, the problems growing out of Canada's great and unprecedented development. One of the most serious of these problems is the railway question to which I have alluded.

What other inference can we draw than that the Postmaster General intended to impress his hearers with the belief that the government was going to assist one or more of these railway schemes now in contemplation.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman intend to discuss this matter much further ? He is not in order.

Mr. BENNETT. I was about through, and as this discussion has been proceeding on the same lines, it seems to me that I am justified in making these references. However, if necessary I shall move the adjournment before I close. It must be clear to everyone that both the Postmaster General in Toronto and the Minister of Marine in Montreal intended to give fair notice to the Canadian public that subsidies would be granted by this government to some of these lines of railway. The only difference between the two is that the Postmaster General has perhaps shown a little more tact than did his colleague the Minister of Marine. In trying to explain away his interview, the hon. Minister of Marine said he was simply repeating the current gossip of the newspapers regarding the Transportation Commission. Well, it has no doubt been frequently reported in the public press that Sir William Van Horne was to be a member of the commission, but I challenge the hon. minister to produce a single newspaper which has given in that connection the name of Mr. John Bertram or Mr. Harold Kennedy.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You have not read the papers.

Mr. BENNETT. I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce a single newspaper which gave, before this interview, the names of those gentlemen in that connection. As regards changes in the tariff, it is pretty evident that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, made a slip and an unguarded statement. The hon. Minister of Finance has endeavoured to side track the question by stating that anything not official is not to be charged to the government as a whole, that the government are not responsible for anything that appears in the press, except in the official publication of Canada—the Official Gazette. But the hon. Minister of Finance knows very well that the reason which his right hon. leader gave for dismissing the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) from the cabinet was that he had read the reports which appeared in the different newspapers from time to time of the utterances of his ex-colleague. It will not do for the Minister of Finance to treat the matter in the cavalier way he has done. The fact of the matter is that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was unguarded in what he said in Montreal the other night. He was among his friends, and he wished to show his friends that he knew something of the inner cabinet secrets—as no doubt he does—and he wished to show the other ministers too, probably, that he had leave and license to take more rope than has been allowed to the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). That he has

taken plenty is apparent, and that he has not hanged himself is also apparent. The cabinet cannot afford to dispense with the services of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and he is free to say what he will where he will. I will move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance a question. The report of the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the Montreal 'Herald'—and I am informed that practically the same report appears in the French papers—says :

> If it is found that a revision of the tariff was necessary or that legitimate industries required protection, the right thing would be done. If it appeared that full justice could not be done during the session, the government might name a committee from the cabinet to secure the opinion of the country as was done by the present ministry in 1897.

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether this is the policy of the government or not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The policy of the government in tariff matters is usually announced in the budget speech, and I do not feel at liberty to make any announcement in advance of that.

Mr. KEMP. Then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had no authority for making that statement.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I extremely regret that the government have so far departed from the custom of that great type of parliaments and governments, the British parliament and the British cabinet, in making its announcements to the world. There are two channels through which announcements usually come, and one of these is by speeches made by prominent ministers at great public functions, at which they practically declare their policy to the world, and that announcement is regarded as quite as authoritative as though made on the floors of parliament. Now, if we believe the report to be correct, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in this case did exactly what an English cabinet minister would do. And one great reason why we were justified in taking that as an official announcement of the government, is the fact that for several days, although that specific statement was made in a prominent daily paper in the great city of Montreal, a daily paper that was friendly to the present government, the hon. minister did not think it worth while to deny it or say that it was an incorrect version of his statement, until he was challenged here in the House. And now that that is done he takes shelter under the plea of an incorrect report. The whole public, in the meantime had come to the conclusion that the minister's statement was an official announcement of the government. I say it is very regrettable that the present government have so far departed from the well-understood methods that obtain in Great Britain, and that they tell the people of the country that the only thing we can believe with regard to this cabinet is what appears in the 'Canada Gazette' unless the statement is made by the Minister of Finance or the First Minister on the floor of the parliament. I am afraid that is rather discrediting the personnel of the cabinet and the cabinet as a whole, if we are not free to take the announcement of a prominent minister at a prominent function as indicating the policy which the government intend to follow.

TREATMENT OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I wish to bring to the attention of the House and of the government a matter which I think is of some urgency. It is in connection with the immense movement now taking place, of settlers from across the ocean and across this continent to our North-west. It is a matter of gratification to us all, and more especially to those of us who come from the North-west, that the settlers now coming in there by thousands are practically all British. It seems that circumstances have brought about a change which even our own officials could not bring about. On Saturday last, there were no less than four ships discharging immigrants at the port of Halifax, and, during the next few hours eight special trains started across this continent to the North-west. They passed through and by Ottawa Monday last. I took occasion to devote the greater part of that day to seeing and questioning these immigrants and ascertaining what accommodation was being provided for their transport across this country. The conditions which they were subjected to were simply scandalous. Not only did I see this myself, but I may tell the Acting Minister of the Interior (Hon. Sir William Mulock), agents of whose departments are on the trains, that from communication with those agents, I believe they are aware of the facts, and are prepared to report that the treatment and the accommodation provided are simply not decent. On one train especially, that was here Monday, a train composed of eleven cars, there was not more than one car that was fit to travel in for twenty-four hours continuously. The other cars were borrowed from the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial. The worst, unfortunately, were government cars, borrowed from the Intercolonial Railway. I am not seeking to criticise or find fault with the transportation companies. This is a public matter, altogether public. These cars were simply short trip day coaches, coaches with fixed, narrow seats, with no berth below and no berths at the top, without even so much as parcel racks. Passengers here were complaining very much. They told me that the aisles even had to be used the previous

nights for sleeping, the seats not being movable at all. There was only one car on one of these trains where water was obtainable. I was so informed, and I believe it, for, reaching here where water was obtainable, the passengers proceeded to have a good wash. And the lavatory conveniences were used indiscriminately by male and female. This is not common decency. These people are a very superior class, compared with what our immigration has been at times. They are people who have come from good homes. They are not all young men ; there are families and a large proportion of women among them. And I say it is a reflection on our country and on our methods that they should be carried across the country in this style. When they left Halifax they had before them four, five or six days' travel. When they reached here they had been on the trains nearly two days, and they had nearly four days still ahead of them.

Now some remedy should be applied, some way should be found by which the immigrants that are coming to this country may be properly transported. Yesterday 2,000 people sailed from Liverpool, and the number is likely to be increased. The railway company may say that they have not rolling stock sufficient to convey them. No matter what the explanation is, the thing must be remedied. Although the company are transporting them across this country, the company is not responsible for their coming here, they are induced to come here by the representatives of this government. They were told that travelling in this country is far more easy, far more safe and comfortable, and far more luxurious than in their own country, and on this information they do not provide as they otherwise would for their journey. It is not until they get here that they find that this state of affairs exists. Now I am not prepared to take any reason as being final that provides for a continuance of this state of affairs. It is not sufficient to say that they are settlers, that they are being transported across this continent at a very low rate indeed. That may be, but at the same time it does not meet the case. The Immigration Department have officers on those trains who go along with the immigrants, with the idea, I presume, of obviating any difficulties they may meet with. I can understand that possibly the company could not be expected to have sufficient rolling stock on hand, and the probability is that they will not have next week, nor during the whole of the season. Now there is a tremendous immigration coming in this year. All the steamships sailing from Liverpool are practically booked up now away into the season, and if this trouble continues it means sending back to the old country the very worst reports. It means unfavourable criticism, it means dissatisfaction, it means demoralization, and is one of the worst things that could happen to people who have left their homes for this new country. Now in bringing this matter up, of course I have no purpose of finding any fault with the government, or with the company, but I do insist for the sake of these immigrants, for the sake of our own reputation, for the sake of that western country where they are going to settle, that something be done immediately to provide for their transportation and to obviate a repetition of these difficulties.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). With reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) as to the defective arrangements for the transportation of immigrants arriving in this country for the North-west, I think the House will agree that that hon. gentleman has rendered a public service in drawing the attention of parliament and the government to the condition of affairs which he describes. It will be the duty of the government to use all means within its power to correct any abuses of this nature. We can understand that railways may have unexpected difficulties when confronted with such a large demand upon their rolling stock as is the case at the present time, owing to the increased volume of immigration, greater than the country has ever witnessed heretofore. Nevertheless I agree with my hon. friend that we must not accept excuses, but must bring every possible pressure to bear in order that the transportation should be creditable and suitable to the service required.

Mr. R. H. POPE (Compton). I am sure we all agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) in his effort to have the transportation facilities as perfect as possible for these newcomers from the other side. But that subject is one that has been engrafted into this discussion, and I think it is well that we return to the subject under which this adjournment was moved. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the ministers from the province of Quebec, the ex-Minister and the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, are somewhat in the position of the parrot, they talk too much and they get into trouble. Of course we might be asked to excuse the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, owing to the fact that he is young in the business and has not been properly trained. I would advise the First Minister to create a kindergarten of some sort where these ministers of his can be trained, in which some of the ambitious young men who are sitting behind the First Minister and who no doubt are looking forward to enjoying at an early day a front seat, with the salaries of a cabinet minister, may be put to school, and be properly trained, so that when they do rise to that position and are honoured by an invitation to a seat in front, this country may not be disturbed and excited, and will be able to judge from the

public utterances of the cabinet ministers that he has a right to say what he did say. Now, Sir, I have been interested in the discussion that has taken place at various times in this House, and have taken some little interest during the last six or seven years in the welfare of hon. gentlemen opposite. I must say that I do not blame the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the same extent that some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House might be inclined to do. In the first place he is young, and tender, and unsophisticated, therefore, I think we ought to look upon his faults with some leniency, and perhaps he will do better. Perhaps this will be his most serious violation of the great constitution of this country, because it is a violation of the constitution of Canada for any minister to make too pronounced a statement upon a public question. We see now sitting lonely opposite us one of the greatest leaders of the Liberal party since 1896, who also fell into this miserable trap of speaking too previously. Now he sits alone over there, because he violated the constitution of Canada, and jeopardized this whole confederation. And now we have a juvenile coming along who has succeeded him, and who is doing the same thing. Now, Sir, we see an old trained politician, a man who has been many years a member of this House and a member of this cabinet since its formation, a man who has recently received title and honour from his Sovereign, and as I look at the 'Globe' newspaper and find the utterances of the Postmaster General at that meeting in which he knew he was to be followed by one of these parrot gentlemen from the province of Quebec, I can understand that he did feel jealous, and he says now: 'I know that in days gone by I have been forestalled in this province by the ex-Minister of Public Works, who has cut more ice, so to speak, in my own native province than I have myself; consequently I think it is well that I should avail myself of this opportunity. He says that in the most diplomatic language, of course, but at the same time he intimates that he knows something of the cabinet of Canada. 'I have some appreciation,' he says, 'of the policy of the cabinet of which I am a member, and I will take the opportunity at this banquet of intimating'—I need not repeat what he said, it has been read here this afternoon. But the statement is intimated as plainly as language could do it, having regard for his position as a minister of the Crown with six or seven years of training.

Well, Sir, he spoke there and he laid the foundation for the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to follow. He said: What shall we do? Shall we go backward or shall we go forward? Shall we aid these great transcontinental lines? Some of them have been built, but considering the country through which the new lines have to pass for a thousand miles—the country north of Lake Superior, I presume, he meant—can we expect any man to go and construct a road over that difficult country without assistance? So that it is not surprising that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries at that meeting, where he was surrounded by those gentlemen, who have linked arms with him, and supported by newspapers, which, a short time ago, condemned him as one of those things that were not suitable to be Cabinet ministers, enthused by finding himself surrounded by new converts to his popularity, with all these surroundings and after having partaken of a luxurious dinner should have become possibly a little bit unguarded in his statements. That the hon. gentleman, the juvenile of the Cabinet, should have given utterance in very strong language to the policy of the government is not to be wondered at. We have the 'Globe' of to-night which says of the Transportation Commission:

> It may be taken for granted that Mr. Préfontaine's foreshadowing of the personnel of the transportation commission is authentic, and that it will be composed of Sir Wm. Van Horne, of Montreal; Mr. John Bertram, of Toronto and Mr. Matthew Kennedy, of Quebec.

The Toronto 'Globe' had never heard or any newspaper in Canada had never heard of it until the hon. gentleman broke forth on that unfortunate evening in Montreal. When we know that the hon. Postmaster General could fully appreciate the jeopardy in which he placed himself in Toronto, we can appreciate that the hon. Postmaster General felt anxious that this should be made public before this new man steps in from Quebec, because he said to himself: I have had as much experience as this other man. I have played a small part in a small game; the ex-Minister of Public Works that man whom they would burn in effigy in my province, has come up, notwithstanding all the sacrifices I have made for my native province, he has cut the ground from under my feet; I find another man coming from the province of Quebec and the only safe position for me to take is at least to formulate an idea and endeavour to convey some idea to the gentlemen who are listening to me that I, the Postmaster General of Canada, am in possession of the secrets of the cabinet and that these railway lines are to be subsidized. I do not say that there is anything wrong in a public man saying that great railway lines will or will not be subsidized but, after the severe lesson which has been taught the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, after he has been without much ceremony practically driven out of the Cabinet on a great principle of the violation of the constitution of Canada, if this is to be the punishment that it is to be meted out to a man of his position and rank in the cabinet, I say, Sir, that the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries ought to make way

for some of those other gentlemen who are in the kindergarten preparing for the portfolios that are waiting for them on the front benches.

Motion (Mr. Bennett) withdrawn.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 16) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. MONK. What is the object of this Bill ?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it may be sufficient at the present time for me to explain that this Bill is framed to effect an object which was discussed at some length on one of the last days of last session to provide that railways in the prairie country of the North-west shall be properly fire-guarded.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) wishes that the Bill shall go to the Committee on Railways and Canals where we shall have it fully examined.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). On our side of the House it was not expected that we would go into Committee of Supply to-night. It was thought that the evening would be taken up with these public Bills, and I may say, so far as I know, that we are not prepared to go on with supply. There are several Bills which we expected would be discussed but which have been allowed to stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In view of the statement of the hon. gentleman, I will withdraw the motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Motion withdrawn.

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). I rise to correct a misstatement that appears in the Ottawa Evening 'Journal' and the Ottawa 'Free Press' in relation to some remarks made by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) last night, when some member of the House interrupted that hon. gentleman in his very learned and interesting speech, by interjecting the term 'rats.' The 'Journal' and 'Free Press' credit your humble servant with that interruption. It was not my interruption, and I ask these journals to make the necessary correction.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.

Mr. POPE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 2, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Thompson (Haldimand).

Bill (No. 76) to enable the city of Vancouver to acquire certain lands and interests adjoining Vancouver harbour.—Mr. Macpherson.

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 77) to promote the safety of employees. He said:—This Bill is similar to the one I introduced last session. Its object is to compel railway companies to use certain safety appliances, such as automatic couplers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MILITIA PENSION ACT.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir F. W. Borden) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 78) to amend the Militia Pension Act. He said:—The object of this Bill is to amend the Pension Act in such a way that members of the civil service who become officers of the permanent force or militia, under the Militia Pension Act, will have their time counted for which they paid into the superannuation fund of the civil service. I may add that this amendment is precisely similar to the provisions of the North-west Mounted Police Pension Act passed last session.

Mr. SPROULE. Would that not be paying them double ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

SCOTCH HILL STATION.

Mr. BELL asked :

1. Has a petition been received by the Department of Railways, through the minister or other official, asking that the station at Scotch Hill be made a booking station ?

2. What action has been taken by the department on the petition, if received ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). It does not appear that any petition has been received asking that Scotch Hill be made a booking station.

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RAILROAD SUBSIDY.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What amount has been paid to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, Limited, for subsidy upon the line from Port Hawkesbury to Broad Cove Mines, up to the present time ?

2. What amount, if any, is now owing to the said company in respect of such subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. The sum of $311,375.53 has been paid to the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, Limited, for subsidy upon the line from Port Hawkesbury to Broad Cove Mines up to the present time.

2. All the subsidy earned has been paid.

LIVES LOST IN RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. How many accidents involving loss of human life have taken place on the railways of Canada since the first day of October, 1902 ?

2. How many human lives were lost in such accidents, or as a result of such accidents ?

3. Has the government appointed any person, or instructed any of its officials to make a special and rigid inquiry and examination into, and report upon the causes which led to such accidents, including the system by which the traffic of the railways is operated ; the speed the trains were moving when the accidents occurred ; the condition of track and rolling stock ; the hours which the train men, station agents, telegraph operators, and other officials of the companies were on duty, in connection with the movement of the trains to which accidents occurred ; the wages paid employees; the sufficiency and qualification of the staff employed on the trains, and at the stations, telegraph offices, &c. ?

4. If such officer has been appointed, has he made any report to the government ; and if so, is it the intention of the government to lay the report before the House ?

5. Is it the duty of any public official, and if so, of whom, to inquire into and report to the government, upon all railway accidents which occur in the Dominion ?

6. If there is no such official, is it the intention of the government to appoint an officer for such purpose ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Last session a return was moved for, I think, by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), of the number of accidents which had occurred on the railways during the preceding three years. An effort was made by the department to obtain this information from the various railways, but without complete success, only a partial return being made. We have been promised from time to time that the information would be sent to us, but it has not yet found its way to the department. The question which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) asks is with respect to accidents occurring since the first October last. I have mentioned the point I first stated in order that the House might be aware that we are endeavouring to procure information extending over a very much longer period. I give the answer to the hon. gentleman's questions so far as the reports of the railways to my department since the first October, 1902 enable me to do so, as follows :

1st. There have been 142 separate and distinct accidents.

2nd. There have been 179 human lives lost in such accidents, of which 38 lost their lives in collisions between trains.

3, 4, 5 and 6. The matter is under consideration, but no action has been taken.

ABOLITION OF TONNAGE DUES ON CANALS.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

In view of the requests of vessel owners and shippers, in the interest of Canadian transportation, is it the intention of the government to abolish the tonnage dues on shipping passing through the canals ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is a deputation coming to interview the government on this question. And we deferred consideration of the matter until we have received that deputation.

PROPOSALS FOR TRANSCONTINENTAL LINE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Have any definite proposals been made to the government in regard to the building of an additional transcontinental line of railway through Canada ?

2. Will the government lay these proposals before parliament previous to accepting any of them or making any final arrangement in regard to assisting in the construction of any such line ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to make a binding agreement with any company, syndicate, or any person, in regard to the construction of said line, without previously consulting parliament in regard to the same ?

4. From whom have proposals of the kind referred to above been received ?

5. What is the date of such proposals ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). It is impossible at present to answer any of the questions the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has asked. The House has already been informed that communications, largely verbal, have taken place between the government and the parties on this subject. But it would be premature to make any announcement now. As soon as this can be done in the public interest, parliament will be informed fully.

CATTLE-GUARD COMMISSION.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Léonard—asked :

1. The Minister of Public Works, having on Monday last stated in the House, in reply to questions, that 'there are a number of cattle-guards yet to be tested; and that George Robertson, Esq., M.P.P., is not now engaged in the work.' How is the Railway Cattle-guard Commission now constituted, and who are the members of the commission ?

2. When were the services of Mr. Robertson, as commissioner, dispensed with or discontinued, and for what cause ?

3. Who has been appointed in his place, and when ?

4. How many cattle-guards, or cattle-guard devices, are there yet to be tested ? Who are the persons who invented, or are producing, or offering them; and when and where are the tests to be made ?

5. When was the latest test of cattle-guards made ?

6. Has the Minister of Railways done anything to expedite the termination of the inquiry, and the making of the report ? And if so, what measures, and when were they taken ?

7. Has the minister taken any means to ascertain when the report will be ready; and if so, what has been done ?

8. Was any limit of time fixed for the making of the report ? What was the limit ; and has it been extended, and until what date ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. and 2. Mr. F. W. Holt, C.E., remains the sole commissioner in connection with the cattle-guard tests, Mr. Robertson having withdrawn from the commission on the 14th of February. The work was then supposed to be practically concluded, and a report prepared, which had been substantially settled upon between the two commissioners, which only remained to be put in form and signed.

Since Mr. Robertson retired, a number of persons have offered and produced cattle-guards which they wish to have tested, and Mr. Holt has been continued in the service, according them that opportunity.

3. No one has been appointed in Mr. Robertson's place ; it was not deemed necessary to do so.

4. and 5. There are 61 devices yet to be tested, and the following are the names of the persons who invented, or are producing or offering them :

William Baker,
Adolphe Larose,
P. J. Bois,
James Wood,
L. A. Lacount,
E. H. Graham,
W. H. Smith,
J. W. Kendall,
The Trackmans,
R. H. Pentecost,
J. E. Cole,
H. F. Service,
James Finn,
W. J. Henry,
W. Porter,
Thos. Logan,
M. Thibault,
T. Burgess,
The Positive,
M. McMillan,
F. X. Wade & J. R. Timothy,
A. R. Dansen,
Jno. J. Gartshon,
Wm. Holliday,
W. Cameron,
A. G. Bust,
Jas. Cavanagh,
Major Whitcomb,
D. McKinnon,
Joseph Webber,
W. F. Boardman,
Samuel H. G. Jones,
Thos. Logan,
R. C. Russell,
E. C. Smith,
A. Briggs & S.P. Densen,
Jas. McKinder,
Arthur Thom,
Walsh Bros,
Henry LaPlante,
E. Maimy,
E. B. Reid,
W. Lampman,
H.W.D. Armstrong, C.E.
Akers & Tennant,
D. P. Cosy,
Mr. Davis,
F. McEdwards,
M. C. Wilson,
Gideon Brown,
F. J. Irvine,
Peter Kenan,
Mark J. McGowan,
Jno. H. Stewart,
P. J. Tucker,
W. G. McLean,
S. C. Westro,
A. Baker,
Marshall, by Mr. Ross,

Mr. LENNOX.

The tests are being made at the exhibition grounds, Ottawa, every day, and from day to day. The latest is going on to-day, and the tests will be continued until the guards have all been tried.

6. and 7. Yes ; the minister has given orders to complete the work as rapidly as possible. The report will be ready as soon as the tests are completed—it is practically now ready, except as to these later devices.

8. Yes ; it was thought that the examinations might be made into the cattle-guards in use on the different railways in the United States and Canada, and inquiries made and information obtained, and the report ready in four months at the outside. The necessary and most important part of the inquiry has been concluded wherever cattle-guards were in operation. The time occupied in making the tests was much greater than it was supposed would be required, owing to the interest which people were taking in the subject in various parts of the country, and their desire to meet the commissioners and state their views to them, and a great number of meetings were held, particularly in the province of Ontario, at which the commissioners were present.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH NEW BRUNSWICK AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask when the correspondence with the law officers of the province of New Brunswick will be laid on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I hope to be able to lay it upon the Table this afternoon. I sent it over to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) a moment ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And how about the correspondence with Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The papers I sent my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) included both so far as we have them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not the papers I received—I examined the file carefully.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. With New Brunswick the discussion was, I think, verbal. I do not think there are any letters. My recollection is that the Attorney General and the Prime Minister of New Brunswick called upon me, and the representations on the subject were verbally made. But if there was any correspondence with New Brunswick on the subject, I will produce it to-morrow.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL—SCHEDULES AND MAPS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like also to ask the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether or not he is prepared to lay upon the Table of the House, or to submit to us, the schedules that have been prepared for the purposes of the Redistribution Bill. It is currently stated in the press and throughout the House that schedules have been prepared for the purposes of the Bill, the attention of the government having been given to the matter for a long time. I am not at all disposed, at the present moment, to question the fairness of the government in making the proposition which they did the other day with regard to this Bill, but I wish to point out to my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that to prepare schedules and not hand them to us might result in the end, in very much less fairness to us than if they had been attached to the Bill in the first place. For instance, if my right hon. friend—I am merely suggesting this—has prepared schedules which it is intended to insist upon, there would surely not be much fairness in withholding them until the committee meets, giving us no opportunity to examine them. I am not at all suggesting that that is the course the government intended to pursue, but I am suggesting that, not only in fairness to us, but from the standpoint of making good progress when we do get to the committee, it would be only right that any schedules that have been prepared should be submitted to us in order that we may consider them now. The same is true of any maps that may have been prepared, because it is alleged that a map of the proposed constituences has been made and is now in the hands of the government. If any map of the constituencies, as proposed by the government has been prepared, it also should be handed to us. I think it is only right that I should bring this matter to the attention of the government at this early date, because I find in the columns of various well informed journals the assertion that the schedules have been gone into with great care, gone into in detail, and are now in the condition in which it is proposed to present them to the committee.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to say to my hon. friend that I have received some ten, perhaps twenty, different schedules from different parts of the country, asking that the division of certain constituencies should take place on such and such lines. I would be much surprised if my hon. friend had not himself received similar schedules.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then he has not been so highly favoured as I have been, because I have received any number of them. But I have taken the ground that we would not commit ourselves to any details in advance. We intend to have this Bill fairly gone into and dealt with. Suggestions without number we have received, suggestions have been considered, but the government has not committed itself to anything whatever. We go into the Committee perfectly free handed, and not only so, but desirous of taking every county by itself so far as its division is concerned, and in this work we hope to have the assistance of my hon. friend and his friends. No maps have been prepared either.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course I accept, under the circumstances, the statement of the right hon. gentleman that no schedule has been prepared, and that no work has been done on any schedule to put it into the form in which it is proposed to submit it to the Committee.

CORRESPONDENCE RE ALASKAN BOUNDARY, INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE, AND BOND-HAY TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one other matter that I would like to mention to the hon. gentleman. Some weeks ago, shortly after the debate on the address, I drew the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the fact that the papers respecting the Alaskan boundary had not yet been brought down. I understood at that time that the fault was not on this side of the Atlantic but with the British government. I also referred to the papers respecting the colonial conference, and pointed out that no papers whatever with regard to that had been laid upon the Table of the House; and that members on this side were absolutely destitute of any information except such as they could obtain from documents laid before the imperial parliament. I also referred to the papers respecting the Bond-Hay treaty. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman can give us any information on the subject.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With regard to the papers concerning the Alaskan boundary, I can assure my hon. friend that I am just as anxious as himself to bring them down. There are some despatches which are necessary to make other papers intelligible, which are secret despatches. We cannot publish them unless we have the authority of the Colonial office. We have asked for this authority more than ten days ago, and have not received an answer yet. But I intend to press again for the authority, and if we cannot get it within, say, the next month, we will have to bring down what papers it is permissible to bring, and leave the others to be brought down later on.

With regard to the Bond-Hay treaty, all the papers are now ready, and I think that I shall be ready to lay them on the Table not later than Monday. There is also in this treaty one secret despatch as to which we should have to ask the consent of the Colonial office. I see no difficulty at all in getting it. With regard to the papers concerning the conference, we have no other report than that which has been published by the imperial authorities. Perhaps it would be advisable to have this report brought before parliament and printed, and if that is acceptable to my hon. friend, we shall do so immediately.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought possibly that this government, having sent representatives to the conference, would have some report of its own, some information of its own to bring to the House, in addition to that which has been made public in the mother country and the various colonies.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. BELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask when the Postmaster General's report will be laid upon the Table.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir Wm. Mulock). It was laid on the Table some time ago.

Mr. BELL. How is it, then, that it is not distributed ? There are no copies in the post office available for members.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I presume it will be found in the distribution office. It is not the practice to put them in the post office boxes. Has the hon. gentleman applied to the clerk of the distribution office ?

Mr. BELL. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That would be the proper place, I think, to apply.

Mr. BELL. I thought it was the practice to put copies of all the reports in the post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The clerk of the distribution office is an officer of this House, and if he has not complied with the usual practice, I suppose when his attention is called to it by the chairman of the Committee on Internal Economy, he will attend to it. Perhaps my hon. friend has not looked in the box.

Mr. BELL. Yes, I have made application at the post office, and was not able to get any copies there; for that reason I have called the attention of the hon. gentleman to this matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The clerk of the distribution office is not under my control, he is under the control of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am under the impression that the report was distributed before the session. Perhaps that is the reason why it cannot be found in the boxes.

AUTOMATIC GRAIN-WEIGHERS IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

House resumed consideration of the following proposed motion for :

Return showing all correspondence between the Inland Revenue Department and manufacturers of automatic grain-weighers, used on threshing machines, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Between the Inland Revenue Department and inventors of automatic grain-weighers for threshing machines. Between the Inland Revenue Department and thresher men using automatic grain-weighers, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Also, copy of report of chief inspector and scale architect re the standard grain-weigher, manufactured by the Globe Manufacturing Company, of Winnipeg.—Mr. Stewart.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). I regret that when the House was discussing this matter yesterday, the hour for recess arrived, and cut off the debate. A couple of minutes would have sufficed me to say all I wished to say in support of the contention of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Stewart). I regret also that the facts of the matter are such as compel me to endorse the remarks that were made by the hon. gentleman from Lisgar (Mr. Stewart) and the future remarks made even more vehemently by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd). The question is one of considerable importance to the grain growing sections between Lake Superior and the Rocky Mountains. The fact is becoming emphasized in various ways that Canada is a large country. Western Canada itself is a large country, and the wheat growing industry of western Canada has become a very important enterprise. The grain products west of Lake Superior now exceed annually one hundred million bushels. This fact in itself is the testimony that the industry has become a very important one. The industry of threshing out these large crops of grain is also a very important one, and it is found that the method which has been employed in times past, the method of weighing or measuring the threshed grain has become obsolete and impossible. In Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the conditions have led to the invention of an automatic weighing device which to-day is a necessity, and although the device is not a legalized instrument for weighing or measuring, the threshers and farmers in that country are compelled to use it. The fact that this device has not been legalized, and the further fact that it has been necessary to use it for some years, have led to a considerable

amount of litigation both in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Cases have been taken in Manitoba by the threshers to collect accounts against farmers for threshing, and the decisions have been given to the effect that where this automatic weighing device has been used the threshers cannot legally collect their accounts. In reality all the threshers of that country are now dependent for their pay upon the honour and good faith of the individual farmer.

Cases have also been taken in the North-west Territories and the decision of one trial judge was similar to the Manitoba decision. But, last fall, I may say, the Attorney General's Department of the North-west Territories took up one of the cases and obtained a decision from the appeal court to the effect that if the grain was measured in a bin where the bin was so constructed that the cubic measurement could be obtained, the thresher could legally collect his bill from the farmer. Still that is only in a few cases practicable, so that in the North-west Territories and Manitoba, the automatic weighing device not being legalized, the threshers is at the mercy of the individual farmer for the collection of his account. As was stated yesterday afternoon, the representatives from Manitoba and the North-west Territories were, a year ago, invited to go over to the Inland Revenue Department to witness tests being made of this automatic weighing device, and I, with others from the west, was over on two or three occasions. The device was very thoroughly tested over there and tested to the satisfaction of all of us and we understood that it met with the satisfaction too of the officers of the Inland Revenue Department. Up to the present time the sanction of the department has not been given to the adoption of this automatic weigher. In asking that the department give legal sanction to the weigher, we are not asking anything which will endanger or harm any interest or any persons. The machine is satisfactory to the thresher and it is satisfactory to the farmer. It is approximately, and I believe absolutely, accurate. Farmers have told me that the results in the elevator, where there is a legalized weighing scale, tally aproximately accurately with the results given by the automatic weigher. I simply wish to join the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Stewart) and the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) in urging the matter upon the attention of the House and particularly on the attention of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). Mr. Speaker, at the outset I must say that I have no objection to bringing before the House all the correspondence and papers in any way relating to the facts as submitted in the motion of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr Stewart). Last year I invited to the department some hon. gentlemen representing constituencies in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to confer with me on matters relating to the weighing of grain. In June last, as the correspondence will show, one of the officers of the department, Mr. Magness, of Winnipeg, inspector of weights and measures, wrote to the department, stating that he thought he had invented a machine which would be satisfactory to both the owners of threshing machines and to the farmers and that he thought this machine should be admitted to verification. I ordered immediately that Mr. Magness should come down to Ottawa, bringing with him the machine which he had invented. The machine was tested and I must say that after the trial one of the officers of the department, who had no special authority either to examine or verify, wrote a certain letter which will be brought down with the other documents. Later on, in order not to put farmers and owners of threshing machines to the necessity of engaging in new litigation, we brought here an expert, and I must say to my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) that I think he is a little in error when he says that the gentleman who was then brought here as an expert and later on appointed as chief inspector of weights and measures, was half a blacksmith and half a scale manufacturer. Mr. Fyfe is well known throughout the Dominion as one of the best qualified men that we could find. He was strongly recommended not only by the scale manufacturers in the Dominion, but by many other people who had had the advantage of ascertaining his qualifications. I may say that in many instances I am told that large corporations, such as the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway companies, have invited Mr. Fyfe to act as their expert. After having examined the weighing machine in the presence of Mr. Magness he said that the machine was not in compliance with the law, and at that time Mr. Magness seemed to admit that it was true. I wish to state here that my hon. friend is again in error when he says that it was very easy for the department to change the law and admit to verification that weighing machine. I know he is not a lawyer, but he might have asked some lawyer, who might have told him that it was impossible for the department to change the law by Order in Council. That section was read and properly interpreted yesterday by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche).

Mr. BOYD. Have you not verified special weighing machines in the department?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, I will answer my hon. friend in a moment or two. I have not now, what I expect to have, three or four cases in which, for certain purposes, weighing machines were admitted to verification because they were in conformity with the law. That is my information, but I will be in a position in a

few minutes, or later on, to give instances and show cases as they actually are. When that question was brought before the House last year I stated that Mr. Magness would be in a position later on to supply the market with a good weighing machine complying in every respect with the law. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) cannot expect that the head of the department or any officer of the department could of their own knowledge decide whether a machine should be admitted to verification or not. As to that we have to accept the decision of the chief inspector and I am glad to say that he has always spoken with authority. I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) and my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) have faithfully represented the views of the farmers of the North-west and of Manitoba, and I believe myself that the difficulties of litigation with regard to the threshing of grain must be remedied as soon as possible. But I ask my hon. friend, if the position of the owners of the threshing machines and the farmers would be any better even if we had admitted to verification a machine which did not comply with the law. Had we done that, it would have increased the litigation because any body who had anything to do with a contract might go before the court and say to the owner of that thrashing machine: I will not pay because that machine is not in conformity with the law. Neither would the certificate be sufficient in such a case, because I know of one or two instances in which decisions have been rendered in the courts of the province of Quebec where the certificate was held not to be sufficient. The department has not been negligent in trying to secure a machine which would give satisfaction and at the same time put a stop to litigation. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) to say yesterday, that the farmers and the owners of these machines had to use certain vessels pending the advent of a machine which would give satisfaction, but if they had been provided with a machine which did not comply with the law I imagine that the difficulties would have been the same. If the weighing machine was not a legal one, even though it had been approved and a certificate given, another litigation would have followed. I will not touch for the present at least on the political part of the speech of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd). I am ready and the department is ready to give to the farmers of the North-west a machine which will be satisfactory, but hon. gentlemen will hardly contend that the department is bound to invent a machine. That must be left to the ingenuity of the individual, and at least credit must be given to the department for having in its service, Mr. Magness who has done his best to meet the wants of the people of the North-west. When Mr. Magness was here, and after he had talked with Mr. Fife, he made up his mind to make some changes which had been suggested to him by Mr. Fyfe. I presume that this has been done, and if my information is correct, a machine will be supplied to the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west for next season. Inquiries have been made by the department in several countries where such machines are in vogue, and if it is found impossible to get a machine which will comply with the terms of the law, then with the assent of my friends on both sides of the House, I will bring in a measure in order to relieve the just grievances of these people.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. minister: How long he has been looking for that machine, and how long he has regarded these grievances as just?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Since last year; before last session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before last session?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Before last session. I think the matter was brought before me about a year ago or perhaps more. I do not know what happened during the time of my predecessor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister ought be able to give us some information as to what happened in the time of his predecessor, because as far as public business is concerned, of course he realizes, that it does not all date from the commencement of his regime. The difficulty seems to be that at present the people engaged in threshing cannot carry on their business in a effective manner without violating the law and that, according to the minister's statement, has continued for more than a year. The hon. gentleman has not been able to tell us how much longer than a year it has continued because he only dates his information from the date when he assumed control of the department. Does the hon. minister really think that it is the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories should be obliged, in order to carry on their business effectively, to violate the law? Does he think that a year or more is a reasonable time to allow that condition to continue. I am inclined to think that some greater activity than has been manifested by the hon. gentleman in the past should be manifested in the future; that he should bestir himself a little more about this matter and bring the existing condition of things to a very speedy conclusion. It is greatly to be regretted that the condition should have ever been created at all, but having once been created it is certainly most desirable that every means should be taken to bring it to a conclusion as soon as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. I would advise the hon. gentleman to apply to the Ontario government for a machine, only for the fact that their machines also violate the law.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I may explain that, to my knowledge, and according to the correspondence which I have in hand, there were verbal explanations. The correspondence began in June of last year. I do not want to be accused of negligence, and I hope the gentlemen from the province of Manitoba have confidence enough in the ability of Mr. Magness, so that they may use this machine. If Mr. Magness, or the Globe Manufacturing Company, which I understand has taken up his interest, is not in a position to supply a machine which will pass inspection, then I will ask parliament to pass a law which will enable us to verify these machines.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not wish to accuse my hon. friend of too much negligence, but I would use the expression which he applied to my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), and say that he is a little negligent, that is all. As to the details of the matter, I do not know much about them, but I understood from his statement that this condition of affairs had existed for about a year.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL CORRUPTION.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. He said : Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I may perhaps be permitted to make a few observations bearing upon what I conceive to be the necessity for some enlarged scope of the Elections Act as regards offences, and increased stringency as regards punishments. The necessity for preserving the purity of the electorate lies at the very foundation of the maintenance of the perpetuity of free institutions. A pure, patriotic electorate will ensure to a country the continuance of free institutions and good government. A celebrated American poet has said :

> The crowning fact, the kingliest act
> Of freedom is a free man's vote.

He does not refer to the man that keeps that article for sale; he does not refer to the venal vote, the purchasable vote; but he refers to the vote of the man who esteems his franchise a priceless heritage, and will exercise it according to his convictions and beliefs relating to public policy and the conduct of public affairs.

The necessity for the maintenance of this condition of things is one the importance of which we cannot overestimate. In this country there are being laid the foundations of a nation—a nation which may hope to attain great prominence in the affairs of the world in the future; a nation which may hope to have an enormous population, great resources, great wealth, and a first-class influence among the nations of the world. But our hopes as to the future can hardly be realized if we permit the virus of corruption to infect the blood of the people. If we permit this, we shall simply have entailed upon us the consequences that have invariably followed political corruption and the debasing of the electorate.

The expression is frequently used; we are devoted to measures, not men. But measures cannot be carried into operation without men. We must have men who are the incarnation of good government and good measures in order to carry these measures into effect; and we can hardly have that class of men under a condition of things where the vote of a country is purchasable. If an electorate is for sale, if it is a question of the amount of money expended as to who shall be elected as its representative, then the very foundations of the stability of our institutions are swept away. The man who so far forgets his duty as a citizen as to purchase his election by a lavish expenditure of money, is a man who is likely to take measures to recoup himself for the expense which he has incurred; and the electorate which has chosen such a man as its representative has no right to expect any other line of conduct.

Our future depends, I have said, on the purity of the electorate; and if the system of corrupting the electorate cannot be stamped out, of course the evil will grow rapidly in magnitude. If the lavish expenditure of money is to be a necessary feature of running an electoral contest, then it becomes a matter of primary importance to political parties to provide funds for election purposes, and there is an inevitable tendency to corrupt practices on the part of the government in power. We had an instance of this in 1872, when the government in power felt the necessity of securing a large sum of money for the approaching election contests of that year; and the method adopted by that government, the sale of a great public charter, was one of a most demoralizing character, which became a permanent blot on the history of this country. The influences which led to that violation of the proper rules of public conduct will be at work now and at all times in the future if we have a purchasable electorate and are unable to stamp out this evil; and these influences will naturally lead to actions on the part of governments that cannot be condoned or excused—the scaling of subsidies, rake-offs, methods which politicians do not need to be instructed in or to have alluded to: there will be a powerful incentive that will lead governments to resort to these means to ob-

tain money. In order to secure purity of administration, we must have purity in the electorate; and in order to have purity in the electorate, we must adopt means absolutely to stamp out the influences and the evils that are growing in magnitude in this country day by day.

As to the extent of electoral corruption, I do not know how great it may be. As to whether it is a crime to increase this extent of electoral corruption, I have no doubt whatever. It is a crime of the first magnitude, and a crime that we ought to adopt methods, so far as we possibly can, to avoid. As to the extent of electoral corruption, I say I do not know how great it may be. I suppose I need not attempt to instruct any member of this House with regard to that matter. I dare say we are all well aware that it is an evil of considerable extent, if not of great extent, in this Dominion. I presume we are all aware that very many ridings are influenced in the elections by the corrupt expenditure of money—that there are ridings where the result of the election is merely a matter of how much money is spent, and which party will spend the most. There are ridings which ought to be disfranchised owing to the thorough, absolute corruption of the electorate. As to which of our political parties is the worst, naturally the Conservatives will say that the bulk of this work is done by the other side and naturally the Reformers will take the opposite view ; but I think it will be found that one is just as bad as the other. Each one spends all the money it can. Instead of vieing with each other in these corrupt practices, we had better vie in the attempt to put them down. If we study the question over we can find the means of doing so and thus confer untold blessings upon the country. At present the candidate who prosecutes his canvass on proper lines, who avoids the improper expenditure of money, is, in nine cases out of ten, heavily handicapped. He is clogged in the race and many a man who would refrain from this kind of work, is compelled to do it in order to meet similar influences which are working against him. Elections can scarcely be run under present conditions without the expenditure of money. What should be the object of our law governing elections ? Its primary object should be to put an end to these practices by adopting measures that cannot fail to do so. We should not hesitate to apply drastic remedies. We should increase the number of offences and the severity of sentences and punishments, and if we do so to a sufficient extent I believe we will succeed in stamping out the practices. So far as electoral corruption is concerned, I am informed that in most of the states of the American union it has been absolutely stamped out. That has been the case in the states of New York and Pennsylvania. Three weeks ago there was a trial in the city of Buffalo concerning the election of a sheriff. The sheriff was charged with having promised an office and some emoluments to a friend for his assistance in the election. He was liable, on conviction, to be sentenced to five years in the penitentiary, but escaped on a verdict of 'not proven.' The law of that state is now in such shape that it is perilous to indulge in any of these illicit practices. The man who pays a bribe puts himself at the mercy of the scallawag who takes the money. This is so perilous that the practice has ceased. I believe that we can reach the same result here. The present law does not go far enough, and I propose some amendments which will have the effect of giving it the requisite extension. Perhaps the promoters of that law intended it to go as far as necessary. But it has not put an end to corruption. On the contrary, corruption is spreading rapidly and the influence of this condition of things shows itself in other lines of public life. The best elements of the country are alarmed. Men of all parties deplore this condition of things and ask whether there is not some remedy. Can we not put an end to this evil which threatens the well-being and stability of our state. The amendment I am about to submit creates in the first place a few more offences. In that respect the original Act is not as comprehensive as it should be. It also increases the penalties to such an extent that infractions of the law, if the accused be convicted, involve not only a loss of money but loss of liberty. These are penalties which will make crime odious and cause every man to shrink from the consequences.

Without further general remarks let me call the attention of the House to the provisions of this Bill. Section 108, law 1900, relating to Dominion elections gives a number of offences in detail, as set out in subsection 'A' to 'I.' I propose to add three more subsections, 'J,' 'K' and 'L.' Subsection 'J' is as follows :—

(j.) Every person who by abduction, duress or any forcible or fraudulent device or contrivance, impedes, prevents or otherwise interferes with the free exercise of the elective franchise by any voter, or compels, induces, or prevails upon any voter to give or refrain from giving his vote for or against any candidate at any election ;

Subsection 'K' is as follows :—

(k.) Every person who, being an employer, pays his employees the wages or salary due, in pay envelopes, upon which there is written or printed any political motto, device or argument containing threats, express or implied, intended or calculated to influence the political opinions or actions of such employees, or within ninety days of a general election puts or otherwise exhibits in the establishment or place where his employees are engaged in labour, any handbill or placard containing any threat, notice or information, that if any particular ticket or candidate is elected or defeated, work in his place or establishment will cease in whole or

in part, his establishment will be closed up, or the wages of his employees will be reduced, or other threats, express or implied, intended or calculated to influence the political opinions or actions of his employees ;

The following is subsection 'L' :—

(1.) Every person who, being an officer or employee of Canada or of any province thereof, directly or indirectly uses his authority or official influence to compel or induce any other such officer or employee to pay or promise to pay any political assessment, or—

(2.) Being an officer or employee of Canada or any province thereof, directly or indirectly gives, pays or hands over to any officer such officer or employee, any money or other valuable thing on account of, or to be applied to, the promotion of his election, appointment or retention in office, or makes any promise or gives any subscription to such officer or employee to pay or contribute any money or other valuable thing for such purpose or object,—or

(3.) Prepares or makes out or takes any part in preparing or making out any political assessment, subscription or contribution, or sends or presents any political assessment, subscription or contribution to, or requests its payment of, any such officer or employee;

These are the three subsections which I propose to add to section 108 of the law of 1900, and I propose to change the character of the punishment as follows :—

And every person so offending——

that is, committing any of the offences in this alphabetical list from 'A' to 'L'—

——is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, and shall forfeit a sum not exceeding five hundred dollars to any person who sues therefor, with costs, and shall be disfranchised for a period of seven years, or, in case the offence is committed by a corporation, it shall forfeit its charter.

Provided always, that the actual personal expenses of any candidate, his expenses for actual professional services performed, and bona fide payments for the fair cost of printing, advertising, bill posting and rent of halls or rooms for meetings, shall be held to be expenses lawfully incurred, and the payment thereof shall not be a violation of this Act.

The following section I have copied from the Penal Code of the State of New York, and upon it I would rely more than upon any other provision of the Bill for putting an end to the evils I am speaking of. This would be substituted for sections 134, 135, and 136. It would be a section general in its character, more comprehensive, more easily understood, terser and more epigramatical. It is to be inserted after section 108, and would be numbered 108a :

A person offending against any provision of the next preceding section of this Act——

—that is, against any of subsections 'A' to 'L' of section 108—

—is a competent witness against another person so offending, and may be compelled to attend and testify on any trial, hearing, proceeding, or investigation in the same manner as any other person. The testimony so given shall not be used in any prosecution or proceeding civil or criminal against the person testifying. A person testifying shall not therefor be liable to indictment, prosecution or punishment for the offence with reference to which his testimony was given, and may plead or prove the giving of testimony accordingly, in bar of such indictment or prosecution.

Now, under this section, the man who is bribed may bring an action against the briber, and the penalty is $500, or less at the discretion of the court, payable to the complainant, and any number of men who have been bribed may be subpœnaed as witness and may give their testimony under the provision of this Act which exonerates them from all consequences, civil or criminal in relation to this matter. It is found that, in the state of New York, under the provisions of this Act, the business of bribing men to vote—a business which is carried on with a certain degree of impunity under our laws—is one in which the consequences are so grave, the Act so perilous, the briber being so completely at the mercy of the parties who take his bribe, that parties conclude not to go into it. So the money is not forthcoming and the agents are not there to distribute it. In fact, the business cannot be carried on with safety, and there is an end to the whole thing. We have to adopt something of this kind if we are to cope with this evil in Canada. And if this section 108a is put in our law, it will absolutely put a quietus on the whole business of buying electors at the polls. The fine going to the informant, it will be an inducement to him to bring the briber to book. The briber will be so completely at the mercy of the bribed that there will be an end of the whole business.

4. Section number 126 of the said Act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor :—

126. Any person who, while a candidate for the House of Commons either before or after nomination day, is guilty of bribery, fraud, or wilful violation of any election law, shall be for ever disqualified from holding an office of trust or profit under the government of Canada, and shall be disfranchised for the period of seven years next after his being so found guilty.

This is copied from the Penal Code of the state of Pennsylvania, and renders any candidate who is guilty of bribery or fraud ineligible for office for life.

5. Section 142 of the said Act is amended by substituting the words 'seven years' for the words 'one year' in the fifth line thereof.

The provisions of this Act will necessarily require consideration and argument in Committee. I shall not detain the House longer with arguments on the Bill the general feature of which I have attempted to put before the House. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to say a few words on the general principle of this Bill before we go into Committee, as I probably should not be allowed the same latitude there. Personally, for a long time, I have held that what we required more than anything else in connection with the corruption at elections, is to bring to light, to disclose the facts and put on record the various devices that are resorted to for the purpose of bribery and then to punish the guilty parties. It seems to me that if that were done, there would be two beneficial results. One would be to leave it as a matter of history or record which could be for ever quoted as against the party that indulged in corruption extensively, and the other would be to direct public attention to it so that the sentiment of the country would frown down election corruption as it ought to do. Now, in my judgment, the present law providing for the purpose of punishing corruption at elections falls far short of present needs. Election trials are too expensive for private individuals to carry on. Not only have individuals not the means or the time to carry on the trials, but they do not wish to incur the annoyance and trouble that must necessarily be incurred in the trial of a controverted election. This should be done, in my judgment, by the state. It cannot be successfully done by private individuals, because the majority of men who are put forward as candidates for this House, whether they are or are not elected are not sufficiently wealthy to bear the cost of these trials. The present method of conducting controverted election trials results in shutting the door at the very threshold of inquiry where electoral corruption is being exposed. A petition is presented, the particulars are given and the election trial commences. The candidate against whom the petition stands finds that many acts of corruption have been committed, which, if brought to light, will assuredly result in unseating him; and the parties who are prosecuting him find that the trial is going to be a very expensive affair for them. They do not wish to go to the trouble, but they wish to void that election. The result is that a collusive agreement is entered into between the petitioner and the respondent. The respondent agrees to allow the election to be voided on the petitioner presenting one case and establishing one case of corruption to the satisfaction of the court. It is even said that they go further in this collusive corruption amongst themselves. They allow the respondent to select the case that is to be presented to the court; it may be one of a very trivial character, but so long as it will satisfy the court, he will throw up the sponge and allow the election to be voided. He selects his own case for the purpose of trying to convince the public that there was no extensive corruption, but that there was only some act of an insignificant character, or agent, or party whose agency may be established. Through the admission of the respondent, the court takes it up and voids the election.

Is there an inducement for the court not to go any further? I am told that there is an inducement, in the fact that a specific amount is paid the judge for the trial of an election petition, which amounts to $100; whether the time required for holding that trial is long or short, the same amount is paid to the judges. Therefore, it naturally follows that if an election is voided inside of one hour after the court is opened, the judge has less trouble, less labour, and he gets a larger amount for the work he has done. Therefore it is an object to him to void that election with the least possible delay and the least inconvenience to himself. The result is that many of these election petitions end in that way when only a single case of corruption is presented to the court, while the other cases which are never brought to light, a hundred times worse it may be, than the one which has been presented to the court. Everything is hid from the public, and we do not find that educative effect that would result from laying all these cases bare to the public; nor have we that moral influence that would be effected in the sentiment of the community against electoral corruption, because the community does not know anything about it.

Now I will point out what I consider should be the proper method to follow. The law provides that an election petition must be presented upon an affidavit that in the opinion, or actual knowledge of the petitioner, extensive corruption prevailed at that election. I contend that the affidavit should not be made without there are good grounds for it being made, in other words, it should not be colorably made. When that affidavit is made, it should be assumed that it was made honestly, and with all the force and effect of a solemn oath. Then, I say, the petitioner should be prepared to go into court and vindicate his own standing, vindicate his own oath, by bringing to light these alleged acts of corruption that he actually believed or actually knew took place. He should not be shut off at the threshold when he commences that inquiry. Now what is the excuse for his being shut off? He says: I am a poor man, it will cost several thousand dollars to prosecute this election petition, I am unable to pay it, I have no funds at my disposal, I cannot employ expensive counsel to prosecute; therefore after I have accomplished the first part of this petition, I will relieve myself of all the expense and worry incidental to prosecuting that election petition. That should not be the case. I say that petition should be prosecuted to the end, and it should either disclose the fact that corruption extensively prevailed, or establish the contrary; otherwise the petitioner would need to admit

that he was misinformed, or that he was unable to establish the allegations set forth in that petition, and he should acknowledge it like a man. Let the candidate who was elected have the credit of its being known to the world that his election was conducted upon honest lines.

Now then what I think might be a remedy for this evil would be something like the following: If twenty-five electors in that electoral district, after an election took place, made application to the Crown by way of petition, to which a declaration was added that to their actual knowledge, or honest belief, from information, circumstantial evidence or otherwise, in their possession, they believed that extensive corruption prevailed, and they asked the Crown to appoint a commission of judges to go into that inquiry, then let the Crown grant their petition, pay the expense, and put at their disposal counsel so that they may present their evidence. Let that commission of judges go into that electoral district and conduct the inquiry as long as witnesses are offered to bring out the facts. Let the whole matter be laid bare, let a report be made to the Crown, and afterwards let the Crown deal with it. Now the benefits that would accrue from this system would, in my judgment, be two. First, we would bring to light the various methods of political corruption that are extant, so far as they could be brought to light. It would be a matter of record that could be cited against either political party, to their discredit. It would also result in educating the sentiment of the community up to the desired standpoint that corruption of that kind should be punished, should not be condoned in either political party, and should be frowned down by the respectable element of the community. In addition to that, it would go further. Instead of hiding these acts of political corruption, it would bring them to light, and the Crown could then go on and prosecute the guilty parties. I venture to say that I am within the mark in stating that ninety-nine out of every hundred acts of political corruption are never brought to light, and the country knows little or nothing about them. If the country did know there would be public sentiment so strong behind the law and behind the government, that no political party could continue in power for any great length of time which did not make a reasonable attempt to punish those acts of corruption. That is, in my judgment, the only proper method by which we can reach them. If all these acts of political corruption were brought to light the party or candidate guilty of them would be disgraced before the country, and a public sentiment would be created which would render them impossible for the future.

Now there is a system growing up rapidly at present that is a disgrace to any country in the world, I mean this collusive corruption between both political parties. They are both at fault, they are both to blame, they are both violating the law. In some instances, I regret to say, there is justifiable reason for believing that even the judges of the land are to some extent tainted by the custom which prevails at the present time. Need I point to the case of a judge in connection with the North York election, who corruptly took part, collusively took part, in the settlement of an election petition that must have otherwise come before the courts, made an agreement between the contending parties, stipulated what money was to be paid, kept it secret so far as to satisfy the parties to it, and afterwards gave it to the public when it satisfied his purpose to do so, in the interest of one party or the other? Is it not apparent to the world that notwithstanding the disgraceful condition of affairs in this country to-day in regard to election corruption, it is impossible to punish the evil-doers? The sooner we provide some new machinery of law to remedy this condition the better. The law which is proposed by the Bill of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is all well enough so far as it goes, but it will be like the others; it will not strike at the root of the evil. It cannot bring to light what we desire shall be brought to light because it cannot result in punishing the guilty parties. It cannot effect the thing we desire to effect. We want something that will be an educative force, something that will educate public sentiment up to the condition that it will not condone corruption in elections on the part of either political party, and the sooner the present government set about to devise some means of accomplishing this the better it will be for the country. If the government do not provide a law for that purpose, I say that in the future they will be held accountable for their acts of omission if not for their acts of commission which will not redound to their credit. or to the credit of that political party, or to the credit of the country.

Mr. M. K. COWAN (South Essex). Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking up the time of the House discussing questions of political morality, but it does seem to me that the lecture which we have just received comes with very bad grace from the lips of an hon. gentleman who invaded the riding of South Ontario to call upon the Conservatives great and Conservatives small to rally round the standard of that self-convicted criminal, Mr. Billy Smith, after he had made the scandalous revelations in the witness box which he did make.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say in answer to the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) that he makes a statement he is not warranted in making. Mr. William Smith never was a convicted criminal.

Mr. COWAN. A self-confessed criminal.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me say that Mr. Smith was a respectable member of the community when I went to his convention.

Mr. COWAN. And asked them to nominate him.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, as a personal friend of Mr. Wm. Smith, I would not be doing my duty were I not to resent publicly, and in the most emphatic way I can, what has been said here to-day by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan). I can tell the hon. member for South Essex, say what he will about Mr. Smith, that Mr. Smith stands to-day in the hearts of the people of South Ontario, irrespective of politics, as an honest and truthful man, at all events. Now, what was the position ? There was a keen contest being waged in the riding of South Ontario, on the Conservative side by Mr. Charles Calder, and on the Liberal side by Mr. John Dryden. I am not going to say here what has prevailed in elections in South Ontario, as conducted by Mr. John Dryden ; the courts prove that, they prove it distinctly and they prove beyond contradiction that Mr. John Dryden has never dared to face a court in Ontario or a judicial decision, because, when brought to bay, he has thrown up the sponge and confessed bribery wholesale throughout the whole riding. What was the position of Mr. Smith ? Mr. Smith, knowing that there was only one way of fighting fire, and that is with fire, on his own behalf, and with other independent men in the riding, irrespective of Mr. Calder, went to work to fight Mr. Dryden in South Ontario in the then ensuing elections. What was the result ? A fund was subscribed, and that fund is placed in Mr. Smith's hands. When Mr. Smith went upon the witness stand, with the fear of God on the one side, he told the truth of it, and what was the answer afterwards ? What was the answer, I ask the hon. member for South Essex ? Mr. Smith was a candidate in that riding during the last election, and he polled within seventy votes of the number polled by the hon. member (Mr. Ross, Ontario) who represents that riding, and when it is considered that Mr. Smith has always had narrow majorities in South Ontario, when it is considered that on that occasion a dead set was made against him in the riding, that the force of the McLaughlin Carriage Company, which in former elections had been almost passive in Oshawa, was on that occasion thrown against him, it is no matter of wonderment that Mr. Smith was defeated. In prior elections, owing to the fact that the McLaughlin Carriage Company had given a quiet support indirectly to Mr. Smith ; at least, it had not interfered against Mr. Smith, he was elected by narrow majorities, but owing to the fact that this Liberal government had protected the McLaughlin Bros. to a greater extent than ever before, McLaughlin Bros., with the men they command in the riding and with the other forces they control, went against Mr. Smith in the campaign, and the result was that Mr. Smith lost the election. I am not going to say that there were any improper means taken on behalf of the hon. member who represents that riding, but I believe that hon. gentleman will say that as far as Mr. Smith and his friends are concerned in the last campaign no improper or illegal means were resorted to on his behalf. Here was the position : Mr. Smith had made this honest confession under oath that there was a fund. Mr. Dryden had gone into the witness box and with sanctimonious mien had made out that he knew nothing of the means resorted to to secure his election against Mr. Calder on that occasion. Who were the men who brought about the election of Mr. Dryden ? Why, Sir, there was not a party hack from one end of the province to the other that was not in the riding. The Sullivan gang, who stand to-day hitched up with the Provincial Secretary, were on every highway and side line in South Ontario. I can recall the names of dozens of men brought into the riding, and here was Mr. Smith and the local workers putting up their hard earned money and fighting against this gang brought in there from outside. I have known Mr. Smith since I first came to this House eleven or twelve years ago ; I have known Mr. Smith as prominent in stock-raising in Ontario, and let me tell hon. gentlemen in this House that, in the business in which he is concerned, as a stock importer, Mr. Smith occupies one of the most prominent positions in this province, and any man who knows Mr. Smith knows that he is a man of sterling worth, a man of great honesty and one, who, when it came to a question of political preferment or of telling the truth, sank political preferment in preference to telling what was untrue. Mr. Smith is the darling idol of the Conservatives of South Ontario. Why should he not be ? He is a gallant and courageous fighter when up against odds, and after the fight, when it came to a question of truthfulness and honour, he was prepared to tell the truth even to the great hurt of himself and of his friends. Once again I resent the imputation cast upon Mr. Smith, and I beg to say that Liberals as well as Conservatives in their heart of hearts have more respect for Mr. Smith than for John Dryden in the riding of South Ontario.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I am very glad that the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) has brought the matter before this House. I know it has been heralded broadcast throughout the country that Mr. Smith is a criminal. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) being a lawyer, I would like to have his assistance in getting the administration of justice to straighten out this tangle. The administration of justice

throughout Canada is controlled by the Liberal government from Ottawa, and the Liberal government in Ontario have control of the administration of justice in that province. Now, if William Smith is a criminal, how can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) charge the Conservative party of Canada with negligence of duty in not prosecuting that criminal ?

Mr. COWAN. Does the hon. gentleman want an answer now ?

Mr. INGRAM. I will take my seat if you wish to speak.

Mr. COWAN. The reason why is expressed in the following statement of Judge Ferguson :—

I have some regret that this large offender Mr. Smith is not before us. I have nothing to say of him but that his evidence is the most glaring piece of corruption that I have ever heard.

The reason Mr. Smith was not before them was because they could not get him before them, however anxious they might be on account of the statute of limitations standing in the way.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) to say that Wm. Smith left the province in order to evade justice ? Mr. Smith resides in South Ontario and he has resided there ever since continually, and he gave this evidence himself.

Mr. COWAN. The court did not believe him.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the court believed him and condemned him on his own evidence.

Mr. COWAN. Will my hon. friend pardon me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Don't interrupt.

Mr. COWAN. I know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) wants to be fair even if some gentlemen on the other side do not. This is the statement of Judge Osler :

I should not call Mr. Smith's manner candid. He showed a disposition to fence with the counsel. I should call it brazen, that is the word. I look upon the evidence of Smith as being a brazen, distinct, strong denial ; a denial that I do not believe.

Mr. INGRAM. I rose with the intention of being fair and I hope to have the hearing of at least gentlemen in this House who desire to be fair. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) will carefully read the evidence in the South Ontario case he will find that Mr. Smith admitted having expending something like $1,200 during that election.

Mr. COWAN. Certainly.

Mr. INGRAM. That he collected a fund for that purpose and expended it.

Mr. COWAN. Not collected ; but he said he spent it.

Mr. INGRAM. He admitted in court that he handled the fund, and that was the evidence. Now, if Mr. Smith has done wrong and is a criminal, why is it I ask that the Department of Justice has not prosecuted him ?

Mr. COWAN. At the time the prosecution took place there had been no charge made against Wm. Smith, because the evidence was not brought out until the trial. They did not have him before them, and the statute of limitations then steps in.

Mr. INGRAM. Did not the judges have the power to imprison him ?

Mr. COWAN. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. I leave it to my hon. friend and the lawyers on this side of the House to settle that. But this much I do know, and it is that the Department of Justice has been lax in prosecuting offenders under the Election law. It does not lie in the mouth of any person to charge the Conservatives with not prosecuting that class of criminal. Let me say that Mr. Smith has been a highly respected member of this House. He had as good a record as perhaps any other member in this House during the time he was here, and more than that, I will say that Wm. Smith is not the only person in this country who could give evidence of that kind if they chose to be honest. It is notorious that those who administer justice in the province of Ontario have little to their credit for the manner in which they have administered the law against electoral corruption. In the county of Elgin to my knowledge, they have allowed criminals time and again to leave that county and go unwhipt of justice.

Mr. COWAN. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask a question.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

Mr. COWAN. I do not desire to bring out these post mortems, but the hon. gentleman must know that in the West Elgin case, when the warrant was issued against Pritchett, that warrant was got out of the possession of the constable, so Pritchett stated, by one of the hon. members now representing the city of Hamilton, and by Mr. O. E. Fleming, of Windsor, and that it was impossible for them to issue a second warrant upon that information and therefore the absence of a warrant allowed the fugitive to escape.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Pritchett resided in the city of London and the Liberal government dare not prosecute him. He had nothing to fear from the Liberal party. They dare not prosecute him. What else could he do but make his peace with the

Conservative party in order to come back to this country. He had no fear of the Liberal party at all. The hon. member for Hamilton is here to speak for himself. We know perfectly well that this Pritchett was in South Ontario and that Thomas Lewis was there to, and to-day Lewis administers the license laws of the province of Ontario in the department of Mr. Stratton.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). I did not catch exactly the expression used by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan), but I understand he quotes somebody as saying, that the member for Hamilton on some occasion got a warrant against the man Pritchett out of some one's possession and so prevented his prosecution. I do not know who said that, but it is an absolute falsehood.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. And any man who says it or pretends to assert that it is a fact, tells an absolute falsehood, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COWAN I know that Pritchett swore to it on his oath and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) has not so far as I know ever denied it before.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). It is somewhat unusual I think to make an attack of this character upon a gentleman who is not in the House, for the purpose of attempting to discredit an hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) who made a speech which certainly was not of a partisan character. However, I have heard my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) pursue tactics of that kind before and I cannot say that I was very much surprised at it to-day. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) would look around, possibly he might find in the ranks of the Liberal party to-day gentlemen who had experienced the result of a trial in the election court. I do not propose to follow his methods and to make references that I could make if I desired to pursue the tactics of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan). I would just suggest to him that possibly in the future some of his own friends would thank him, if he did not introduce matters of this kind; otherwise some references which might not be very pleasant will perhaps be made. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) has enunciated his views in regard to matters of this kind. Some eleven years ago he spoke with reference to these things, and I happen to have in my hand the expression of that right hon. gentleman's views with regard to one constituency in Canada. He said:

> He knew there was a large number of men in the country who wanted to be bought. He knew that because he had bought them twice when he was an unrepentant sinner.

I commend that expression of opinion to my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan). I will also ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce to thank the member for South Essex for another quotation which I shall make. The right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said this in the House of Commons:

> I am speaking a most lamentable, but at the same time a most certain truth when I say that as regards the 215 constituencies of this Dominion with the exception of a very small percentage, the balance of power under our system is practically placed in the hands of the most corrupt section of the community. I make this statement advisedly as I make it with very great regret, but it is so and to all intents and purposes the only practical difficulty which stands in the way of the party possessing the reins of power, and having at their disposal sufficient sums of money, is simply the difficulty of bringing these corrupt means into direct and actual contact with the great masses of the electors. Were that mechanical difficulty, as I might almost call it, overcome then I have no doubt whatever that the opposition in this country would be practically exterminated at any general election that might take place.

We have seen some of the efforts that have been made within the last few years to overcome this mechanical difficulty. We have seen gangs of men, outsiders, hired for the purpose, going into many constituencies for the purpose of overcoming the mechanical difficulty referred to by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. No one who has weighed the evidence can have any doubt that the Hon. Peter White was elected at the by-election at Brockville, and there is equally little doubt that the Conservative candidate was elected at the by election in West Huron. Both of these elections were stolen, and the government accepted the stolen goods; and after the election courts revealed certain facts, the government, or the followers of the government at least, used every effort in their power to prevent an investigation notwithstanding certain promises which were made in this House; and when the motion to continue the investigation was made in this House at the following session, it was voted down, and there has been no investigation since, and Mr. Pritchett, the man who worked these elections, has not been prosecuted. After leaving the country, he came back and openly stated that he knew he would not be prosecuted, because the Liberal government dare not prosecute him, and he has continued to remain here, and the government not dared to prosecute him. I did not intend to bring these matters before the House at the present time; but when we see such tactics as those adopted by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) to-day, hon. gentlemen opposite will not take it amiss, I suppose, if I call to their attention certain matters—and the list is by no means exhausted—which have somewhat affected their status in days gone by.

So far as the merits of the Bill are concerned, I would not like to commit myself at present to every word or line of it; but certainly it is one which should go to a second reading and which should result in useful legislation. There is no doubt that means are employed in elections in this country which are altogether opposed not only to the spirit but the letter of the law. I am not speaking from a partisan standpoint; I am speaking of facts which we all know to exist, and while the law may quite properly be amended in the direction my hon. friend has suggested, I think the chief difficulty at the present time is that there are no sufficient means provided for enforcing the law. I am not sure that it may not be the duty of this government or of some subsequent government to make some provision for an officer who would have the same independence as the Auditor General, and whose duty it would be to look into any election in Canada where there is suspicion of any corruption, and to act as a public prosecutor, to see that those guilty of corruption and wrong-doing should be brought to justice. Another suggestion has been made, which I think deserves the attention of the government as well as of us who are sitting in opposition; I mean the suggestion that one possible remedy for bribery at elections might be found in the enactment of a law providing that any man failing to vote at an election without sufficient excuse should lose the right to vote for a certain period afterwards, say seven years. At present there are two great abuses with regard to men voting at elections. One is the practice of paying men to stay at home and not vote. That is a sure way of making the use of money effective. In that way you cut down the vote of the opposite side. Then, there is the corrupt man who stays at home and will not go to the polls at all unless he is paid. I for one would be inclined to give a measure containing the amendments I have suggested very careful and favourable consideration.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, the Bill of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) meets with my full approval and support; but I would like to have added to it a clause that would compel the returning officer, in case of a recount, to deliver the ballot boxes to the judge of the county court. I have had experience of this need. We have been discussing to-day matters concerning the province of Ontario. I was elected at the last general election by a majority of three, and was declared elected. My opponent asked for a recount, and the ballot boxes were ordered to be taken from Alberton, in West Prince, to Summerside, where the judge resides. What happened in the meantime ? During their transit between Alberton and Summerside, one of the ballot boxes, in which I had a majority of thirty-five votes, was stolen from the car, for the purpose of preventing the ballots being counted and depriving me of the seat I hold in this parliament. It makes very little difference whether Smith, Jones, Brown or Robinson holds the seat; but it is important that the electors of Canada should be protected, not only in casting their votes on the day of election, but in having their votes placed in the custody of the proper authorities. I brought this matter up in this parliament in the session of 1901, and explained the facts. I said then, as I say now, that the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) was responsible for the safe delivery of those ballot boxes by the conductors and brakesmen in charge of the railway. These men are held responsible for the safe delivery of a barrel of flour or a barrel of sugar; yet they allowed the votes of a number of people in West Prince to be lost without making any effort to ascertain what had become of them. When the gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches saw that a hundred people in a polling division were being deprived of their rights and privileges as voters, why did they not make an effort to ascertain what had become of that ballot box ? But nothing was done. They allowed the transaction to pass without comment or action, simply because it was intended to deprive your humble servant of his place in this parliament.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). I would like to add a clause to this Bill, if the mover has no objection :

That any person found guilty of subscribing money towards an election fund with a view of bribing the electorate, shall be subject to a fine of not less than $500 and liable to six months' imprisonment.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

On section 1.

Mr. BENNETT. Take this subsection (k) which reads :—

(k) Every person who, being an employer, pays his employees the wages or salary due, in pay envelopes, upon which there is written or printed any political motto, device or argument containing threats, express or implied, intended or calculated to influence the political opinions or actions of such employees, or within ninety days of a general election puts or otherwise exhibits in the establishment or place where his employees are engaged in labour, any handbill or placard containing any threat, notice or information, that if any particular ticket or candidate is elected or defeated, work in his place or establishment will cease in whole or in part, his establishment will be closed up, or the wages of his employees will be reduced, or other threats, express or implied, intended or calculated to influence the political opinions or actions of his employees.

It seems to me that if the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will go back a few years, he will recollect when the great party to which he belongs had, as part of

its stock in trade in the election campaign, a certain pictorial exhibit which would come under this clause. Or if he does not, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) may recall that in the elections of 1891, his party made considerable capital out of a picture entitled 'putting the mortgage on the farm.' The artist depicted in that picture the worn out physiognomy of the wife, the sickly faces of the children, the pale features and tottering hand of the farmer as he was about putting his signature to the mortgage, and then the lesson was conveyed that unless the protective tariff were abolished in its entirety, foreclosure would inevitably follow. Surely the hon. member for North Norfolk is not going to prevent his party leader from putting before the public gaze once more pictures that may illustrate the effects of its policy. The particular picture to which I have referred may not be produced but there may be others. There may be pictures showing the prosperity of these manufacturers who have been given increased protection by this government. Now that the agricultural implements interest in this Dominion has been placed in a solid position by having two senators engaged in that business to represent it in the Upper Chamber, surely the hon. gentleman will not take from these two gentlemen the right to display illustrations in their establishments, showing how well the present tariff has worked in their interests. Surely he will not prevent the carriage manufacturers, who are benefited by a five per cent increased duty on cutters, depicting to an interested public the good effects of this increased protection given by the present government. I would ask the hon. gentleman to think over that clause, and perhaps out of gratitude to that old picture of the mortgage on the farm he may revise his opinion.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman has made a comparison which does not apply. I am not professing in this clause to deal with the legitimate methods of influencing public opinion. It is a legitimate method to publish articles in newspapers and pictures in newspapers and to disseminate information in a general way. This clause does not seek to interfere with the liberty of the subject in that effect. Its object is to prevent personal threats by the employers. It deals only with an improper exercise of influence by an employer over his employees. It deals with the attempt to intimidate them by threats, to influence their action, by threatening to deprive them of employment or reduce their wages—actions just as reprehensible as the purchase of votes or the purchase of electors to remain away from the poll, actions which the law condemns and which are quite distinct from attempts made in a general way, by arguments on the platform or through the press or by pictorial illustrations for general circulation, to produce an impression on the general public. This subsection is to prohibit an employer from approaching an employee with threats to deprive him of employment or reduce his wages.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) will permit me, I would like to ask him a question. Suppose that the employer of labour, instead of making these threats himself causes some one to circulate a report that the loss of employment or reduction of wages will follow the giving of voting in a certain way. This would be quite as effective as a direct threat. How does the hon. gentleman meet that ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Under the provisions of the law, that would be an improper influence.

Mr. CLANCY. It is not specified, and it might be a very difficult thing to trace. If the employer were charged with it he might say that it was merely a general rumour for which he was not responsible.

Mr. CHARLTON. What bearing has that upon this subsection ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is attempting to remedy an evil, but there would be no remedy if the employer did not personally commit the offence—and, of course, he would take good care not to identify himself with such a threat, but would take equally good care that somebody else should make that threat for him. I would like to call attention also to this clause :

(j.) Every person who by abduction, duress or any forcible or fraudulent device or contrivance, impedes, prevents or otherwise interferes with the free exercise of the elective franchise by any voter, or compels, induces, or prevails upon any voter to give or refrain from giving his vote for or against any candidate at any election ;

Now, the hon. gentleman had in his mind the repeal of section 112, because this would be a portion of section 112. There are many other means of intimidation that could not come under the provisions of this Bill. I have a Bill myself on the same subject. In the province of Ontario, the hon. gentleman knows very well, there is no secret ballot. And he knows very well also that that fact is made use of at every local election in the province of Ontario—not openly, it is true, because then it would lose its effect—to intimidate the electors, and that electors are so intimidated from one end of the province to the other. Men are told that they need not hope to escape punishment if they vote against certain candidates, or, at least, that their only hope is in the mercy of the men who know just how they vote. I have a Bill providing that every person who declares that the Dominion ballot, which, as a matter of fact in a secret ballot, is not secret, shall be

punished. Men who have told that the local ballot is not secret, and have no means of knowing whether it is or not, have been intimidated on more than one occasion by the statement that the Dominion ballot likewise is not secret. I have a Bill making it an indictable offence for any one to make that statement to intimidate voters. If you repeal section 112, which enumerates many actions which are offences under the law, you make it impossible to punish persons guilty of those actions. I am not a lawyer, but I venture to state that no lawyer drew the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Charlton's) Bill. It was drawn by a layman, I am sure, and it is quite as faulty as one would be that I might draw myself. I hope the hon. gentleman will not insist upon the form of his measure. And I am going to appeal to the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) upon this point. I would suggest to that hon. gentleman that we should not consider his Bill without considering also the Bill that I have on the same subject. I do not know anything that would be more likely to open the door to the very evils that, I have do doubt, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) means to remedy than the changes he proposes—without considering the general effect of those changes. The hon. gentleman simply adopts a part of section 112 and repeals the rest of that section. I am sure the Minister of Justice will agree with me. And I would ask him, for he is a good lawyer, not to attempt to deal with this Bill without considering other Bills on the subject. I think we should not have gone into Committee on this Bill without having at least taken into consideration, other Bills the enactment of which might be prevented by passing this one.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Charlton's) Bill is in the right direction. But I do not know whether it is intended to refer to companies employing labour.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is.

Mr. INGRAM. It seems to me that it is for individuals rather than for companies.

Mr. CHARLTON. It applies to companies also, and the penalty for violation is that the company loses its charter.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to quote an instance involving a point which this Bill should be made to cover. In the last provincial election in North Perth, a certain railway official used his influence on behalf of a certain candidate. When remonstrated with, he denied using his influence, and to square himself he issued a circular something like this: 'This is to certify that every employee of the company is at liberty to vote for John Brown without interference.' Now, John Brown happened to be the Liberal candidate. So, the employees were told that they were at liberty to vote for the Liberal candidate. We should have a section of the Election Act providing that any interference on the part of a superintendent or general manager or other official of a railway designed to influence the votes of employees of the company should be a violation of the law. This would be a section in the interests of all, for we must realize that managers of these institutions are not always Liberals, and that the Liberal government will not always have it in their power to use influence with the employees of railway companies or other large corporations.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to read to the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) the provision of Bill (No. 15) and to ask him to say whether it is covered by the Bill we are now discussing:

1. Section 112 of the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, is amended by adding after the word 'loss' in the fifth line thereof, the following words: 'or makes use of any language to the effect that the ballot to be used or the mode of voting at the election is not secret.'

I ask the hon. gentleman now if section j of section 1, in the Bill of the hon. member for North Norfolk would include an offence such as I propose to punish in my Bill?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have carefully considered the hon. gentleman's Bill, and my impression is that his suggested amendment would be absolutely useless to effect the object he aims at. It would be useless, because his object is to reach the process of intimidation and to stop it. It is intimidation to say to a man: If you vote in this particular way I shall know it; I will know how you vote, because the ballot is not secret, and by the knowledge I have acquired, by the fact that the ballot is not secret, I will be able to injure you. There is a process of intimidation. Now section 112 says:

Every one who, directly or indirectly, by himself or by any other person on his behalf, makes use of, or threatens to make use of, any force, violence or restraint, or inflicts, or threatens the infliction, by himself, or by or through any other person, of any injury, damage, harm or loss——

Then the section goes on to say:

—or in any manner practices intimidation.

Now these general words are broad enough to cover the case suggested by my hon. friend, and it seems to me meets, as far as possible, the case he suggests. I think in drafting legislation of this sort it is always wise to make the words general enough to cover every case, instead of specializing a case, as suggested by his amendment.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will permit me to say that I have stopped far

short of what he has read, and say 'any manner of intimidation.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hardly think, with all due deference to the opinion of the Minister of Justice, that the case comes within the term 'intimidation.' A voter might not like to have his manner of voting known, and yet might not be oppressed by any sense of fear, he might not desire to have it known for social or business reasons. The fact would remain, however, that he did not desire it to be known, and if he thought it would be known, perhaps he might not vote at all. In this view it would hardly be said to come within the meaning of the word 'intimidation.' Of course the principle laid down by the Minister of Justice is a good one, to use general words and not to specialize. To attempt to specialize and not specialize thoroughly, would result in more harm than good. But there is this to be said in favour of the standpoint of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy): He is speaking of something that has occurred in his own experience, he is speaking of a particular evil, and it would be possible to accomplish his amendment by providing that the special provision proposed as an amendment to the statute should not in any way restrict the effect of the general words which are used. I would like to understand from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), why it is that he repeals section 112, and I would like him to point out to me whether all the provisions of 112 are included in this Bill, or if not, why he thinks they are not necessary?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perhaps it would be better to dispose of this clause in the form in which we have it now, and when we reach that repealing clause, 112, it can be discussed. There are some verbal changes in this clause which I think are necessary.

Mr. CHARLTON. In answer to the question asked by the leader of the opposition, I may say that the transfer of the section 112 to this place was due to the fact that I considered the section specified an offence in the same line as the subsection from 'a' to the one preceding this, and put it there for the purpose of having the provisions with regard to punishment on the next page, applicable to this as well as to the others. If this was condensed somewhat we might yet believe that it embodied all the provisions contained in section 112. But if that is not the case, section 112 as it stands upon the statute-book can be substituted for the language here. It was transferred here merely for the purpose of bringing it and the other offences under one general term.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In the last paragraph there is considerable change in the penalty. Two years is substituted for 'six months,' a penalty of $500 to $200, and there is disfranchisement for a period of seven years under forfeiture of the charter. These provisions are entirely new. That clause will require careful consideration.

Mr. LANCASTER. I want to point out that this section from the very beginning of subsection 'j' would be much more effective if all the words after 'who' in the first line of subsection 'j' to the word 'impedes' in the second line, were left out. I do not see why we sholuld limit the impeding, preventing, &c., to any particular sort of interference. It says: 'Every person who by abduction, duress or any forcible or fraudulent device or contrivance, impedes.' Why should they impede at all? Why should they impede, prevent or otherwise interfere with the free exercise of the elective franchise by any voter, in any way at all? One can see at once that a dozen cases might arise which a court would have to decide did not come within these words. I think the Minister of Justice will agree with me that if we would make the law effective, as we ought to try to do, we ought certainly to strike out these words so that if any one is impeded, prevented or otherwise interfered with in any way whatever there ought to be a penalty, instead of saying that the impeding must be done by 'abduction, duress or any forcible or fraudulent device or contrivance.' Any lawyer will see that you are hedging the prosecution around with many insuperable difficulties. I submit it would be much more effective, and better legislation, and would accomplish the object we have in view, if these words were struck out.

Mr. COWAN. I think the House generally will agree that it is the desire of all parties to have an election law that is not only drastic, but one that will reach the various crimes that may be committed during, as well as prior to and subsequent to a political contest. There ought to be some provision that whenever a man, for any consideration, or under any promise, connives for an illegal purpose at getting information from another and in consideration of that information stifles the ends of justice, either in Canada or a foreign country, he ought to be punished. I find here that a case arose of that kind in the year 1899, and I propose to read to the House the evidence in order that the House may see the seriousness of the crime and the manner in which the information was procured.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it evidence?

Mr. COWAN (reading):

Mr. Watson next introduced the question of the Detroit affidavits, read by Mr. Whitney in the legislature. The first one was, the witness said, made by Judge Carpenter on December 29 last. It was prepared by Mr. Barker. It was prepared by Mr. Barker, a lawyer of Hamilton, a tall, thin man. The document was written in the hotel Cadillac. The parties met

by appointment, a note being left with Mr. Spence, with whom witness was staying, fixing the place of meeting. Mr. Spence went with him; they met Mr. Barker and Mr. Fleming, of Windsor.

In reply to Barker, witness said he would make an affidavit under certain conditions.

Q. Under what conditions ?—A. That they would withdraw the warrant that was out against me ; they would protect me.

Q. How ?—A. By allowing me to go home ; have the warrant withdrawn and not prosecute me, or something to that effect.

Q. In consideration of what ?—A. That I would tell them what I knew about the West Elgin election.

Q. Have the warrants been withdrawn ?—A. So far as I know, I would not be here if they had not been.

Q. Have you seen the warrants since ?—A. I saw them once in Windsor in Mr. Fleming's office.

That statement was made by me a few moments ago ; I made it upon the authority of the man who had made the sworn statement. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has used rather strong language against me, even going so far, I think, as to call me a deliberate liar in stating what Pritchett swore to that he met the hon. member in Detroit, while if the bargain made at that meeting had been made in this country, would have rendered the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) amenable to the criminal law.

Mr. BARKER. I said a few moments ago distinctly that any man who makes the assertion which I understand the hon. member for South Sussex——

Mr. COWAN. Pritchett swore to it.

Mr. BARKER. Any man, I do not care who or where he is, who makes the assertion that I ever promised to withdraw, or said one word to the effect that I would withdraw or procure the withdrawal of the warrant, or in any way interfere with the prosecution of Pritchett, or any other man, tells a deliberate falsehood. I saw the man Pritchett. He was about to make an affidavit and he did make the affidavit. He asked me in the presence of Mr. Fleming if, on behalf of the Conservative party, I would say that he should not be prosecuted. I told him distinctly half a dozen times that I would give him no such promise, that I could give him no such promise. I told him that the prosecution was in the hands of the Liberal party, that the county attorney of Elgin was a Liberal, and that if he wished to enforce the warrant he could do so.

Mr. COWAN. How did you and Mr. Fleming get the warrant in your possession ?

Mr. BARKER. That statement that we got the warrant into our possession is an absolute falsehood. I never saw the warrant. I never heard of it. How would we get the warrant ?

Mr. COWAN. From the constable ?

Mr. BARKER. I did not know who the constable was.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) knows.

Mr. BARKER. I said that the matter was in the hands of the county attorney of Elgin—a Liberal.

Mr. COWAN. Not a Liberal.

Mr. BARKER. I say this to the hon. member (Mr. Cowan) that I did not promise to withdraw that warrant or any other warrant. I repeat it in the strongest language—I do not care who says it or who repeats it. It is an absolute untruth and there is not the slightest foundation for it.

Mr. COWAN. What I stated was——

Mr. BENNETT. Give us Cap. Sullivan and his gang.

Mr. COWAN. I do not know Cap. Sullivan, but apparently the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) does.

Mr. BENNETT. I have seen the blackguard with your ministers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that as both hon. members have had their say we had better proceed with the consideration of the Bill.

Mr. COWAN. I have just had the first half of mine, Mr. Chairman. I want to be perfectly fair to the hon. member for Hamilton. All I can say is that Pritchett swore to it, that it was printed in every newspaper, that it was spoken of concerning the hon. member for Hamilton from many political platforms, and that it was brought up in this House. Yet, this is the first time that I have ever heard any contradiction of it. Pritchett swears that the hon. member for Hamilton prepared the affidavit and he swears that they had the warrant and had it at Windsor. However, I am prepared to accept the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton and to congratulate him that he is the first hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to join with us in saying that Pritchett was a liar, because, down to the present time, hon. gentlemen opposite have always declared that he was the most truthful gentleman that ever gave evidence.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must urge hon. gentlemen——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh; fair play, fair play.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. My object is to bring the committee back to the work before it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on ; go on.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member for South Essex says that I never denied it. I denied it the first time the statement was ever made in my presence. He says further that the warrant was withdrawn in Windsor.

Mr. COWAN. I made no such statement. I said that Pritchett said that he afterwards saw the warrant in Mr. Fleming's office, who was the gentleman who was with you when the affidavit was drawn and when you made the promise, if a promise was made.

Mr. BARKER. I was never present in Mr. Fleming's office in Windsor and I cannot say whether that is true or not. I can only answer for what occurred when I was present. Pritchett was told positively that the warrant would not be withdrawn, that no effort would be made to withdraw it, and that if he returned to Canada he might be arrested so far as the Conservative party were concerned. I said: You will be arrested by the Liberals. He said: Oh, I will take the risk of being arrested by the Liberals. I dare them to arrest me.

Mr. SPROULE. They have not arrested him yet.

Mr. INGRAM. I would ask the mover of this Bill if section 'K' applies to companies or corporations, such as railway companies. There is very grave doubt as to whether it really applies to corporations and if it does not apply to them it is useless. It would appear that an employer may not do certain things but a foreman engaged by an employer might do all the things in this section and yet it would not apply.

Mr. CHARLTON. Look at the fifth line on the second page, ' or in case the offense is committed by a corporation it shall forfeit its charter.'

Mr. INGRAM. That would not apply to the case I have mentioned.

Mr. BENNETT. A great deal of this kind of legislation in Ontario is a laughing stock, and whether our federal legislation on this matter is going to follow suit remains to be seen. While the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill is not a lawyer, the Minister of Justice is, and the Minister of Justice must be responsible to the people for such legislation as this. It would appear to me that the manager of a railway or even the foreman on a railway, being an employee, could not be got at under clause 'J.' I agree with the principle of the Bill because no one in this House suffers more from intimidation than the candidate in East Simcoe. There are two large public institutions in that riding and the grossest intimidation is practiced by the gentlemen who are in charge of these institutions under the local government. In addition, the lumbering concerns are as a rule adverse to the cause I represent. There should be a clause added to this Bill to meet such cases as that. I have known it to occur that on the day prior to an election the men were called before the mill at the dinner hour and were frankly told—this occurred in the local election—that owing to the numbers being on the ballots it would be known how they voted, that there would be an officer of the company in the poll to keep watch, and that in the interest of the company the men must support the Liberal candidate. That has also been done in the federal contest. The employer thinks that a more efficacious way than to issue a circular which might come up in evidence against him. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) wants to meet such cases of intimidation as that he must amend his Bill. A deaf and dumb employer would be denied the privilege of suggesting to his men by letter or circular how he wishes them to vote, but the employer who is fluent of speech can intimidate his men into voting as he wishes. But there is another view of this matter. Surely the law will not say that the owner of a manufacturing concern must not in conversation with his men express his opinion as to how he thinks the tariff for instance might affect his particular industry. That would be hampering the right of the individual. If this Bill really carries out the view the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) seems to have, he would have to provide for the punishment of a manufacturer who at a public meeting expresses his opinion as to what results a charge of tariff would have on the particular industry with which he is concerned.

Mr. INGRAM. I submit that the Minister of Justice should have some opinion to give on this Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have been appealed to more than once but whenever I rose to reply some hon. gentleman had intervened to address the House. When this Bill was introduced I was under the impression that it met with general acceptance and I was anxious to hear what should be said in favour of it. I was anxious that it should get into committee so that we might hear the details discussed. So far as my opinion is concerned of any value to this House I would say that the clauses of this Bill down to clause 'L' provide for nothing that is not provided for by section 112, and that section 112 provides for many things that are not provided for by this Bill. The difficulty suggested about the employer, or the employee or the foremen would be met by section 112, and it is not met by this Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. That is a very good reason why in the case of Bills of this character the clauses which it is proposed to amend should be printed so that we know what we are doing.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not intend this Bill to get out of committee with-

out saying what I had to say about it. Some people pretended to be very virtuous when this Bill was introduced, and anxious that it should become law, and I was waiting until my time came to express an opinion about it.

Mr. INGRAM. It occurred to me that the Bill was in the right direction but whether it was not already provided for by law I was unable to say. I have had occasion to study the Election Act pretty frequently but I confess that I cannot carry out all its clauses in my head. If the clauses which it is sought to amend were printed we would know what we are doing.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Some thing may be said in favour of subsections 'L' and 'N' of subsection 1, but that is all I think that would be useful in the Bill. The provision in subsection 2 is better met under the Canada Evidence Act. Section 4 goes too far and will fail entirely of the purpose my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) has in view I expected to hear the Bill fully discussed in committee, and then to ask that the committee should rise and at a future date I might have some statement to make in connection with the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To whom did the Minister of Justice refer to as being very virtuous and wishing the Bill to pass ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would rather not pursue that matter any further.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Our object on this side of the House is to make the Bill as efficient as possible. Some time ago I myself made the suggestion which the Minister of Justice has now made that subsections 'J' and 'K' do not embody all the provisions of section 112, I think that the Minister of Justice should be able to tell us now what is the policy of the government in regard to this. A public Bill of this kind is under the control of the government and should be dealt with by the government, and I expected that the Minister of Justice would place before us for consideration the amendments which he thought ought to be made. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has not done that. I think he ought to do it as being responsible for legislation of this character. That is to say, he should come here with a suggestion of amendments which the government think ought to be made in this Bill and let the Committee have a chance of considering them. I fully agree that we cannot pass the Bill in just its present form, though I am not clear as to my concurrence in some of the suggestions which the hon. Minister of Justice has made. The Bill will require considerable amendment before it is passed. In saying that I am sincerely desirous of assisting the hon. gentleman who has introduced it in his very good intention of making the election law more effective. But I would like to know whether the government have had under consideration the two possible amendments which I suggested on the motion for the second reading of the Bill. One is the appointment of an officer to fill the position of public prosecutor under the election law, who should be placed in the same independent position as the Auditor General now ocupies. The other, which would be more pertinent as an amendment to the Franchise Act, is to provide that any man who does not see fit to exercise his franchise shall not have the opportunity of exercising it for some time thereafter. I think the two sides of the House might meet on common ground with regard to some of these matters, and do much to remedy a condition of affairs that is not creditable to either political party in Canada.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I would like, before the Committee rises, to have this added to the Bill :

That any person known to subscribe to an election fund shall be liable to a fine of not less than $500 and to be imprisoned for not less than six months, with or without hard labour.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. With reference to the remarks of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I always carefully consider to the best of my ability legislation of this sort before it is brought before the House. At the same time, I do not think it would be right or proper for me to express a final or settled opinion until I hear all that is to be said on the measure. I come here for the purpose of listening to the discussion. I have my opinions, but they are not, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable. I come here for light, and perhaps, after I hear further discussion, I may change some of my opinions. I wish to have the measure discussed by men who, from their experience in election courts, can give light on many of these matters; and when it is fully discussed, my intention is to ask the Committee to rise and report progress, so that I may have an opportunity of considering all that has been said, and, when the Committee meets again, I may have some statement to make to the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's remarks have reference, and very properly, to this particular Bill. My own view, speaking for myself—and I do not think my colleague will dissent from it—is that the representatives of the people on both sides, by a special committee, ought to take into consideration the question how we might amend the electoral law so as to avoid those evils which have received so much prominence in the past. I am glad to hear the hon. leader of the opposition speak in the same sense to-day. It is not worth while for us to make recriminations across the House in regard to the conduct of elections. We must recognize, from the revelations of the election courts, that there

have been manifestations in connection with elections which must be a cause of regret to men on both sides; and if we approach the subject dispassionately, with a desire to bring about some improvement, I think something might be done. One view I have held so strongly that it has been called a fad, is that the courts should themselves take cognizance of an election without waiting for a petition. The judges might investigate an election, say within one month or two months after it took place, while it is fresh in the public mind, and while men are ready to bring forward evidence if they have it. The present method of requiring a petition to be filed is open to objection. For instance, it is wrong to fine a man a thousand dollars before allowing him to file a petition. If there has been corruption in an election, we ought not to put difficulties in the way of an investigation, which is done as the law now stands. It might be difficult to get the judges to perform the duty I suggest; but after all, while some of the judges are overworked, a considerable number of them have ample time to undertake it. They would not wait for a petition, but the investigation would be compulsory. Then, when I went into an election campaign, I would go into it with the fact before my eyes that shortly afterwards my conduct would be investigated.

Mr. INGRAM. What does the hon. gentleman think of compulsory voting ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Compulsory voting in the ordinary sense of the word we should hesitate to enforce; but such compulsory voting as has been referred to this afternoon is, I think, well worthy of consideration; that is, that if an elector does not think enough of the franchise to cast his vote, his name should be left off the list for some time afterwards. To that extent I would favour compulsory voting. Many of these questions present difficulties, but we are here to try to solve these difficulties, and I am persuaded that if hon. gentlemen on both sides, instead of fighting each other, united to devise the best remedy for the evils referred to, we could accomplish much good. With regard to the trading off of election petitions, it does seem a public scandal; but on the other hand one-half of the petitions are filed without any knowledge or information, and there is no great harm in withdrawing them. But with a proper administration of our election laws, we might save a great deal of scandal and trouble that now exists. We should make an attempt in a non-partisan spirit, and if our hon. friends opposite will receive the suggestion in that spirit, we would be glad to meet them in a committee and endeavour to bring about a reform in the law, not simply to the extent to which the hon. member for North Norfolk desires, but beyond that in other directions that may make for purity in elections.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. INGRAM. I would suggest that the government bring in a resolution for the appointment of a committee for that purpose.

At six o'clock Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. CHARLTON. There seems to be a very thin House to-night, and just before recess the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) suggested the striking of a special committee for the purpose of considering the provisions of this Bill and also other features of the election law, and formulating, if possible, a complete measure. Perhaps under the circumstances it would be better not to proceed with this Bill now. Neither the Minister of Justice nor the Minister of Finance is here, and many hon. members who had participated in this debate are absent. The proposition made by the hon. Minister of Finance can scarcely be considered in his absence, and I think the better course would be to rise and report progress. I beg therefore to move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 19) respecting drainage on and across the property of railway companies.—Mr. Cowan.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return of all goods of whatsoever kind entered by the Intercolonial Railway duty free, for use of said railway.—Mr. Fowler.

Copies of all Orders in Council, documents, and corespondence between the Government, or any Department, and Messrs. McKenzie & Mann, or the Canadian Northern Railway.—Hon. Mr. Tarte.

Copies of all judgments or opinions delivered by the Supreme Court of Manitoba, touching the alleged rights of exemption from taxation, claimed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in respect of the land of the said company, in the North-west Territories, or in Manitoba.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 18) to amend the Interpretation Act. He said : Mr. Speaker, the Bill the second reading of which I have the honour to move was suggested to me by the sensation, if I may use such an expression, which was created in the province of Quebec at the time of the rendering of the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of Roy vs. the Canadian

Pacific Railway Company. When I have stated the facts in that case as briefly as possible, the House will at once understand the object of the Bill under consideration. Roy was a farmer in the province of Quebec. His barn was in the neighbourhood of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The barn was consumed by fire, and Roy sought to recover damages from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the ground that his barn had been ignited by a spark from one of the locomotives of the company. He brought his action in the Supreme Court of the province of Quebec. The court of original jurisdiction rendered judgment in favour of Roy for the sum of $300. Mr. Justice Langelier, of the Superior Court, who heard the case in the first instance, and whose judgment, as well as the judgment of the Court of Appeals, which was rendered subsequently, can be found in the Law reports, appeals cases, 1902, at page 220, held that the fire had been caused by a spark from a locomotive of the Canadian Pacific Railway and one of his considerants or motives, reads as follows :

Considering that the circumstances unfolded in the case leave no doubt that the fire was kindled either by sparks escaping from the locomotive or by fire thrown in some other way from the train;

Considering that there thence results a presumption of negligence or carelessness on the parts of the defendant's employees in charge of the train, and that it was the defendants' duty to negative this presumption, which they have not done ;

Considering that the defendants were responsible for damages caused to the plaintiff by the fire ;

—and the judge gave Roy a decree as I have said, for the sum of $300. An appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench in the province of Quebec was taken on the ground that, in fact and on the finding of the court below, it was not shown that the fire was caused by any act on the part of the appellant or their employees and also that the complainant had not proved negligence and that they were not liable by law. The Court of Appeals of the province of Quebec held that the Canadian Pacific Railway was responsible in spite of its proof, which the Court of Appeals considered satisfactory, that, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had adopted all the modern appliances necessary to prevent accidents by fire arising from sparks issuing from the smoke-stacks of their locomotives. In spite of this fact and of the argument, very strongly urged on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that, having proved that they had taken every precaution and having been authorized by parliament to run their trains, they were not responsible for damages caused by the running of their trains, the Court of Appeals of the province of Quebec, considering that the defendants while authorized to operate their trains, are, nevertheless, liable to damages which the exercise of this right may cause, and, that, in this regard they are subject to the rules of liability fixed in this province, by the civil law of this province, affirm the judgment of the Superior Court. I may say here, for the information of the House, that the Court of Appeals based its judgment on the following articles of our civil code for lower Canada :

Article 356: civil corporations constituting, by the fact of their incorporation, ideal or artificial persons, are as such governed by the laws affecting individuals; saving the privileges they enjoy and the disabilities they are subject to.

Article 1053. Every person capable of discerning right from wrong is responsible for the damage caused by his fault to another, whether by positive act, imprudence, neglect or want of skill.

Article 1054. He is responsible not only for the damage caused by his own fault, but also for that caused by the fault of persons under his control . . . Masters and employers are responsible for the damage caused by their servants and workmen in the performance of the work for which they are employed.

Now, let me quote the remarks of Mr. Justice Hall in rendering the judgment of the Court of Appeals in the province of Quebec, as reported in the law reports of appeal cases :

The appellants' argument is that as parliament has given to them the statutory power to use locomotives for hauling their trains, the necessary use of fire in them, and the occasional escape of sparks from them, must have been anticipated, and therefore, if every reasonable precaution is taken against such escapes the railway companies are relieved, in advance, of the consequence of any fire resulting from sparks accidentally escaping.

The appellants admit that at common law they would be responsible for damage to others caused by fires from their locomotives, irrespective of the question of negligence on their part, but contend that the statute, by authorizing the use of locomotives, has taken away the common law liability, and left them responsible only for the effect of negligence. The English authorities support this position, commencing with the case of Rex v. Pease (1), followed by Vaughan v. Taff Vale Railway Company (3), Fletcher v. Rylands (3), Smith v. London and Southwestern Railway Company (4), and lastly, the important case of Port Glasgow and Newark Sailcloth Company v. Caledonian Railway (5), with the report of which we have been favoured by Appellants' counsel, as found in 30 S.L.R. 587 (6), in which it was held : that the legislature by authorizing the use of steam engines on railways, has impliedly indemnified railway companies against the consequence of the use of such engines, provided they are of the best construction and that the proper safeguards are used for minimizing the risk of fire damage.

The same principle has evidently been followered in those provinces of the Dominion in which the English law has been adopted, and by our Supreme Court in cases which originated in such provinces.

Mr. Justice Hall proceeds as follows :—

The appellants have conclusively established, we think that the principle for which they contend is supported by English jurisprudence

wherever that jurisprudence is in force, but in a matter pertaining to civil rights and liabilities in this province we are controlled by a different authority, which is binding upon us whenever it conflicts with the law of England, as it does upon this question, and under that authority we are of opinion that a different rule prevails. As Mr. Holt clearly puts the matter in his Canadian Railway Law, page 18: 'The French law, and consequently the law in the province of Quebec, is that the (railway) company is always responsible, notwithstanding the adoption by them of every means of precaution known to science. Upon such question it is our duty to refer to the French jurisprudence and text writers, not that that country dictates or enforces our laws, but because our civil laws were derived from France, and find therefore, its best exponents. Their jurisprudence is uniform and conclusive, and proceeds upon a principle derived from the Roman law which must commend itself to all as both equitable and just, namely, that no one may use his property in such a way as to injure that of his neighbour, 'Sic utere tuo ut alieo ne lædas' and the French authors carry this principle so far as to contend that even the legislature has not power to violate it, and that whenever it confers special privileges upon an individual or a company, the reserve in favour of the neighbours rights must be understood to have been intended.

Mr. Justice Bossé spoke very much in the same terms. I may say that the judges of the Court of Appeal in the province of Quebec, in delivering this judgment, referred at great length to our constant jurisprudence in the province of Quebec upon that very subject. The cases which they quoted are reported at length in our own report, but they are summarized in this very full report, the Law Reports of Appeal Cases, 1902, page 220, the case of Roy. I will endeavour to be as short as possible and not go more fully into what was held by the Court of Appeal, as I think the House sufficiently understands that point. The case was taken to the Privy Council on the ground, I suppose, that rights in future might be affected, because the amount of the judgment was only $300. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council unanimously recommended that the judgment be set aside and the appeal maintained, and Roy's action was dismissed. It was dismissed without costs, because costs had not been asked for. The Lord Chancellor spoke as follows :—

The serious and important question sought to be raised in this appeal is whether the railway company, authorized by statute to carry on their railway undertaking in the place and by means that they do carry it on, are responsible in damage for injuries not caused by negligence but by the ordinary and normal use of their railway.

Both courts below have held that in the province of Quebec the railway company is so responsible and the question is whether that is the law.

The argument appears to be founded on the suggestion that Quebec has a civil law of its own, and that in that province all corporations like all other persons are responsible for causing damage to their neighbours by a fault—

that is to say, any actionable wrong, whether imprudence or want of skill ; and another article of the Code provides that civil corporations constituting by the fact of their incorporation ideal or artificial persons are as such governed by the laws affecting individuals, having the privileges they enjoy and the disabilities they are subjected to.

If the immunity claimed for the appellant were simply claimed upon the ground that they were a corporation without reference to what they are authorized to do in that capacity, the argument would be well founded; but the fallacy of the suggestion lies in supposing that immunity is claimed because they are a corporation. If it were so, there would be no difference between the law of England and the law as so expounded in the province of Quebec ; but the ground upon which the immunity of a railway company for injury caused by the normal use of their line is based is that the legislature, which is supreme, has authorized the particular thing so done in the place and by the means contemplated by the legislature, and that cannot constitute an actionable wrong in England any more than it can constitute a fault by the Quebec Code.

Further on the Lord Chancellor says :—

This permission——

That is to say, the authorization of parliament to run a railroad.

This permission, of course, does not authorize the thing to be done negligently or even unnecessarily to cause damage to others. Much was argued by the learned counsel for the respondent as to the peculiar jurisprudence of Quebec, but in truth there is no such difference between the law of England and the law of Quebec in this respect as he seemed to suppose. The law of England, equally with the law of the province in question, affirms the maxim 'Sic utere tuo ut alieo ne lædas.' But the previous state of the law, whether in Quebec, or France, or England, cannot render inoperative the positive enactment of a statute, and the whole case turns, not upon what was a common law of either country, but what is the true construction of plain words authorizing the doing of the very thing complained of.

The legislature is supreme and if it has enacted that a thing is lawful, such a thing cannot be a fault or an actionable wrong. The thing to be done is a privilege as well as a right and duty, and it seems to the Lordships it comes within the expressed language of the code (article 356).

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I desire to call attention to is the fact that, as indicated by the remarks of the judges who delivered judgment in the Superior Court as well as in the Court of Appeal in our own province, there has never been any variance in our own province as to the principle hitherto prevailing there, namely, that persons or corporations, as in the present case, even when exercising a right, or doing something which has been expressly authorized by statute, if in the exercise of that right those persons or companies commit a wrong or cause damage, they are responsible for those damages. The jurisprudence in our own province has been uniform upon that point, and it sems to me, with all due re-

spect to the judgment rendered by their Lordships in the Privy Council, and it has seemed to a great many lawyers and judges in our own province, that this is the correct interpretation of our own law. The judgments in our own province have been uniform, and they are based upon holdings of the French courts, the highest courts in France, which, as Mr. Justice Hall said, in delivering the judgment of the Court of Appeals, are not binding upon us excepting in so far as they serve to interpret the principles of a system of law which is the same as that which prevails in our own province.

Therefore, I say that the jurisprudence in France as well as in the province of Quebec is uniform upon this subject. The hon. Minister of Justice, in a very exhaustive and able article which was published in one of our legal monthly publications, 'La Revue Legale,' goes very fully into the study of the case of Roy vs. the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which, as I stated in the beginning, has created a very widespread interest among the legal fraternity and I might almost say among the general public in the province of Quebec. The hon. Minister of Justice in that article quotes the two judgments rendered in France which, to a very large extent, insofar as they are to be considered as precedents, or expositions of the system of law, which is our own to a very large extent, held precisely as our courts have held. The case which has frequently been quoted before our own tribunals is the case of the First Chamber of the Imperial Court of Bordeaux which reversed the judgments of the imperial courts in France and held, as it has been held in our own courts unanimously in the province of Quebec, that, even where a railway company in France is authorized to carry on the operations of a railway company, to run trains with all the danger that it entails, even when duly authorized in every respect and observing all the precautions possible to avoid accidents, if a railway locomotive sets fire to a building in the course of its operations the railway company is responsible. That is the decision of the Imperial Court of Bordeaux rendered in 1859. The second decision is the decision of the Tribunal of the Seine, also in 1859. I will not quote fully either of these judgments, though I intended to do so, but they hold absolutely the contrary of what was held by the Privy Council in this case of Roy. It is evident that in these cases the companies pleaded that they were exercising the right authorized by the supreme authority of the land and that they exercised that right with all due precaution; nevertheless, under the articles of the French code, very similar, if not absolutely identical to our own in reference to torts, they were held responsible. I will also quote from an author who is a very high authority; indeed, he is the highest on questions of damages—Laurent. Laurent, one of our best commentators, referring to the case of locomotives setting fire to buildings, exactly as in the case of Roy, says:

> Fire, or sparks which escape from locomotives often produce fires. Are companies in such case responsible? There can be no doubt as to the affirmative answer to this question when the accident is produced by faulty construction of the locomotive. When the locomotive is provided with proper appliances to prevent the issuing of sparks out of the smoke-stack the question is more doubtful.

And he proceeds to quote the decision of the Bordeaux Court. adding:

> One applies, in a case of this kind, the principles which regulate dangerous establishments. It would be useless for the company to invoke as an excuse the authorization which it has received to execute its works. The court will answer that the state has not conceded the right to cause damages.

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice, in this paper, seems to arrive at the conclusion, nevertheless, that there is no such authority in France as corresponds with our own parliament, particularly with the limitless authority which our parliaments have exercised, certainly, for a hundred years and as there is, according to the argument of the hon. Minister of Justice, no authority in France having the paramount strength which our parliament has, we cannot compare the jurisprudence of France with our own on a question of this kind. Well, the answer to that seems to me that although, as a matter of public law, if I say use that expression, the law making authority in France is not, in many respects, similar to the law making authority which we have here under British institutions, nevertheless, there is no doubt that in France railway companies, to exercise their rights, require the sanction of some supreme authority without which they cannot exercise those rights any more than railway companies can exercise them in our own country, and that, therefore, there is more analogy than this article of the hon. Minister of Justice would lead one to believe, there is more reason to give strength and value to the jurisprudence of France than at first sight one would think from the consideration invoked by the hon. Minister of Justice. But, at any rate, there can be no question as to what has obtained hitherto in our own country. The jurisprudence is all in the direction which I indicated as being the direction adopted by the Court of Appeals when it decided the case of Roy. I do not say, for my own part, that, even admitting that there is a difference between the absolute and paramount authority of our parliament, and the authority which the administration possesses in France, it makes any difference in regard to the responsibility in a case such as the case of Roy. because, the principle which the Court of Appeal of the province of Quebec adopted in the case of Roy, was: that under our civil law the relation between a private individual such as Roy and a company such

as the Canadian Pacific Railway authorized to carry on its operations, is a relation which springs absolutely from our civil law—it is not governed by any principle of public law, but it is a relation which is governed absolutely by the principles of our civil code. And if we adopt these principles and adhere strictly to the doctrine of all our authors as to that relation ; even if the parliament of Canada has power to grant the most extensive privileges to a railway company or a telegraph company, or a company of any kind, nothing can disturb that relation as established by our Civil Code. Otherwise one would have to arrive at the conclusion that the civil relations which are entirely under the control of our provincial legislature, would be disturbed in every instance where the parliament of Canada has authorized the doing of certain things, and persons or companies enjoying the authorization of the parliament of Canada or of the Quebec legislature under this idea of a paramount authority, would be in a more advantageous position in regard to their civil relations with individuals than would ordinary persons who would not enjoy that special statutory advantage. That I think is contrary to justice and contrary to law. I am not going to attempt to discuss at length the question raised by the Minister of Justice in this interesting paper published by him; I shall not endeavour to establish before this House the principle, that under our law there was a civil responsibility in such a case as the Roy case. I proceed upon the principle that the interpretation given by our own courts to our own law is a proper interpretation, and that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council if it held that it was not the law of our province, was mistaken ; which is a possibility which has happened already, because we know that in certain cases—rare cases it is true—the Privy Council has reversed its own decisions. Taking as the point of departure, that that is our law, this Bill is the solution which I have endeavoured to apply to this question. It is impossible, of course, and it would be improper, to seek to change the judgment rendered by the Lords of the Privy Council, but after consultation with many lawyers in my province and some judges, we have come to the conclusion that to avoid the happening of such things in the future as happened in the Roy case, it would be a proper thing to amend section 7 of the Interpretation Act, in order to emphasize the fact that in Canada property and civil rights are subject entirely to the jurisdiction of the province. I will quote the article of the Interpretation Act which this Bill is intended to amend, and I may say that in any event it seems to me that the amendment of the Interpretation Act can do nothing but good in the future. Article 7 says :

In every Act of the parliament of Canada, unless the context otherwise requires :—

(1.) The enactments apply to the whole of Canada.

(2.) No Act amending a previous Act which does not apply to all the provinces of Canada, and no enactments in any such amending Act, although of a substantive nature or form, shall apply to any province to which the amended Act does not apply, unless it is expressly provided that such amending Act or enactment shall apply to such province or to all the provinces of Canada.

The Bill which I propose amends paragraph 1 of section 7, and the section as amended would read as follows :

In every Act of the parliament of Canada unless the context otherwise provides : The enactments apply to the whole of Canada : Provided always, that no right, power or privilege conferred by an Act of the parliament of Canada, or by a charter granted under an Act of that parliament, shall exempt any person exercising that right, power or privilege, from any liability incurred by him under any Act of a legislature or under the common law.

This means that under section 7 as amended, there would be an affirmation in express terms, that no power granted by an Act of the parliament of Canada or by a charter, shall exempt any person exercising that right, power or privilege from any liability incurred under the law of the province relating to property and civil rights. That disposition of the Interpretation Act shall apply generally not only to railway companies, but to telegraph companies, electric companies and all industrial companies as to which there may be legislation in the future, and courts called upon to decide questions of tort or damage must take into consideration that clear indication in the law as amended, that whatever power the parliament of Canada can confer, it in no way interferes with the disposition of the law of one of the provinces under section 92 of the British North America Act, which reserves exclusively to the province the control as to property and civil rights. I do not know that it is possible for us here to go further than this. My hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) has an Act before the House which I suppose I may say has been suggested by this same case of Roy.

My hon. friend in that Bill proposes a different remedy which at first sight seems very acceptable to those who believe, as we in the province of Quebec, that railway companies, even when exercising a statutory right, are nevertheless liable for the damages which they cause. The enactment proposed by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville is that the railway companies shall be absolutely responsible for fires caused by their locomotives. But what I submit to this House is that by an enactment of that kind we are invading the legislative domain which by our constitution is reserved absolutely to the provinces. We are enacting a law having reference to property and civil rights, and I question very much

if that enactment would not be considered ultra vires of this legislature; and it presents this other feature, in that it imposes upon the other provinces a system of law as to tort and damages which has never prevailed there; because, I take it, although I am not familiar with their systems of law, that in the other provinces of this Dominion the rule of law laid down by the Privy Council in the case of Roy is the rule which prevails everywhere. It is only in the province of Quebec, under the system of the old Roman law and the French civil law, that we are in a certain sense exceptionally and advantageously situated in regard to fires such as happen in the case of Roy; and it is deemed important in our province that we should preserve that disposition of the law which requires railway companies to indemnify farmers and others whose barns are set fire to by the operation of the railways, whether they are exercising a statutory right or not. In other words, I have been induced to bring in this Bill in order to emphasize, if possible, the guarantee which our civil law gives in cases such as the one now under consideration. How far this Bill may succeed in preserving that privilege I do not know. I would be quite prepared to adopt any other remedy of a practical nature that might be suggested. But after careful consideration of the question, and after submitting that question to the consideration of a great number of persons in my province who are more conversant than I am with the intricacies of our law, they have come to the conclusion that the Bill now submitted to the House is the most effectual remedy that can be provided under the circumstances. At any rate, that Bill, by extending the provisions of the Interpretation Act, and by emphasizing the principle that any enactment of this legislature should not interfere with the enactments properly made of our own legislature, can do no harm. Therefore, I think the Bill ought to commend itself to the consideration of this House.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll). The question has been raised in some quarters in our province, that this parliament has never the right to interfere where property and civil rights are concerned; but I was not prepared to hear the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) sustaining the same doctrine before this House to-night. There are some matters which are under the jurisdiction of this parliament, on which we could not legislate unless civil rights were affected by our legislation. This parliament has jurisdiction on every subject within its province, and if, when it legislates upon these subjects, civil rights are incidentally affected by our legislation, our jurisdiction is extended to those civil rights. Take, for instance, the question of bankruptcy and insolvency. These two questions are under the jurisdiction of this parliament. It is evident that if we legislate upon them, questions relating to property and civil rights will be affected by our legislation; but this is necessary in order to give effect to the legislation enacted by this parliament. Take, for instance, the granting of a charter to a railway company. It is evident, if the charter is granted and the railway is operated, that question relating to property will arise, and our jurisdiction is extended to those questions of property in so far as it is necessary to give effect to the charter we grant. This question came before the Privy Council in the case of Tennant vs. the Union Bank of Canada. In this case it was argued that property and civil rights, being assigned to the provincial legislature by section ninety-two of the British North America Act, the parliament of Canada was absolutely debarred from trenching on these subjects. But, says the judgment:

> Section 91 expressly declares that 'notwithstanding anything in this Act' the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada shall extend to all matters coming within the enumerated classes; which plainly indicates that the legislation of that parliament, so long as it strictly relates to these matters, is to be of paramount authority. To refuse effect to the declaration would render nugatory some of the legislative powers specially assigned to the Canadian parliament. For example, among the enumerated classes of subjects in section 91 are patents of invention and discovery, and copyrights. It would be practically impossible for the Dominion parliament to legislate upon either of these subjects without affecting the property and civil rights of individuals in the provinces.

The same principle has been affirmed in the case of Cushing vs. Dupuy, which is reported in the appeals to the Privy Council. In this case:

> An Act relating to bankruptcy, passed by the parliament of Canada was objected to as being ultra vires, in so far as it interfered with property and civil rights in the province; but, inasmuch as 'bankruptcy and insolvency' form one of the classes of matters enumerated in section 91, their lordships upheld the validity of the statute. In delivering the judgment of the Board, Sir Montague Smith pointed out that it would be impossible to advance a step in the construction of a scheme for the administration of insolvent estates without interfering with and modifying some of the ordinary rights of property.

Mr. MONK. I do not dispute that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understood that the hon. gentleman did dispute it. At all events, the whole trend of his argument was that we should not interfere with matters of property and civil rights, which should be left to the province. That impression has been created by the discussion which took place here last session, so much so that the Minister of Justice has been accused in the press of being an enemy of the French civil law of the province of Quebec.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought that what the hon. gentleman has been stating is an elementary principle which has been well recognized for many years.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It settles this argument if it is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not settle this matter of legislation, because this parliament can refrain from doing what it has the power to do.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has admitted that his Bill is the result of the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of Roy vs. the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Privy Council decided that when a railway company had taken all possible means to prevent fire, and when it was shown that there was no negligence on its part, the company was not responsible. This is not the first case in which this principle has been affirmed. It was affirmed in the case of Vaughan vs. Taff Vale Railway Company, the same principle was affirmed. The court held :

Although it may be true that if a person keep an animal of known dangerous propensities, or a dangerous instrument, he will be responsible to those who are thereby injured, independently of any negligence in the mode of dealing with the animal or using the instrument; yet when the legislature has sanctioned or authorized the use of a particular thing, and it is used for the purpose for which it was authorized and every precaution has been observed to prevent injury, the sanction of the legislature carries with it this consequence : that if the damage results from the use of any such thing, independently of negligence, the party using it is not responsible.

This is the same doctrine as that which has been laid down in the case of Roy vs. the Canadian Pacific Railway. The courts of the province of Quebec, however, have hitherto leaned towards the doctrine that railway companies are responsible irrespective of negligence, but my hon. friend must not forget that in France a law was passed in 1845 which, while of course maintaining the liability of railway companies, limits that liability. Article 7 of the Law of the 12th July, 1845, forbids the placing of less than sixty feet from a railway of thatched roofs or other deposits of an inflammable nature :

Section 7 of the Law of July 15, 1865, prohibits the placing, within a distance of twenty metres from the track of a railway, of thatched roofs, hay-stacks or any other materials of an inflammable nature.

Mr. LENNOX. Does that law affect us ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It affects the interpretation of our Quebec civil law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It has been argued by the hon. gentleman and others that when a building is destroyed by a fire caused by sparks from a locomotive, it is just as much expropriated as it could be under the ordinary process of law, and it was only equitable that the proprietor should be given compensation, but is this contingency affected by the Bill now before the House ? The Privy Council has declared that when they give a charter to a railway company, that carries with it a privilege. Should the hon. gentleman's Bill pass, the right which the company enjoy under this privilege would remain absolutely the same.

Mr. MONK. Supposing we incorporate an electric company and in carrying out the powers granted to it by our parliament, observing all due precautions, that electric company causes damage, does my hon. friend not think that in an action to recover our courts would to a certain extent be guided by the affirmation of a principle contained in this enactment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am arguing the effect of the Bill of the hon. gentleman in the light of the judgment of the Privy Council. The Privy Council has decided that when we grant a charter we grant a privilege and the hon. gentleman's Bill provides :

(1.) The enactments apply to the whole of Canada : Provided always, that no right, power or privilege conferred by an Act of the parliament of Canada, or by a charter granted under an Act of that parliament, shall exempt any person exercising that right, power or privilege, from any liability incurred by him under any Act of a legislature or under the common law.

Supposing this law should pass, it will not affect the interpretation given those laws by the Privy Council. Our Quebec courts have decided that railway companies are responsible under our civil law, but the Privy Council has decided that they are not. It is wholly a question of interpretation, and even should this Bill pass the Privy Council will still decide that when we grant a charter to a railway company, we grant a privilege, and that privilege relieves the company of responsibility according to our civil law as it now stands. Of course if the legislatures change the law as to liability, then their legislation may clash with our legislation, and this may have serious consequences. I am in sympathy with the object of the hon. gentleman but I do not think that this Bill will accomplish it. I am rather disposed to think that the Bill of my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) will be more effective. I am therefore of the opinion that the Bill of the hon. gentleman should not pass, but that the House should rather consider the Bill of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Demers).

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have placed upon the Order Paper a Bill, the object of which is similar to that aimed at by the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), which is

under discussion. I may perhaps be allowed briefly to explain the reasons why I have introduced this Bill, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. gentleman's Bill was already on the Order Paper. As just remarked by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Carroll), the object aimed at by the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier is not likely to be reached by the measure which he has introduced. Indeed, this Bill enacts, that, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, any Act of the parliament of Canada must be so interpreted that it shall not exempt any person from any liability incurred by him under any Act of a provincial legislature.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has dealt with the matter. Had their Lordships declared that the laws of the province of Quebec did not apply, I grant that the amendment to the Interpretation Act, embodied in the hon. gentleman's Bill would attain the object sought. But the Privy Council have based their judgment on the Civil Code of the province of Quebec and they have said: 'The Dominion parliament grants a certain privilege to railway companies, and under section 356 of the Civil Code civil corporations, constituting by the fact of their incorporation real or artificial persons, are as such governed by the laws affecting individuals, saving the privileges they enjoy under their charter. Hence it follows that, under the Civil Code, the privilege granted railway companies to carry on their business and operate their railways by means of locomotives is recognized beyond a doubt, and I believe the Bill introduced by my hon, friend does not provide a remedy. The Bill which I have brought down does not apply solely to the province of Quebec, but its object is to provide a common law as to the liability of railway companies, which shall apply to all the provinces of the Dominion.

The common law says that if I set fire to my property I am responsible for damage to a neighbour's property. That is the common law in Great Britain, in the United States and in all the provinces of the Dominion as well. The judgment rendered by the Privy Council does not say anything to the contrary, and the reason why the decision of our courts was set aside, not that our common law conflicts with the English common law, but because the power of our parliament is paramount. A railway company which is empowered by its charter to operate its line and to use locomotives for hauling its trains, is responsible, in common law, for damages to others from sparks emitted from locomotive engines. Therefore, it is in virtue of its charter that the company may claim a privilege conflicting with the common law.

Now, the object of my Bill is to say which is the common law that shall apply to all the provinces. So, I submit that the Bill introduced by my hon. friend does not meet the case we are now dealing with.

I may perhaps be told that this has nothing to do with civil rights in the provinces. The answer to that objection is that the Railway Act embodies many provisions relating to property. For instance, you will find in the Railway Act provisions concerning land expropriations, which is beyond doubt a matter pertaining to civil rights. I may add that, during this session, we have had a Bill before this House, to the effect of providing compensation for owners of cattle, when there are no proper cattle-guards.

From session to session, within the last few years, we had this Bill before us, and I am not aware that any question as to whether it was intra vires of this parliament has ever been raised. From what I have said it follows that the only remedy is the one proposed in my Bill, namely, that recourse should be had to this parliament, within whose jurisdiction it is to remove all doubts as to privileges granted under charters obtained from parliament.

Mr. JOHN McGOWAN (Centre Wellington). I think this is a matter of very great importance, not only to the province of Quebec, but to all the provinces of the Dominion. And, if parliament has the power to deal with this matter, the sooner it passes some such law as is proposed, the better. Some time ago, I shipped a carload of goods by the Grand Trunk Railway. Every precaution was used in seeing that no fire should get near the goods. But they caught fire from a spark from the locomotive on the Grand Trunk and were seriously damaged. I went to a lawyer, a first class lawyer, and he told me that I had no redress against the Grand Trunk on account of the fire, unless I could establish that the locomotive was defective in some particular. Of course, I could not prove that—would not attempt it. The lawyer advised me to make some settlement with the railway company, and this I had to do. All through the province of Ontario, fire constantly arises in farmers' crops from the sparks thrown out by locomotives. Fire gets into a crop of hay, let us say, and not only burns up the crop, but burns down fences and everything else. There ought to be some redress for this. When the railway companies have goods in their own charge and those goods are damaged, it seems a great hardship that the party owning them cannot get redress. If this parliament has power to pass any law providing for liability on the part of the railway company, it ought to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). It is, of course, clearly laid down and has been plainly announced not only by the Privy Council, but in parliament that, in those matters over which this parliament has control, as in bankruptcy or insolvency or similar matters, it has the right to make all necessary provisions for the purposes of carrying out

its legislation. For instance, it provides the procedure in respect of bankruptcy, and makes other necessary provisions which will occur to every lawyer who has considered the matter at all. Then, it necessarily follows that, in dealing with matters of this kind you must interfere with civil rights and the jurisdiction of parliament to interfere with civil rights to that extent is undoubted, and has been so for a long time. It is quite competent for parliament to limit its legislation in that regard, as I suggested to my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Carroll), and, in doing so, to provide that the making of that enactment shall not extend beyond a certain limit so far as concerns its interference with civil rights. I do not think any person would doubt that. It would be competent for the parliament of Canada in making an enactment in regard to a railway or anything else to provide that the Act should not extend beyond a certain limit in its interference with civil rights. That is all I meant by an interruption to which the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) made some allusion. Now, the common law of England as announced in the recent decisions—that is, decisions within the last fifty years—is that the right to construct and operate a railway in a certain place is a bar against civil liability to any person injured by it, in the absence of negligence. And as the Solicitor General says, it must be shown to the court that the railway company has not employed the most improved appliances to prevent damage. That is not a principle applicable to railways alone, but to other similar works. A great many decisions during the last twenty five or thirty years have been given with regard to the erection of gas works. Very often the application of the principle depends upon the particular language of the statute. To every one who has had occasion to examine very closely the decisions with regard to this matter it will be plain on what very slight foundation the jurisprudence with regard to railways rested in the first instance. It depends very often upon the question whether the particular manufactory or railway is authorized in a particular place. A general power, for example, to erect a gas works does not necessarily give power to erect a gas works in a residential part of the city. But if you have power under the statute to erect a gas works or any other manufactory creating nuisance in a particular place, another result might follow. The criticism that might fairly be offered to the language of the Bill is not exactly, it seems to me, on the lines suggested by the Solicitor General? He does not seem to think that it is language that could amount to anything. On the contrary, it seem to me too comprehensive. It might have the effect of nullifying many Acts passed by this legislature.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Absolutely.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If it means anything it means that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might be open to that argument, as I was suggesting privately to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The hon. gentleman tells me that the Bill was drafted by other gentlemen and placed in his hands and his attention had not been directed to that. I think it is perfectly easy to deal with this matter from the standpoint of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, but I would be inclined to think, as I have suggested, that this may carry it too far.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. All I said was, that so far as the Quebec law is concerned, the language of the amendment would make no difference—the law would be the same.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not make any suggestion as to the Quebec law. I do not pretend to understand that. I do not know whether it would make a difference in the law of Quebec or not. But it seems to me it would have the effect of very materially altering the law not only for other provinces, but for Quebec also. A right or privilege may be given by statute but you come to the Interpretation Act and find it is taken away by this particular provision. For example, you find that an officer of the customs has a right to enter a house under certain circumstances and make a search. But you might find under this provision that he is not saved from the action for damages taken by the party whose house he has entered.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And that which is declared by us to be a privilege might be an actionable wrong under the local legislature.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Or under the common law.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would be an anomaly for which we ought not to be responsible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In dealing with the question whether this Bill ought to be passed or not, it is a question whether, assuming that it would be right to restore the law of Quebec to what it was supposed to be, this Bill would not require considerable amendment before it should pass the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should be a little reluctant to express any opinion on this subject as raised by the hon. member's Bill, having had only a little while—since the discussion commenced—to turn it over in my mind. But I have been very much puzzled to find what limitations would be placed on the

Bill of the hon. gentleman. So far as I have been able to get at the meaning and effect of the language, particularly in the concluding portion of the clause, it would seem that parliament would be recognizing that what it granted with one hand it was, in an indirect manner through its Interpretation Act, taking away with the other. It would seem that while parliament was endeavouring to regulate the liabilities which attached necessarily to the exercise of the privilege which it was conferring, it was at the same time, in explicit terms, recognizing that other liabilities which it had no hand at all in regulating, and which were necessary to the proper exercise of the privilege conferred, could be created by another legislative body or bodies, either to cut into or to supplement the liabilities which parliament itself, and the courts interpreting the Act of parliament, considered would only attach to it. I do not know whether I make myself clear, but it is very much in the line of the trouble which suggests itself to the mind of the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). They say here that no authority or privilege conferred by parliament shall exempt any person exercising that law from any liability which the legislature may attach to its exercise, or which the common law would attach to its exercise. The legislature might make an enactment which would be in its operation and effect distinctly contrary to the intention of parliament. Parliament might say that under the railway charter a company might go on and expropriate lands under certain conditions; the legislature might say that if lands are expropriated by any railway company, and civil rights are interfered with, and property taken, such and such responsibilities must attach. I do not wish to speak too decidedly as to the proper meaning of these words, but it seems that you would absolutely leave the legislation of this parliament in such a maze of complications that no one could tell where they were, no one would care to accept any charter, and no one would ask for any privilege for fear he might find himself absolutely ruined by attempting to exercise it. I would think, off-hand, that if it is the opinion of parliament that the law as it stands to-day with respect to liabilities of railway companies in reference to such cases as my hon. friend has in his mind, ought to be changed, modified or reconsidered in some form, it would be equally within the competence of parliament to do it, and would more surely prove that the Act which my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) has introduced would provide a remedy. I have not examined his Bill, but I heard what has fallen from hon. members who have spoken upon it, I do not know how far parliament ought to go in respect to that, therefore I reserve my opinion upon it. It seems to me that we can see where we are going in the case of the Bill of my hon. friend from Iberville, but we cannot see where we are going in the Bill of my hon. friend opposite.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I considered when this Bill was first introduced that it was one of the most serious pieces of legislation that we were called upon to deal with. It is legislation fraught with the most serious consequences, if it were placed on our statutes. In effect, what is it that this amendment to the Interpretation Act asks us to do? It asks us to declare that when we confer upon a corporation that we have a right to bring into existence, certain powers and privileges, that corporation can only exercise those powers and privileges subject to the legislation of the provinces over which we have absolutely no control. Now to state the case in that way is to show the importance of the legislation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is, so far as civil liabilities are concerned.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, that would be the anomalous position that we would take, the anomalous legislation we would be responsible for, if the parliament of Canada were to declare that a corporation should have a right to do a thing, or if we enjoined upon a corporation to do a certain thing, and then we were to confer upon a province a right to declare that that which we empowered the corporation to do, was an actionable wrong. One does not require to go any further than to state that. Take, for instance, the case of a railway company connecting two or more provinces together. In order that that railway company might get its charter it will be forced to come here and get legislation from us; and in our legislation we would say that they had a right to operate within these provinces. Our legislation provides as to the equipment of that railway, as to the mode of protecting of rights and property of the public which that railway has to adopt. But the very moment that railway company went into operation, if this Bill were passed into law, when that railway company operated in different provinces, each province would have a right to say: You shall not operate that railway except subject to the conditions we impose upon you. Where would that lead us? Is it conceivable that we would pass such legislation as that? I do not mean to discuss the matter any further than to show what the consequences of such legislation would be.

I said a moment ago, in answer to a remark that fell from the hon. leader of the opposition, that the moment you concede the right of the Dominion parliament in a proper case to interfere with civil rights in a province, that very moment you concede that the judgment of the Privy Council in Roy and the Canadian Pacific Railway was

a proper judgment. And what is the reason for it? The code of the province of Quebec upon which so much reliance has been placed, is only a statute, and the provincial legislature can amend it in respect to those things upon which it has a right to legislate, it can amend it either by direct legislation or inferentially. And with respect to those matters over which we have control and with which we have a right to interfere, we can amend the code, and we are doing it all the time. When we give a railway company the right to operate in a province and say that that corporation shall be exempted from liability provided it complies with certain requirements, we are within our constitutional rights. I never could understand the reason of the judgment upon which the Court of Appeals—I say it with all due respect—rendered judgment in this case. They talk about sic utere tuo ut aliemum non laedas. That is a principle of law applicable to the common law of England as well as to our own, and if you are authorized to do a thing by this parliament, you cannot be held to have done that which will make you liable for damages. If this parliament authorizes the doing of a thing, and says to you: We confer upon you authority to do so and so, on what principle of law can you be held responsible for damages for exercising that right which we confer upon you? It seems to me I need not go further in the discussion of this case of Roy and the Canadian Pacific Railway. At one time that case was considered in our province as of the highest importance, far reaching in its consequences and as an infringement upon the rights of our provinces in respect to civil rights. Perhaps it may be impertinence on my part, but, not agreeing with that view, I ventured to write an article in one of our legal papers to which the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) referred, so that I need not weary the House by repeating what I said there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In stating that there might be legislation which would remedy the condition of affairs brought about by this decision of the Privy Council, of course, I am not considering whether the Quebec decisions are right or wrong. What I venture to suggest and what I believe to be right is that the parliament of Canada in incorporating any railway company may say this: The company may build a line between two given points, it may operate that line, but in so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, if it creates any damage by fire through its engines it shall be responsible to the same extent as if it had not received the protection of this statute.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It can limit the extent to which the civil liability is incurred.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not understand my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to intimate that he would be taken as approving of any such legislation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not discussing the policy of the legislation. I am merely discussing the power of this parliament. In other words, I am stating what is the simple fact that this parliament, having power to go to the utmost extent in regard to civil rights, need not go to such an extent, but can go only half way, or not at all, and so the civil liability would still remain.

Mr. MONK. I may say that I have no special desire to see this particular Bill passed, but I do not think the legislation is of such an extraordinary character as the hon. Minister of Justice indicates. The point raised by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and by the hon. member for Halifax, strikes me as being a very important one; that is to say, that this legislation is too comprehensive. It is the first time that the point has been indicated to me. The hon. Minister of Justice has never mentioned or indicated it before, but I may say that just such legislation as my hon. friend from Halifax pointed out a moment ago as being within the purview of this legislature has already been enacted in this parliament. The Railway Act, to give an instance of it, section 288, speaking of the results of the inspection of railways as regards civil liability, says. I do not want to read the whole section:

> No inspection had under this Act—
> —in any manner or way to lessen such liability or responsibility of any such company, under the laws in force in the province in which such liability or responsibility arises.

That is an example of legislation which is, I think, quite within our powers exactly on the lines mentioned as possible by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and if the Bill now under consideration in this House has a fault it is the fault of going too far, as has been indicated, but it is on the same lines as section 288 of the statute.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is on the same lines; yet, the extent to which that Act goes is clear. It states just exactly the ground it wants to cover and it stops there.

Mr. MONK. The effect of article 288 is exactly to produce the effect which the hon. Minister of Justice considered as an absurdity, because, that section, as I read it, says: Whatever may be the inspection made your liability as a railway company will remain what it ought to be under the civil law of the province.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Read what the Privy Council says on that section at page 231 of the report of the Roy case.

Mr. MONK. I will in a minute. I am reasoning on the section as I understand it irrespective of what the Privy Council may have decided. I submit that under that section the province of Ontario, or the province of Quebec, by their legislatures, may impose any kind of liability on a railway. Is that not the case ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so.

Mr. MONK. It may be within its sphere because the Privy Council decided a very long time ago in a case of which I forget the title at the present moment that there is a division of the field and that when the parliament of Canada is within its powers and exercises these powers it may exercise them to the fullest extent in order to carry out the object of its creation to a certain extent invading the provincial powers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does my hon. friend not see that the section is framed for the purpose of rendering it impossible for any party to contend that because there has been an inspection and that inspection has produced certain results, or certain conclusions have been arrived at, the fact of these conclusions having been arrived at—

Mr. MONK. Relieves him from responsibility.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it does not either enhance or diminish the liability that the railway company would be subject to if the inspection had not been made.

Mr. MONK. I understand that the object of that enactment in the Railway Act to which I refer is to stop the railway company from saying : We have been inspected, this is the result, and therefore, we are not liable to damages.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that is the object.

Mr. MONK. Well, on the same lines, in the case of Roy, the railway company said : We have been authorized by the statutes of the Dominion of Canada to operate this railway and whatever may be the law in the province of Quebec in regard to torts, or damages, this statute of the Dominion of Canada protects us. That is the way I understand it and the object of this Bill, although I admit it may be too comprehensive, is to declare that no enactment of the Dominion parliament will have the effect of exercising a right conferred by the Dominion parliament from liability under the common law of the province or any Act of the legislature within the powers of the legislature. Of course, if you suppose a case such as the hon. Minister of Justice supposed a moment ago of a statute of the province of Quebec nullifying an enactment of the Dominion parliament in respect to railways over which it has control, that enactment in the provincial legislature would be ultra vires, would be beyond its powers, because, under the Constitutional Act we have control here over certain railways in the matter of legislation. Under the decision of the Privy Council and which effect the jurisprudence of our courts in regard to railways to the fullest extent that might be necessary in order that we might fully exercise our powers under section 91 of the Confederation Act. But, we cannot go beyond.

I submit that we cannot enact in the parliament of Canada, the Bill which my hon. friend (Mr. Demers, Iberville) has before the House, because we would then be legislating the question of civil rights which is reserved exclusively to the provinces. If the Bill of my hon. friend should become law, there would be a different kind of liability in the English provinces for railway companies from what there is for individuals. There would be a special liability for railway companies enacted by this parliament, which would not be the civil law of the province. The difficulty I find in the Bill of my hon. friend is that it invades the provincial domain, although at first sight it would seem to be far the simplest way to remedy the evil. The judges of the Privy Council declared that the civil law of the province of Quebec applied in this case of Roy, but they interpreted it differently from the interpretation given to it hitherto in all countries which are governed by the principles of the old French law. There is no doubt in my mind that they were right in finding that the principle which must apply in this case is the principle of our provincial law, and if the legislation suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Demers, Iberville) became law, it would be contrary to the jurisprudence of the Privy Council in the case of Roy, and the generally accepted jurisprudence, that it would be an invasion of the provincial domain of legislation. These are the words in this Act to which exception has been taken on the ground that they are too comprehensive:

> No enactments of the parliament of Canada shall exempt any person exercising a right, power or privilege under a Dominion statute, from any liability incurred by him under any Act of the legislature or under the common law.

It is certainly of a very general character, but I think that it must be understood in the sense in which it has been intended and has stood upon our statute-books for a very long time. Under section 288, of the Railway Act, nothing shall exempt a person holding powers from this legislature from liability under the common law of the province or any Act of the legislature, in so far as the common law will apply, or the Act of legislature is within the power of the legislature. No man would pretend that it would be in the power of the legislature to enact laws nullifying intra vires enact-

ments of our parliament here. I do not think that any such Act of the provincial legislature would be considered constitutional. The difficulty is the division of the field of legislation between the two powers. If there was no division of the field, the Bill presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Demers, Iberville) would be a very much simpler way to remedy the crying evil which exists in the other provinces where there is no doubt whatever that the decision in the case of Roy would properly apply. But the difficulty in this case is that it is a question of civil law, and I submit that the furthest that we can go is to declare that no empowering enactment passed here; not only in regard to railway companies but in regard to any enterprise whatever which this parliament has the power to regulate, shall be construed as exempting the party exercising that power from the control of the legislature in so far as that control may be exercised, or from the common law of the province in so far as that common law may apply; and it can only apply as restricted by the provisions of our Confederation Act.

Motion (Mr. Monk) for the second reading of the Bill negatived on division.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think our chief business will be the consideration of the estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will continue the Public Work's estimates in the hope that we may be able to finish them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There seems to be some delay in the translation of the Bills, and we will likely have to go on with the estimates.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 3, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

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

Mr. MONK.

The Committee recommend that Mr. S. A. Mackay whose appointment at the beginning of the last session as temporary substitute on the staff of translators of the Official Report of the Debates to replace the late N. H. Beaulieu until some permanent action was required to be taken, and which appointment was approved of by the House on the 24th March, 1902, be paid for his services at the rate of $4 per day, said remuneration to be computed from the date of the last payment made to him, viz.: 27th May, 1902 to the 3rd April instant.

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

VACANCY IN ST. JAMES DIVISION.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the notice which I gave a few days ago, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Léonard:—

That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to make out a new writ for the election of a member to serve in this present parliament for the electoral division of St. James (Montreal), in the room of Joseph Brunet, whose election has been declared void.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Canada Northwest Land Company, Limited.—Mr. Thompson (Haldimand).

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

That from this date to the end of the session government orders have precedence on Thursdays, immediately after questions to be put by members.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the Prime Minister considered the effect this will have on Private Bill legislation? I have not considered it, I am asking for information. It has been suggested by some hon. gentlemen that at least one more Thursday should be given for private legislation.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not see why, because this motion does not interfere with the hour for private Bills on Thursday.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). It interferes with the whole day on Thursday.

Mr. SPROULE. The translation of Bills is so very much behind that some of them have not been ready, and the time for private Bill legislation ought to be extended.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am reserving an hour after dinner for private Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER. Private Bills may be taken up on Wednesday and Friday night.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). It does not interfere with private Bills.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. From this day to the end of the session it takes the whole of Thursdays. It takes the first Order of the Day on Thursday, and the questions to be put by members.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. After questions put by members.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is the order for Thursday:

Questions put by members, Public Bills and Orders. Notices of Motions, Government Notices of Motions, Government Orders.

This is the order for Wednesday.

Questions put by members, Notices of Motions, Public Bills and Orders, and from half past seven o'clock P.M., Private and Public Bills for the first hour.

There are no private Bills on Thursdays.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the government to what has been said in the legislature of New Brunswick by the Attorney General of that province with regard to the question of redistribution which has been recently discussed in this House. I will read from a newspaper report:

Hon. Mr. Pugsley, replying to the leader of the opposition, said his attention had been called to the report of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech, but he had not been led by reason of these remarks to retract anything he had said in regard to this matter, or to have any doubts as to the strength of the position the government had taken. The statement in the speech from the Throne in regard to the reference of the question to the Supreme Court, was based on the following telegram from the Minister of Railways to the Premier :

Ottawa, Ont., March 23, 1903.

Hon. L. J. Tweedie,
Chatham, N.B.

You are warranted in stating that while the Dominion government has not agreed in opinion with views expressed on behalf of the provincial government on the subject we talked, it is prepared to co-operate with you in securing an early decision on the question from the Supreme Court. You may state this fact in any way you prefer.

(Sgd.) A. G. BLAIR.

Having received this despatch from the Minister of Railways the government was resting easy, confident that the promise made would be carried out. We are thoroughly satisfied that Mr. Blair would not have sent this telegram if the matter had not been settled and the Dominion government having agreed to the reference, will take the necessary steps to carry it out. While it is a matter of regret that Sir Wilfrid Laurier does not take the same view of this question as the provincial government, we need not feel alarmed at the difference of opinion, if there is a difference of opinion. Sir Wilfrid may have referred to the protest of Prince Edward Island, which is an entirely different case from ours, and which is based on the idea that a province, having gone into confederation with a certain number of representatives, can never have that number reduced. Sir Wilfrid says we must abide by the constitution, and we say the same, but we say also that under the British North America Act we are not entitled to lose any member because our population has not fallen since the last preceding census by one-twentieth as compared with the population of the four original provinces of Canada. He was not at all concerned because the authorities at Ottawa took a different view of this question from that of the provincial government. It had been their experience to have such differences with the Ottawa people, who after confederation took a very low view of the rights of the provinces. For instance, they maintained that our lieutenant governor was not the representative of the Sovereign and that we did not have the fisheries on our own territory. We have been going on fighting for provincial rights ever since then, and in most of the contests with the Ottawa government the provinces have succeeded. The mere fact that we live in a small province is not a conclusive argument against our being entitled to form an opinion as to the meaning of a statute. It would probably be found that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was not referring to our case at all when he spoke of the opinions that had been expressed by Sir John A. Macdonald and others. While in Ottawa we were told by the Department of Justice that the point raised by us had never been raised before.

Now, I mentioned this because it seemed to indicate that possibly there may be something more in the way of correspondence between the province of New Brunswick and the Dominion government. I mention it as a reminder to the Minister of Justice who said yesterday that he would bring anything further down. I also mention it because I think it is right that the House should be informed as to the attitude of the government in that regard, whether this despatch from the Minister of Railways and Canals correctly announces the attitude of the government, and if it does, what is to be done in that regard. We have had no intimation from the government that any doubt whatever existed in their minds respecting this matter, or in the mind of the legal adviser of the Crown. But you will observe, Mr. Speaker, and my right hon. friend will observe, that here is a definite and precise promise that the government will take any steps which are necessary for securing a decision upon this point from the Supreme Court of Canada.

The telegram, which I will again read, says :—

You are warranted in stating that while the Dominion government has not agreed in opinion with views expressed on behalf of the provincial government on the subject we talked, it is prepared to co-operate with you in securing an early decision on the question from the Supreme Court. You may state this fact in any way you prefer.

Of course, I am reading merely from a newspaper report, but, I assume it is a correct report. This is a very important statement of government policy, which, it seems to me, might have better been made in this House than through the medium of a telegram announced in a provincial legislature. A question of that kind was brought to the attention of the House the other day when my right hon. friend was not present. I think the House is entitled to know what the attitude of the government is in regard to this matter and to learn whether or not it is contemplated, if the provinces demand it, to grant a reference of this question to the Supreme Court, and if that is the case, how does it happen that my right hon. friend has made no announcement on this subject to the House, and that there is not the slightest reference to it in the Bill which has been introduced to provide for the redistribution.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The information which my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) desires is quite appropriate, and I will give him the fullest explanation it is possible to give. Some time, I think in the month of February, we received a delegation from the government of the province of Prince Edward Island, and also, I believe from the government of the province of New Brunswick, which made representations to the effect that they believed they should not lose the representation of population which it was stated they were to lose. We discussed the matter with them and told them very frankly that the government had no doubt at all, that the lines which had been followed in the previous redistributions of 1882 and 1892 were correct, and that, in so far as we were concerned, we had no doubt whatever that the province of Prince Edward Island would lose one member, Nova Scotia two members, New Brunswick one member and Ontario six members. New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island especially objected very strongly to this interpretation of the law. We told them that we could not alter our views, and after giving the matter our best consideration we still adhere to the opinion which we have expressed in the Bill. They asked us whether we would have any objection to having the matter referred to the Supreme Court. We stated that we had no objection at all, and that we would, in fact, co-operate with them if they would take the initiative, but in the meantime, having no doubt upon the matter, we could not delay proceeding with our Bill. I have had no written correspondence myself on the subjec with the government of New Brunswick. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) sent the telegram that was read before the House by the hon. member for Halifax. I have had some correspondence on the subject with the government of Prince Edward Island, and I have just given an order to have this correspondence brought down with the other correspondence which will be laid on the Table of the House, perhaps on Monday. While we will not take the initiative, if the subject is brought up we will be ready to co-operate with them so as to have the matter argued before the Supreme Court.

NAVAL DEFENCE.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. leader of the House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to a statement which appeared in yesterday's Toronto 'Globe' respecting a proposed naval defence scheme of the government. The report says :

There is considerable speculation as to the nature of the measure for naval defence which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will recommend in fulfilment of what was said at the colonial conference in London last summer. The idea has been expressed that it would probably take the form of a scheme for establishing gunsheds on the sea coast of Canada, where the fishermen may be trained in naval artillery. It seems probable, however, that, as in the case of Newfoundland, cruisers will be provided, in which those who are willing to undergo training would serve for a certain period of time. The cruiser 'Calypso,' which has been commissioned for this purpose in Newfoundland waters, is by no means a modern vessel, but is equipped with guns of the latest type. The men are paid 58 cents a day whilst on service, and also receive rations. It is stated with respect to Canada that Hon. Raymond Préfontaine has before him a scheme which involves the appearance of three third-class cruisers in Canadian waters, one off the Atlantic coast, the second at Toronto, and the third on the British Columbia coast. Presumably the British government would be willing to send vessels for this purpose, or, if the Dominion government approve of the scheme, suitable vesels could be acquired by them. The appearance of a war vessel in the upper lakes would seemingly be open to objection under the Rush-Bagot treaty, but against a mere training ship the United States could make no complaint, as they have themselves introduced vessels of this class. If this scheme goes through it is thought there would be no lack of recruits, seeing that at least 45,000 fishermen ply their calling on the coasts of the maritime provinces, and any number of smart mariners are to be found on the upper lakes.

I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman to this statement, and to ask if it is the intention of the government to introduce legislation in this direction ? It is a matter of the most vital importance, and I think some information should be

given to the House at the earliest moment as to what the intention of the government is.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government has no information to announce to the House, because all these statements are premature and unauthorized.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My right hon. friend did not take the point that it has not been in the 'Canada Gazette.'

The PRIME MINISTER. We will wait until the next issue of the 'Canada Gazette.'

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 8) to amend the Expropriation Act.—The Minister of Justice.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Resolution respecting Chinese immigration (the Prime Minister) read the second time and agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 82) to amend the Act respecting and restricting Chinese immigration.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Order for :

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 13) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—The Minister of Justice.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want to object to the order of procedure, but we were told last night that the order of business to-day would be Supply.—Public Works.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was not aware of that, and if that be so, I will move that we go into Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that some hon. gentlemen who, perhaps, would like to be heard on this Bill, are away, under the belief that the House is going into Supply.

The PRIME MINISTER. The point is well taken. If the House is not prepared we will go into Supply.

Order allowed to stand.

SUPPLY—LABOUR TROUBLES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

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

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, before the motion to go into Supply is decided upon, I desire to take up the time of the House for one minute and especially to secure the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) in regard to the very serious condition of affairs existing at the present time and which has existed continuously for some time past in British Columbia. I refer especially to the serious conflicts in the province, interfering with the business interests of the province between capital and labour. At the present time and for some weeks past the great coal mines in the Crow's Nest Pass have been closed down through a conflict existing between the companies and their workmen. The cutting off of this coal supply has very seriously interfered with the supplying of fuel to the smelting industries of the great Kootenay country. For some time past a very serious strike has existed among certain employees on the Vancouver section of the Canadian Pacific Railway. On Vancouver Island, in the district which I have the honour to represent, some of the most important coal mines have been closed off. At the Crow's Nest coal mines, negotiations have been constantly going on between the men and the employers, and to some extent the same thing is true of the strike on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I want particularly, however, to call the attention of the minister (Hon. Sir William Mulock) to the very peculiar and extraordinary condition of affairs which exists in connection with the Wellington Coal Company's mines. The men employed in these mines made up their minds that they would have a trades union, that they would affiliate that trades union with the international union on the other side of the line. For this reason the owners of the mines discharged the officers of the union, closed down the mines, and they have disorganized a happy community of nearly 4,000 people, who were depending absolutely for their livelihood on the operation of these mines. I can quite conceive, Mr. Speaker, how very difficult it is when labour and capital is in conflict, and when negotiations are kept open between the two parties to the conflict; I can quite understand how difficult it is even for the government to intervene to bring about a settlement. But here is an instance in which, because a large number of men employed in a very dangerous industry thought it a proper thing to combine for the sake of their own interests, these coal mines were closed down by the owners and the working men deprived of their livelihood as a consequence. It is important, Sir, for more reasons than one that matters of this kind should be presented to this parliament. In the first place, attention ought to be called to them here because there ought be some authority in the government of this country whereby serious conflicts between labour and capital detrimental to the public interest could be put an end to by the government interceding between the two. When workingmen as represented by trades unions do unlawful acts; when, for instance, they

attempt to break their contract or when they make unreasonable demands, you hear a great outcry from all quarters condemning these trades unions. Well, Sir, we ought just be as ready to condemn oppression and wrong-doing on the other side, and to bring to the public attention unwarrantable tyranny perpetrated by a corporation which prevents men from exercising their lawful right to combine in their own interest. Let me say here, Mr. Speaker, that there is not an industry existing in the wide world to-day where combination of labour is as necessary as in coal mining; there is not an industry operating to-day where men labour under such disadvantageous conditions as to their safety, as they do in the operation of coal mines. I am speaking on the floor of this House, from having a very extensive experience in coal mines myself. I know by practical experience all that it means. There is no industry in the world to-day that is so extensively regulated by government enactment as the operation of coal mines, and why? It is for the reason that there is no existing industry that has in its operation such dangerous elements, and that needs such strict regulation and supervision by government authority. Need I remind the House of this painful fact. In the operation of the Crow's Nest coal mine, less than a year ago over one hundred men lost their lives with one blast. Need I remind the House that less than two years ago, in one of the very mines closed down by the Wellington Coal Company, because the workmen wished to have a union; seventeen men were done to death and buried in the mine. It is unnecessary for me to remind the House that serious accidents have occurred in these British Columbia coal mines resulting in the death of hundreds of the miners. I repeat that there is no industry so dangerous as the occupation of the coal miner, and I say that there is no body of men who so badly need an organization to enable them to protest against oppressive regulations. If the men are to be prevented by the coal mine owners from having trades union organizations, then they would be debarred from complaining of the dangerous conditions that may exist in their surroundings. And, Sir, the day has gone, I think; the day ought to have gone when the right of workmen to combine should be questioned.

There is another reason why I believe that this important question should be dealt with on the floor of parliament. Let me point out that the enormous privileges possessed by this particular coal company on Vancouver Island were received from this parliament of Canada. Nearly twenty years ago, this company obtained from the hands of this parliament 1,900,000 acres of land on Vancouver Island with all the minerals in that belt, free of taxation for ever and with $750,000 in cash to build seventy-two miles of railway. And in spite of this grant; in spite of the enormous extent of this privilege, this government does not appear to hold one single particle of control over the carrying on of that extensive business. These people, who twenty years ago became the possessors of this vast wealth belonging to the people; these are the people who turn around to-day and say to the workingmen who have to risk their lives: You shall have no combination for your own protection. Although the men did not demand anything, never sought a single benefit, the only reason being that the owner objected to the international connection, it may be a matter of opinion whether the miners of Vancouver island are doing the very best thing in thier own interests by forming such a connection before they are united at home; but this is their own business, and as for the Wellington Coal Co., they have more than once interfered and discharged men because they desired and tried to affiliate with a Canadian union. Up to the time that these men made unreasonable demands it was an act of tyranny to interfere with their legal and moral right to combine. I direct the attention of the Minister of Labour to this condition of things. I say again that when two parties are in conflict and when the public interest is suffering, it is the duty and province of government to step in to protect the public right. In all the affairs of life this principle prevails. If two men on the main street of Ottawa were to come into conflict; were to question each others rights, were as a result to obstruct the public highway, the chief of police would never question the individual liberty of these two men, but would instantly invoke authority to make them settle their difference. That principle if it be right in such a local matter, is a hundred fold more needful when extensive public rights are being invaded. When the public interest suffers because of a conflict between capital and labour; because of the oppression of labour by capital, then it should be in the power of government to interfere to safeguard the public interest. I would like the Minister of Labour to look into this matter. I believe the condition of affairs is so serious that it necessitates immediate action, and I would like the hon. minister to take the matter into his immediate consideration and contrive some means of dealing with it, such as sending a commission to the province of British Columbia to take evidence under oath, ascertain the reasons for the present disastrous condition of affairs there, and lay the facts before the public.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). In connection with this subject which has been brought up by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Ralph Smith), I think it would be well for the government to take into consideration the result of the great industrial struggle which took place in the United States last year, and which deranged the business of that country, caused an

infinite amount of suffering, deprived millions of people of a supply of hard coal, and was in every respect most disastrous. That struggle resulted from the refusal of the operators or mine owners to recognize the labour unions, and it was fought out to the death. At last, the companies were forced to have the grievances of themselves and the unions referred to a commission appointed by the President of the United States. That commission visited the mines, examined the miners and the mine owners, took cognizance of all the facts bearing on the question, and have recently delivered their verdict. That verdict does not by any means exonerate the mine owners, but places on them practically the responsibility for that great struggle and the troubles which resulted from it. The result of that deliverance is that the trade unions are recognized, the hours of labour shortened, prices increased, and the mine owners placed in the unenviable position of being forced from the position they took at the beginning of the struggle. Of course, the labour unions were not faultless. There was the question of the employment of non-union men, and some violence was used to prevent them going to work. The commission recognized the right of non-union men to work as well as union men. But I rise to call attention to this great struggle and the deliverance of this commission, composed of eminent experts in many lines and one judge of the United States Supreme Court, for the purpose of directing the minister's attention to a source of information which will perhaps be of service to him in dealing with this matter when he takes it under consideration.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Burrard). I wish simply to accentuate, if possible, the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith), because we have very few men in Canada who can speak as strongly or with as much authority on the subject of trades' unions and the actual working of trades' unions in connection with coal mines as that hon. member. But I do not wish to bring into the discussion any extraneous matters. We in British Columbia, as you are probably aware, are face to face with many labour troubles, which are practically threatening our existence as a province, and I trust that the Minister of Labour will see his way to appoint a commission to investigate the causes which have led to these troubles. I am in receipt of letters every day, from all classes of people and from all parts of the province, calling attention to the terrible state of affairs which exists there, and which, if it is not soon remedied, will have a very serious effect on the industrial life of that province. We had a strike on the Canadian Pacific Railway, which began in a small way in Vancouver, and I am told that strike was caused by the refusal of the company to recognize the right of the clerks to form a union. I do not wish to discuss the question of trades unions. I think we all recognize that men have a right to combine; and if the strike in question was brought on by the refusal of the company to recognize the union, I think there ought to be an investigation of it. Although the strike began in a small way, it may lead to very serious consequences, because a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. The province of British Columbia is a province of great natural resources and is capable of sustaining a large population; but it is not going ahead in the way that it ought to do, and I think these labour troubles have a good deal to do with that fact. I do not suppose that it is necessary for me to say that if these labour disputes existed in the eastern part of Canada, the government would take immediate steps to settle them. Our whole province is practically upset because of them. We have strikes at Fernie, on Vancouver island, and on the mainland. I do not undertake to suggest a remedy; but I think that if a commission were appointed as suggested, to make an investigation and report to this parliament, some good might result. I am not speaking for any class or any company, but for the whole people of British Columbia, when I say that we must have some remedy, and the remedy must be applied at once.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). The troubles which the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) and his colleague, (Mr. Macpherson) have brought before this House this afternoon are of such vital importance to British Columbia and are creating such mischief out there as to demand the serious attention of this House. As to the proposal that a commission should be sent to investigate, probably that is the only thing that can be done immediately; but I cannot myself see that any good can be hoped from it. We have never had any explanation from the government as to why the commission of the Labour Commissioner who was in British Columbia two or three years ago was revoked about eighteen months ago. Since then there have been two commissions sent to British Columbia at great expense to this country; but here is a case in which I think all the information necessary would have been in the department and before this House now if that commission had been continued. But I also rise to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour to this one common feature in all these strikes, not only those now in progress in British Columbia, but some that hove occurred in eastern Canada; that is, the refusal of the employers to recognize the unions. The cause of the U.B.R.E. strike on the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has now, unfortunately, extended to Winnipeg, was the refusal of the company to recognize the Brotherhood of Railway Employees. The strikes at Fernie, British Columbia were due to the same cause. The

last 'Labour Gazette' proves conclusively that the whole trouble is due to a stubborn refusal of the employers to recognize the union at all. Some time last month the Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. Mackenzie King, went to Fernie to investigate into the causes of the strike there. He went to the company's office and in his report thus described his visit:

> The general manager had left on the day previous to attend a convention at Victoria, B. C., called for the purpose of forming a mine owners association.

And he proceeds to say that the manager had left word with his secretary to inform the Deputy Minister of Labour that the mine owners would not deal with their men as an organization. Here is a most remarkable state of affairs. We find these mine owners, who are combining themselves, denying to their men the right to do the same. As a matter of fact all the strikes in Canada to-day, and all those which have taken place within the last two or three years, have turned on the question of the absolute refusal of the employers to deal with organized labour. And that is the difficulty which we must first tackle. The hon. Minister of Labour has a Bill regarding disputes on railways, and I have given notice of a Bill the same as that which I presented last year, to strengthen the conciliation Act, but nothing in either of these Bills will touch this point, which is the critical point in all these troubles.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The subject brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend is most important and far reaching. Labour troubles are not confined to Canada, although perhaps the particular part of Canada referred to in this debate has been the special centre of industrial disturbance for some little time. Various governments have endeavoured to deal with this phase of the labour problem, but so far it cannot be claimed that much success has been achieved. We have in New Zealand what is called a compulsory arbitration law, which has been in force nearly ten years. But there are those who contend that it is about to break down. Certainly the employees, to a large extent, in New Zealand are reported as dissatisfied. That measure is one of a strictly compulsory character. The awards are dealt with by a board having legal jurisdiction to enforce them. There is only one tribunal that I am aware of where industrial disputes may be settled outside of legal compulsion, and that is the forum of public opinion. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Smith), I understand, wants us to appeal to that forum in the present instance by appointing a royal commission to inquire into all the facts and lay them before the public. He alludes to the powers and privileges granted to the company at Nanaimo. These lands, he says, were granted by the government some twenty years ago as a concession for the construction of a railway seventy-two miles in length, and he contends that in view of the liberality of the government the company ought to be fair and generous towards its employees. While admitting that contention, still it cannot be denied that if any rights should have been secured the railway employees, the proper place in which to have secured them was the charter granting the company its powers and privileges. But if these lands have passed from the Crown and the fee simple in them is now vested in the company, or in the individuals who are responsible for the trouble, the power of any government to confiscate the lands or apply any special remedy is gone, and we have to fall back upon whatever power parliament may be able to exercise generally. A year ago there was a strike at the Nanaimo mines in which 900 men took part. I sent out my deputy, and he was able in a few days to bring about industrial peace. He induced the parties to enter in an agreement providing for peace for a length of time, but apparently that truce has been broken, although we learn it now for the first time. Within the last couple of months the Department of Labour was asked to interfere in connection with the Crow's Nest strike, and the deputy minister proceeded to the locality. The company, however, declined to accept any intervention and there is no law to force them to do so. It is a question whether public opinion will approve of a compulsory measure of interference in the ordinary disputes arising between employers and employees. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) very properly refers to strikes in coal mines as of a special character. In that I agree with him. Coal is a necessity of life, only to be found in very few spots, so that coal mining is an industry of a monopolistic character, and public opinion would perhaps approve of special legislation dealing with that industry, just as public opinion approves of parliament intervening to maintain the running of railways and prevent their operations being interrupted by disputes between them and their employees. We are only making a beginning in labour legislation. My hon. friend says that at one time there was a commissioner in Vancouver. Well, a commissioner was appointed there, I think in 1899, but not under any law. He was appointed simply, I think, by the Department of Justice to take note of matters in the vicinity of Vancouver, and later on parliament adopted a Conciliation Act based on the Imperial Act of the same name. That Act has been enforced with more or less effect for the past three or four years, but under it intervention is not permitted except with the consent of the parties. When the parties refuse, as they sometimes do, intervention is impossible. Whether public opinion would war-

rant our enacting a law which would give the right to the government to intervene in matters of dispute between employer and employee is a matter on which I would not venture to form an opinion. No doubt there is a conflict of opinion, but it seems to me that there is a gradual educational process going on, and that by degrees employers and employees will come to appreciate any measure that will favour the intervention of disinterested parties in order to prevent these industrial wars.

I am not perhaps at liberty to place on the Table the correspondence I have received from parties to industrial disputes, it is of a semi-private character. But I can say this without going into details, that since presenting the Bill now before parliament to provide a tribunal for dealing with railway labour troubles, I have received communications from employees outside of the railway world asking if a similar measure might not be with success extended to them. My view has been that it would be better to place the Railway Bill upon the statute-book, and then the industrial classes including of course employees could see for themselves the exact text of it, and have an opportunity of judging of its efficacy when put in force. Then if public opinion asked for an extension of the principle involved in the Railway Act to troubles in other walks of industrial life, I have no doubt parliament would accede to that demand. But it seems to me unwise to force legislation too rapidly. If we proceeded and applied the principle in the Bill now before parliament to disputes between private employers and their employees, forcing it upon them before they were ready for it, perhaps we would make less progress than by waiting. There is such a thing as going too fast, and I am of opinion that no labour legislation will be effective unless it carries with it the good will, largely, of the persons to whom it is intended to apply. Entertaining that view I have no hesitation in saying that my own feelings are altogether against the compulsory feature of the New Zealand Act. I believe that in this country where there is such a feeling in favour of freedom and manhood, the working classes would resent anything in the nature of the legal compulsion which is the feature of the New Zealand Act.

Now with reference to the particular trouble in British Columbia to-day, and especially that in the Wellington mines, I am not in a position to offer an opinion one way or the other as to the rights or wrongs of the dispute. My hon. friend has given a statement, which I presume is his explanation of the dispute. No doubt he has given it correctly, as he understands it, and it may be that he is absolutely correct. But it would be inexpedient to offer an opinion on one side of the case only being presented. As to what may be done to bring about a more satisfactory state of affairs, that is a most serious problem. There is no law by which we can compel an employer to give labour to his employees. We may have some control over companies having charters, and who are more or less under legislative jurisdiction, but when it comes to the relations between the private employer and a private employee, I know of no law that will compel an employer to employ or will compel any man to work. At the same time we must use our best offices to try and bring about harmonious relations, and endeavour to induce both contestants to moderate their views and to settle their disputes. It is in that spirit, I presume, that my hon. friend suggests that we should organize a commission to investigate the causes of all these various industrial disturbances in British Columbia. I can conceive of great good coming from such a measure. Whether the time is yet ripe is a matter for consideration. Whether the public opinion of British Columbia has reached that stage when it would welcome intervention of this character, is a matter for serious consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. You might as well extend it to political strikes out there.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like to interject political questions into this discussion, but I think never yet in this House have we had any political controversy over labour troubles. We have always endeavoured to proceed as a united body without reference to party, in the discussion of industrial troubles, and in this instance I hope there will be no exception. We are too much interested, the welfare of Canada is too deeply concerned in the labour question, to make it a political football. I have only to say, therefore, to my hon. friend, that the government will consider his suggestion at once, and consider it as a most urgent matter demanding early consideration. It is to be hoped that if we turn the light of public opinion upon these controversies, good may result.

As to the strike upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, when the Bill before parliament becomes law we will then have a legal right to intervene. It is not necessary for me to anticipate discussion upon that point, but that measure, as you perhaps are aware, contemplates giving the government a legal right to intervene, examine witnesses, take evidence, and submit the finding of the tribunal to parliament and to the country. It is hoped that when that state of affairs is attained, the parties to these controversies will respond to public opinion just as the parties to the coal strike in the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania responded to the demand of public opinion. They submitted that trouble to arbitration, and now, I presume, propose to abide by the result of the award. The government is fully alive to the importance of this question and will give it every possible consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would remark to the Minister of Labour that there does not seem to be much of a remedy suggested by anything that he has said to-day. We gather from him that he considers the business of raising coal to be somewhat of a monopolistic character, which would justify government interference more than any other business in the country. At the same time he tells us that he is applying to the railways of this country a measure which he shrinks from applying to the business he has just named. I do not regard that as a very logical position. I am expressing no opinion at the present time as to whether it is advisable to adopt that course, but taking the statement the Minister of Labour has made to-day, certainly we are constrained to believe that there is much more reason for applying this principle to the case of a great corporation engaged in the business of mining coal than to any other class of corporations in Canada. The hon. gentleman has suggested that we turn on the light of public opinion, whatever that means. I do not know exactly how the government or parliament are going to turn on the light of public opinion any more than it is turned on at present. The light of public opinion is turned on through the press of this country probably as effectively as it could be done by any other means.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By getting at the facts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He does not seem to offer much comfort to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith), who has brought this matter to the attention of the House. With regard to the strike in the United States, I am informed that there was a measure in the laws of the state of Pennsylvania providing for arbitration in case of such strikes, and that it proved absolutely ineffective in the recent strike. Has the Minister of Labour any information on that point ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. member for Vancouver could give us some information with regard to that, because it might be of assistance in considering the matter which he has brought to the attention of the House. I know he is well informed on these labour questions.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). I am sorry that I have not got that information in my possession at the present time, but I will be very glad to procure it and to present it to the House.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). A word about the compulsory New Zealand Act which has been in operation in that province for a number of years. There were only three cases submitted to that tribunal, two of them have given the greatest satisfaction To prove that that legislation is acceptable to the people of New Zealand, I may mention the fact that Mr. Seddon, the premier of that colony and of the government who introduced that compulsory Bill, was returned to power last November with a larger majority than he had before. I have among my papers not only the New Zealand Act, but the details of the trials that have taken place under it. Public opinion in the United States condemned the great strike that was so injurious not only to that country but to the Dominion of Canada, but public opinion was as helpless to deal with it as a parcel of children, until the President of the United States took it in hand himself. Public opinion condemns strikes, but then public opinion in Canada is quite helpless to deal with such matters under present circumstances. The remedy must be in the hands of the government, otherwise the people will be as helpless here as they were on the other side of the line

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

Public Works—chargeable to income—public buildings, Ontario—Toronto Dominion public buildings, improvements, renewals, repairs, &c., $8,000.

Mr. CLARKE. When we were in Supply considering these items two or three days ago, the hon. Minister promised to bring down certain correspondence on the subject. Will he lay that correspondence on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). The correspondence has been prepared, and I will send it over to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest that this item be allowed to stand until the arrival of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who will be here in a few moments.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very well, take the next item.

Item allowed to stand.

Toronto post office—alterations and additions, including elevator and fittings, $23,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Only $10,000 was voted for this last year. What does the hon. Minister propose to do with this money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations have been made for some time that the accommodation in the Toronto post office was not sufficient, that the building was in a poor state of repair, and that considerable improvements were needed. A contract was let for this work amounting to $35,000, tenders being called for by advertisement. This vote is to complete the work. The total estimated cost of the work made by the chief architect was $34,413. But after consideration, they thought they could complete it for $33,000. This vote, with the $10,000 voted last year, will make up the amount.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. Minister say if the contract was let to the lowest tenderer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was not.

Mr. CLANCY. I shall have to ask my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to lay upon the Table the tenders and the contract, as well as any other papers in connection with the Toronto post office improvements that he may have.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no objection. If there is anything further, I shall be glad to furnish it.

Mr. CLANCY. I will let my hon. friend know if there is anything further.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. CLANCY. No ; I understand that the item stands.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last week the request was made that this item stand in the absence of my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy). I understood then that he wanted some information brought down. I do not know any reason why the item should stand again. Any information the hon. gentleman wants I am quite prepared to give.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend will see, of course, that we are early in the session and early in the estimates ; and, since he himself states that the contract was not let to the lowest tenderer, I think we should have full opportunity to consider this item. No time will be lost, it seems to me, by letting this item stand ; on the contrary, it may facilitate the work very much if we have an opportunity to look at the papers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman requests it to stand I have no objection at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Stands.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What about the previous item ?

Mr. CLANCY. I should like both to stand because I understand they are both for the same purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. It is the item for the Toronto post office alterations that I want particularly to stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. When the hon. Minister of Public Works was giving us some information respecting the work at the Toronto custom house he promised to bring down the correspondence. I understand from the hon. minister that there is no correspondence. What he laid before us is a memo. and a list of prices that are allowed the contractors who are doing the work. There is no correspondence to show who suggested the work should be done this way, or as to whether these prices are fair prices, or who assumed the responsibility of advising the hon. minister to do the work on these terms and conditions. Did the local architect, Mr. Curry, advise that these prices should be paid to Messrs Brown & Love to do the work under these conditions without asking for bids from other reputable contractors in the city ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I explained on a previous occasion, reports received in the department showed that this building was really in a very dangerous state. The chief architect himself went to Toronto, discussed the whole matter, made this arrangement and took the responsibility of it, and I endorse what he did. I believe everything is proper and that the prices are reasonable.

Mr. CLARKE. Did he have any consultation with the local architect up there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any correspondence between the local architect and the chief architect ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the chief architect was on the ground himself.

Mr. CLARKE. From whom was the report received as to the critical condition of the building ? Was it from the local architect ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. The local architect reported that the building was in a critical condition, the chief architect went up, and between them they gave out a contract to have the work done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Without asking for bids to do the work from other contractors ?

North-west Territories—Court house, lock-up and police accommodation, &c., $1,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is this court house ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a general vote for the territories. The previous vote was $1,000 and it has been increased by $500. This is found necessary owing to the increased number of buildings, and these buildings, being of wood, the vote was not found sufficient to keep them in repair.

Dominion public buildings—renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation of the increase ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is only one explanation ; we are asking $1,000 more because of the increased number of buildings in the territories. The $4,000 previously voted was found to be insufficient. Our property is being destroyed owing to the fact of our not having money enough to look after it and repair it properly.

Macleod court house, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. minister what public building there is now at Macleod ? There is a public building of some nature but whether it is owned by the territories or the Dominion I do not know; yet, when I stop to think it must of necessity belong to the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is that there is no public building except the one under construction now; that is the new court house.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know whether Macleod is an incorporated town or not. I was only there once in my life. There is a brick building of fairly considerable size and I assume it must be a public building and a government building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know the building myself that the hon. gentleman refers to and it is a very good hall. It must belong to the municipality. The deputy informs me that we have no public building there except this one which is under construction. This building is under construction and under contract and this amount is to complete the contract.

Mr. BENNETT. If my recollection is right, Macleod was one of the first towns in the North-west Territory and it hardly seems conceivable that there have been no public buildings at that place for the transaction of public business outside of the buildings of the Mounted Police force. Can it be possible that in connection with the administration of justice there is no public building at Macleod ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They had a rented building previously.

Mr. BENNETT. Which building was it that was rented ? Was it the public hall ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a contract, I suppose for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the total amount expended, and what will be the entire cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount of the contract is $13,973, and printing and advertising, heating, furniture and fixtures, electric wiring, fencing, sidewalks, clerk of works and incidental expenses, bringing the total to $21,735. The chief architect informs me that this is quite sufficient to complete the whole building.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The contract has been let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the contract has been let to the lowest tenderer.

Red Deer—Court house, lock-up, &c., and land office, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the contract been made for this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract has not been let.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the site been purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site has been purchased for $830. One of the causes of delay was that there was some question as to whether it would be a wooden or a brick building, and there may be a further report as to whether the building will be of wood or of brick. The chief architect thinks that a suitable building can be put up for this amount.

Mr. CLANCY. One would come to the conclusion that there should be a considerable difference between the cost of a wooden building and the cost of a brick building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect informs me that on a rough estimate there would be a difference of $6,000 or $7,000. This estimate would be for a wooden building but if it were decided to be in the public interest to put up a brick building we would have to ask a further amount of $6,000 or $7,000.

Mr. CLANCY. This is practically voting an appropriation in blank Neither the minister or the chief architect appear to have decided whether they will put up a wooden or a brick building. Now when we are voting money in this way we should know as nearly as possible what the character of the building is to be and what it will cost. I do not think that the minister himself will contend that the principle upon which he asks this vote is a proper principle.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I said this estimate was made for a wooden building and the vote was for a wooden building, but there was a petition asking for a brick building. I told the hon. gentleman that a report had not been made on that, but if it were in the public interest to erect a brick building we would have to ask for a further vote. None of this money will be spent for a brick building without a further vote being asked and an explanation given.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand the minister to say that none of this money will be spent until he comes back to the House for a vote under the changed conditions.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think it would be right for me to ask a vote for a wooden building and then if we decided to put up a brick building which would cost a great deal more, to make that change without informing the House.

Mr. CLANCY. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman.

Yorkton court house and jail, $5,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this let by contract to the lowest tenderer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is under construction and it was let to the lowest tenderer at $8,760. The total cost is estimated at $14,529. There will be the heating to do and the furniture to put in and so on.

Mr. MORIN. I have already told the Minister of Public Works that the money of the people was not properly spent throughout the country and here is a case in point. You are asking a vote of $10,000 for a court house, lock-ups, &c., and land office at Red Deer; and $5,500 for a court house and jail at Yorkton. Now if you can afford to spend $10,000 to build a post office in a town like L'Assomption with a population of 1,605 and $10,000 in Thetford Mines, it would only seem reasonable that you should expend more money for these important public buildings in growing towns in the North-west Territories. There does not seem to be any system about the thing. The government does not seem to have any rule to guide it in these matters.

Dominion public buildings generally, $34,500.

Mr. FOWLER. What does this item apply to ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to cover miscellaneous items of expenditure, chiefly in the architect's office in connection with public buildings throughout the Dominion.

Mr. FOWLER. Does any portion of this vote go to the armoury at Sussex in the county of King's, N.B. ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the chief architect had occasion to do any work in connection with that building, or to send any person to inspect it, that expense will be paid out of this vote. This applies particularly to the head office staff of the chief architect. The subject my hon. friend refers to will come up under another vote.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the $5,000 which was voted last year been spent ? If not, how much of it has been spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year there was a supplementary vote of $2,000. The total amount expended was over $7,000. We thought we might manage next year with $5,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand that there was an over-expenditure of $2,000 last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A supplementary vote was taken to cover that amount. I cannot tell my hon. friend just what the amount of the expenditure for the present year is ; but a vote of $5,000 was taken, and I hope we shall be able to remain within that amount.

Mr. CLANCY. I am anxious to know the reason for the somewhat exceptional expenditure of last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There seems to have been an increased amount required for telegraph stations, &c.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite understand the reason for these different items : public buildings in Nova Scotia, public buildings in New Brunswick, public buildings in the maritime provinces, public buildings in Quebec, public buildings in Ontario, public buildings in Manitoba, public buildings in the North-west Territories, public buildings in British Columbia, and then public buildings generally. I suppose this arrangement is a relic of some old system ; but I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether he does think it a very business like way of bringing down the estimates. We might have half a dozen more items for public buildings in detail.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend seems to take the view I did myself when I came to look at these estimates. I suppose this arrangement was forced on the department by parliament wanting to know everything in detail. If one vote were taken, including all these items, there might be a feeling that some of the provinces did not receive the attention they were entitled to. That was perhaps the first reason for the system. There is also some advantage to the department in giving the items in detail. If the officials of the department were allowed to draw on a general vote, instead of being limited by these detailed votes, the expenditure might be thought excessive.

Mr. CLANCY. With regard to the item under consideration, the expenditure last year was $7,132.33. Out of this there was expended for stationery for the office $2,482.80. This does seem to me to be an extraordinary sum for stationery, and perhaps the hon. minister can give some explanation of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not having been long connected with the department, I am unable to say whether that item is excessive or not. However, on con-

sultation with the deputy minister, we think we can make the total for this year $5,000, instead of $7,000, and also for next year, for which this vote is asked. I may say that the stationery is all purchased through the government Stationery Department.

Mr. CLANCY. I can quite understand that the hon. gentleman, in the short time he has been in the department, may not have mastered all these details, but it seems to me that his deputy should be able to give him the reasons for this heavy expenditure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Over a thousand dollars seems a great deal for photographic supplies, and it seems a little strange that they should come under the head of public buildings generally.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These photographers are all in connection with public buildings.

Mr. FOWLER. Are you making a collection of the photographs of public buildings ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These photographs really save a great deal of expense and loss of time, as they save the copying of plans and also travelling expenses. The engineers and architects are photographers themselves and save the department the expense of sending photographers to do the work.

Mr. CLARKE. A local newspaper suggested, respecting the hon. gentleman's predecessor, that he was very active and ambitious and could do all the work of all the other departments, and the Toronto 'Globe' suggested that he thought his colleagues had nothing to do but sit in front of government buildings and have their photographs taken. Would there be any connection between that suggestion and this item ? We are certainly entitled to fuller information than we have had.

Salaries to resident clerk of works, $10,500.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the salary of Mr. McLean included in this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is for the resident permanent clerks. The gentleman my hon. friend refers to was only clerk of works while the work was going on, and he is paid out of a special vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the duties of these officers ? Are they permanent officers of the department stationed at different points ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are three in Quebec, three at Ottawa, two in Manitoba, two in British Columbia, one in New Brunswick, and none in Nova Scotia. My deputy informs me that in Nova Scotia the chief engineer there acts as clerk of works. These men are practically the representatives of the department in these various provinces. They look after the public buildings and report and are held responsible for the different expenditures thereon.

Mr. CLANCY. Are these men sent about from place to place ? I understand that there are local clerks employed as well where public works are being done. If these men are not architects, their position would seem to be merely ornamental.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These men act as agents for the department in the various provinces and besides there are local clerks of works who act as foremen and see that everything is done according to specifications, These men were appointed previous to this government taking office and no changes have been made, and my deputy informs me that they render valuable service. They are supposed to be practical men and well qualified for the positions they hold. As I have tried to explain, this does not refer to the clerks of works, foremen, or whatever you call them in charge of the works under construction. These are representatives of the department in the various provinces. I do not know that there has been any reason to find fault with the qualifications of these men.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister will see that I was not finding fault,but trying to gain information with respect to representatives of the Public Works Department who may be necessary, as the hon. gentleman states, in places a long distance from the capital, and who stand between the engineer acting for the department and the clerks of a works locally. I simply asked if they were architects, and, whether, if called upon to discharge the duties of architects, they would be able to do so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The officers referred to are not architects. Of course, you could not engage architects at the salaries paid to these men.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to know upon what principle these local men are appointed. Is a mason selected in the case of a building to be constructed of stone, a carpenter or master builder for wooden structure, and so on ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The policy of the department has been to take practical men. I myself favour, as far as possible, the appointment of architects. But there is no fixed rule. The clerk of works is recommended by the member for the riding. Practical men are appointed, who are supposed to be qualified, to see that the specifications of the architects on which the contracts are taken, are carried out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there a resident engineer in each province where these clerks are at work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are in the provinces several engineers in the different branches of the department, in addition to these men. The staff for which this vote is taken have duties altogether connected with building.

Public buildings generally—construction of armouries, $9,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps the hon. minister can tell me now whether any portion of this is being expended on the armoury at Sussex, and if so, how much, and for what purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I find details of expenditure during the current year, 1902-3, amounting to $2,276.17.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that expenditure up to the present time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, up to the 1st of January last.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the hon. minister kindly give me the details of that expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) can hardly expect the full details. If the hon. gentleman moves for a return, I will bring down all the details in the usual way.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. minister allow this item to stand until that information is given ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see any objection in allowing the item to stand.

Mr. FOWLER. I wish the opportunity to discuss this matter. There are some things in connection with it that ought to be brought to the attention of the department. If that had been done before perhaps these things might have been stopped.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not desire to prevent the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) from having every opportunity now or on a future occasion of discussing this matter. But he will see that the expenditure he wishes to discuss is only a small portion of this whole item. When I bring down the details, the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity, for the item can be passed with that understanding. Besides there will be, in the supplementary estimates, a special item for the Sussex armoury and the matter can be discusssed on that item.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not see why the item should not stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have tried to explain to my hon. friend—there are fourteen public buildings covered by the item we are now discussing ; hon. gentlemen on either side may wish information with regard to any of these matters and I am ready to give them all I can. It would be more convenient for the committee to give whatever information is required now and allow the item to pass. The hon. gentleman can reserve his right to discuss the matter on some other item of these estimates, or the item in the supplementary estimates will afford him an opportunity.

Mr. FOWLER. The only thing I desire is to bring to the attention of the department the condition of affairs in connection with the Sussex armoury.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I guarantee my hon. friend that he will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the hon. minister why the improvements in connection with the armoury in the public building in Brampton were not gone on with, as promised.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have consulted the deputy minister, who informs me that the matter referred to by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has not come to the attention of the Public Works Department. It may be an item in connection with the Militia Department, and perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) may be able to answer.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). I do not remember it.

Mr. BLAIN. I brought this matter up the year before last, and I will read what was then said for the benefit of the minister :

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand there is a proposal to fit up a room in a public building for the armoury.

Mr. BLAIN. Have tenders been asked for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a small work, and we shall not ask for tenders. I think it will cost about $1,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Will that be under the charge of the hon. gentleman's department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The request has been made to us.

So there must have been a request in the department for the expenditure of that money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is the expenditure asked for in connection with the public building there, or with the armoury ?

Mr. BLAIN. It is a joint building, partly a public building and partly an armoury.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That will come up under another item, I will try and get the information.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister lay on the Table for a general discussion of armouries hereafter, a return to the request

that was made to the department concerning the expenditure of that money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring that down on Monday.

Mr. FOWLER. Before this item passes, I want it distinctly understood that this return will be brought down containing this information, and that I may have an opportunity to discuss this question under any other item of the hon. gentleman's estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I promise to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of discussing it, after the report is brought down, on any other item in the estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister has mentioned that several armouries are under construction. Perhaps it would be well to tell us in a general way where they are, and the amounts expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give the names of all the places where the last vote has been expended, that is where the largest amounts have been paid. Small amounts under $100 are not referred to. Baddeck, N.S., $1,398; a small item for the Halifax drill hall; Middleton, N.S., $5,410; Sussex, N.B., $2,176; Woodstock, N.B., $780; Brockville, Ont., $3,150; a small amount for the Brantford armoury; St. Thomas, Ont., $496; Windsor, a small amount. Then there are new armouries; Kaslo, B.C., $3,504; Kamloops, $6,604; Nelson, $7,763; Revelstoke, $6,439, making a total of $37,126.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like the Minister of Public Works to give us some information as to the status of those clerks who seem to have permanent positions, but are not classified. The leader of the opposition asked a moment ago if they were permanent clerks. Now there are some cases where they seem to be in the outside service, and some of them are located in Ottawa, but they do not appear in the civil service list. We ought to know something of the positions they occupy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is right. I think under the Civil Service Act they are not recognized as permanent officials, but they are recognized as such in the departments. Most of them have held their positions for a long time. Not all of them are even appointed by Order in Council; but in the department they are considered as permanent, and some of them are responsible representatives of the department in the various provinces. It is in that sense that I used the words 'permanent employees'; but according to the Civil Service Act they would not come under that term.

Mr. CLANCY. It would be very convenient if these officials were classified in some manner so that we could know where to find them. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is following the course adopted by a preceding government, but that is no reason why it should be continued. The hon. gentleman will see how inconvenient it is to find in the Auditor General's report that sums are being paid to these officers, while we find no mention of them in the civil service list; there is no means of tracing them, no means of ascertaining what position they occupy. There should be some class in which we would be able to find all the persons who have permanent employment in the department, whether in the inside service or the outside service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will take a note of the observations of the hon. gentleman, and see in what way these employees may be classified. When the returns are brought down, I will be able to show hon. members who these employees are, when they were appointed, and what their salaries are.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the building used as an armoury at Orillia. In that town two companies have their headquarters, and I find on reference to a local newspaper there, that the building is of such a nature that they are not permitted to store rifles in it, and instead of these rifles being at Orillia, they are kept at the town of Barrie, a considerable distance away. The result is a lack of interest in these rifle companies in the town of Orillia, and I suppose that condition and that result will apply all over the country. I think some system should be adopted of constructing, perhaps, cheap buildings, but such as will serve the purpose in different towns, particularly in places such as Orillia where two companies have their headquarters. May I ask the minister to consider seriously the question of the erection in the town of Orillia of a building that would meet the requirements of the local militia, and one in which they might store all their arms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already had that matter under consideration. As I mentioned at a previous sitting of this House, I think it is a disgrace to the country that we have not better provision made for taking care of the rifles of the various companies. I am in favour of adopting a system of erecting a cheaper class of buildings at the various headquarters, buildings which would supply all the needs, and which would not cost a great deal. I think smaller buildings might be used, and yet be quite sufficient for the storing of rifles and other things.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps the hon. minister would permit me to read an article from a local newspaper of Orillia, which

will give him an idea of the condition of things there :

The new rifles were issued some time ago, but they are all stored away at Barrie and it seems they are going to stay there. The rifles will be very useful locked away in Barrie, and in the meantime the soldiers here can become expert shots with peashooters, which will be very useful in time of war. They will likely parade on May 24th with a lath and a butter knife tied on the end for a bayonet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the minister read an item for an armoury at Middleton. What is it to cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount spent is $5,501.74, and the total probable cost is estimated to be $8,400.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there any difficulty about the construction of the building, or the taking of it over ? There was some statement in the public press that a difficulty had arisen in regard to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not quite understand my hon. friend. Does he ask if there was some difficulty about taking it over ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). About taking it over—some difficulty, either about obtaining the land or taking over the building. Has there been any correspondence on the subject ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think, if my memory serves me rightly, the party we purchased the site from complained that he had not been paid, although the building had been erected. He was getting very angry, and wanted an increased price. The delay was in the Justice Department.

Mr. CLARKE. The man thought he was not getting justice.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter has now been put through, and it is all settled up satisfactorily. There was some delay in getting the papers to the stage when we could get a certificate from the Justice Department to issue the cheque for the land.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it a wooden or a brick building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A wooden building.

Mr. PORTER. I observe in the statement of expenditure read by the hon. Minister of Public Works of this sum of $37,126, that no portion of it has been set apart for the erection of an armoury at Belleville. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether it is the intention of the government to provide for that in the supplementary estimates ? I may, while referring to this subject, call the attention of the hon. minister to the fact, which, no doubt, has been represented to him, that within the last year it was found, upon inquiry, that the drill hall, or armoury, in Belleville, which had been in existence for a number of years and which had been occupied by the 15th battalion, had become unsafe, and in consequence of a promise made, the drill hall was demolished, torn down entirely, the battalion being led to believe that a new drill hall would be erected during the present year. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether any provision is being made for that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Porter) is somewhat mistaken in stating that I referred to the expenditure during the year. An application has been made to the department. It is quite impossible for me to say whether or not there will be anything in the supplementary estimates. Speaking for myself, personally, as I know there is a good battallion and a good militia spirit in the city of Belleville, I would be very glad if my colleagues and the House could see their way clear to granting an appropriation for the erection of a building at Belleville.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) was quite mistaken in saying that there was any condition in reference to the taking down of the old drill hall. There was no promise made. It was taken down because it was condemned by the architect as being unsafe, and it had to be taken down. The question of building a new drill hall is under consideration. I have no hesitation in saying, speaking from my point of view as Minister of Militia, that a new building should be erected, and I shall advise the hon. Minister of Public Works that as soon as it can be done, a new structure should be put up at Belleville.

Mr. TAYLOR. While the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) is in his place, I wish to draw his attention to the state of affairs that exists in Gananoque. We had a drill hall and armoury there, and it was taken down without being condemned. A new site was purchased, and we hoped to have had a drill hall and armoury erected on the new site. That was four or five years ago, but nothing has been done yet. A warehouse was rented to store the battery and arms in and they are stored in that building yet. I hope provision will be made in the supplementary estimates to carry out the promise that the government gave when they took down the old drill hall and purchased a site, and that a new building will be erected providing suitable accommodation for our battery and rifles so that the arms may be removed from the place in which they are now stored, because the warehouse is in the middle of a lumber yard and beside the railway track.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There was some communication made to me two or three years ago in regard to some assistance towards an armoury and drill hall in the eastern part of the county of Halifax. I think the sum suggested was a very trifling one indeed. There are some companies organized, or proposed to be organized, in that part of my constituency. I suppose there must be some 25,000 people east of Halifax. The place to which I refer particularly is the Musquodoboit valley. I think some consideration might be given to this request, if there is any necessity, which I believe there is, for a place to store the arms of the men who are in the service there. I suppose that this armoury at Middleton is intended for the whole county of Annapolis ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. For the 69th battalion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much of it is in Annapolis ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Part of it is in Annapolis and part in Lunenburg.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The population of Annapolis would be somewhat in excess of that of the district I have mentioned, but it would not be greatly in excess, and I observe that an expenditure of $8,000 is being made at Middleton. Middleton is only a small town of possibly a thousand population, I should think.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think about that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, the armoury is intended not for Middleton, but for the whole district. Looking at the claims of the district of Musquodoboit valley, I think they might justify the expenditure of a moderate sum of money. I do not know whether the hon. minister has any recollection of the claims which were made by some of the people in that village for assistance. I think he will find some correspondence in his department in regard to it, and I would invite him to give it his attention, because I think it is well to encourage this spirit in the country districts. I know that companies organized in the Musquodoboit valley would be composed of as good material as you could find in Canada.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not recollect having received any correspondence such as the hon. member for Halifax speaks of, nor am I aware that there is any military organization in the section unless it is connected, possibly, with the 78th regiment, which has its home partly in Truro and partly in Pictou counties. The city of Halifax has two battalions, the 63rd and 66th.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And the Halifax garrison artillery.

Mr. TAYLOR.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. These are all city corps. I will look into the matter now that it has been suggested to me, and certainly my desire is, so far as possible, to provide everywhere a home, or a suitable headquarters for the different organizations of the militia.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My recollection is that there was a small drill hall in Middle Musquodoboit, a number of years ago, which had fallen so much out of repair that it could not be used, and the claim which was made was that a small sum of money should be expended in putting it into such repair that it would be an encouragement for military organization in that district.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will look it up.

Mr. CLARKE. I was not present when the minister read the list of armouries on which it was proposed to spend this money and I did not hear how much he intended to expend in completing the armoury at Toronto. I see that the Minister of Militia and Defence is in his place and I am quite sure that with his co-operation there will be an item in the supplementary estimates to complete the Toronto armoury, if it is not provided for in this vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total of this vote is $9,000 and that would not go far in Toronto. There will be an item under which we can discuss the Toronto armoury.

Experimental farms—new buildings and renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What new buildings are you putting up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be a new horticultural building at Ottawa to cost $2,500; repairs, Nova Scotia farm, $600; new barn Brandon farm, $2,500; repairs to buildings, $500; Indian Head, repairs, $500; Agassiz, repairs, $400; Total, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This must be for an extension or addition to your present horticultural building at Ottawa. Where is the horticultural building on the experimental farm ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that I can describe where it is. It is one of the buildings on the farm. The hon. gentleman must have seen it.

Mr. SPROULE. You have a place for raising plants and flowers and I suppose this is an extension of that. You take a vote of $2,500 for a new barn at Brandon. I was looking at the buildings there last fall and I thought there was a fairly good building there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is undertaken at the request of

the Department of Agriculture as being urgently needed. The chief architect of the Public Works Department has no personal knowledge of the state of these buildings but in view of the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) I will make further inquiries.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not complaining of the expenditure if the buildings are needed and I presume they are. I sometimes thought that a more liberal expenditure should be made in the interest not only of the farmers but of the agriculturists throughout the country. I thought there was a fairly good building at Brandon when I saw it last fall.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall get the report of the Department of Agriculture and show it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the department to erect any new buildings on the Nappan farm.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have no request this year from the Minister of Agriculture for new buildings.

Mr. FOWLER. Are these repairs done by day's work or by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the repairs are done by day's work under the supervision of the clerk of works of the province.

Mr. SPROULE. You would not erect a new barn by day's work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A new building would be let by tender and contract.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any change in the policy of the department as to the method of constructing public buildings and doing public work generally ? The hon. gentleman's predecessor took the ground that very many buildings should be constructed by day's labour, and I would like to know whether that is the hon. minister's policy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the present time it is the policy of the department to let all public buildings to the lowest tender if it is satisfactory.

Ottawa public buildings, including repairs, ventilation and lighting, furniture, &c., $125,000.

Mr. BENNETT. As this is a large item, will the minister give us the details—the different amounts for the different purposes ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall be pleased to give the information as far as I have it. This covers general repairs and maintenance in connection with gas, power, lighting, heating, ventilation, closets and fire services. The buildings that have to be maintained are the parliament buildings, the eastern block, the western block, the Langevin block, the Supreme court, the geological museum, the printing bureau, the fisheries building, and the national art gallery. I suppose my hon. friend does not want the different amounts spent on the different buildings ?

Mr. BENNETT. I think the minister might state how much is for maintenance, how much for rents and how much for other services.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The information given to me is not subdivided in the way the hon. gentleman suggests. The work, as my hon. friend knows, is generally done by day's labour, by the staff employed under the architect and the engineer of the department. I can give him the amount expended for wages and the amount for materials.

Mr. BENNETT. It was more a question of rents.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rents come in the next item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is between $90,000 and $100,000 paid in wages, and about $35,000 for materials, which would include lumber, paints, oils, glass and some furniture. A good deal of the furniture is made in our own workshops by the carpenters and other mechanics. This item also includes the furniture purchased for the different departments.

Mr. FOWLER. What do you do with the furniture that is cast aside ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that, under the supervision of the present architect, they are making very good use of the old furniture, by making it into new furniture. The policy is of course to collect the old furniture and sell it by auction.

Mr. FOWLER. You do not buy the furniture ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We buy some. The repairs are largely done by our own men, and a good many tables and desks are made by the carpenters in the workshops.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that there has been some change in the system of lighting this chamber. Perhaps the minister will give us a statement as to the cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no cost for the change of light. As I stated yesterday, a request was made by the electric company to try the arc light instead of the incandescent. I gave them permission to make the test, and I would like to have the opinion of hon. members as to whether the change is more satisfactory or not. For one thing, the new light is very much more natural, more like daylight, than the other.

Mr. FOWLER. What change has been made in the system of ventilation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The architect says there is no change. It is the same system, but there is a different method of using the blower, the air being brought from the top.

Mr. FOWLER. What did that cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The cost was merely nominal, the work being done by the staff of the department.

Mr. FOWLER. Did it cost $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The architect informed me that the total expenditure for ventilation this year, for materials and wages, would be about $1,500. These little jobs are done by the workmen employed in the shops, and no separate account is kept of them.

Mr. CLARKE. How is it that the lighting of this chamber is sometimes so much better than at other times ? Sometimes, under the system you are experimenting with, we have a beautiful light, easy to the eyes and very natural, but at other times it is very dim. If we could keep it at the degree of excellence we have had it at times, it would be a great improvement on the lighting of last year and a very great improvement on previous years. Is the light on full now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, at present I can read very plainly. Of course, this new system is only in an experimental stage, and perhaps when the lamps are put in permanently it will be more satisfactory. But we will give it a little trial before adopting it. I think that the light is an improvement, and if perfected would be much appreciated by hon. members.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any uniformity in the purchase of these fittings and furniture ? If not, it is high time that some little economy should be practised and not allow every gentleman who wishes to purchase such articles to get whatever may best seem to suit his taste. Who makes the purchases of office furniture and fittings ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are made by the deputy minister and certified by the minister.

Mr. BENNETT. It will be well to look into some of these items. I find, on looking over the Auditor General's Report, that there are some fearful and wonderful expenditures. At page 126—V, the Census department saw fit to buy last session two medicine chests at a cost of $6 each. Why should the Census department require these medicine chests. If we are to have medicine chests for every department, we had better buy a job lot at once and get them cheap.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That item does not come under my department. I do not find any item of that kind under the heading of Public Works.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will look at V—126 in connection with the Census department he will find that Mr. Valiquette bought, among a variety of other things, two medicine chests at $6. But if that item is not in the hon. Minister's department, here is one that is. I find that $19.50 worth of gray hair was bought. Was gray hair bought because it was cheaper than red ? That will be found on page V—131.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That could hardly have been the Minister looking for gray hair.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to call the attention of the Minister to the expenditure of two of his colleagues. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) seems to be a mild mannered gentleman when disbursing the public moneys, for when he wants a desk for his department it only costs $40. But the Minister of Militia is extravagant in his tastes, for I find on V—129 that he purchased a desk—I presume it was for himself—which cost $155. I have out of my humble means bought a desk for myself and thought that an expenditure of $40 or $50 purchased a very fair desk. I have seen a $100 desk and thought it something to be envied. But I never saw a $155 desk. Perhaps the hon. Minister can describe the beauties of this article. But while the Minister of Militia has been extravagant, still greater extravagance has characterised another hon. Minister in the purchase of a desk, for I find that in this no less a sum than $165 for one. I know that the House will shudder when it hears who this extravagant minister was. It is no less a personage than the Minister of Labour and the Postmaster General. It is due to the House and the farmers of Ontario that he should explain how he possibly could have disbursed $165 of the people's money, drawn from the pockets of the farmers, to purchase a desk. Before the item passes, I would ask the Postmaster General to rise and give a realistic description of this desk that he purchased with the money of the people of Canada.

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Bazinet.

Bill (No. 54) respecting the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, and to change its name to the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Quebec, Saguenay, and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Edmonton Street Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Winnipeg Western Land Corporation, Limited.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 63) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—Mr. McGugan.

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Bruce.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Brockville and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Northwest Coal and Coke Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

OTTAWA VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SPROULE moved the second reading of Bill (No. 59) respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Monk.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I ask that this Bill be allowed to stand. It is not printed in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

Order allowed to stand.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Ottawa public buildings, including repairs, $125,000.

Mr. BENNETT. At page 131 V of the Auditor General's report, I find an item, 'Goldie & McCulloch safe with marble top, $185.57.' I have never yet had the pleasure of seeing a safe with a marble top. Will the hon. Minister of Public Works kindly tell us what is the necessity for a marble top on an ordinary safe, and if it added to the cost to any extent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the figures at hand giving the difference in cost between a safe with a marble top and a safe with an iron top. But the hon. gentleman having brought the item to my attention, I shall make inquiries among the officers of my department and will let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems that this recklessness of expenditure is to be found in every department of the government. The necessity of having a marble top on a safe, is something that never dawned on my mind until I saw this item. It seems to be about in keeping with the other expensive appointments of the department. This afternoon we had the expenditures on ordinary roller-top desks purchased by the departments. Some ministers, modest in their expenditures, will get a desk at $40 or $50, which, from experience I should think would be a very fine desk. But the Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden), according to the public accounts, made an investment of $155 for a desk, and, not to be outdone, the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) it would seem, had invested $165 in a desk. I assume that that was one of the roller-top style also. I assume it to be only fair to the House and the country, as hon. gentlemen opposite, when in opposition, preached from the house tops that expenditure should be rational and altogether on the same basis as incurred in one's private business, that the Postmaster General should rise in his place and, at least, give a description of the desk, for many hon. gentlemen, like myself, may not have an opportunity for a few years at least, of gazing on that wonderful piece of furniture.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I inquired of my deputy since we adjourned at six o'clock in reference to this article of furniture. He informs me that it is not merely a desk, but that it has certain post office additions to it. It is a structure partly a desk and yet it is not a desk, because in addition to being a desk it is fitted up with drawers, files, and pigeon-holes set apart for the different officers of the department, and also for the work connected with the various countries that Canada is in communication with on post office business. The work is classified in these various departments, the respective officers of the department have keys and access to this structure, each going to the portion of it that contains the work coming under his particular charge. It is rather an elaborate structure, but there is great economy of time on the part of the officers, because, instead of having an officer detailed to distribute the various papers and documents to each of the branches which require attention, the

papers are sorted and placed in these various compartments as in a post office and each officer has access to his compartment.

Mr. FOWLER. It is unfortunate that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence is not here so that we could have a little explanation as to this very expensive desk which was purchased for his department. Perhaps it will be found that it has a whole set of accoutrements attached. The desk of the hon. Postmaster General has a post office attachment, and, therefore, it would only be natural to suppose that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, who is a close second in the matter of expenditure with the Postmaster General, have a regimental attachment to his desk. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether it is necessary to have all these particular accoutrements.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman uses the word 'accoutrements.' I do not know whether he has reference to my colleague, the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, or not.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, I thought you might be able to give an explanation of the matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know nothing about the organization of the Militia Department. If the hon. gentleman's question has reference to my own department, I think I have given the reason why these divisions are supplied. It is for the same reason that you would have compartments, or boxes, in a post office. Instead of having to have officers in attendance to hand out the documents, the documents are classified in these compartments and the various officers are furnished with keys to them and have access to them. In economy of time and the proper despatch of business this is considered a very ingenious and suitable method.

Mr. BLAIN. Where was this desk made ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) where it was made. We give a requisition to the Public Works Department, and they supply what is asked for.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether, in consequence of this labour-saving machine, he has been able to dispense with any of the clerks in the Post Office Department. He has paid a very extensive price for this desk. Of course, if he has been able to save in the matter of the services of clerks and thereby reduce the amount paid in salaries, he might have some justification for purchasing this expensive piece of furniture.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think my hon. friend is serious in presenting a question of that kind.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that the desk was made by the Harris, Campbell & Boyden Furniture Company. Is that a Canadian company ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the name of an Ottawa firm.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to suggest that the sums paid for these desks would appear to be a little high, although they may be good value for the money, the hon. Postmaster General knows that he has under his charge postmasters, especially village postmasters, who complain that their salaries are remarkably low. I would also like to remind the hon. Postmaster General, who is something of a farmer himself, that if he goes into the county of Grey, or into the northern portion of York, the farmers will think that what is paid for a desk would make a fair payment on a farm. They would think this a little expensive.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have made some inquiries in regard to the purchase of this article of furniture. It is only fair to say to the committee that the item as recorded in the Auditor General's report is somewhat misleading. What is described as a desk, is practically an office for the deputy postmaster general. I dare say the other desk in the Militia Department was for the deputy minister and for the better accommodation of the department in doing its business. This is not a desk, as we understand it—one of those roller-top desks. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said that we may have got good value. I think if hon. gentlemen saw the desk of the deputy postmaster general, they would say that it was a great convenience and facilitates very much the business of the department. Considering the size of the various compartments, and the convenience provided for the holding of papers and the saving of time, I think it will be found a very valuable improvement in the equipment of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say, while this item was under consideration, that I have noticed several rooms around this House for the use of members, which seem to be rather luxuriously furnished. They have fine roll-top desks and everything convenient and comfortable, while in other rooms occupied by other members, there are few, if any, conveniences at all. I happen to occupy a portion of a room in which there are six or seven of us. There are three tables that would cost, perhaps, $2.25 apiece, there is not a place to lock up anything except within the drawers of the tables and the room is even without shelving of any kind. There are only three electric lamps for seven members and two or three chairs. I have applied to Mr. Speaker—I am sorry that he is not here to-night, because I am informed that he is responsible for this condition of affairs—for some additional fur-

niture, and he says that the parsimonious economy insisted on by this government is such that he cannot afford to give me any more furniture.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. An economical government.

Mr. SPROULE. Noticing the very handsome outfits which ministers have in their departments and in some of the rooms about this House—and I am not saying it by way of grumbling—I think we might fare a little better nevertheless if we do belong to the opposition. I asked Mr. Speaker if he could furnish a little cupboard or anything where we could put papers away.

Mr. COWAN. You want an ice box.

Mr. SPROULE. What is tickling the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) now.

Mr. COWAN. You ought to have an ice box.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt whatever that my hon. friend will profit very much by his advice if he will take it to himself, so that he will keep himself moderately under control. I think this is hardly fair. It does seem to me that when we are here to do the country's business we ought to have some more conveniences for doing it in our rooms than we have.

Mr. COWAN. You will be there for a long time. You ought to have more accommodation.

Mr. SPROULE. That is an argument in my favour. I am drawing the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to this matter because his predecessor was always very good to us. I know that when we applied to him for anything he always tried to meet our views, and I know his liberal and generous successor is quite equal to the late minister. I hope he will take note of this and that he will profit by this discussion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I really think the accommodation provided for hon. members of this House is small enough. The members ought to be entitled to such furniture and lamps as the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) has referred to so that they can do their work with some comfort. I know it is a great advantage for a gentleman having to attend to correspondence and other business to have a desk which he can lock up and find his papers in order when he returns. If an application were made for furniture, such as the hon. member referred to, I feel satisfied that the House would be very willing that it should be granted by the department. I quite agree with what the hon. member says as to the desirability of having these conveniences for hon. members. Only one or two hon. members have come to me and I have only been too glad to supply their wants in that direction. There is, of course, a limit. The amount of the vote is based upon a fixed expenditure, but there is always a margin for the purpose of supplying these conveniences each year. I shall be glad to give every application I receive the consideration it deserves, and so far as I can, help to increase the comfort and convenience of the members.

Mr. BELL. What is done with this furniture which must be accumulating in large quantities in the different buildings ? Every year there seems to be extensive purchases, and still the members of the opposition find it impossible to get anything more than a plain table, in fact they cannot get a cabinet or a desk. I suppose there must be occasionally a cleaning out of these departments; what is done with this old furniture after the purchase of new furniture ? Is it sold at auction ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The great bulk of this new furniture has been bought for the new buildings, new rooms that have been made during the last two or three sessions. There was no old furniture to store away. The business in the different departments has increased so much that we have to rent buildings outside, and some of the furniture has been used in them. As I stated before six o'clock, in case of a room that was refurnished, if there was an old table, or desk, or anything of that kind past usage, it was sold by auction. Latterly, as I explained, the man in charge of the carpenters has been taking some of the old furinture to the workshop and having it made over by the workmen under his charge. Any that is of no use is sold by auction. But these new purchases that are made, most of them, are to furnish some half a dozen new rooms that were opened during the last recess.

Mr. BENNETT. On referring to the Auditor General's Report of last year I find a startling state of affairs revealed. If the general public of this country were aware of it they would be filled with amazement when they are told that it costs every day of the year, on the average $300 for looking after these buildings. Referring to page V—120 I find that there was spent last year for labourers and carpenters about these buildings, $60,536. Turning to the next page I find that there was paid out for a staff to oversee these men, no less a sum than $8,220. Further down there is a so-called mechanical staff costing $20,410. It is a startling fact that it costs $100,000 a year for the maintenance of these buildings. I have not the figures of a few years ago, but I cannot believe they ever ran up to such immense amounts as this. It is about time that the pruning knife should be applied. As to furniture it must be plain to any man who knows anything about it that it must be a most extravagant desk that costs $165. You go on through this expendi-

ture and what is revealed ? Chairs costing $12 or $13 a piece. I suppose it is the old story of having a good time for the first time in your life. That seems to be the rule followed throughout these departments. Every page of this Auditor General's Report shows that there is a most reckless and extravagant expenditure in every department of the government. This expenditure ill becomes gentlemen who for years made the burden of their song some little trumpery, trivial, petty expenditure that a decent man would have been ashamed to mention.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any portion of this money being spent to fit up offices outside of the main building ? I understand there are several buildings in Ottawa rented for the use of the government; is this money being used to fit up those buildings as well ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When a building is rented and furniture has to be procured for the staff, the Public Works Department is called on to furnish the necessary furniture for these rooms out of this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. What proportion of this was used for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $35,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Was any portion of it used for the census staff ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would include repairs done by our own staff ?

Mr. FOWLER. On page V—131 I see an entry : 'W. C. Edwards Company, Limited, black walnut back for book case, $50.' Would the minister tell us what the front of that book case cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister informs me that he thinks that must be a misprint. It probably means a black walnut book case.

Mr. BELL. How are these supplies procured ? Are they bought from time to time on an order from the department, or is there an effort made to procure them all at once by asking for tenders for the articles required ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In some cases when there are a number of articles to be bought, tenders are asked for them, but as a rule they are bought by the architect's branch from the different manufacturers and dealers as the case may be.

Mr. BELL. Are prices asked for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. There seems to be a great number of desks and office chairs bought for the different departments. There is an account here for decanters and tumblers, and absorbent cotton even, which some years ago would have been made a text for a sermon by our friends opposite.

Mr. SPROULE. Since they have opened up the bar in the restaurant, and now that the temperance question has died out, and the referendum has been defeated, we must expect them to furnish the bar. We were exempt from those items for some years, but I suppose we must look for them in future.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That must have been a mistake ; it must have been for a water bottle.

Mr. BENNETT. At page B—135, of the Auditor General's Report, there is an item for a 'pair of crutches with iron tips.' What member of the cabinet got the crutches ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One of the carpenters was seriously injured, and the department thought it only fair to do something for him, and among other things he was supplied with crutches.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister promised us before dinner that he would explain that item for '$19.50 worth of gray hair.' Has the minister had any light upon it since the dinner hour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will have to take my word that the gray hair was not for the Minister of Public Works, but for some of the other members of the cabinet.

Mr. BENNETT. I will accept the explanation that it was for some of the bald-headed members.

Mr. CLARE. From year to year we have very extensive expenditure noted here for desks and office furniture, and stationery, and so on. I do not wish to say that there are any of these desks missing, but there should be some system of keeping track of all the materials which the departments buy. Is stock taken annually of the furniture and such matters in possession of the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The system is to keep a regular list of everything that is purchased from time to time, and if anything is disposed of, which is not very often, that is entered.

Mr. CLARE. Is there any system by which the government take stock annually of the goods which they have on hand ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think it has been the custom to take stock annually, but the books would show for a number of years, when an article was purchased, from whom it was purchased, and so on.

Mr. CLARE. An enormous quantity of these things has been purchased for the

last five years, and there should be some system of tracing these articles and knowing whether they are on hand or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are constantly furnishing new buildings on account of the increasing business of the country. There may occasionally be an item for replacing furniture which has worn out, but the great majority of these articles were purchased to supply new offices to accommodate the increasing staff which is necessary to carry on the increasing business of the country.

Mr. BROCK. The business of the country is certainly growing at an enormous rate, and naturally you have to extend your buildings and you have to furnish them. Instead of having a few thousand dollars for this expenditure, as we had some years ago, we have now a few hundred thousand of expenditure. In view of this, it is not out of place to say that you should have some way of taking stock of the quantity of furniture and the enormous amount of stationery that you must have on hand. Thousands and thousands of dollars worth of stationery are used every year. An ordinary merchant would keep an account, not only of his stock in trade, but of his furniture and other assets as well, and why should not the government conduct its business in the same way ? It might give some trouble, but it would be a safeguard for the public, and it would be consoling for honest employees to know that they had the same furniture in their offices at the end of the year that they had at the beginning. The minister would do well to start a set of books which would show what furniture and what stationery is on hand. I do not know where all those beautiful fancy goods come from that are distributed among the members every year. I think perhaps that is an item that might be very well dispensed with. I do not like to find fault with it, because having taken them and kept them, I am possibly not in a position to do so, but there must be a great many thousand dollars expended in that way every year, and I think we might dispense with that. Under these circumstances, I think it would be well to keep stock of the quantity bought, the quantity disposed of, and the quantity on hand at the end of the year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend's suggestion is quite proper, but I believe that each department has an officer for the special purpose of keeping track of the stationery. I know that in my department I could not get a lead pencil myself without applying to the officer in charge of the stationery. Honourable members will admit that one could not make an estimate of what it might cost to maintain and equip and keep in proper order the buildings which we have in Ottawa. I think it is a fair criticism, however, to say that we should see that we get value for what is expended; and if any purchases are not proper or the prices paid are not fair, I would be only too pleased to have them brought to my attention at any time. I have not had sufficient experience to say whether the system is as perfect as it might be; but I may say that there is nothing particularly extraordinary in this vote, because I find, on looking over the totals for many years back, particularly to 1879, that a great deal more had been voted in previous years than we have at the present time. But I will look into the matter and endeavour to see that proper books are kept, so that we may keep track of the purchases and avoid waste—so that we may see that only purchases are made of such articles as are required, and that we get value for the money expended. The cheapest article, as my hon. friend knows, is not always the most economical for a permanent institution, and due regard should be had for the service got out of it.

Mr. BROCK. Does the government insure all the furniture it has, or take the risk itself ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None of the departments carry any insurance at all. The government carries its own insurance in all the departments, except in case of some special contract; but after the contract is delivered, we carry our own insurance.

Mr. BROCK. If you carry insurance, you would have to keep stock, otherwise in the event of fire you would have no way of establishing your claim.

Mr. FOWLER. As the Minister of Militia and Defence is now here, perhaps he will give us an explanation of this very expensive desk which he has purchased.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not had an opportunity of looking up the matter, and was not aware of having purchased a desk of this kind. I have no doubt a requisition was made to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works for a desk, and he probably thought that the importance of the Militia department and the excellent work that has been done there justified the purchase of a desk in accordance with the importance of the department. This is the first intimation I have had of what that desk really cost. I am not able to give a very full description of it. It is a desk and table combined, a very handsome piece of furniture, and I shall be very glad to have any of my friends on the opposite side of the House, or any others, call and see me there, and I will show them the desk. That is the only explanation I can give at the present moment.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems that we are to judge of the importance of a department

by the gorgeousness of its furniture. According to that standard the department of Agriculture is a very mean department, because the desk of the chief officer there only cost $35 or $40. If the Minister of Agriculture were back from the east, it seems to me he would not be pleased with the explanation the Minister of Militia and Defence has given as to why his desk is so much more expensive and gorgeous than that of the Minister of Agriculture. I suppose it was not on account of the honours which have been showered on the Postmaster General and the Minister of Militia and Defence lately that they had to tone up their departments.

An hon. MEMBER. They had to oil up.

Mr. FOWLER. I am glad, however, that we have had some sort of explanation from the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. BENNETT. I notice that the Secretary of State also seems to be indulging in luxurious appointments, because when he dangles his feet on the floor, they rest on a rug that cost $45. May I ask if the Secretary of State has shown a disposition lately to indulge in other extravagances, by making further requisitions ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not had any requisitions lately from the Secretary of State. I think he must be supplied now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the real necessity for spending such an enormous amount on labourers ? $90,000 seems to me a great deal of money to spend on labour in connection with repairs and maintenance.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, the number of buildings that have to be taken care of is pretty large. They are the Senate, the House of Commons, the Governor General's Secretary's office, the Privy Council, the Department of Justice, the Auditor General's office, the Department of Finance, the Secretary of State's Department, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Indian Affairs, the Department of Militia and Defence, the Department of Customs, the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Department of Inland Revenue, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Railways and Canals, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Postmaster General, the Library of Parliament, the Supreme and Exchequer Courts. It is a pretty extensive institution to look after. I am not prepared to say that there are not more men employed than are really necessary. We keep a certain number employed from year to year, and at certain times we engage temporary help. The officers in charge of these men are all under the jurisdiction of the chief architect, in whom we all have a great deal of confidence, and I am sure that if he were aware that more men were employed than were necessary to attend to the work, he would report the fact to the department.

Mr. SPROULE. How many men are employed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is in the neighbourhood of one hundred all the time in the employ of the department at Ottawa.

Mr. SPROULE. What is being done about lighting ? I have noticed that occasionally this session the lighting is very bad.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I explained before recess, the electric company asked for the privilege of making a trial of the arc light instead of the incandescent, and we have allowed it to do so. It is not going to cost the country anything. We have drawn the attention of the company to the fact that the lighting is not regular, but it has been very good the last few days. It is merely an experiment, and the great majority of the members think it an improvement.

Mr. SPROULE. What do the electric lights in the buildings cost ? Some years ago we went into that question at considerable length, but the plant then had not been installed, and we could not get definite information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two dollars per light of sixteen-candle power per annum.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a very high price for a number of lights. In many of our country villages, we pay very little more, and of course, use fewer lights.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have an inquiry made into the matter and see if we cannot make some reduction. The average price I find is about $4, but we have a contract for a number of lights at $2.

Mr. SPROULE. You can get lights at $3. In our village we only pay $2.25.

Mr. FRASER. In the town I come from it is not that cheap. It costs about $50 a year for eight lights.

Mr. BUREAU. It costs $3.75 per light per year at Three Rivers, where there is abundant water power.

Mr. SPROULE. They are sold right in our place at $25 per year for eleven lights of sixteen-candle power each. In some places the charge is even lower, and a portion of the time the electricity is supplied by steam. Throughout our part of the country, I could count up many towns where the charge is below $3.

Mr. PARMELEE. For a continuous light?

Mr. SPROULE. Not all night. Only until 12 o'clock, and then on again at 5.30 a.m., but we are offered an all night service for the same price by another company.

Mr. FRASER. Usually in small towns they pay by measure.

Mr. SPROULE. We pay a flat rate per light, and there is no meter at all. Will the hon. minister be good enough to tell us what he is doing about improving the ventillation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The ventilation will cost something like $1,500. There is no change in the system, but we have added some apparatus for pumping in fresh air, which I think is an improvement.

Mr. SPROULE. In some places about this building, you occasionally use gas as well as electricity. Is it the same company that supplies both ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, separate companies.

Rents—Dominion public buildings, $33,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this cover all the outside rents ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $44,500 is the total amount for leased buildings. I think that out of that item the city of Ottawa is paying something over $30,000. Glancing the items over, I am pretty well satisfied that it runs over $30,000 in Ottawa. I shall have to ask a sum in the supplementary estimates. This is $33,500, but the total in the departments is $44,500.

Mr. CLARKE. Some announcement was made a short time ago of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite as to the erection of another public building in Ottawa. It would be a good move to procure the necessary land and put up a decent building. The government would save money, instead of paying this enormous sum in rents every year. Has the hon. minister any statement to make as to the erection of a new departmental building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not at the present time. But I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke). Not only would we save money by putting up a new public building, but we should have far better facilities for conducting the public business than at present. Of course, I have been in the department only a short time and have had a good deal to do. But before the session is over, I hope that, with the assistance of the officials I may be able to prepare something to propose to the House to remedy the difficulty we are now labouring under.

Mr. CLARE. I hope the Minister of Public Works will carry out this resolution and lay before the House a plan for a new building. Every year for the last three years when this matter has come up we have had the same answer—that the matter would be taken into consideration. I find that, in looking over this list, for instance, that the building used by the census commissioner and his staff was to cost a rental of $3,000, according to the statement of the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). A few days later, in bringing down his estimates, by some mysterious process, the rent had doubled, and was $6,000 instead of $3,000. The then Minister of Public Works called down his deputy minister for not having corrected his first statement. In looking over the expenditure, I find that this item has again increased and is $6,500, instead of $6,000. I notice other peculiarities about these rentals. For instance, here is an item for $2,000 paid to the Misses Thistle for two years rental. I cannot understand why rent for two years should appear in this account. In several instances this crops up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was the rental of a building that was rented as a matter of urgency by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BENNETT. Referring to the building used by the census department, may I ask the Minister of Public Works, in view of the fact that the department are not only paying $6,500 a year, but that last year they spent upwards of $10,000 in improving the building, is that $10,000 to be deducted from the rent or has any agreement been made under which that amount is to be paid back partly or altogether ? It seems almost incredible that the government while paying this enormous rent—for it is an enormous rent, for capitalized it amounts to $130,000—should expend about $10,000 in repairs and improvements.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Under the arrangement that has been made, improvements made by the department are not allowed for.

Mr. BENNETT. Can the hon. minister tell us how much longer they are going to use the building—how many years before the term for the lease will expire ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that the lease is terminable at the option of the department at the end of any year.

Mr. BENNETT. And, on the other hand at the option of the landlord also ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister informs me that he would have to bring down the lease to be sure of its terms. But it is terminable at the end of the year at the option of the department.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems strange that the department should conduct matters on

this basis. In the first place an enormous rent is paid, and then $9,000 or more is spent in repairs. If I understand the items, and I think I do, the department have actually installed a system of hot water or steam heating—which is it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A system of hot water heating.

Mr. BENNETT. Can the minister tell us whether it is intended to make any more expenditures on this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no intention of making any changes or improvements in this building. If repairs are needed during our occupancy of the building we are liable for them.

Mr. BENNETT. Were any repairs put on the Thistle building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. LENNOX. Why was the rent increased from $6,000 to $6,500 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that $6,500 is the amount of the rental under the lease.

Mr. CLARE. When this hot water system was put into the building, were there any arrangements made that at the end of the government's term of occupancy that system could be taken out again ? Surely it is not intended to present these people with a system of hot water heating in addition to this large amount of rent. I cannot imagine such an arrangement being made in a business matter. Some arrangement should have been made for taking out this hot water system. Second hand radiators are as good as new. If the system was to be put in, arrangements should have been made to allow of its being taken out again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was no arrangement on the subject. The building had been occupied for a good many years and the system of heating, I understand, was suitable for the occupants of that time. The building was rented by the Department of Agriculture and fitted up by the Department of Public Works for the purpose for which it is used. But the heating was not satisfactory. Many of the rooms had not any heat at all. So, the department put in a new system of heating.

Mr. CLARE. I can well understand that, when men were working in these rooms the rooms had to be properly heated. There is no objection to that. But there should have been an arrangement that the government could take out the system when they left.

Mr. BARKER. Was it any part of the terms of the lease that the government should spend $9,000 in improving the property ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the terms of the lease provided that the government had to make any changes or improvements they required for their own purposes.

Mr. CLARE. And though not obliged under the terms of the lease the government have spent $9,000 in improving the property.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, they simply did this because they found it necessary in order to make the place suitable for the staff to work in.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How long will these buildings be required for the purposes of the census ? Is it expected that the census will be completed before the next one is taken ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall have to get the information from my hon. friend, I could not give it off hand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this building used exclusively for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So I understand. I have never had the pleasure of being in it.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand it is not the intention of the minister to renew the heating apparatus for this building. How about the furniture ? Will they leave the furniture in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The furniture comes under a different head. We will move that out, of course.

Mr. LENNOX. It would be interesting to know if the interest of the country has been preserved in another way. In the new Ontario Act there is a provision concerning landlords and tenants that if the lease is drawn in a certain way the tenant can, at the end of the term, remove all the fixtures. Perhaps the minister could inform us if there is a clause in the lease which will enable them to remove those fixtures at the end of the term ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not got the lease here, but I have not the slightest doubt that the interest of the public has been safeguarded in that direction.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister have the lease brought down ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have a copy brought down.

Mr. FOWLER. The other day we had a statement of the cost of the census up to date. Would the minister tell us if, in that statement, are included the rents that are paid for these outside buildings that are used exclusively for census purposes ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are not included in the cost. The

rents are paid by the Public Works Department out of this appropriation, and would not be included in the expenditure of the other department of the census.

Mr. FOWLER. How much rent has been paid up to date for the use of these buildings for census purposes exclusively ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During the three years that this building has been used for census purposes, the rent would now be about $19,500. That is the one building that we pay rent for which is used for the census.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that charged up to the item for taking the census ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it would not be included in that.

Rideau Hall, including grounds, renewals, improvements, furniture and maintenance, $17,000.

Mr. WILSON. I am glad to see the Postmaster General in his place, because in 1895 or 1896, I think, he made a very strong speech about the extravagance of the government at Rideau Hall.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Get the speech and read it.

Mr. WILSON. I have read it, it is a very good speech, and it would have been very much in the interest of the country if this government had lived up to the sentiments of that speech. If they had torn down the old building and built a new one, it would have been in the interest of the country, because the buildings are not very ornamental, and I should judge are not nearly as comfortable as they ought to be for the money expended on them. I have been looking over the expenditure under this head for the last three or four years, and it has been almost enough every year to build a decent building. In 1899 we spent on that building in the way of furniture, additions, repairs, &c., $29,736 ; in 1900, $24,991 ; in 1901, $31,249.11 ; in 1902, $14,012. I see in the estimates for the coming year, $28,000. Now I think in one of these years they built a new addition to the hall at an expenditure of about $40,000. I think this is a very lavish expenditure, and something ought to be done to stop it. My hon. friend when in opposition took very strong ground against this expenditure. I believe he was acting Minister of Public Works during the absence of the late minister in the old country, and he was in charge when there was a very large expenditure. Had the hon. gentleman began when in office to carry out the principles he laid down when in opposition it would have been better for the country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend is confounding my views with his own. I do not think he will find that I ever discussed the expenditures at Rideau Hall. I did discuss a feature connected with the Governor General, but I did not, so far as my recollection goes, discuss the internal economy of that house. He suggests that the expenditure on Rideau Hall was especially high during the time I was acting minister. I was acting minister for a few months in 1900, and during that time it was my duty to carry out certain works, not originating during my temporary occupancy of the office, although I share the full responsibility for them. Those works consisted, among other things, of the thorough underdraining of the building. The hon. gentleman will be surprised to know that the drainage of Rideau Hall was so defective that the water lodged to the extent of several inches, and sometimes a foot, in the cellar, and it is a wonder that many lives were not lost. It became necessary to construct drains, much of them through rock, which made the cost very high. I saw myself the condition of affairs in the basement at Rideau Hall, and I am sure my hon. friend would have been one of the first to say that such a condition should not be allowed to continue. I presume, like others, he occasionally shares in the advantages that that institution affords. But when he presses us to be economical, I would refer him to his colleague the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)—I was going to say the minister ; I hope some day he will be minister. It is only a few moments ago that that gentleman was complaining of our economy. He wanted us to spend more money.

Mr. WILSON. I was surprised at that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was surprised too ; nevertheless he shows that he is becoming more enlarged in his views, and I would commend his example to my hon. friend.

Mr. WILSON. I will undertake to furnish the speech made by the Postmaster General if this item is allowed to stand. I had occasion at one time in this House to quote extensively from it. I have a vivid recollection of the criticisms that he offered on that occasion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think I discussed Rideau Hall, but I have discussed the classes of expenditure the hon. gentleman is now discussing. I have explained that during my temporary occupancy of the department there was a large expenditure for drainage, and an additional building, which became necessary. If the hon. gentleman were to visit it, he would see the need of it, and the need of furnishing it. The late ex-Minister of Finance was familiar with all the circumstances connected with the furnishing and the expenditure, and he did not see anything in it to take exception to. He asked a question or two across the floor of the House, and when he learned how the expenditure

was carried out, without so expressing himself, by his dropping the subject, he satisfied me that he was perfectly content with the expenditure.

Mr. WILSON. How does the hon. gentleman explain the next year? If they left Rideau Hall in such a good condition for $24,000 or $25,000 a year, why was it that the very next year there was over $31,000 spent on it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was not there then.

Mr. WILSON. No man can evade the responsibility of the government if he is a member of it. The expenditure was cut down next year to $14,000, but this year it has gone up to $28,000. My recollection is that the hon. Postmaster General did not only criticise the expenditure of Rideau Hall, but he also criticised the number of cabinet ministers and he also objected to the Governor General's salary. He made a comparison between the cost of the government in the United States and of our government in Canada showing that they had only eight ministers while we had fourteen. We have not heard him saying anything in that direction since he and his party took office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is a growing time.

Mr. WILSON. Yes, it is a growing time and I say that these hon. gentlemen are benefiting by the growing time, but that does not excuse them for having failed to carry out what they advocated while in opposition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know whether I have any sins to answer for, that were committed while I was in opposition. I had the same views then that I have now. There is a certain class of criticism that is legitimate, and it perhaps matters very little to the public who have to pay the bills what any hon. member has said either on the opposition or on the government side as to the actual facts of the money expended. What I want to draw the attention of the Committee to is that I have been looking into this matter a great deal and have gone back fifteen or twenty years. I find that for some reason the department has not been quite frank in regard to the expenditure on Rideau Hall. So far as I can find out it costs the country about $25,000 a year to maintain Rideau Hall and that from time to to time smaller estimates have been brought in than were required with the result that accounts have been running over and debts have been accumulated. I think that parliament and the people are entitled to know what the actual cost of maintaining and furnishing this place is. I do not, as a minister, wish to come here and submit an estimate pretending to maintain Rideau Hall for less than it is possible to do it. If, on carefully looking into the matter with the officials of the department, I think any saving can be made I am quite willing to try and make it. I am quite willing that any hon. member on either side of the House should point out the fact if he thinks that any undue or unnecesary expenditure has been made in this connection. As I have just taken charge of the department, I thought that I should come frankly to the Committee and tell them what it has cost the country for a great many years to maintain this place. It is my intention to ask the Committee for an additional expenditure to clean up the back debts that exist and I say it frankly to the Committee that the maintenance of Rideau Hall will cost about $25,000 per annum.

Mr. CLARKE. What has been expended on an average for 20 years on this ramshackle place?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $25,000.

Mr. CLARKE. $25,000 will pay the interest on three-quarters of a milion dollars at 3 per cent. Surely it would be better to put up a building for $250,000 and stop this leak.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You would have to maintain a larger building at greater expense.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This of course includes the cost of the maintenance of the grounds. It is not all for additions or improvements.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is $8,000 for heating.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not for heating.

Mr. CLARKE. A modern building would save half of that on the heating alone.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There would be $3,000 for the maintenance of the grounds. I do not think they are kept up extravagantly in comparison with private grounds even in Canada and certainly not in comparison with public grounds in other countries. The grounds could not be kept in the state in which they are for much less than $3,000 a year. Hon. gentlemen in this House know from their own experience that much smaller grounds cost a great deal of money to maintain them properly. Unless there are other items in which some saving can be made I want the Committee and the country to know that it takes the sum I have mentioned to maintain Rideau Hall and it has taken that for a great many years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we are all agreed that Rideau Hall should be kept up in an efficient state or rather in such a state as will be creditable to the country as a whole. What my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has suggested is a

subject that was passing through my own mind. The expenditures on additions and improvements and repairs to this building during the past twenty years must have aggregated an enormous amount. Is it not a fair question for the hon. Minister of Public Works to ask himself whether it would not be in the interest of the country to tear that building down and erect another that would not require so much money to maintain. It seems that $8,000 a year for lighting and heating a building of that kind is absolutely absurd. In my limited experience of such things I should consider it altogether out of the question, although I do not doubt it has been expended, and is necessary to be expended in the present condition of the building. If you have spent $100,000 in additions and improvements in the last ten or fifteen years, and I dare say you have expended that sum, that sum itself would put a good modern building which would not be so expensive to maintain as this one. I do not believe very much in this policy of patching up an old building and adding to it from time to time, and in the end having still an old building difficult and expensive to maintain.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to refresh the hon. Postmaster General's memory as to the statements he made in 1895—

> These sums are quite beyond the resources of the people of Canada. We have disbursed annually during 25 years an average of $21,785. and in addition $4,754 for furniture for Rideau Hall.

Perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell us how the resources of the people of Canada will stand an annual expenditure of over $30,000 which he will stand up and defend to-night while condemning a smaller expenditure under the administration of the Liberal-Conservative party in 1895.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has read the answer in the light of the circumstances under which I made the observation. He says that in 1895 I expressed the opinion that $21,785 and $4,754 was too much for the then resources of Canada. I was speaking in 1895. We are now in the year 1903. Canada is a different country under a Liberal government from what it was in 1895.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad that my views are concurred in by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CLARKE. The patches on the farmer's trousers are as bright to-day as they were then.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this the policy that the hon. gentleman advocates that when the revenue of the country is larger the government propose expending more on furniture and other things at Rideau Hall ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman had better make his own speech.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like the hon. gentleman to give us an explanation how it was that he condemned in this House an annual expenditure of $25,000 when the Liberal-Conservative party was in office while now he stands up and defends an expenditure of more than $30,000 per annum for the same purpose.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I should think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) is an observer of the times and if he is he can supply the answer to himself. The condition of the country in these days was very different from what it is now. We then had an unprogressive party in power; they paralyzed the trade of the country and it was necessary to be economic at every point, even to the extent of hampering the public service. With the limited revenue of the country at that time you were plunging into debt—do you want me to make a campaign speech and explain it all to you. You know the state of the country and of its finances in those days and you know the state of the country and of its finances to-day. We can now afford to manage our affairs more in harmony with the requirements than we could then, and as long as the present administration is in office and its policy produces such happy results the country will be in a position to deal in a more progressive spirit all along the line.

Mr. CLARKE. The letter carriers will come in then.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The letter carriers and all classes will benefit. During my regime it has been a great pleasure to me to improve the status of the letter carriers over what it was when my friends opposite were in power.

Mr. BENNETT. It is refreshing to hear the Postmaster General talk about the condition of the country in view of the fact that in his own department they will sell you a postage stamp that you cannot use in the ordinary postage business. What did his department do to inflate his revenue. Some time ago they sold the jubilee stamps to a denomination as high as $10, and if to-day you take one of these $10 stamps to any post office in the country they would not even exchange it for two cent stamps. That is done to inflate the revenues of the Post Office Department.

Mr. CLARKE. It makes the country look like two cents.

Mr. BARKER. The Postmaster General has made a comparison between 1895 and the present day justifying large expenditure now because of the growing time. I take it that in 1895 this country was willing to pay whatever was necessary for the keeping up of Rideau Hall. The prosperity of the

country or anything like that has nothing to do with it ; it was and is simply a question of keeping up that property in a fitting manner for the Governor General of Canada. The Postmaster General when he was in opposition complained that it took $21,000 a year to maintain the property in a fitting manner for the representative of our Sovereign, but he now spends $30,000 a year in doing that identical work.

Mr. CLARKE. And not doing it as well.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) has misapprehended my speech. If he will read the speech he will find that I spoke of nothing else except as to what the country could afford. Looking at a comparison of our revenues, the country could not afford to do then what perhaps it ought to have done in this matter. It can afford now.

Mr. CLARKE. The Postmaster General seems to misapprehend the situation entirely. The hon. gentleman from Peel (Mr. Blain) quoted from a speech of the Postmaster General a strong denunciation against his predecessors in office because of the expenditures in connection with Rideau Hall. When the Postmaster General came into office he found that the expenditure for a quarter of a century averaged $20,000 or $50,000 a year, but the Postmaster General and his colleagues who have been presented to us as a good business administration are spending $30,000 a year. If there was any business about them they would erect a modern building that would be much more economically maintained.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What price.

Mr. CLARKE. Say $500,000 if necessary, and at three per cent it would cost you $15,000 per annum. The Postmaster General now justifies an annual expenditure largely in excess of the expenditure made by his predecessors which he denounced at the time. I venture to say that if an examination of Rideau Hall were made to-day, it is in no better condition than when he came into office when it was maintained at a much less expenditure.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Oh, yes, it is. It is a different building altogether. It is the difference between white and black.

Mr. CLARKE. That old building ought be pulled down and a new building put up and if the hon. gentleman would advise the doing of that he would be saving money to the country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps so.

Mr. CLARKE. It must be apparent to every one who has visited Rideau Hall that it is a waste of money to spend $30,000 annually in trying to keep up that aggregation of old apartments. It is my opinion that it is the duty of the government to make the necessary provision to put up a decent modern building.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would we not be at the expense of maintaining that too ?

Mr. CLARKE. It certainly would not cost so much for maintenance as the old building does.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the cost of maintaining the city hall in Toronto ?

Mr. CLARKE. That is a different matter altogether.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is expensive enough.

Mr. CLARKE. The city was obliged by the grand jury and by legal process to put up a court house and it was thought that a saving would be effected if both the court house and the city hall were under the same roof. That is an extravagant building but the city was forced to make the change because of the action of the grand jury and of the judiciary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is not the slightest doubt but that if we had a new modern building a considerable saving would be made in the annual maintenance especially with regard to heating and lighting. I do not think there would be a very great deal of saving in other directions. It would be much more satisfactory as my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) says if we had a building more creditable to the country. However, we are dealing with the item as it is before us and I felt it my duty, after an examination of the expenditures for some fifteen or twenty years to ask for a vote according to the expenditure in the past. These estimates were prepared two or three weeks after I came into office and I have since found that it will be necessary to bring a supplementary estimate equal to the average cost for the past few years. It is only fair to say that out of this amount some $3,000 was spent for maintenance of the grounds. I do not think that is extravagant ; I think that must be fairly well managed. The question of putting up a new building is one well worthy of consideration. It would give greater satisfaction no doubt to the occupants and to the people of the country. The maintenance could be reduced somewhat, not very materially, but perhaps about twenty-five per cent, unless that new building would bring around some new expenditures that we do not think at the present time. The aggregation of old and patched up buildings that are there now certainly cost more for maintenance than would a modern building. I wished the House to know what the actual

facts have been and there is no use deceiving ourselves with regard to the maintenance of these buildings. As long as I occupy the office I shall invite criticism as to whether or not that money was properly expended. If I find that any reduction can be made I shall endeavour to make it, but the experience has been that for fifteen years it has cost about this amount to maintain the property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The sum of $33,500 is paid by the government every year for rents. I suppose some of that will be dispensed with when the census is completed, if it is ever completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend was not in when I gave the explanation of that. The total amount we pay in rents throughout the Dominion is $44,500. In the city of Ottawa we pay in round figures about $30,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That represents, at the rate of interest which the government is obliged to pay, about $1,000,000. There were discussions during the past session as to the erection of another building; and it seems to me, if that were done, some economy might be effected. It has been suggested that there is some difficulty in regard to a site. I think the government has plenty of land for the purpose of another building without buying any more land. There is a site where the Supreme Court building is now, affording plenty of room between Bank street and the location of the conservatory for a very large and suitable building—a building that would be an ornament to the grounds, and would afford accommodation for many offices, besides having the additional merit of providing a suitable room for the Supreme Court, which is very badly housed at present, and suitable accommodation for the library of the Supreme Court, which is now in a disgraceful condition for lack of room. I would like the minister to take this into consideration. I know that a great deal of dissatisfaction exists on the part of members of the bar who come to Ottawa with the accommodation provided for the Supreme Court. In addition to that, I may suggest to the Minister of Public Works that we have really enough space in the buildings now at the command of the government to carry on the business of the country if that space were properly economized. I do not suppose it could be, because the buildings have been constructed in a different way. But my hon. friend has, no doubt, been in some of the great buildings in New York, such as the Produce Exchange, in the basement of which many clerks are provided with all the accommodation they require in a comparatively small space. If a building were constructed where I suggest, I believe the annual expenditure of the country could be reduced, and the Supreme Court could be housed and many offices provided, in such a way as would do credit to the country.

Mr. COCHRANE. When looking at the estimates this afternoon, I must confess that I was very much surprised at this vote of $30,000 for rent of extra offices. I do not require to go back a long way in my memory to recall the time when the members of the present government were sitting on this side of the House, and when they made the corridors ring with their shouts about the extravagance of the Tory party in filling all the public buildings in Ottawa from cellar to garret with civil servants, and when they used to picture to the farmers of the country how they were robbed to support such an extravagant lot of civil servants. They made them believe that the buildings here were so full of civil servants that they were almost forcing the roofs off. Are the buildings too full now? Yes; the census staff used to be in the Langevin block, but now it is in a large building by itself; then the models were moved out; and now the building is filled with officials from cellar to garret, and the government are paying $30,000 a year to rent other buildings. Can you say, you are another, you did it too? I recollect very well that a gentleman who is now relegated to a sublimer sphere—and we know what contempt the hon. Postmaster General used to have for members of parliament who accepted offices of emolument—used to visit my constituency and find fault with the extravagance of the Tory party for expending more money on Rideau Hall; he even complained of the cost of washing the napkins. Now the Postmaster General tells us the country can afford it. Is that the way a prudent farmer manages his business? When his finances are buoyant, does he not first take the mortgage off his farm instead of indulging in greater extravagances?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We can never afford extravagances.

Mr. COCHRANE. You just keep still. You told an hon. member to make his speech. I am making mine. I want to tell the hon. Postmaster General that he is there to answer questions that we ask, and not to put questions in my mouth. The hon. gentleman thinks he is the monarch of all he surveys, his right there is none to dispute; but I look on the hon. gentleman as the people's servant, and he should recognize that fact, and not attempt to dictate to me what I shall say. I am here to answer the very bold and extravagant charges which the Postmaster General used to make. What is his policy? The policy of the Conservative party, which he used to say was bleeding the people white. Now it is a buoyant revenue, and the extravagant expenditure is only a liberal one. How things have changed. I wonder that the hon. gentleman does not have remorse in his sleep, and wake up crying, 'The Lord have mercy on me for my hyprocrisy.'

Mr. LENNOX. In the expenditure for Rideau Hall, at page V—144 of the Auditor General's Report, I see this item: J. A. Teasdale, 12 pillows, at $3, paid twice, $72. This is an item that ought to be explained. I may say, with regard to the question of a new building, that if this matter had been looked at in a judicious way some years ago, before the expenditure referred to by the hon. Postmaster General had been made, it might have been wise to consider the question of pulling down the present buildings, and erecting more suitable ones. But in view of the fact that within very recent years, large additions have been made to these buildings, I do not think this is the time for us to consider the question of going into increased expenditures. I submit whether the reduction in the annual charges would be such as to justify our incurring an expenditure of a very large amount. In this account are a great number of items that would not be lessened by the putting up of new buildings. In fact I am inclined to think that if we went to the expense of erecting new buildings, that would involve the expense of new furnishings and fittings and a variety of expenses which we are not able to anticipate at present, and there would still be the ordinary annual charges as great, or perhaps greater, than they are to-day. It is to be regretted, whether we attribute it to the present government or preceding governments, that the advisability of putting up more modern and compact buildings was not considered years ago. But having regard to the large expenditures made in extensions within a few years. I do not think it is well to have the idea go forth that we are contemplating the expenditure of a very large sum to put up entirely new buildings.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister has said that $44,500 is what is paid in rents, out of which $30,000 is paid in Ottawa. Will that $14,500 cover all the rents paid throughout the country? Does it include the various post offices for which the government pay rent?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It includes all the department pays.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that mean post offices?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we rent any post offices it does, but I do not think we do.

Mr. INGRAM. There are several small towns where there are no government buildings and in which the department gives an allowance to the postmasters for rent. Is that included in the $14,500?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Public Works department have nothing to do with these post offices. This is for rent paid directly for public buildings throughout the Dominion.

Mr. COCHRANE.

Mr. INGRAM. I wanted to distinguish between what the Public Works department pays and what is actually paid by the government of the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not aware that the government of the country pay any other rent.

Mr. INGRAM. I certainly have not made myself plain. There are several post offices throughout the country, which are not government buildings, and for the use of which the department makes an allowance to the postmasters for rent. That, I presume, is not charged up in this $14,500, but comes out of the Post Office department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We make an allowance to a postmaster for supplying the department with office accommodation. We have nothing to do with keeping it in repair. The postmaster supplies the boxes and collects the rents, and we make a rental allowance to him for supplying us with accommodation.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the point. But I do not want it to go forth that the government are paying only $44,500 for rents. I think it is much larger. Take the city of Ottawa. You have $30,000 charged for rents. Is that a fixed rent liable to last a number of years, or are the leases affecting certain buildings on which the government pay rent liable to cease soon, and thus the rents be decreased?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is likely to increase to meet the demands of the various departments for increased accommodation. I have refused in several cases, and tried to get along with the accommodation we have. In connection with the large immigration into Manitoba and the North-west, the business of the Department of the Interior has so increased that more place is urgently demanded to carry it on. I would not like to say that I see any prospect of decreasing the amount of rent unless we put up a building of our own.

Mr. INGRAM. The government should consider the advisability of erecting a building, because it is a well known fact that the high rate of rent paid to parties in Ottawa for the use of their buildings is altogether in excess of what it ought to be. Would it not pay the government much better to buy land and erect a building? Even if that should cost more to begin with, it would be a source of economy in the long run. That item of rent, instead of decreasing, is liable to increase, and I think it would be a proper policy for the government to erect public buildings of its own. I judge from the remarks made before recess that the government are considering the advisability of erecting some building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. While I did not make any definite promise

before six o'clock, I promised to bring in a report before the close of the session as to what I thought should be done in this direction. It will cost a considerable sum of money, and it is wise that we should have an opportunity of carefully considering the plans, &c., before making any recommendation. I think it is a matter we must deal with as quickly as possible.

Mr. COCHRANE. If we are ever going to have the census completed, the building in which that work is being done might well be dispensed with. I have always thought it was a most extravagant rent for the government to pay, namely, $30,000, for some ten years for that plain building, four stories high, on Medcalfe street. I do not think that it is nearly all occupied, and surely, if the census is ever to be completed, we might save that $10,000 or $15,000 rent we have to pay on that building.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This item was passed half an hour ago.

Mr. COCHRANE. And I would draw your attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Public Works has been answering the questions we have asked on the subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I know it. But the question under discussion is 'Rideau Hall, $17,000.'

Mr. LENNOX. Is the minister prepared to answer the question I asked with reference to the item paid twice? At the same time, I might call attention to another item of the same class—the eighth item on page V—114, two mats at $3.50 each, paid twice, $7, extended $14. It seems that there is some mismanagement in this affair. Apparently, the accounts have not been looked after carefully, when, on the same page we find in two places items which admittedly have been paid twice.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A careful audit showed that these amounts were included twice and the amount was refunded. I will have a memorandum from the accountant's branch giving full information of how this occurred.

Rideau Hall—allowance for fuel and light, $8,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) will have something to say with regard to this.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have always supported this item. I think my record is all right on this.

Mr. CLARKE. What kind of fuel do they burn there, Mr. Chairman? This is a dreadful expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is that some years ago—I think during the incumbency of Lord Dufferin—an arrangement was made with the Governor, which has been continued ever since, that, instead of furnishing fuel and light, the government was to make an allowance of $8,000. We pay that over to the Governor.

Mr. CLARKE. I was not aware of that. This is a mere matter of book-keeping, then. As a matter of fact, His Excellency gets $8,000, and the amount is charged to heating and light.

Mr. BENNETT. Was that sum allowed when the Postmaster General moved his memorable resolution to reduce the salary from $50,000 to $35,000? I am not aware whether the Minister of Public Works voted for the resolution or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Could the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) give me the date? According to my recollection, and to the information given to me now, this arrangement was made in Lord Dufferin's time.

Mr. BENNETT. I remember the vote. I voted against the Postmaster General's resolution. I think it was in 1892 or 1893.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This arrangement was made previous to that.

Mr. BLAIN. When was this agreement entered into to pay this sum of $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During Lord Dufferin's time—twenty-five or thirty years ago.

Furniture—Dominion public buildings, $12,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this to furnish new buildings the government is erecting outside?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for furniture for all the public buildings throughout the Dominion.

Mr. FOWLER. Has it anything to do with the Ottawa public buildings?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. If the hon. gentleman cares to know how the amount is expended, I may give the summaries of expenditure for last year: Nova Scotia, $704; Prince Edward Island, $63; New Brunswick, $1,112; Quebec, $1,800; Ontario, $2,500; Manitoba, $847; North-west Territories, $423; British Columbia, $944. These expenditures are up to 1st January last, and make a total of $8,490.

Mr. INGRAM. As there is a small balance on hand, is it the intention to pay some of the accounts that are outstanding?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should be sorry to know that there are amounts not paid. I am afraid that the departments, including the Department of Public Works are a little careless in paying accounts. This arises from the system of taking too small a vote and not having

enough to pay for the services of the year. That I do not approve of—it is bad policy. If there is money to the credit of the account, I will pay outstanding amounts; if not I will ask for a supplementary vote and pay them.

Mr. INGRAM. There is a balance left unexpended?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was on the first of January.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there any since?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is probably a small amount.

Mr. INGRAM. I should be glad to call attention to a small item or two that might be paid.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to know when the salary of Mr. John Frawley, caretaker of the Orillia public building commenced at $300 per annum?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) put that question when the item is under discussion under which that salary is paid? I will then give the information.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well. The comment I wish to make is this——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) will excuse me, but we are soon to reach the appropriation out of which this salary is paid.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have reached the foot of the page, and perhaps the hon. minister does not propose to go further.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are now at the general item No. 124. I think we had an understanding that so many nights having been passed on these votes, this one should be passed. This applies almost altogether to the Ottawa buildings.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, many hon. members are absent, this being Friday night.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be willing to reserve the right of any hon. gentleman to make any remarks he wishes regarding this, whether it passes or not. But there is no item here, so far as I know, that will not be included in the supplementary estimates for 1902-3. So, there will be the same opportunity for discussion that there is under these items. My hon. friend will notice that these items refer to the Dominion public buildings at Ottawa. But there are two or three items besides, upon which the discussion might be resumed.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Ottawa public buildings—heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $67,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Does this include fuel purchased by public tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it includes fuel for the buildings at Ottawa alone.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the cost last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The votes for many years past have been taken in a very unsatisfactory manner, one year's expenditure running into another year's expenditure. But so far as I can ascertain from the department, it costs about $85,000.

Mr. CLARKE. This business administration will lose its reputation if it permits this condition of affairs to go on much longer, allowing the cost of one year to dove-tail into others.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a somewhat serious matter, and I would appeal to the members of the Committee on both sides to treat it as such. The system has existed for a great many years. This government is perhaps just as responsible for allowing the system to continue, as was the preceding government for initiating it, that is, taking votes too small, and carrying the expenditure over into another year. I would like the assistance of hon. gentlemen on both sides in remedying this unsatisfactory condition of the accounts.

Mr. CLARKE. Under the circumstances, I would suggest that the Committee rise now, and in the meantime the minister can give his attention to this serious matter, as he admits it is. We have made substantial progress to-night.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I appeal to the hon. gentleman to allow me to put this vote through.

Mr. CLARKE. We should have to get all the particulars of the prices paid for this coal, to whom paid, and how much was bought, and how much is owing to each person now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This item might be allowed to go through, because there woud be abundant opportunity for discussion on other items. I want the fullest investigation made into these accounts by the officials of the department; but they must have time, and hon. gentlemen must remember that the officials are here from three o'clock in the afternoon till all hours of the night. I assure the leader of the opposition that this matter will come up again, and can be discussed, and full explanations will be given. There is nothing to be gained by letting this vote stand.

Mr. CLARKE. I am sure we have no desire to interfere with the operation of the department by keeping the officials here to an unreasonable hour at night. In view of the statement made by the minister that before the final disposition of the estimates he will bring down all this information, personally I have no objection to the item passing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the minister could give us a good deal of this information now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was going to state to the House that I have conducted an investigation for a number of years, and I find that a special vote has not been taken to meet this item.

Mr. CLARKE. A regular slip-shod method.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Somewhat.

Mr. INGRAM. Do we understand the hon. gentleman is going to bring down the amounts paid, and from whom the coal was bought ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am prepared to give that information now for the present year. I find this system has been going on for a number of years, taking a small vote and every year expending more than we have voted. There are two objections to that system. In the first place, we have not a clear knowledge of what we are expending for this purpose; secondly, we cannot do business in a satisfactory way without getting somewhat near a correct estimate of the vote that is required. The contract for the supply of coal for the present year was let to John Heney & Co. The prices were : Furnace coal, $6.45, egg coal, $6.50, stove coal, $6.50, blacksmith coal, $6.

Mr. INGRAM. In what season of the year were tenders asked for ? Because if you apply early in the year you are in a position to get your coal cheaper ; whereas if you wait till late in the season, it will cost more.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year the advertisements for coal were sent out in May ; this year the advertisements are out now. I do not think that it is necessary to make the contract earlier in the season than April or May.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this per ton of 2,000 pounds, or per long ton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Per ton of 2,000 pounds.

Mr. CLARKE. The price seems to be a pretty long price.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend had the responsibility of furnishing the coal under the contract he would not think so. I must say that the Ottawa contractor stuck to his contract, unlike dealers in other places in the Dominion and furnished the coal at the price at which he had agreed.

Mr. CLARKE. The coal would be ordered in the summer, I presume.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know when it was ordered, but the contractor here has been delivering right along every week, or month, as it was required and is doing so yet at the price agreed upon.

Mr. BLAIN. What quantity does he supply under the contract with the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Six thousand four hundred and twelve tons were called for under the contract.

Mr. BLAIN. What system have you of weighing the coal ? Is it left in the hands of the company that sell it or do the government have an inspector ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is weighed on the government scales and checked by our own man.

Mr. CLARKE. There was some wood, was there not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, 276 cords of mixed hardwood at $4.75 a cord—very cheap.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. minister read the prices of the coal again ? It was all anthracite coal, I understand ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All anthracite coal.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there no bituminous coal used in the buildings at all ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend refers to the coal that is used in the grates. This grate coal costs $7.70 a ton. There is no bituminous or soft coal burned in the furnaces of this building ; that is all anthracite. We paid for grate or cannel coal $7.70 a ton.

Mr. CLARKE. And for the anthracite coal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Six dollars and forty-five cents per ton.

Mr. CLARKE. And there was another item of $6.50 a ton.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was for 200 tons of egg coal ; soft coal, $6.50 ; blacksmith coal, $6. There were only twelve tons of that.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the hon. gentleman tell us when the contract was made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In May last.

Mr. FOWLER. May, 1901, or May, 1902.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. May, 1902.

Mr. INGRAM. This is an outrageous price to pay at that season of the year. I got my own coal for that and I did not put in a thousand tons of coal the same as the government did. Did you call for tenders in Ottawa to supply the departments with coal, and if so, what was the lowest tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We called for tenders.

Mr. CLARKE. How many tenders were received ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the names of the tenderers here, but six tenders were received last year.

Mr. CLARKE. And this was the lowest ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. I must say that the government is paying a pretty high price by contract for coal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We were fortunate in having a contractor who delivered the coal. I am sorry to say the tenders this year are much higher. We advertised in the public press for tenders. It is a nice large order, and I do not see why coal dealers in any part of the country should not put in tenders. My hon. friend is perhaps comparing the price we paid with the price at the place where there is a very much lower freight rate than there is to Ottawa. There is a very great difference in the freight rates between here and Toronto for instance ; that is from the anthracite field. We take only anthracite coal from Pennsylvania. If the hon. gentleman will compare the price we have paid with the prices of coal in other cities, he will see that it is a reasonable price.

Mr. INGRAM. I am prepared to admit that if you made the contract in May, 1902, and did not have it delivered until December of that year, the prices are all right, if the contractor carried out his agreement. I know that many dealers did not carry out their agreements throughout the country generally. If he carried out his agreement and he was to deliver the coal during the summer months, comparing the price with that in other places, then, the price is high. Of course, I do not know what the freight rates are. I am only judging the price from that prevailing in my own locality.

Mr. CLARKE. It is understood that we are to get all this information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring down all the information when I ask for the balance of this vote in a very short time.

Ottawa public buildings, elevator attendants, $9,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does this mean ?

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is to pay the cost of running the elevators in the public buildings at Ottawa—in this building, the east block, the west block, in the Langevin block and the census building. In the parliament building there are four elevator attendants, and they get $45 a month each. They are striking for higher pay.

Mr. CLARKE. They are not getting too much if they are only getting $45.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that ; they have been bothering the life out of me. In the east and west blocks there are three elevator attendants, in the Langevin block one engineer, one fireman and six elevator attendants, and in the census building one elevator attendant.

Mr. CLARKE. How many are there altogether ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fifteen.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is an attendant in connection with the elevator service in the Seybold block. What did it cost to install the elevator there ? Is it an electric elevator ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the department put in an elevator at a cost of about $2,000.

Mr. BENNETT. That gives us rather a shock. I did not find that in the other expenditures, and it will be a tribute to the department over which the hon. gentleman presides, that not only have they installed a hot water service, but that they have put in an elevator service for the owner of the building. Certainly this is a business administration.

Ottawa public buildings, gas and electric light, including roads and bridges, $24,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. After looking into this item I think that this sum of $24,000 will cover the lighting.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then the cost of maintenance of the Ottawa public buildings must be more than $200,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The $125,000 was for installation and work in connection with ventilation and lighting; for materials used and work done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But still one is rather staggered at the aggregate of all these amounts. Leaving Rideau Hall out of the question I see the following items here : $125,000, $67,000, $9,000, $24,000, $7,000, $8,000, $5,500. There is nearly a quarter of a million dollars which seems to be pretty large for the mere upkeep of these buildings.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since I came to the department I have been

making every possible investigation with a view of finding out how the money was expended. I am anxious to make a saving if I can, and I wish the House to have full information as to the actual cost.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the actual cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this particular item this will cover the cost.

Ottawa public buildings, telephone service, $7,000.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not know whether room sixteen has a telephone or not, but I think room six should have a telephone.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no telephone in room sixteen; some think it is necessary but I do not think it is.

Mr. INGRAM. There is a telephone in the Liberal whip's room, but there is no telephone in the Conservative whip's room.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I had the honour of being whip along with the present occupant on the other side of the House, we always applied mutually for any advantage and I was not aware until this present moment that there was not the same privilege given to the opposition whip as to the government whip. So far as this House is concerned a grant to one party should be equally given to the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the chief whip of the opposition desires a telephone and the government whip has one I certainly shall feel it my duty to grant the request.

Mr. CLARKE. How many telephones are in use in these buildings.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have 223 telephones in connection with the departmental and parliament buildings.

Mr. CLARKE. I appeal to the minister if that is not an enormous number. Why, if you had one in every room I don't think that there are 223 rooms in all the buildings. Are there any outside?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The following is the number of telephones: Department of Agriculture, 14; Auditor General, 3; Customs, 5; Dominion Police, 8; Finance Department, 3; Government House, 6; Geological Survey, 3; House of Commons, 14; Indian Affairs, 3; Inland Revenue, 9; Department of Interior, 19; Department of Justice, 16; Department of Labour, 1; Mounted Police, 3; Militia and Defence, 20; Marine and Fisheries, 8; Ottawa River Works, 3; Post Office, 8; Printing Bureau, 5; Parliamentary Library, 4; Privy Council, 10; Public Works, 38; Railways and Canals, 6; Secretary of State, 5; Senate, 4; Trade and Commerce, 5. Total, 223.

Mr. CLARKE. In the minister's own department there are thirty-eight telephones. Are they working overtime or how do you come to have so many? I cannot expect the minister to be familiar with the location of the telephones in the other departments, but perhaps he could tell us where the thirty-eight telephones in his department are located.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not made myself familiar with them, but I have been looking into the matter somewhat.

Mr. CLARKE. I think it would bear investigation.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not a fact that many of these telephones are in the private houses of the officers of the department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That would apply to the ministers and deputy ministers and to the chief officers.

Mr. BENNETT. In the Privy Council Department not only has the minister's secretary got a telephone in his house, but the assistant to the secretary has one as well.

Mr. CLARKE. In a growing department like the Department of Labour there is only one telephone and in the important Department of Finance there are only three, and they seem to get along with that number. It seems unreasonable that we should have thirty-eight telephones in one department. It appears to me that it requires some explanation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the Department of Labour there is one telephone and one chief officer, but the hon. member will admit that in the Public Works Department it is reasonable to expect that the deputy minister, the chief architect, the chief engineer and the engineers in charge of outside work should have telephones. I shall look into the whole matter. In fact the list is on my desk now and under consideration to see if there can be a saving made, but I cannot promise a saving because I do not know what the conditions are.

Mr. CLANCY. Out of the total of 223 telephones how many are in the public buildings and how many outside.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are 138 inside and eighty-five outside. It does not necessarily follow that they are in dwellings, but they are outside of these grounds. I will bring down a full list, so that the hon. gentleman may see them for himself. I may mention an application which I had to-day. We fitted up the third floor of the House of Commons. A great many members attend the Railway Com-

mittee on that floor from eleven to one; and it was represented to me that it would be a great advantage to the gentlemen, I think on both sides of the House, occupying the rooms on that floor, to have a telephone. I do not see how the minister can refuse that request. Some of these telephones are sessional.

Mr. CLANCY. I was not aware that gentlemen having rooms for their private convenience were asking for telephones. I was not aware that there were rooms for gentlemen belonging to both sides of the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. I said that we fitted up these rooms, that they were occupied by gentlemen on both sides of the House, and that they applied for a telephone. However, that will come up when I submit the list.

Ottawa public buildings—grounds, $8,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that for the maintenance of these grounds ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Are they maintained by contract or by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By day labour. We have a foreman in charge.

Major's Hill park, $5,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase here of $1,000. What is the reason of that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The increase has been asked for because it was found that the amount previously voted did not meet the expenditure. There has been a new building erected there, and perhaps the park is kept up better than it used to be. Half of the salary of the superintendent is charged to this account, $720 ; there are two gardeners at $40 a month, and seven labourers at $35 a month, for nine months ; new plants, seeds, water system, manure and contingencies ; making up the $5,500. I do not see very well how the park and the buildings can be maintained in the state they are in now at much less cost. I have looked over this item, and I think it desirable, while we have charge of the park, that it should be kept up in as good a state as at present ; and we ask this amount rather than overdraw the account.

Mr. CLARKE. I think that is the proper policy, and it does not appear that the gardeners and labourers are paid too much ; their salaries are very small. If there has not been sufficient money voted, where do you get the money to pay these accounts, or do you have to stand off the men until the money is voted by parliament ?

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the usual way, and it is a very poor principle.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman get Treasury Board orders ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Salaries of engineers, firemen, caretakers, &c., Dominion public buildings, $99,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works when the salary of John Frawley, caretaker of the public building at Orillia, commenced at $300 per annum ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will the hon. gentleman let me take a memorandum of that and give him the information on Monday? I have not the information here.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I will ask the hon. gentleman another question : Does he propose to pay to John Frawley $300 next year as the caretaker of that building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is he a new appointment ?

Mr. BENNETT. He has been there a year or so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter has not been brought to my attention before.

Mr. BENNETT. I have no fault to find with the payment of the salary ; but I wish to bring to the attention of the minister the whole matter of the caretaker of the Orillia public building. A man named Baskerville was appointed by the late government, about 1893 or 1894, to perform the duties of that office, I think at the same salary of $300 per annum. There was a by-election in East Simcoe in 1897, when the Postmaster General came into the riding and camped there with his camp followers ; and, smarting bitterly under the defeat administered to him by the electors of that riding, that hon. gentleman came down here bound to revenge himself on any person and every person who had assisted to bring about that defeat. It was shown to him that there was a caretaker in the Orillia public building who, in all probability, having been a Conservative, had voted for me ; and forthwith his decapitation was proceeded with. It was utterly impossible to show that the man had not discharged the duties of his office well, or that he had in any way interfered in the election beyond the exercise of his franchise as a free man. What happened ? He got peremptory orders that he was to vacate the building. When the matter was brought up here in the House of Commons, the then Minister of Public Works informed the House, as the debate at that time will show, that he had decided on a new line of policy in regard to the Orillia public build-

ing in accordance with the wish of one of his colleagues ; and the line of policy that he pursued was this, that the caretaker's services were to be dispensed with, and for the future the postmaster of the town would have charge of the building. That was simply a means to an end. Though it was utterly impossible to formulate against the man a charge of inefficiency or of having interfered in the election, he was thrown out by the Postmaster General's instructions—because he was the minister who had charge of that district, and to whom the then Minister of Public Works referred in very plain terms as the colleague whose instructions he was endeavouring to carry out. A little later, this Mr. Frawley—and I have nothing to say derogatory of him, because I believe he discharges his duty all right—was installed. And in order to give a little appearance of decency to an intolerably indecent transaction, he was kept down there for a limited time at the small salary of $10 a month. But when the hon. gentleman thought sufficient time had elapsed to work out his little scheme, without too great a shock to the public, Frawley was given the same salary as that paid the former occupant, Mr. Baskerville. If ever there was a miserable display of party spitefulness, it was this. Smarting under the defeat which he had met in the riding, he took this roundabout way to gratify his little vindictiveness and put this man out of his position. But this man is still alive and recording good Conservative votes in East Simcoe, and the minister's treatment of him will stand as a disgraceful monument of party spite and mean vindictiveness.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The observations of the hon. gentleman from East Simcoe, so far as I have any recollection of the matter, are utterly without foundation.

Mr. BENNETT. I would simply ask the hon. minister whether it is not the case that he was in that riding and conducted a campaign and that he came back smarting under defeat, and that the man whom he appointed to fill the office formerly held by Baskerville is receiving the same salary as Baskerville was paid. When I remonstrated with the hon. Minister of Public Works at the time in his own office, he asked me not to blame him, that it was too small a transaction for him to take in hand, but that orders had been given him from another quarter. That quarter I knew, however, was the quarter occupied by the Postmaster General himself.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is hardly necessary for me to repeat my contradiction. I have no recollection of ever hearing of the existence of the man to whom the hon. gentleman refers. I do not think that the circumstance ever occurred such as the hon. gentleman describes of my having been a party to turning this man out of office. I do not think I ever heard of his existence before to-night.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. the Postmaster General if, when dismissals are made throughout the country, as many have been, without any charge having been preferred, these dismissals are made with his knowledge or do his officers take it upon themselves to make them. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman whether in all cases these dismissals are made with his knowledge and approval. I am now speaking more particularly of cases where no charges were preferred, and the man was simply told that his services would cease on a certain day and some person be appointed in his place.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is the hon. gentleman alluding to postmasters ?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With regard to postmasters, it is my duty to know of every dismissal or removal from office. I have no doubt that I authorized every such transaction ; but whether I did or not, I assume the full responsibility. Occasionally, one of my colleagues has been acting in my absence, but I presume he would only do what I would have done myself if present. It may be assumed that I have authorized every removal which has taken place.

Mr. CLANCY. I am very glad that the Committee and the country should know the position which the hon. minister takes. But I fear he would scarcely stand on a crossroad in this country, and make the denial he has made to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). I know nothing about the particular case to which the hon. member for East Simcoe referred, but I know of other cases so small and so mean that I hesitated coming to the conclusion that the hon. minister had any knowledge of them. He says now that he has knowledge, or even if he has not, he takes full responsibility. Well, I know of many cases where men were receiving small salaries and were simply told to go. No complaint was made against them, their public service was good, but some persons conspired to turn them out and the minister dismissed them. The country will be shocked at the hon. gentleman's statement to-night. He takes full responsibility of these dismissals from one end of Canada to the other and then makes the most flat denial of a case of dismissal which occurred in East Simcoe.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend asked me about post offices, and the case in East Simcoe was that of the caretaker of a public building. I take full responsibility for every removal from a post office. If the hon. gentleman desired to be fair with me, he would give me the cases

to which he refers and discuss each case on its merits. He would then be able to judge whether I was warranted or not in the course I took I am prepared to justify every removal of a postmaster that has taken place. I think the hon. gentleman will find that I have protected the postmasters. He will find that his remarks will not have the sympathy of the Conservative postmasters, and that I have made very few changes in the vast army of postmasters who were in office when I took charge of the department.

Mr. CLANCY. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I intend drawing his attention to some cases concerning which I have the correspondence and which will bear out the statement I make to-night. The hon. gentleman has told us that the Conservatives have been very well treated because he has permitted them to occupy their positions. That is the substance of what he has said.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the return I get for treating them well.

Mr. CLANCY. All that the Postmaster has the right to demand of any postmaster, whether Liberal or Conservative, is a fair, and honest service, and if a postmaster, who has given this service is permitted to retain his position, he is simply getting just treatment. If any postmaster whether Liberal or Conservative is not doing his duty fairly, he should lose his office. But so long as he does his duty, he should not be discharged, and I do not see that the hon. minister is entitled to any particular credit for not having discharged such a man. He has told us that Conservative postmasters will say he has treated them well. Has he given them exceptional treatment ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In many cases I have stood by them when I would be quite as well warranted in removing them from office. I have always given them the benefit of any doubt. I have always favoured the postmasters in office. I would like the hon. gentleman to inform me of any particular cases in which he thinks injustice has been done. The removals have been very few indeed. In the western provinces, the removals have been infinitesimal, and that I presume is the section of the country to which the hon. gentleman refers. There have been grounds for removal that were in my discretion ; and I think I have in all cases leaned to the side of those who were in office. My hon. friend has a neighbour who has had some experience of my practice.

Mr. FOWLER. Do I understand that the Postmaster General is prepared to discuss now the removals he has made ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the proper time comes—not now.

Mr. FOWLER. We will discuss it when the time comes.

Mr. INGRAM. As I have been referred to, and as I desire to do what is fair by both sides in the discussion that has arisen, I may say that my brother is postmaster in St. Thomas, he was suspended and a thorough investigation took place. He was reinstated and paid his full salary while out of office. I think the Postmaster General was fully satisfied that the complaint was not warranted, and for that reason he reinstated him. I think the Postmaster General did justice, and I am prepared to give him credit for doing justice after investigation. Also the postmaster of the city of Windsor was suspended. I do not know the details of the investigation, but I know that the result was that the postmaster was reinstated. Of course, I know that, when the government came into power in 1896, by a ruling they made, certain persons who were appointed to office within a certain period previous to the change of government were dismissed. In the town of Aylmer, in my own constituency, Mr. D. H. L. Price was appointed by the Conservatives as postmaster. He served several months under this administration, then he was dismissed and another put in his place. No fault was found with him, but the reason for his dismissal was the ruling which had been made, providing for the dismissal of those appointed within a certain time of the Liberals coming into office. These are the facts, and I state them candidly.

Mr. BENNETT. On the 24th April, 1899, I asked the question :

1. Who is the caretaker of the public building at Orillia ?
2. When was he appointed ?
3. Upon whose recommendation ?
4. What salary is paid to him ?

The Minister of Public Works of that time answered the questions as follows :

1. John Frawley. 2. Fourth November, 1898. 3. Frawley was the man employed by the former postmaster who was at the same time caretaker, to do the cleaning of the building. It was found that he performed his work very satisfactorily, and that was the reason why he was appointed caretaker. 4. $15 per month.

Now, every word in that bears out the statement I made a little while ago, that after the dismissal of Baskerville, who was the former occupant, the work devolving upon the postmaster, the Minister of Public Works appointed Frawley as caretaker at $15 a month. My recollection was that it was $10. No man of common sense will believe that the then Minister of Public Works had any animus against this man Baskerville, and I challenge the Postmaster General to show that there is in the Department of Public Works any complaint against him for having been derelict in the discharge of his duties. And I here say, and say without reservation, that the report

of the debates will show that the Minister of Public Works, when endeavouring to explain why he had dismissed Baskerville, plainly intimated that it was by reason of political pressure brought upon him by a colleague. The Postmaster General will not deny that he was in that riding—as he had a perfect right to be, and as I have no doubt he will be again. Every one knows that each minister has a certain portion of the country of which he takes charge for campaign purposes, and these constituencies are in charge of the Postmaster General. I leave it to any man of sense on the other side to say whether it was vindictiveness and spitefulness on the part of the Postmaster General that brought about that dismissal of Baskerville, or whether it was because the then Minister of Public Works sitting in his office, knowing nothing about the matter, made up his mind, for the reasons for which nobody can divine, that Baskerville ought to be decapitated. I shall place the statement of the Postmaster General before the people of Orillia, and I do not think they will have a very high regard for his veracity.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the appointment of caretaker for the town of St. Thomas public building been made yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. FOWLER. There is an increase in this item of $10,000. Why is that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The department is taking over the caretaking of post office buildings of Montreal and Toronto, and it also has six new buildings to take charge of during the coming year.

Mr. FOWLER. How was the caretaking for Toronto and Montreal paid for before ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe the caretaking was very unsatisfactory. It was done by the Post Office Department. We are in a better position probably to look after that sort of thing, having the clerks of works, who will hire the men and have the work done properly. Great complaints were made that the offices were not properly cared for.

Mr. FOWLER. By how much will that reduce the expenses of the Post Office Department ? The Postmaster General has been boasting of a surplus. He started with a surplus, but came out with a pretty heavy deficit before he got through with the Auditor General's Department and the Finance Department. His Newmarket story is pretty threadbare. How much would this reduce his expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know exactly—a few hundred dollars.

Mr. FOWLER. Then I do not see how you account for this increase. You have only six new buildings, which, at an average of $300, would be about $2,000. But this is an increase of $10,500. Where does the other eight thousand dollars odd come in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) knows that the vote has not been increased in accordance with the service. There were sixteen new buildings added to the list last year, and this year there were six. I am not prepared to say what the saving would be to the post office department in our taking over Montreal and Toronto. The complaint of the officials was, apparently, that the work was not done at all. Perhaps my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) can speak about that.

Mr. CLARKE. I was going to ask the hon. minister if there were any complaints on file. I never heard of any complaints of dereliction of duty on the part of the caretakers. Have the officials complained ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there was a letter written by the post office inspector regarding the state of the building

Mr. CLARKE. That letter will be brought down ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Who was the post office inspector who complained ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I don't remember now. It was done at the request of the department, on the complaint that he was not keeping the post office in a proper state.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to understand this thing. I understand the minister to say that a saving to the post office of about $200 was effected by the change.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Then how much could be saved by transferring this expenditure to the Public Works Department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not prepared to say just how much it will cost to keep the post offices at Montreal and Toronto in a proper condition, perhaps a few hundred dollars a year. Some labour will have to be employed, some charwomen. We are not taking these over for fun. Representations were made officially to the department of the necessity of assuming this charge.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not want to object to the change being made if it will result in economy. But must there be a new caretaker and more persons employed in this post office at Toronto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some of these caretakers have been urgently requesting a little increase in salary. Many of them get less than $400. They complain bitterly that they cannot support themselves and their families on their present salary, and a small increase of $25 or $50 will be given to some who appear to be underpaid.

Mr. INGRAM. The caretakers appear to have almost absolute control over the public buildings, and this remark applies to the departments of Inland Revenue, Post Office and Customs. I think the caretaker in each building should be subject to the orders of the head of his department. They should receive instructions to keep their places in proper condition. In our district we have found that the caretakers will not take their orders from their superior officers.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 6, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the New Canadian Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Clare.

Bill (No. 86) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—Mr. Smith (Wentworth) by Mr. Gourley.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Russell, province of Ontario, by reason of William Cameron Edwards, Esquire, having been called to the Senate, I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

ELECTORAL DIVISION OF ST. JAMES.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that in obedience to the order of the House of Friday last, April 3rd, I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the electoral district of St. James, Montreal.

YUKON TERRITORY—TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to inquire from the Prime Minister whether any communications have been received from the Dawson Board of Trade with regard to the concession known as the Treadgold concession. Some members of parliament have received a communication from the board of trade in which the following is alleged :

It is the wish of the Dawson Board of Trade, that you be forwarded a copy of a telegram sent this day to Messrs. the Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Premier of Canada ; Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior; William Mulock, Postmaster General, and James Hamilton Ross, member of parliament for Yukon, and which reads as follows :

Oppose any attempt to pass Order in Council or Act in parliament that will in any way confirm Treadgold concession. Are having monster petition signed and reliable data prepared to forward Ottawa asking government to aid in furnishing water for mining purposes. People are a unit in making demand and will insist upon government protection from monopoly of Treadgold octopus.

THE DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE,
H. C. Macaulay, President.

And it is the further wish of said board that your influence, help and co-operation in assisting the people of this territory to make the necessary recommendations to the parliament of the Dominion of Canada to prevent the passage through parliament of the Treadgold concession and water grant from Klondike river and Rock Creek such as is and has been contemplated.

The Treadgold concession and water grant as granted by an Order in Council and which when ratified by the parliament at its next session will become law is in the opinion of this board one of the most iniquitous measures that was ever inflicted upon the people, and (in the consideration of the Dawson Board of Trade) will work a great hardship upon the people of this territory since it will mean the virtual bankruptcy of all the property holders of Dawson and surrounding territory, and instead of the Klondike becoming the prosperous country we expect, it will virtually become the property of Mr. Treadgold and those who are associated with him in his scheme.

An immense petition to the Dominion parliament to cancel and disallow this measure is being prepared and circulated (a copy of which will be sent you) embodying the objections of the people of the Yukon to the granting of this measure and asking the government to provide water for the miners of this territory.

Then, the communication proceeds at great length to state grounds against the Treadgold concession, with which I will not trouble the House at this time. Accompanying it is a copy of a petition which, in the second paragraph, in referring to this concession, says :

That the benefits conferred upon the grantees are of incalculable value and involve an enormous exploitation of the public resources of this territory for the benefit of a few favoured concessionaires.

And in the fourth paragraph it says :

That the need of this territory is not the creation of monopolies but their prevention, and the encouragement of the individual miners by securing equal privileges and opportunities to all as far as the law and the administration can provide them.

It concludes by asking that the Order in Council of April 21, 1902, may be cancelled. I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) what the position of the government is in reference to the Treadgold concession, and whether this communication has been received by the government ? I would like any information as to the action of the government in future in regard to it which the right hon. gentleman thinks it proper to give to the House now.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of the paper which has just been partially read by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I do not remember if any other communications have been received by the government outside of that. But, as is frequently the case, there are probably two sides to this question ; there is the side of those who oppose the concession and the side of those who favour it. The government, about a year ago, amended the Treadgold concession in a manner which it was thought would be satisfactory to the miners of the Yukon. We certainly had no intention of creating a monoply, but we thought that by passing this concession, we were providing the miners of the Yukon with water for their mining operations. This view of the case has been controverted. There is another side to it, but no action has been taken so far, and it is not contemplated, at all events, at this moment to take any action. It may be that we will have to reconsider the action taken by the government if we find that the representations made have some foundation, but I am not prepared at this moment to say anything further to my hon. friend.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Abstract of Statements of Insurance Companies of Canada for the year ended 31st December, 1902.—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—Mr. Campbell.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) to extend the power of Loan Companies.—Mr. Thompson (Haldimand).

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Imperial Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Bank of Montreal.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Power Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Thompson (Haldimand).

Bill (No. 76) to enable the city of Vancouver to acquire certain lands and interests adjoining Vancouver Harbour.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Canada Northwest Land Company, Limited.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

QUESTIONS.

TRANS-CANADA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the government received any proposal from the Trans-Canada Railway Company, in regard to the construction of a new Transcontinental railway ?

2. Has the government invited the said railway company to offer its terms for the construction of said railway across the continent ?

3. Will it be a condition of any agreement for said construction that it should begin at its eastern terminus ?

4. Has any demand for financial assistance for said construction been made to the government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). It is impossible to answer any of these questions at present. The House has already been informed that communications, largely verbal, have taken place between the government and other parties, but it would be premature to make any announcements now. As soon as this can be done in the public interests, parliament will be informed fully.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AS VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. What servants of the government, in permanent or temporary employ, went to South Africa in any of the 3rd, 4th, 5th, or 6th Canadian Mounted Rifles ?

2. Were the places of all these kept for them on their return ?

3. What ones were not reinstated ?

4. Who received Canadian pay while in service in South Africa, viz., the pay, or any pay for their office as member or employee in the Canadian civil service ?

5. Will those not yet reinstated in their positions be reinstated forthwith ?

6. Did any minister promise those in government service that their places would be retained for them ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). I would ask that the first four questions be put in the form of a motion. If the hon. gentleman will make a motion I will be very glad to bring down the information, which it is difficult to do in the form of an answer to a question. With regard to question No. 6, I am informed that no minister promised those in the government service who went to South Africa that their places would be retained for them.

Mr. CLARKE. What about question No. 5.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot answer that.

SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTABULARY.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Have any documents been received by the Department of Militia and Defence, complaining of the treatment the Canadians received in the South African Constabulary ?

2. If so, has the department taken any action; or does the government intend to take any action in the matter; and if so, what action ?

3. Has the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia, or any officer of his department, been called to the following article, which appeared in the Montreal 'Star,' Monday, March 30, 1903 ?

CONSTABULARY BACK, TELL OF GRIEVANCES.

Allege That They Were not Well Treated in South Africa.

Reasons for Leaving.

When seen to-day by a 'Star' reporter, they somewhat reluctantly discussed their reasons for leaving the South African Constabulary.

Some of the Grievances.

The following are a few of their grievances. They allege :

That the British officers, in carrying out the government's order to reduce the strength of the constabulary from 10,000 to 6,000 men, attempted, without just cause, to dismiss most of the Canadians ;

That if a Canadian whom they wanted to get rid of, failed to purchase his discharge, he was dismissed from the service on the pretext of being unfit for duty in the constabulary ;

That such dismissal carried with it a certain odium, to the great disadvantage and injury of those thus summarily dismissed ;

That is virtually amounted to a bad conduct dismissal ;

That a person so dismissed was obliged to pay his own expenses back to Canada ;

That, when it was determined to dispense with the services of a Canadian, and when the Canadian refused to purchase his discharge, charges were trumped up against that individual, leaving him no alternative but to get out of the service ;

That, in the appointment of non-commissioned officers in the Canadian squadron of the constabulary, the Canadians were needlessly discriminated against, English sergeants invariably being appointed to the vacancies on the non-commissioned staff as they occurred ;

That, in some cases, Dutch officers and non-commissioned officers were given the preference over Canadians by the British officers in the matter of promotions ;

That, while the other British troops received their issues of clothing regularly, the Canadians were not so favoured ;

That, in many cases, the Canadians were obliged to either purchase certain articles of clothing, which the government should have supplied, out of their private funds, or suffer hardships and inconvenience ;

That, on an average, each Canadian was obliged to disburse out of his private purse upwards of £1 10s. each month in order to secure the actual necessaries of life ;

That attempts were made to convert the Canadians into mere military machines ;

That a show of independence on their part was regarded by the British officers as an act of insubordination ;

That the most trivial breaches of discipline on the part of the Canadians were rigorously punished, while similar infractions on the part of the troops belonging to the British columns were not noticed.

In discussing these grievances with a 'Star' reporter to-day, the men emphatically declared that nothing in the world would tempt them to return to the life they had but recently left in South Africa.

Only One Blanket Each.

Some of the men had received only one blanket each during the whole of their sojourn in South Africa. In order to sleep with any degree of comfort during the cold nights of the South African winter, they were obliged to fall back on the blankets—two per man—which they had brought with them from Canada.

Matter of Uniform.

In the matter of uniforms, bandolier equipment, belts and other accoutrements, the men allege that the Canadians were shabbily treated in comparison with the British Tommy.

When they left the constabulary, they each received a ticket to Durban. From Durban they had to pay their passage to England out of their own pocket money. The trip cost $60, or 15 guineas, per man.

The expenses of their passage from England to Canada were borne by Lord Strathcona.

4. If so, what course of action, if any, does the department, or the government, propose to take regarding these alleged serious grievances ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). To the first question the answer is 'none' and that answer will apply to the second question as well. To the third question the answer is : not until I read the article as quoted in the hon. gentleman's question. In this connection, I think it would be proper in further answer to the questions to say that extracts from an article published in the 'Mail and Empire,' two days after the article quoted here, might appear in the 'Hansard' alongside of the quotation in question. That article reads as follows :

CANADIAN TROOPERS.

Letters received from Canadians in the South African Constabulary indicate that there are those who are well satisfied with their treatment. One correspondent who signs himself: 'A Canadian Trooper' is quite indignant at the stories brought home by discharged men. He suggests that many of these have been 'kicked out as unfit for service.' Without expressing an opinion on this phase of the subject, it must be said that the correspondent speaks with apparent authority on other points. He explains that when the war ended the corps was twice as strong numerically as was necessary in times of peace. However, there was no effort made to reduce it immediately for obvious reasons. Now that the whole country has settled down the order has gone forth that many of the troopers are to be discharged. Our correspondent conveys the impression, complimentary to himself, that the very best men are being retained and the inefficient and dissatisfied discharged. As proof that all is well, he says, in effect. 'Behold me; I remain.' Canadians who have protested against the way they were treated, say, in effect, 'Behold us; we could not stay.' The public has little other evidence before it. The truth lies somewhere between the extreme statements: 'They ill-treat us because we are Canadians, and they are good to us because we hail from Canada.' It is hard to believe that any British officer would annoy a colonial trooper because he was a Canadian. The probability is that the opposite would be the case. The trouble is that many officers treat Canadians just as they would treat denizens of London, E.C. Londoners are used to it; Canadians are not, nor does the public opinion of this country demand that Canadians become lackeys for English officers. A Canadian trooper is a fighting man; he is not a soldier. Our correspondent does not touch on the question of the 'haw-haw' ways of the officers. He does, however, find fault with the men who complain that they were turned adrift penniless. He intimates that the card game and the canteen are responsible for this, and that the men have only themselves to blame. If there is truth in this suggestion it should silence the unmanly whining of the victims of the bob-tailed flush. This journal does not sympathize with this complaint. The troopers had their pay; that all have not arrived home penniless is evidence that this is sufficient, under certain circumstances. If they did not save it, no one will find fault, as long as they do not begin to lament. Thus the case stands. The final verdict will depend largely on the future conduct of the ex-constables themselves. If they acquit themselves like men in the new life that lies before them, they will be believed when they criticise the army. If not they will be discredited.

In reply to question No. 4 I may say: There does not appear to be anything for the government to do. The government is in no way responsible even if it were true that members of the South African Constabulary had been harshly treated.

COMMISSION FOR REVISION OF STATUTES.

Mr. SPROULE asked:

1. Of whom is the commission for the revision of the statutes composed?
2. When did the commission begin its work?
3. What progress has been made in the work of the revision?
4. At what date is it expected that the commission will complete its work?
5. Has the rate of remuneration to the members and officers of the commission been fixed; and if so, what is it?
6. What is the estimated cost of the proposed revision, when completed?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll):—

1. The Minister of Justice and Solicitor General, members ex officio, the Right Honourable Sir Henry Strong, President; Edmund Leslie Newcombe, K. C., Deputy Minister of Justice; Wentworth E. Roscoe, K.C., of Kentville, Nova Scotia; Augustus Power, K.C., of the Department of Justice; Edward R. Cameron, K.C., Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada; Henry Robertson, K.C., of Collngwood, Ontario, Barrister; and Louis Philippe Sirois, of Quebec, Notary Public; Hon. R. J. Ritchie, of St. John, and Horace St. Louis, of Montreal, Advocate, Secretaries of the Commission.

2. The commission began its work on 21st November, 1902.

3. The commissioners have held two meetings at Ottawa and a number of the statutes have been revised and printed by the individual commissioners. It is hoped to have all the work already printed passed by the commission about the end of this month.

4. It is too early to mention a date for completion of the work.

5. The following rates of renumeration have been fixed:

	per an.
The Right Hon. Sir Henry Strong ...	$ 3,500 00
Mr. Newcombe	1,500 00
Mr. Power	1,200 00
Mr. Cameron	1,200 00

The remuneration of the other commissioners and the secretaries has not been fixed.

6. No estimate has been made of the cost.

THE DOUKHOBORS.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. Has the government any information as to the alleged pilgrimage or expedition of the persons known as Doukhobors, during the months of November and December, 1902, in the North-west Territories and the province of Manitoba? If so, what is the information?
2. How many persons were engaged in such pilgrimage or expedition?
3. What was the alleged object of such pilgrimage or expedition?
4. Did the government take any steps to interfere with, or prevent the completion of such pilgrimage or expedition; and if so, what were such steps, and what were the means employed by the government for the purpose?
5. Under what law, or by what authority, did the government so interfere, and take such steps and measures, if any?
6. If the government seized and sold any horses, sheep and cattle, of the Doukhobors, in November and December last, by what au-

thority, or under what provision of the law, was such action taken ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). :—

1. The government received information from its officers that a number of Doukhobors intended to and did make a pilgrimage in the months of October and November last year.

2. Of the total of about 8,000 Doukhobors in the west about 1,800 men, women and children engaged in the pilgrimage as far as Yorkton. There were about 450 men and boys in it and these continued as far as Minnedosa.

3. Conducting a religious crusade.

4. The government through its officers advised the Doukhobors not to start on this pilgrimage and after they had started persuaded them to return. The women and children were taken back by special train and wagons or sleighs, the men partly by special train and the rest of the way by foot.

5. Under no specific law, as the action of the government did not require such.

6. No horses, sheep or cattle of the Doukhobors were seized and sold by the government in November or December, but in the month of October some cattle and horses which had been turned loose by the Doukhobors were, with their consent, sold by the government by public auction.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

1. Until what date is the government prepared to receive proposals in connection with the construction of a transcontinental railway ?

2. Is the government willing to recommend that financial aid be granted by parliament to those who are ready to execute such construction ?

3. Will the government entertain a proposal for a land grant in favour of such enterprise ?

4. What are the principal conditions which the government will impose upon those who are prepared to undertake such construction ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair)). It is impossible to answer any of these questions at present. The House has already been informed that communications, largely verbal, have taken place between the government and other parties, but it would be premature to make any announcements now. As soon as this can be done in the public interests, parliament will be informed fully.

IRISH IMMIGRATION.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Has the Canadian emigration office at Belfast, Ireland, been closed ; and if so, for what reason, and on whose recommendation ? If the office is open, who is the officer in charge, and when was he appointed ?

2. How many Canadian emigration agencies are there in Ireland ; where are they located ; and who is the officer in charge of each such agency ?

3. How many Irish emigrants were sent to Canada by the government agents during the past departmental year ; and what was the expenditure made in connection with the maintenance and work of the Irish emigration agencies, salaries of agents, travelling expenses, &c.?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock).

1. The office at Belfast was closed for a few days, the minister having instructed Mr. O'Kelly, the agent there, to take the place of Mr. C. R. Devlin, who resigned his position as Canadian Emigration Commissioner at Dublin, on March 5th. The Belfast agency is now open, and is temporarily in charge of Mr. Kilburn, from 1st April.

2. Two. At Dublin and Belfast, Ed. O'Kelly, Dublin, Mr. Kilburn, Belfast.

3. One. All Irish emigrants arrived in Canada during the year ending 30th June, 1902, as a result of the work performed by the immigration agents in Ireland.

The total amount of expenditure for salaries, office, living, travelling and other expenses of the immigration agents in Ireland during 1902-03 was $14,173.60.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

Is it the duty of any public official, and if so, of whom, to inquire into and report to the government, upon all railway accidents which occur in the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). No official in particular has been assigned to the duty of making inquiry into railway accidents, but since and owing to recent railway accidents, the subject has been engaging the serious consideration of the government.

"LE CANADA" AND L. J. LATOUR.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Is the government aware that the following circular has been addressed to postmasters in different parts of the country, and especially in the province of Quebec ?

Montreal, March 24, 1903.

To the Postmaster.

Sir,—As you are aware, we are to commence in a few days the publication of the new Liberal organ, 'Le Canada.'

The management of the company directs me to write you, in the name of the good cause, to ask you to help us regarding our circulation (within the limits of the possible, be it well understood).

Needless to tell you that the postmaster fills an important role in his locality in regard to newspapers and can render great services.

We count upon your legitimate sympathies and on your co-operation for the 'Canada.' Your work will be recompensed.

We give you the following commission :—10 per cent on collections, and 25 per cent on the subscriptions, according to the list that you will prepare for us.

I venture the hope that these offers will be taken into consideration.

I close with thanking you in advance for all that you may do for the newspaper and for our undertaking, the success of which you doubtless have at heart.

Your ever devotedly,

L. J. LATOUR,
General Circulation Manager.

2. What position does the said L. J. Latour hold, or has he held, in the civil service at Ottawa ? What is his salary ? When was he appointed ?

3. When did the said L. J. Latour obtain six months' leave of absence, and for what reasons?

4. When did he draw his salary the last time, and what amount did he draw ?

5. Is it true that this L. J. Latour is at present replaced in the civil service by his young son, who is entirely incompetent to fulfil the duties of his position ?

6. What are the age and salary of young Latour ?

7. Is it true that L. J. Latour has collected, and collects, amongst his colleagues in the civil service subscriptions and contributions to the future new publication, 'Le Canada.'

8. Would the government take cognizance of this fact, a notorious one for those who live in Ottawa, and inform the civil service employees that they may retain their positions, even if not subscribing for the newspaper 'Le Canada,' provided they fulfil their duties in their respective positions ?

9. Does the government approve of those subscriptions ?

10. What means does the government propose to take to put an end to this state of things ?

11. Will it have the amounts of their subscriptions returned to those employees, or increase their salaries in consequence ?

12. Who are the directors of the new publication, to whom reference is made in the said circular ?

13. Which ministers of the present government, and which members of this House, are financially interested in the said newspaper ?

14. Is it not true that the said newspaper will be published under the ægis of members of the federal parliament and of the Quebec legislature ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. Jas. Sutherland) :

1. No.

2. Departmental mail officer Public Works Department at a salary of $3 per day from 1st May, 1902.

3. On the 6th March, 1903, without salary.

4. On the 6th March last, at rate given above.

5. Mr. Latour has a son employed in the Department of Public Works who is considered competent to do his work.

6. Twenty-one years, salary $3 per day.

7, 8, 9, 10, 11. No information in reference to these matters.

12, 13, 14. These matters mentioned in these three questions have no official connection with the department and have not been brought to its knowledge.

ERNESTOWN STATION POST OFFICE.

Mr. WILSON asked :

Has a change been made of the postmaster at Ernestown station post office, county of Lennox ? If so, what are the circumstances under which such change occurred ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The postmaster resigned and Mrs. Oriana Johnston was appointed in his place.

THE CATTLE-GUARD COMMISSION.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. The Minister of Railways and Canals having stated to the House on 2nd April instant, in reply to questions, that Mr. Robertson withdrew from the cattle-guard commission on the 14th of February last ; that the work was then supposed to be practically concluded, and a report prepared, which was substantially settled upon between the two commissioners, and only then remained to be put in form and signed, why has the report of the commission, as originally constituted, not been put in form, signed and returned to the department ?

2. Has Mr. Robertson any conection with the investigation tests, or proceedings, subsequent to the 14th of February last ?

3. What were the causes, or causes alleged, for Mr. Robertson's retirement ?

4. What is the cost of the commission down to the 14th of February ?

5. Was the retirement of Mr. Robertson voluntary, and solely of his own motion ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Although the chief portion of the work of the Commission was done when Mr. Robertson withdrew from the Commission, the inquiries and investigations into the cattle-guards in use on the leading railways in the United States and Canada had been finished, and there only remained what seemed to be a few cattle-guards which had been apparently recent inventions to be tested. The number of these increased, and the delay in finally completing the report has arisen from that circumstance. It is thought better that the report should state whether any of the recent tests would show that any efficient cattle-guard had been designed.

2. Mr. Robertson has not been present at any of the tests since the 14th of February last.

3. Mr. Robertson asked leave to withdraw, considering it was his duty to do so, as he was about to engage in a provincial election contest.

4. The cost of this Commission up to the 14th of February last was $3,624.32.

5. Mr. Robertson's retirement was voluntary and solely of his own motion.

CANADIAN TOBACCO.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

1. Has the government a written report from Mr. Blaise Dugas, of Saint-Jacques de l'Achigan, relating to his trip to Europe in connection

with the sale of Canadian tobacco in foreign countries ?

2. What was the cost of that trip ?

3. What is the amount paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas, and does that sum cover all that is due to him ?

4. What has been the result of that trip ?

5. If there is a writen report from Mr. Dugas, will it be printed and laid on the Table of this House ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. Yes.

2. $470.25.

3. $470.25 paid for time and expenses of trip to Belgium; $146.25 paid for time and expenses collecting samples of tobacco and delivering lectures in Quebec; $36.50, still due for time and expenses delivering lectures in 1903.

4. Useful information has been obtained and published by means of lectures in the tobacco-growing districts of Quebec.

5. Yes.

IMPORTS OF OXIDE OF ALUMINUM.

Mr. ROBINSON (Northumberland) asked :

How many tons of oxide of aluminum (alumina ($Al_2 O_3$) was imported into Canada for the fiscal year ending June, 1902 ? What country or countries was it imported from ? What port or ports was it entered at, and what was the valuation for duty ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). The officers of the department inform me that the article mentioned in this question is not specified under that name in the classification of imports in the Trade and Navigation tables, nor will they be able to get the information asked for without special examination of invoices at different ports of entry. If the hon. gentleman will specify the different articles, such as baroxite, corundum, emery, &c., on which he wishes to obtain information, they will endeavour to get it.

IMMIGRATION STATISTICS.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario) asked :

1. What has been the total immigration into Canada each year during the past ten years ?

2. What has been the total expenditure on immigration each year during the same period?

3. What has been the total immigration during each month of this calendar year ?

4. When did the first immigration, of which the department has a record, commence from the United States to Canada ?

5. How many settlers or immigrants have come to Canada from the United States during each year of which the department has a record ?

6. Of the total immigrants arriving from the United States, how many have declared themselves of Canadian origin ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The return asked for would be rather voluminous, and perhaps my hon. friend would be good enough to make a motion for it.

P.E.I.—WINTER COMMUNICATION.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence received by the government, or any department of the government, and the answers made thereto, concerning the winter navigation of the Northumberland Straits, during the season of 1902-03.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words in explanation of this motion. When Prince Edward Island entered into confederation in 1873, this stipulation was set out in the agreement :

The Dominion government shall provide and maintain an efficient steam service between the Island and the mainland, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the other railways of the Dominion.

There was no stipulation in the agreement that was considered so important by the people of Prince Edward Island and by the delegates appointed to negotiate the terms of union, as this. There was no stipulation that appealed with so much force to the people of Prince Edward Island as this, by which their isolation was to be a thing of the past ; but there is no stipulation that has been so much disregarded. The service during the last season was the worst that has ever been experienced during any year since we came into confederation. It has been all the worse comparatively speaking, because the trade of the island, as well as the trade of other parts of the Dominion, has greatly increased in the last few years, and therefore we felt it the more keenly and severely that that trade was interrupted during several months of the past year. During the last few years the trade of the country in the finished products of the farm has so greatly increased—and this will apply to all the provinces of old Canada lying east of the great lakes—that between 1890 and 1902, the exports of these products have increased $24,000,000 to a total of $80,000,000.

The farmers of Prince Edward Island have contributed their full share of this increase ; and they have besides supplied a largely increased home market. To prove this, I need only mention one item, that of cheese. During the term I have mentioned, the increased manufacture of cheese in Prince Edward Island has been 6,700 per cent. We have increased also in all the other lines of farm products—pork, bacon, ham, live stock, beef, sheep, eggs, butter, &c.—so that our trade to-day is very much larger than it was a few years ago, and consequently when the facilities for moving our products to the mainland come to a standstill, we suffer much more than we did. Not only has our trade in agricultural products largely increased, but we have established a large

trade in frozen fish with the cities of Boston and New York. During the past season, we sent several carloads to Georgetown to be exported in the usual way, but we found we could not have them carried to the markets for which they were intended. They were held over at Georgetown several weeks, the warm season came on, and they had to be sold for the freight and carted out to the fields for manure. Not only with regard to these products, but others as well, tens of thousands of dollars were lost by the people of Prince Edward Island, owing to our inability to export them during the winter. Trade was diverted from the island, merchants who had endeavoured to fill orders could not do so, the orders went to other places, and our people incurred great loss. The extent of that loss I am not in a position to measure at the present, but no doubt it was very severe, and it was not only a loss to the island, but also to the mainland. I have been told by the representatives from eastern Nova Scotia that the products which they generally expect to receive from Prince Edward Island advanced largely in price. In fact it was difficult to obtain them at all. Last winter was of course exceptionally severe, but the difficulties of winter navigation were increased by the mistakes made by the department here in Ottawa. The Department of Marine and Fisheries made some years ago, and particularly last year, the mistake of taking advice from too many people on how to conduct winter navigation, and largely in consequence of that the experiment proved a failure. At present there is a movement on foot at Prince Edward Island to have the management of this service placed in the hands of a local committee. I wish to enter my strongest protest against any such idea. I believe that we will not succeed in having a satisfactory winter service until the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries takes the management of this service immediately under his own control. There are two good men now in command of the winter boats. There is no better man in the service than Captain Finlayson, who has had twenty-five years experience, and Captain Brown, in charge of the 'Stanley,' was an experienced navigator before he took charge and has had five years' experience since then. I would, therefore, advise the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to consult these captains if he requires any more information. There are no men better calculated to give advice. Let him also consult the records of the department, and then make up his mind to place those steamers where the records show they can do really practical work. I would advise him to leave a good deal to the responsibility and judgment of these two captains, and with their assistance and the assistance of the officials he has in the island, he will be able to so conduct the service that it will in future give reasonable and satisfactory results both in the island and the mainland. There is another point which I wish to bring out. Last year there was some mismanagement in the railway service in connection with the winter service in the straits. Several times when the steamer arrived in Georgetown with a large quantity of mail and a large number of passengers, there was no special train to meet the steamer. Of course the steamer could not arrive on schedule time on account of having to meet adverse conditions, but in previous years there was always a special train to meet the steamer upon arrival. Last year, however, the arrangement was not carried out, and when the steamer arrived with mails and passengers, the train had gone and there would be no other for some twenty hours. The hon. members for West Queen's and and East Queen's, and, I think, the hon. member for one of the Prince's, had to put their hands into their pockets and deposit a sufficient amount to hire a special train in order to bring the mails and passengers to Charlottetown. That is a condition of affairs we never experienced before and which should not exist. On one occasion when a large number of passengers came to Georgetown—a sufficient number to warrant, under ordinary circumstances, the railway department in running a special train—the local management declined to do so. The hon. member for West Queen's went to see the superintendent of the railway and offered to guarantee him against loss, provided the number of passengers were not sufficient to pay the ordinary railway fare, but still the superintendent refused, and my hon. colleague had to put up the whole of the money himself. On another occasion a number of commercial passengers arrived, they were several days late, the mails were late, and they wanted to get a train. It was necessary that the mails should be moved by a special train. But even under these circumstances the local management refused to provide a special train until one of the men deposited sufficient money, that is a dollar a mile for the number of miles the train had to go, some forty-six miles, and then they refused to carry the mails, and the mails had to remain over for another day. So great was the inconvenience and loss sustained by the people that the indignation expressed on every hand was something unprecedented in the history of that province.

Now, I cannot for a moment believe that the Minister of Railways or the minister of any other department would wish the officials of their departments to act in that way. I am sure they wish their officials to take into consideration difficulties of this kind as they arise, and to give the people the reasonable accommodation they have a right to call for. I trust that if an investigation has not already been held into this matter, that one will be held, and that no such acts as I have related here to-day will ever be allowed to take place again; I would suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fish-

eries that he take this matter into his consideration and make such arrangements as will put these boats, the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' in a first-class condition. It is now stated that the 'Stanley,' on account of her age and the rough usage she has endured for several years past, requires considerable repairs. If that is the case, I would suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he look into this matter during the summer, and that at the same time he examine the condition of the steamer 'Minto' and put both these steamers in as good a condition as it is possible for him to do. I would suggest that he take the advice of the officers of those steamships, the officers of his own department, that he be guided by the experience of the last thirty years, and that at the close of the navigation of the summer season he place such boats on that route as thirty years' experience has shown to be necessary and practicable. I would also suggest that he give to the captains of those boats a larger measure of discretion, and that he hold the local officers of his department responsible for successfully carrying out that service, and if these men do not give the people satisfaction, that he put other men in their places. I would also suggest to the Minister of Railways that an arrangement be made by which a special train shall meet the winter steamers on their arrival, whether at Georgetown or Charlottetown, to carry the mails and passengers from the port to their destination on the Island. I think he should make such arrangements during this summer as will ensure a service fairly satisfactory to the people. If these arrangements are made during the coming summer, I believe that the service will be satisfactory. I hope, when the minister makes these arrangements, that he will not allow himself to be influenced in any way by the local advice he may receive.

Now, I object to a local board or a local committee having charge of these steamers, because, as I said before, the difficulties we have had to contend with last year will be intensified. Local influence and local prejudice will be brought to bear upon this board, and the service will not be satisfactorily carried out. We Prince Edward Islanders contend, and we have a right to contend, that the Dominion government should carry out the terms of union, the agreement stipulated at the time of confederation ; and if the government places the management of these steamers in charge of a local board or a local committee, the people will hold the government responsible for the non-fulfilment of the service and the bad management that will ensue. I think the departments in Ottawa should now be in possession of sufficient information to enable them to carry out this service in a satisfactory manner, and if they do not do so, then we shall know where the responsibility lies. If the local officials are responsible for the trouble that arose last year, as I believe they were largely responsible, then the Ministers must look after their officials, and the people will look after the ministers. I hope and trust that we will not have a repetition of the trouble of last year, to the great annoyance and loss, not only to the people of Prince Edward Island, but to the people of the other provinces, particularly of Nova Scotia, with which we have so much business and personal intercourse. I have much pleasure, Sir, in moving the motion which stands in my name.

Mr. ED. HACKETT (Prince West, P.E.I.) I want to say a few words on this very important matter. The question of the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is no new question in this House : it has engaged the attention of this House from time to time since confederation. Since I have had the honour of representing a Prince Edward Island constituency in this House. I have endeavoured on several occasions to impress on hon. gentlemen occupying the treasury benches the great necessity of paying more attention to this matter than they have done in the past. The hon. gentleman from King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes), in just speaking to his motion, has corroborated what I have stated heretofore, and it is not necessary for me to enter into details at the present time. But, Sir, he has made a statement this afternoon that condemns the present administration of Canada in relation to this matter. He says that the service last season was the worst since confederation. After all the advice that we have endeavoured to give these hon. gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches, and after all our endeavours to get them to do something tangible in the way of keeping up this communication, we have now a statement from the lips of one of their supporters who represents a constituency of Prince Edward Island, that the service during the past year was the worst since confederation. His statement strongly confirms other statements that have been made in this House before. I have been a little backward this session about raising the question, because so much has already been said in this House in regard to that matter, and I hoped the government would take action without any more urging. But since we have heard such a strong condemnation of the government from one of their own supporters, I think I am justified in referring to the subject once more.

The hon. gentleman has spoken of the great importance of this communication. We know that it is important, not only to the people living in the smallest, yet fairest, province of Canada, the province of Prince Edward Island, but to the people of all Canada from Vancouver to Sydney. I shall not repeat what the hon. gentleman has said about the terms of confed-

eration. The maintenance of steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland was one of the great inducements held out to the people of Prince Edward Island in 1873, when they threw in their lot with the people of Canada. This was largely the cause of Prince Edward Island becoming a member of this great confederation. But that pledge has not been fulfilled. I am afraid from what I have seen of battling with the ice in the Straits of Northumberland, that it will never be successfully maintained, and that we shall be obliged to resort to the plan suggested some years ago by Senator Howlan, a gentleman representing Prince Edward Island, and build a tunnel from Prince Edward Island to the mainland. The distance is only about eight miles. We know what great engineering feats are being accomplished in these days, and we have the opinion of Sir Douglas Fox, an eminent engineer of England, that this tunnel could be built and operated for $12,000,000. We have spent $12,000,000 on our railways last year without a word of objection. And here you have a province, that, under the terms of union was guaranteed continuous steam communication winter and summer, and the people of Canada who made that pledge are bound by that compact to put their hands in their pockets and so provide that that communication may be maintained, and they can only do it effectually by building this tunnel under the Straits of Northumberland.

The hon. gentleman has spoken of the trade that has developed since the winter steamers were built there. He spoke especially of the frozen fish trade of last winter. That trade has become of great importance to the island. Our young men go on the rivers and coasts in the winter and catch large quantities of fish and freeze them, and they expect the means of transporting them to the markets of the continent. Last year, twenty carloads of these fish were delayed at Georgetown, in consequence of the want of this communication. On my way to Ottawa, I travelled on the train with a young man who, though not having a great deal of capital has plenty of energy and enterprise, and he told me that he had seven ton of fish delayed, and they were a total loss. And he said to me : 'Now, when you go to Ottawa, you have good material to work with ; you can show that Canada, that the government of the Dominion are not carrying out the promise made at confederation in 1873.' We do not speak of this in any rebellious mood. We have no desire for secession. We are not doing as an hon. gentleman from Nova Scotia, now on the treasury benches in this House did—demanding secession from Canada. We are acting in the spirit of loyalty to Canadian institutions. But we insist that, as there is now on the treasury benches a gentleman who advocated secession on the part of Nova Scotia at the time when there was not half the justification for it that there is for Prince Edward Island, he and his colleagues shall carry out the promise made to furnish this means of communication; otherwise we may have to follow the example given us by the Hon. Minister of Finance.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, King's) speaks of the severity of the winter. It may have been a cold and severe winter. When I crossed the Straits of Northumberland in a little ice-boat, such as has been in use for a hundred years on the Straits of Northumberland in winter, I said to myself : Here am I going to the parliament of Canada, sent by the people of one of the districts of Prince Edward Island, and I find that we are back to the same means of communication that the people of Prince Edward Island had long before confederation. A great deal of hardship and difficulty is entailed in crossing in these boats in the winter season, and not only should every effort be made to secure the passage of mails and goods, but particularly means should be provided by which the people may be able to cross without this discomfort and inconvenience in the winter season.

The hon. gentleman has spoken of a local committee. I agree with him ; it would be wrong for the government of Canada to delegate its powers in this matter to a local committee in Prince Edward Island. The government of Canada are responsible for this communication, and the people of Prince Edward Island and of the whole of Canada will hold the government to account for it. Therefore, I would not have the government delegate its powers to any local committee. As the hon. gentleman says, local interests might divide the committee, and good advice might not be given.

The hon. gentleman speaks of the captains, and says that the department should consult those officers. As I understand the instructions, they are that the captain is held responsible for the safety of his ship during the winter season while the ice is in the gulf. And, if he is a man of judgment, the captain ought to be able to navigate his vessel in the ice, seeing that it is specially built for such navigation, as an ordinary ship could be navigated in an ordinary season. The hon. gentleman refers to Captain Finlayson and Captain Brown. I do not find fault with either of these gentlemen. But what do we see in the case of Captain Brown. A heavy north-west wind prevailed when he was about to leave Summerside harbour. Every one knows, who has observed the movements of the ice, that the wind has a great effect upon it. Captain Brown was advised by his pilot to remain in the harbour and not attempt to cross to Cape Tormentine on that day. But he left the harbour contrary to the advice of his pilot, and when he got around the light at Seacow Head he ran his ves-

sel into the board ice so that it received the heavy impact of the ice coming down the strait, and so was frozen in. The pilot is accustomed to the conditions of the ice, and, if the captain disregards his pilot's advice, it is quite fair that he should be held responsible for his action. I have nothing to say with regard to the captains. I believe they are good men. The man who is in command of his ship is the one who is held responsible for the safety of ship and cargo. And I think it would be wrong to criticise the action or conduct of the captain.

Another thing the hon. gentleman referred to was the mail service. And, no doubt, he included in that the management of the service under the present Postmaster General, as well as the management of the steamships under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. And what does the hon. gentleman tell us ? He tells us, after all these years of confederation for Prince Edward Island—and I can corroborate his statements, for I am aware of the facts—that the Postmaster General will not pay for a train to convey the mail from Georgetown or Summerside to Charlottetown. So the business-men must wait until a wedding or a funeral takes place and the parties engage a special train, or some noble minded man will come forward and deposit the amount to pay for running a special train.

This being the terrible state of affairs as regards the mails of Prince Edward Island, I most fully corroborate what has been said by the hon. gentleman in that respect. The citizens of Charlottetown, Souris, Summerside, Alberton and Tignish, and all over the province were deprived of their mails because of the penuriousness and meanness of the government, and especially the hon. Postmaster General in not providing a train to convey these mails to their destinations. In this respect the government have failed to carry out the terms of confederation guaranteed to us at the time of union. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals would have readily granted that train if the hon. Postmaster General had been willing to pay for it. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has plenty of trains, he has numbers of men to operate the trains, and he would have performed the service, but the hon. Postmaster General was so penurious that he would not pay $20 to convey these mails from Georgetown or Summerside to Charlottetown, and thus they had to remain over for twenty-four hours until the regular trains were run. Coming on towards the end of the season, when the people all over Prince Edward Island became indignant, because this is not a matter of Liberals or Conservatives, but the indignation was general all over the province, a gentleman was sent down from Ottawa who remained there for a few days. As soon as he arrived at Charlottetown he telegraphed to Ottawa and a special train was provided. Although the season had almost passed, although the time of the greatest difficulty, the time when the people suffered most from the want of their mails had almost passed, when navigation was in sight, a train was put on to convey these mails. I fully agree with what the hon. member for King's has said in connection with the matter. As I said before it is not my intention on this occasion to speak on the subject. For the last two years I have endeavoured to bring the matter to the attention of the House to the best of my ability. I now speak because of the motion of the hon. gentleman and I am pleased to think, that, after the third session of parliament since 1900, we have a supporter of the government from the province of Prince Edward Island corroborating every word I said here during the past three years and condemning the government in stronger language than I can condemn it in connection with this matter.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this subject, because I do not think it is well that the House should get the impression that this is altogether a matter that affects the province of Prince Edward Island or that it is a matter in respect to which the members of this House from the other provinces of Canada have any feeling of indifference. I would like to say a few words from the knowledge I have, living as I do upon the Nova Scotia side of the strait, and being interested in the maintenance of the service, to corroborate all that has been said by the representatives of Prince Edward Island who have been heard here to-day. I am aware that successive governments have been charged by the citizens of Prince Edward Island with failing to carry out one of the very important provisions of the Act of Union between that province and the older parts of Canada, and I know perfectly well that successive governments have endeavoured to give a satisfactory service across the strait. I think, from the local knowledge I have of the situation, that they have now succeeded in providing a service by two steamers which is as good as anything that could be provided, short of tunnel service of which the hon. member for Prince West (Mr. Hackett) has just spoken, and which would be the complete and final solution of this difficulty that affects the people of Prince Edward Island. The tunnel question has not been heard of for a long time in practical politics ; nevertheless, I have a strong impression that some day or other it will again come to the front and at a time when the greatly increased facilities for excavating tunnels and the advantage of cheap money will render the scheme a feasible one. We might expect to see the government of Canada in the position, if the rate of interest should continue to fall as it has been doing for a long time, of being able to undertake to give Prince Edward

Island connection with the mainland by means of a tunnel. It would not be a very bad financial operation. The cost can be easily ascertained and in consequence of the great improvement that has taken place in the method of excavating tunnels and of the cheapening of money, the cost is something that is diminishing every day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is there an estimate of the cost ?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the amount of the estimate ?

Mr. BELL. I think about $14,000,000 ; there were two or three estimates for tunnels of various sizes, but the one that would give a satisfactory passage to a modern locomotive would cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of $14,000,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the length of it ?

Mr. BELL. Nine miles. It is becoming every day more and more feasible. As far as the length of the tunnel is concerned, it is not unprecedented. At this moment, in Europe, a tunnel is nearing completion which is eleven miles in length, and it seems to have been constructed with comparative ease and with comparative absence of loss of life to the men employed. I think that the investigations made at the time that that question was to the front showed that the stratum through which the tunnel would be excavated would admit of comparatively easy work. I do not think that the government is prepared to consider at this moment a tunnel seriously, but they have, in my opinion, in steamship communication, the means of connecting almost perfectly Prince Edward Island and the mainland if the service be handled in a satisfactory manner. But, in the course of the past winter, the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) informs us, that we have had the worst service we have ever had since confederation. I do not think he is altogether right in that respect, because, during some of the years since confederation, people were confined to the old-fashioned mode of reaching the mainland, by the primitive ice-boat. Still, as steam communication has been adopted, I presume he meant to say that more difficulty has occurred in relation to steam communication during the past winter than in any other year. That is entirely owing to one circumstance. If no attempt had been made to keep up communication between Summerside and Cape Tormentine or, if that attempt had been abandoned when the increasing severity of the winter made it hazardous and the communication maintained entirely between Pictou and Georgetown by the two boats, giving every facility for passenger and freight communication, would have been in constant operation during the whole of the winter. It would not be fair to condemn the service simply because the experiment tried in response to the representations from a very important section of Prince Edward Island resulted in imprisoning one of the steamers in the ice floe, and because the attempt of one of the other steamers to get out of that difficulty resulted in breaking her propellor and the second steamer was incapaciated, thus nullifying the whole of the service for several weeks. Instead of diminishing the communication by the established route which time has proven to be a safe and satisfactory one, an experiment was made involving one of the steamers, imprisoning her in the ice and making her absolutely useless for the purpose for which she was placed in the service. The matter is perfectly obvious to any person acquainted with the conditions there that while Charlottetown and Summerside are the most important points, and while mail communication must be kept up uninterruptedly in the summer season when winter comes the conditions change and if there is to be a regular communication between Pictou and the mainland that communication must pass via Pictou and Georgetown. That has been satisfactorily and conclusively proven by the experience of the years in which our race has inhabited this country. I would not altogether go so far as to condemn the government for having yielded to the request of the people of the western part of the island to try the experiment, but I think they have sufficient warning in the experience of the past winter to prevent them from resorting to that experiment in the future. If they do adhere to the winter service route between Pictou and Georgetown with two such steamers as the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto,' we can count on having regular communication between Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia in the winter season. It is true that this has been a severe winter; still, not so severe as some others I can recollect in my own life. It has been a severe winter, and yet I am quite satisfied it was not the severity of the winter which interrupted the communication—it was the fact of having sent the 'Stanley' to run into the port of Summerside where she was caught under unfavourable conditions and that accident resulted not only in losing her service to the country, but also the loss of the service of the steamer 'Minto' as well. There are reasons why it would be very agreeable to people living in Prince Edward Island that communication should be kept up with Charlottetown and Summerside direct, but it is impossible to do that in winter with any facilities that could be commanded by the government, no matter what the expenditure of the government might be in the shape of steamers or ice breakers. Across the mouth of these ports where the water is shallow the drifting ice gets in and under pressure of great

weight there is a solid wall of ice formed through which nothing that floats can make its way. On the other hand the port of Georgetown is always accessible and the port of Pictou is comparatively accessible as well. If the government find itself, with means at their disposal to keep open a communication which is feasible and which has been proved in the past to be feasible, I do not think that the same interruption of commerce will result in any future winter. It is very deplorable, and every one regrets it, that our friends of Prince Edward Island have been subjected to such great loss, and one of the reasons for speaking to-day is to show that we in Nova Scotia have a great feeling of sympathy for our friends and brothers in Prince Edward Island and would like the government of Canada to do everything in their power to satisfactorily fulfil the terms of the Act of Confederation. There is one suggestion which I would make, and it is merely a suggestion. We have heard a good deal in the course of the discussion to-day from the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken, about the defectiveness of the railway service in Prince Edward Island, to the effect that trains were not ready at the moment the boats arrived to take the passengers and mails and freight. We have heard a good deal of censure applied to the hon. Postmaster General. No doubt he deserves a good deal of it and he is fortunately of sufficient stature and breadth of shoulder to bear his burden without feeling much affected by it. But it does strike me that the chief ground of complaint is, that there is some defect in the history of the organization of the whole of this service. These boats are run under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Why should not this steamer service be treated as the service across the Straits of Canso, and these boats be regarded simply as a ferry; a portion of the Intercolonial railway; a part of the service connecting the Intercolonial railway with the government railway on Prince Edward Island. If such were the case you would have concerted action and there would be no excuse whatever for failure on the part of the railway controlling these boats to serve them at every landing place with trains and afford every facility for moving passengers and freight. Were that done it would give to the control of the service a large and competent staff of officials who are at Moncton and at Truro and Pictou. The railway men under the officers of the Department of the Minister of Railways and Canals are perfectly conversant with the conditions of weather, and to my mind they would much more satisfactorily and effectively control and regulate the movements of these boats than they will ever be controlled and regulated as long as they are under a department which has not any direct connection with the great system of railways which must serve to feed these boats, and which these boats must always serve in the capacity of ferries. I do not conceive for my part that the greater distance between Pictou and Georgetown, or Summerside or Cape Tormentine constitute any reason why these boats should not be regarded as ferry boats, and as a portion of the government system of railways just as are the ferry boats which to-day are carrying the traffic of the Intercolonial railway across the Strait of Canso. There are tremendous difficulties also at Canso and this last winter in order to overcome these difficulties, under the management of my friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, a special manager to take complete charge of the ferryage across that strait was put in charge, and the result has been very great efficiency. As every one who has travelled that route knows there are tremendous difficulties of ice and tide to be encountered in the Strait of Canso just as well as in the Straits of Northumberland. I would suggest that this matter be taken into careful consideration and it may be that the result will show that the concentration of the management of the whole service in one hand will result in giving far greater efficiency.

If there be any doubt in the mind of the department that now controls or that will hereafter control these boats as to the proper points for them to make in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, all they have to do is to consult the experienced captains, pilots, and coasters; those whose business requires them to navigate these waters; to be satisfied at once and for ever that the proper points between which these boats should play, are, after the hard part of the winter comes, Georgetown and Pictou. Up to the end of the year, and perhaps in the month of January the water is so free from ice that even if there would be a somewhat great degree of frost there is no difficulty whatever in keeping up the navigation because at that time the water is perfectly clear and open as it is in summer. But when we have entered upon a new year—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was in January that the 'Stanley' was caught in the ice.

Mr. BELL. It may be the first part of January but sometimes the whole month of January is free from ice. It is after we enter the month of January that the trouble comes. In the months of January and February we experience the great difficulties of that navigation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The 'Stanley' first got into the ice on the 12th of January.

Mr. BELL. At Summerside, and she was then caught in the board ice, not in the heavy floe and drift ice which later on is found in the straits.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. She was caught fast enough.

Mr. BELL. Up to the end of the year it may be possible to navigate between these points, but the real difficulties commence in the month of January and last through February and possibly a part of March. If this service is to be maintained in the proper way, I think it is absolutely essential that the government should make itself perfectly understood as having a decided opinion that the service must be continued by Pictou and Georgetown.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). As I represent the constituency lying nearest to Prince Edward Island on the mainland, I hope I may be pardoned if I say a few words in respect to the motion now before the House. It seems to me that it is not so much a question of administration as it is a question of conditions. It may not be known to all the members of this House that until the year 1902 the only attempt at steamer navigation between the mainland and Prince Edward Island was by way of the ports of Pictou and Georgetown. During the season of 1902 an attempt was made to have winter communication between the port of Summerside in Prince Edward Island and Cape Tormentine on the New Brunswick shore. During that winter the 'Stanley' ran with very great regularity and the experiment was a success as an attempt to solve the problem of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland during the winter months. During the present winter the conditions which have prevailed practically made that route somewhat of a failure. I do not say that it has been demonstrated to be an actual failure but certainly under the conditions which have prevailed during the past winter it has not been a success. The difficulty prevailing with respect to winter communication with Prince Edward Island has been—the hon. members from Prince Edward Island will, I hope, pardon me for saying it—has been to some extent sectional. The people of the eastern section of the Island have been very desirous of having communication between the port of Pictou and Georgetown. The western people, that is, those living in the county of Prince, have been very anxious to have communication with the port of Summerside; hence the attempt during the past two seasons to have communication between Summerside and a New Brunswick port. Now, I think it has been demonstrated during the past winter that while boats could not successfully run from the port of Summerside to the port of Cape Tormentine, they could run every day of the year without exception between Cape Tormentine and what is known as Carleton Head or Carleton Point. It will be borne in mind that the distance between Georgetown on Prince Edward Island and Pictou harbour is somewhere in excess of thirty miles, and that the distance between Tormentine and Summerside is about eighteen miles, whereas the distance between Carleton Head and Cape Tormentin is about eight miles.

Now, the question may be asked, why did the 'Stanley' not run between Cape Tormentine and Carleton Head? At Cape Traverse many years ago the government of Canada built a breakwater, which is still there, a monument of a large expenditure of money; but it is impossible for a steamer of any considerable size such as the 'Stanley' to approach that point. The breakwater extends out into the sand bar, and is unapproachable. I do not know for what reason that breakwater was built; but if it were at Carleton Head, there would not be the slightest difficulty of running a steamer to that point every single day during the winter months, without exception—why? Because the action of the tides and the currents is such that twice during every twenty-four hours, or once during every twelve hours, there is an open sea between Cape Tormentine and Carleton Head.

It seems to me this is a matter of importance not merely to Prince Edward Island, but to the Dominion of Canada at large. The trade of that island is very large indeed, It is a very fruitful island and a rich one; and the people of the mainland must be deeply interested in having regular communication with the island, not merely during the summer months, but throughout the year. The matter of their daily mail must be one of supreme importance to the people of the Island. We on the mainland do not suffer in that respect, and in that respect alone this is perhaps exclusively an island question. If there were established at Carleton Head terminal facilities for the 'Stanley' or any other steamer, there is no question that there would be practically a ferry; if more than one service a day were wanted, I believe it could be had. But there can be no question as to the one service. I am warranted in asserting that, by reason of information which I have received from gentlemen who are in no way interested in this matter, who have no sectional views, and who are well informed as to the conditions which prevail in the seasons which are most severe, and are particularly familiar with the conditions that have prevailed during the months of January, February and March of this year.

Now, if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is desirous of taking into consideration this question, and will inquire into the conditions which I have described as existing at Carleton Head, I feel sure that having secured the necessary information and having provided the breakwater at Carleton Head, he will have solved the question of winter communication, without reference to a tunnel, which may come in the distant future, but which we must all

admit cannot come within the immediate future. We who live on the mainland and who look at this matter dispassionately, are, I think, in a position to invite the people of Prince Edward Island, in considering this matter, to sink any sectional differences as to whether the eastern end or the western end of the island shall receive the greatest accommodation. If they have a daily communication between the mainland and the island at a point almost equidistant between Summerside and Charlottetown, their wants will be satisfied, and the requirements of the country will be satisfied. Until the unfortunate accident which occurred to the 'Stanley' resulting in her being frozen in the ice on the seaboard, commonly called board ice, there was almost continuous communication daily between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. Now, there was considerable complaint with respect to the mail communication, and I am bound to say that the arrangements made for the conveyance of mails between the Intercolonial Railway and the 'Stanley' were not satisfactory, for the reason that the mails coming from the west on the Intercolonial Railway and arriving at Sackville at about five o'clock in the evening, had to remain at Sackville, unless there happened to be a special train going, until one o'clock the following day, when they were shipped on the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway and conveyed to Cape Tormentine. The 'Stanley' leaves at about two o'clock in the afternoon; so that the mails arrive at Cape Tormentine about an hour and a half or two hours after the 'Stanley's' departure, and there they remain until the following day at two o'clock with the result that they do not reach Summerside until perhaps five o'clock on the succeeding day. Thus it takes forty-eight hours to convey the mails from Sackville on the Intercolonial Railway to Summerside; that is, assuming that the 'Stanley' was making her regular trips, and I am bound to say she did make her regular trips for a number of weeks until the accident happened to which I have referred. But, at least this can be said, that with open water for a distance of eight miles from board ice to board ice, every day during the winter months, there can be no question of the possibility of regular communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I admit it is imperative that the representatives of Prince Edward Island should be united upon this one thing at least, as it is of vital importance to them to have daily communications with the mainland whether it be at Georgetown, Summerside or Carleton Head.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) Just one word of explanation, Mr. Speaker. The information I have been able to obtain from seafaring men is not quite in accord with what the hon. gentleman states. He argues that where the straits are narrow, must necessarily be the best place for winter navigation. But seafaring men and others who have given some study to this question, say that where the straits are the narrowest, namely, between Carleton Head and Cape Tormentine, the ice has a tendency to pack, owing to the westerly and north-westerly winds which prevail during the autumn and early winter. Consequently where the straits are narrowest navigation is most difficult, but that is the best place for a small boat to cross because you can drag a small boat along on top of the ice. That is why the small boats, which keep up navigation when the steamers are not able to run, find between Carleton and Cape Tormentine the best crossing. My hon. friend says that every twelve hours the tide and the wind form a lake of open water between Carleton Head and Cape Tormentine, which steamers might cross if breakwaters were erected on which they could land their cargoes. But my information is that these lakes do not form always in the same place. It depends upon the winds and the tides, and this open water may be half a mile distant to-morrow from where it is to-day. Consequently a breakwater might be good to-day and be half a mile out of the proper place to-morrow. This is the information I have, and while I would not discourage investigation into the possibilities of navigating the straits between these two points, I think that the hon. minister would be well advised in acting slowly before committing his department to any large expenditure. The people of Prince Edward Island want this service kept up at the best place. On that point we are unanimous, but we do not want any more experiments. Twenty-five or thirty years experience has shown that between Georgetown and Pictou a fairly satisfactory and reasonable service can be maintained until we get another steamer. I believe the time has come when we shall require three steamers. Our trade has so increased that we require now a third steamer, nearly as much as we did a second steamer when the 'Minto' was built. I am sure that the rest of Canada will be glad to know that our interprovincial trade is so increasing that we require greater facilities for carrying it in. We are not sectional in this matter and are glad to see in every portion of Canada trade increasing. We have the greatest country under the sun, and development, not only in the younger but in the older provinces, is going on by leaps and bounds. This demand by Prince Edward Island for another steamer is an additional proof of what I say. There is another point to which I would like to call attention, and that is the fact that although we have a government railway system from Montreal to Charlottetown and from Charlottetown to Halifax, travellers cannot get through tickets or

their baggage checked through. A person leaving Charlottetown for Halifax or Montreal has to buy a ticket on the Prince Edward Island railway, then another on the boats to Pictou, and then another to Halifax, Truro or Montreal. He has to get his baggage checked three times. That is a very great inconvenience.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not the case during the summer.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) No, but it is during the winter. If the officials of the department will seriously consider this matter we could make a better arrangement. I think it is they who are wholly to blame, because we cannot expect the minister himself to attend to these small matters. But it is these small things which occasion so much trouble, inconvenience and annoyance to the travelling public.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I am very much surprised to hear that it has not been found possible or practicable by the railway officials to arrange for through tickets and checking of baggage to and from the island. I am aware that during the summer season, when we have to deal with a private corporation, there is no difficulty at all, and through ticketing and checking are gone on with without any trouble. No doubt the officials of Charlottetown, who are chiefly interested in this branch of the question, have been making every effort to remedy this, and I do not know why they have not succeeded in effecting some through ticket arrangement with the steamers under the management of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I shall have great pleasure in instituting inquiries at once and finding out where the fault lies. It ought to be an easy matter for the two departments or three—if three are concerned—to come to an understanding which will ensure the convenience of the travelling public. As regards what my hon. friend has said about the delays at Georgetown and the inability to secure train connections there, I can only say that this is the first time I have learned that trouble of that kind had arisen, either this year or last. I asked my hon. friend if he had previously communicated with my department, and he does not remember distinctly whether it was with mine or some other department that communications took place. My own pretty strong conviction is that it was not with my department, because I would consider it a very serious grievance to have mails and passengers delayed many hours in consequence of the failure of the steamer to arrive on time to make connection with ordinary trains. I think that the train arrangements on the island are made in such a way as to connect with the steamers, if they arrive on schedule time or nearly that time.

As anybody can see at once, a through train, which has brought passengers from some distance still further east, cannot be detained at the point of connection with the steamer. It is necessary that that train shall continue on its journey with as little delay as possible. No one would think that that train should be kept at the point of connection with the steamer until the steamer arrives, for the steamer may be many hours late. But, if while the passengers who have been delayed at Pictou and have reached Georgetown, should be detained there for many hours, I do not see why the mails which are brought to Georgetown for transmission and distribution throughout the island should be kept for many hours for the want or the absence of a train or the want of through connection. Of course, that is not a matter that I can deal with wholly within my own department. But I apprehend it could be settled without serious trouble between the hon. Postmaster General and myself. I am sure that he is alive to the necessity of furnishing all necessary facilities and accommodation to the public in the matter of train service. By co-operating, we could secure, and would secure that necessary accommodation. My hon. colleague would have a duty cast upon him, and I should be required to see that the trains were carried forward without delay, and so the duty would be cast upon me of considering any proposition he might make for the sending forward of the mail. Of course, he would not expect that the mail should be carried for nothing. But the exchange of reasonable views would lead to the settlement of a matter of that sort. I think it will be possible to avoid an occurrence of the kind referred to. I am not sufficiently informed of the advantages of the various routes offering communication between the island and the mainland to make any suggestion. I do, however, know this, and I think the travelling public feel it, that if it were possible to make the direct connection from Cape Tormentine to some point on the island a few miles distant—my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, King's) says eight miles—it would be a convenience which would be much appreciated by the very great number of people who travel from and to the west. There are many passengers desiring to reach Prince Edward Island, a great deal of freight and much mail matter for distribution on the island, which now has to travel all the way round by Pictou, a distance, I should think, of somewhere between 150 and 200 miles further than it would go if it could make the short connection at Cape Tormentine. The people would receive their mails and travellers would reach their destination many hours earlier than under the present arrangements. So far as light has been thrown upon it, it seems that the way by Pictou and Georgetown is the easiest and safest mode of making communication. But I think the suggestion made during the discussion, that inquiry might be made whe-

ther or not a safe mode of crossing could be insured between Cape Tormentine and Carleton Point, is one which might well receive the consideration of the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). I have but a few remarks to make on the motion before the Chair. I have only to give, to a certain extent, the facts as they are contained in the correspondence that will be filed. Of course, this consists of letters and telegrams relating to instructions given to the officers in Prince Edward Island and on the steamers on the route. According to the information I have procured in the department, the instructions were the same as were given for the season of navigation for 1902. The experience in 1902 of having steamers on the two lines—this is before I came to the department, of course—had shown that this method was a success, according to what I am told. So, last fall, the 'Stanley' was placed upon the route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. She became ice-bound on January 12, and was not released until March 17. The 'Minto' was placed, as on the year previous, on the route between Georgetown and Pictou. But when the 'Stanley' was caught in the ice, the 'Minto' was sent to her assistance. The ice being extremely heavy—it appears that in certain places it was as much as fourteen feet in thickness—the 'Minto' broke the blades of her propeller, and so was rendered helpless until the 'Stanley' got clear and towed her into Pictou. There is no doubt that, if an error was made, the department should not be blamed. The two ports to which the ferries cross had been fixed at the demand of the members for Prince Edward Island. The correspondence will show that, for years and years, those hon. gentlemen had been demanding that the line should be established between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. It stands to reason that, with the severe winter we had this year, when one of the boats was caught in the ice, there was nothing to do but send the other one to its rescue. And that is what was done, and it was the cause of the whole trouble. The correspondence will show there was no error on the part of the officers in charge of the 'Stanley.' And to save the boat, which is a valuable one, the officers of the department thought there was nothing to do but send the 'Minto' to her release. The 'Minto' did not succeed in releasing the 'Stanley,' on the contrary, she was herself disabled, and is now undergoing repairs. She is not seriously damaged, but she could not continue on the line. The service has been resumed since March 17, and it has given satisfaction. I shall make inquiries during the coming season in order to ascertain what is the best line to adopt. But it seems perfectly clear that the old line between Georgetown and Pictou was the best, because there was scarcely any interruption when the two steamers were put on that line. Since 1902 the officers of the department have been endeavouring to improve the service, and if, unfortunately, they did not succeed last winter, I do not think the department should be blamed for the accident that occurred. As regards the building of some other and stronger boats than those now employed, that is a very serious question. There is in the department correspondence to the effect that an iceboat of special construction, of somewhat the same kind as they have in Russia, on the Baltic Sea, might be put on that line. I am informed, however, that the conditions of the two places are not the same. In Russia, where they have iceboats running during the winter that go through ice from two to four feet thick, they do not encounter masses of ice like those in the Straits of Northumberland. According to the information that I have received, it is impossible to construct boats that will go through a pack of ice from ten or fourteen to twenty feet in thickness. Of course, I shall continue my endeavours to get all the information possible in order to be able to decide on the best course to pursue.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the ice ever fourteen feet thick between Georgetown and Pictou ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No ; that was on the route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. The fact is that the 'Minto' could have continued in crossing and giving the communication if she had not been called upon to go to the relief of the 'Stanley.' We tried to get some other steamers, we even tried to get two boats from Newfoundland, and the crew of one of these boats started to go to the relief of the 'Stanley' and discovered that it was impossible to reach her, packed as she was in the ice. All possible means were used. Men were sent out with dynamite who tried to break the ice pack, but they were quite unable to do so, and it was only when nature came to the rescue of the 'Stanley' that she was got out of that ice, otherwise she would have been obliged to stay there until spring. I have no objection whatever to the correspondence being brought before the House, because I think it will show all the facts to be as I have stated. I may say again that the department will make all necessary inquiries into the case, and during the recess I will personally visit Prince Edward Island and the maritime provinces and make myself cognizant of the situation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he made any investigation as to the conditions between Cape Tormentine and Summerside before changing the route, which, as I understand, was formerly from Pictou to Georgetown ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We did not change the route, but we took two routes instead of one, in order to give the people of Prince Edward Island the better accommodation that they were asking for. In 1902 the service was divided. The 'Minto' was left on the old line between Georgetown and Pictou, and the 'Stanley' was put on the other line, which was considered last fall perfectly safe, because it had been in operation during the winter of 1902.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like the minister to explain how it is, if the same conditions do not prevail as regards the thickness of the ice between Pictou and Georgetown as between Cape Tormentine and Summerside, that the 'Minto' had to go to the rescue of the 'Stanley' between Pictou and Georgetown. Did the 'Stanley' take the field of ice with her or did the ice take the 'Stanley'?

Motion agreed to.

HAY AND OATS BOUGHT FOR THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT.

On the Order for:

Copies of all Orders in Council and all correspondence between the imperial government or any departmental officer thereof, and the government of Canada, or any department, or officer thereof; and all reports respecting the purchase in Canada, by or through the government of Canada, or any department, or officer thereof, of any horses, hay, oats, material, supplies, animals, or merchandise, for the imperial government, or any department, or officer thereof, during the years 1900, 1901, and 1902.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The other day this motion stood at the request of the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). If the hon. gentleman wishes to proceed, I am willing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood from the hon. gentleman that probably there were some papers that he would be willing to bring down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might stand for the present, and in the meantime the hon. gentleman will indicate those that he is willing to bring down, so that I may come to a conclusion as to whether it is necessary to speak to the motion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will make his motion now, I will state the view I have of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may require to speak upon it afterwards. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would indicate to me his views at some convenient time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will do that personally.

Order allowed to stand.

EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Borden (Halifax)—moved for:

Return showing:

1. The number of employees appointed in the Public Works Department since the 21st October, 1902.
2. Their names and their salaries.
3. The changes made amongst the employees; the names and the salaries of those who have been replaced or promoted, as well as the reasons for such changes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). Mr. Speaker, I do not think there can be any objection to the motion. I do not think there have been any appointments, or changes, during the time mentioned. However, if there are, we will bring down the information.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

1. The quantity of vegetables entered at the custom-house at Montreal, as imported from the United States, from the first of February, 1902, to the first of March, 1903.
2. The quantity of vegetables entered at the custom-house at Toronto, as imported from the United States, from the first of February, 1902, to the first of March, 1903.
3. The amount of duty levied and collected in each case respectively.—Mr. Monk—by Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Copies of all telegrams, reports, letters, photographs, and correspondence, of every description, between the Department of Agriculture and any person, or persons, whatsoever, relevant to the outbreak of hog cholera in the township of Yarmouth, Ontario.—Mr. Ingram.

Return of all papers, documents, and correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals, the Department of Justice, the Treasury Board, and the Auditor General, or between any of them, relating to the promotion of Mr. F. A. Dixon to the rank of Chief clerk, at a salary of $1,800 a year; to take effect from July 1, 1902, and the payment of said salary; and including amongst other papers the report of the deputy head of the Department of Railways and Canals, as provided for by subsection (a) of section 15 of the Civil Service Act; the Minute or Memorandum of concurrence of the Minister of Railways in said Report; and a copy of the Order in Council creating such chief clerkship; pursuant to section 15 of said Act, and of the Order in Council in this matter of May 20, 1902; and including all papers, documents, letters and proceedings, in this matter, referred to on pages A—49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54 and 55 of the Auditor General's Report for the year ending June, 1902.—Mr. Lennox.

Statement in detail of amounts paid for travelling expenses in connection with the Census of 1891, to any census commissioner, in the province of Quebec, since June 30, 1902; with

names of officers to whom such travelling expenses were paid ; and the places such officer travelled to.—Mr. Monk—by Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Copies of all correspondence, representations, memoranda, Minutes or Orders in Council, appointments, instructions, papers and writings, in reference to or in connection with railway cattle guards or in reference to, or in connection with the selection or appointment of the cattle-guard commission, and the members thereof ; and their action and proceedings, including the retirement of Mr. Robertson, and the appointment of Mr. F. W. Holt, C.E., as sole commissioner, and his instructions and subsequent proceedings ; and including all interim reports by the original or subsequent commission, between the date of the report of the Railway Committee of last session on the Lancaster Bill No. 3 of last session, and this date.—Mr. Lennox.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 2) to amend chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1900, authorizing the granting of railway subsidies.—Mr. Charlton.

On section 1.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the length of this road and what is the total amount to be expended on it ? Why is it that you wish the sum reduced from $60,000 to $30,000.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). I may say to the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that there is no particular road mentioned. I believe it merely proposes the general principle of reducing the amount of the payment from $60,000 to $30,000 to meet the case of short roads where the expenditure is not sufficiently large to permit of an application as the statute stands. The matter was before the Railway Committee, discussed there and carried unanimously.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The old law was that the road must be completed in ten mile sections. It must be less than a ten mile section that you wish to apply this provision to. Why should not a short road of say 6, 7 or 8 miles be completed before the application is made.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). I am afraid my hon. friend has me somewhat at a disadvantage. I am moving this in a formal way in the absence of the hon. member who is promoting the Bill. It was discussed in committee but I have not the same familiarity with the matter which he has. Of course, if the hon. gentleman takes exception, it will have to stand.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have no objection to the Bill, but I do not know to what it is proposed to apply this principle. This is to amend the principle which was introduced into the Railway Act only to give progress estimates in connection with the construction of railways where the amount earned is $60,000. This proposes to reduce the amount so as to enable the government to give a progress estimate on the amount of the subsidy earned when the amount is only $30,000. It is possible that the railway may be a very short one but that is all the more reason why the principle should be retained, and the subsidy should not be paid unless the whole road is constructed. I am opposed to the principle entirely. I think it is wrong to give progress estimates on a road a large proportion of which may not be completed and which may not be of any benefit to the country.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). I understood the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) to say during the progress of the discussion at the Railway Committee that progress estimates were very likely to be done away with before a very great while.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). There was a question as to whether or not it was wise to have the system of progress estimates at all. The view the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals took was that inasmuch as we had that principle in the Act at present he thought there would be no injustice in placing the amount at $30,000 which would enable smaller roads to obtain the advantage of the system, whereas, at present, it can only apply to large undertakings. There was some question in the minutes of the Railway Committee as to whether progress estimates were wise at all, but since we have them and since they apply to large enterprises only, it was thought, in the view of the committee, that there would be no injustice in allowing it to be made more favourable to the smaller companies which might receive $30,000 which they cannot receive as long as the sum is fixed at $60,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That desire will be satisfied by an amendment providing that the amount should be reduced to $30,000 in case of railways not exceeding a certain length.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think practically that is the way it works out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Act is of perfectly general application at present. Even if the road was fifty or one hundred miles long, this Bill would apply to it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What the hon. gentleman suggests has some force in it, perhaps, but I should think the proper way to amend the statute would be by stating that where a road is only of a certain length, where it does not exceed ten, fifteen or twenty miles, then you may make payments where the amount earned is $30,000. I do not know whether that view was suggested in the Railway Committee or not.

Bill reported.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, 1900—AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. CLANCY (Bothwell) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 15) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. He said:—I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he is prepared to adopt this Bill? The reason I ask the question is that there seems to be some difference of opinion between the hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. Minister of Justice as to whether the offence proposed to be dealt with in this Bill is covered by the present law. I take it for granted that if the present law does not cover the offence, the Minister of Justice will accept the remedy provided in this Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. C. Fitzpatrick). My opinion still is that the provision of this Bill is already covered by the existing law. I believe that the words in section 112, 'in any manner practices intimidation on or against any person' are sufficiently broad to cover the evil which my hon. friend complains of.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister will see that it was thought necessary to specifically state in section 112 what were the offences, and after having stated them specifically, then it concludes by saying 'or in any manner practices intimidation upon or against any person.' The offence that my Bill proposes to remedy is just as definite in its nature as any of those specifically mentioned in section 112, but it is not mentioned in that section. The offence I am endeavouring to remedy is as far-reaching in its effects as any already stated in the statute. I am not a lawyer, but taking a common sense view of it, it does seem to me that the existing law leaves the matter so indefinite that it would be difficult to prove in a court the particular intimidation spoken of in my Bill as an offence under the law. I am sure that the Minister of Justice will sympathize with our position in the province of Ontario. Every one knows that we have not a secret ballot in the local elections, and unfortunately that fact is used as a means of intimidation. Then, when the federal elections come on the voters are told that the Dominion ballot, like the provincial ballot, is not secret, and so voters are intimidated. That is the offence which I want to punish. Perhaps the language used in my Bill may not exactly describe the offence which I intend to punish, but if not the Minister of Justice can substitute such other words which will have the intended effect. Of course, if the Minister of Justice takes the ground that such an act of intimidation should not be punished, that is another story, but if he does admit that such gross intimidation should be prevented by the law, then I think he should accept my Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What does the hon. gentleman wish to punish by his Bill?

Mr. CLANCY. I have already explained and the language in my Bill is clear upon the point. It says: Or makes use of any language to the effect that the ballot to be used or the mode of voting at the elections is not secret.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Is it the intention to prohibit the use of these words, because they may be a form of intimidation?

Mr. CLANCY. Not 'may be,' but are, as a matter of fact.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The answer to that question shows the absolute necessity of the position I take, and shows how absolutely useless are the words suggested in the amendment, because if they describe a form of intimidation, the statute brings it within the operation of the law.

Mr. CLANCY. It might be a question with the judge whether they were acts of intimidation. He might take a different view.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This discussion is getting somewhat irregular at this stage. Would it not be better to allow the Bill to go to committee?

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1.

Mr. INGRAM. The words that follow the word 'loss' in section 112 read: 'Or in any manner practices intimidation upon or against any person in order to induce such person to vote or to refrain from voting.' I think the contention of the Minister of Justice would be a very proper one if the offence were a means of intimidating any person to vote or to refrain from voting. That is not the complaint of the mover of the Bill at all. What he complains of is that by reason of being told that the ballot is not a secret ballot, the voter, instead of voting in the way he would have voted, is influenced on the opposite side.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That case is covered by the provision against interfering with a voter in the free exercise of his franchise. Would it not be an interference with the free exercise of the franchise by any person to tell him that you know how he is going to vote?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it would be a very serious interference with the rights of a voter for another elector to tell him that when the election was over he would know how he voted. The Bill of my hon. friend from Bothwell has a special application to the province of Ontario, and perhaps for that reason the hon. Minister of Justice does not see the great necessity for the change, he living in the province of Quebec, where there is an absolutely secret ballot for provincial electoral purposes. Unfor-

tunately in the province of Ontario we have not such, nor have we had for a great many years. It is well known that in all provincial elections the ballot is not a secret ballot. The marking of the ballots is known to the party in power. They have the means of obtaining that knowledge, and without any doubt whatever they do examine the ballots after they are returned to the city of Toronto and are placed in the hands of government officials there. In that way they are enabled to mark the lists for the next general election. So that when an election comes on it is practically known to them just how every voter voted in the previous election. For this reason, we from the province of Ontario, feel that something ought to be done to prevent the intimidation which is practiced on voters in that province. As the hon. member for Bothwell has said, not only is this intimidation carried on in provincial elections, but it has come to be so well understood that it is now carried into Dominion elections, and voters are told, though not truthfully, that their vote will be known in Dominion elections the same as in provincial elections; and men who are not familiar with the election law readily believe that when their vote is known in one case, it is known in the other. It seems to me that the hon. Minister of Justice should do everything he can to assist us in the province of Ontario to remove the evil complained of. I do not say for one moment that the Dominion ballot is not an absolutely secret ballot. If the voter folds his ballot properly, I do not think it is possible for the returning officer to know how he votes; and certainly, after the ballot is placed in the ballot box, no one can find out how the voter has marked it. But I think the hon. member for Bothwell has made it plain that the Ontario ballot is not a secret ballot. In fact, the officers say, and the judges on the bench say, that it is not a secret ballot. I have heard Judge Armour say: 'In the province of Ontario we have not a secret ballot.' Under these circumstances, the hon. Minister of Justice can easily see how voters can be misled in a Dominion election, when they are told by some person, perhaps one having superior knowledge, that their vote can be discovered. I think that an offence of that kind, intended to deter a voter from voting for the candidate of his choice, should be a crime under the election law. I hope that the hon. Minister of Justice will allow the words proposed in the Bill to be added to the election law. It appears that the words in the Act are not sufficiently strong to meet the case. They are too general; let us make them more specific. I trust that the hon. Minister of Justice will lend us in the province of Ontario his assistance to do away with this species of intimidation, which does not prevail in any other part of the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am absolutely in sympathy with every effort that can be made to prevent fraud in elections; but in drafting a statute it is a great mistake to attempt to specialize. The legal theory is to use words of general application, because the moment you commence to specify; you limit the scope of the Act, and the result is disastrous. So far as my information goes, the language of the Act is sufficient to cover the offence sought to be met by this Bill. But if the condition of things in the province of Ontario is such that it is necessary to meet that particular case, I am prepared to consider the matter, and I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, for that purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the committee rises, I would like to suggest that so far as the word 'intimidation' is concerned, the hon. member for Bothwell might regard the offence in question as intimidation, but it does not necessarily follow that the court would so construe it. The words of the statute are: 'Any injury, damage, harm or loss, or in any manner practices intimidation upon or against any person.' But the mere statement that the ballot was not secret might not be considered as covered by these words or regarded as intimidation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps the voter would not so regard it?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is another observation in favour of the view of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has advanced. As I understand the suggestion of the Postmaster General it is this, that you should have words which would be distinctly understood by people who are not lawyers. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice suggests that if this particular offence is not covered by the word 'intimidation' it would be covered by the words 'fraudulent device or contrivance.' Whether or not the mere representation that the ballot is not secret would be regarded as a fraudulent device or contrivance is open, it seems to me, with all deference to the opinion of the Minister of Justice, to some question. If there be a particular difficulty, as suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell, I think the Minister of Justice will agree that he might amend this statute so as not to interfere in any way with the general application of the words. For instance we could add a subsection providing that the words 'fraudulent device or contrivance' would include the offence in question. It is only in exceptional cases we should adopt legislation of this kind, but the case mentioned by my hon. friend from Bothwell seems to be one of these, and the difficulty mentioned by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice might be got over very easily in the way I have mentioned.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I shall consider all the suggestions made. I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). In the absence of Mr. McCarthy, I beg to move that Bill (No. 48) to amend the General Inspection Act be read the second time.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the explanation of the Bill ?

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public works—chargeable to income—rents, repairs, furniture, heating—heating Dominion public buildings, fuel, &c., $60,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). There is an increase here of $5,000. The increase is owing to the increased number of public buildings to be heated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Which new public buildings are these ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Public buildings at Granby, Quebec ; Deseronto, Sarnia, Cardiff, North-west Territories, court house ; Nelson, public building ; Rossland, public building. It was found that the item was a little short anyway. Last year was hardly a fair one to judge by, owing to the strike and the increased prices of fuel ; but, after a careful estimate, it was found that it will require about $60,000 to furnish fuel for the various buildings throughout the Dominion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much is due to the new public buildings, and how much to shortage ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was thought that the item of $55,000 voted last year would turn out to be about $3,500 short. The balance, $1,500, would be for the new buildings.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister please tell us what is the policy of the government in the supplying of coal in the individual towns ? Do the government advertise in each town for supply or do they put in a general advertisement ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have an advertisement which reaches the dealers throughout the Dominion. They can tender for any building or for the whole supply. The practice is, besides that, to advertise for tenders in each place.

Mr. BLAIN. Why should not the government purchase the whole quantity, say $60,000 worth ? They could purchase this coal cheaper than any dealer. At least that is true of the province of Ontario.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) will see that that would be impossible. The coal has to be delivered, in some places, in small quantities, and the buildings to be heated are situated all over the Dominion. A Toronto or Montreal dealer could not supply various places unless he had agents in the several towns, and, of course, none of the dealers have such an organization. The dealer in any town in Ontario applies to headquarters, the same as the dealer in the large city. Of course, they supply practically at the lowest prices.

Mr. INGRAM. Did the hon. minister bring down the statement that he promised on Friday evening with respect to contracts for coal for Ottawa buildings ? That would give us an idea what prices should be elsewhere.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that if my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will look at 'Hansard,' I think he will find that I gave all the information with regard to the principal tenders. It may be that there was a misunderstanding, and that there is further information to be given. There is no objection to the bringing down of fuller information with regard to prices, tenders, &c. But that information relates to the Ottawa buildings, while this item is for coal for public buildings throughout the Dominion.

Mr. CLARE. I think that if the hon. minister could give us an account of the coal bought in the different towns, and the prices paid, that information would be valuable.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall be very pleased to bring down a return showing the amount used in the different towns. Of course, I cannot be expected to have that here.

Mr. CLARE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), who is not present at the moment, informed me at six o'clock, as I understood him, that there was some information to be brought down with regard to this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there were two other items which the hon. member (Mr. Clarke) asked to have stand until the information was furnished. I have a statement here which I will hand to him, and the other statement which he asked for will be laid on the Table tomorrow. The officials of the department could not get it ready to-day.

Mr. INGRAM. Could the hon. minister give me the figures showing the quantity of coal for the government building at St. Thomas, the price and name of the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not able to give the prices of each place, but, as I have said, I shall be pleased to bring down a return giving that information.

Lighting Dominion public buildings, $75,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a very large increase here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This year the committee is asked to vote $75,000, instead of $55,000 as last year. This provides the amount necessary for lighting the various public buildings. Last year we voted $55,000, and I think on the average we have put about $18,000 a year in the supplementary estimates. We thought it was better to have the whole amount stated here. The increase of $2,500 is to provide for the new buildings that have been erected. Last year the total amount voted was $73,000; this year it is $75,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is a marked improvement in the system to bring the expenditures down all in one item. We may conclude, therefore, that so far as this item is concerned, there will be no further vote asked.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not with regard to this item. The object of the department will be to make a correct estimate of what will be required. The difference between the vote of $55,000 and what will be required will have to be brought down under a new estimate, but there will be no supplementary estimate for 1903-4. This is estimated to cover the full amount.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The supplementary estimate to which the hon. gentleman refers has yet to be brought down for this year to cover the shortage of the current year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has been the practice. But henceforth we are going to take an appropriation for the full amount required.

Water—Dominion public buildings, $16,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does this cover the water tax in cities for water supplied to government buildings?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to supply water to the various public buildings under the control of the Dominion government. The officers of the department think that $16,000 will be sufficient. We had a small balance left over last year, when the sum was $16,000, the same as this year.

Electric and other power for running elevators, stamp cancelling machines, &c., Dominion public buildings, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Electricity is used in the Montreal post office for stamp cancelling machines, freight and passenger elevators, $3,200; stamp cancelling machine in Quebec post office, $200; Toronto, elevator at the station in connection with the post office, stamp cancelling machine at the post office, elevator at the custom house, amounting altogether to $950; Ottawa, one elevator in the east block, two in the parliament building, one at the military stores, current for the fire pump, stamp cancelling machine in the post office, $2,270; Victoria, B.C., passenger and freight elevator, $920; Vancouver, stamp cancelling machine at post office.

Mr. LENNOX. Could the minister tell us what it costs to run the elevator in the Seybold building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not run by electricity. These items I have read represent the cost of electrical power.

Mr. INGRAM. Did we not have a power house at the foot of the hill here a few years ago? What was done with that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The machinery became obsolete and the plant was abandoned. The machinery is still there.

Harbours and river, Nova Scotia—Amagandus wharf, $2,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister please explain where in the Auditor General's Report we will find the details of the expenditure at this place?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None of the money voted was spent last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then why should you ask for a vote this year? I see that it has been voted for two years and nothing done. Perhaps, if it is not necessary, you might drop the item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In explanation I may say that it is quite right that this money has not been spent though previously voted, but the work is now under way. It is being done by day's labour, and it is intended to spend $1,000 during the current year, so that, we are revoting $1,000 and asking for $2,000 more as it is estimated that the cost of this work will be $4,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What purpose is to be served by this wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that this wharf is being built for the local trade principally. From the petition presented by the inhabitants of this district there are considerable shipments of fire wood and coal from this point. As other wharfs are a good distance from this place and the roads are very bad it was thought desirable in the public interest to serve these people by building this wharf.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is it a new wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. When was this money expended on this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is under way now. It is expected that $1,000 will be spent before the 30th June. We are asking for a revote of a $1,000 and $2,000 more to complete the work.

Mr. COCHRANE. What will be the depth of the water when the wharf is completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information he asks for.

Mr. INGRAM. The Auditor General's Report does not show any expenditure on this work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, none of this money was spent last year.

Mr. COCHRANE. So that the benefit will be from the landing of coal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Coal and fire wood seems to be principally shipped from that point.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the department purchase the land or how do you secure it before commencing the construction of a wharf like this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this case the proprietor of the land at the foot of the road where the wharf is to be built has made a free grant to the Crown of the site.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any population in this town, or village ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is just a scattered settlement along the coast of Cape Breton.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the expected revenue from this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I doubt very much if there will be any revenue from this wharf.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to this point which I gleaned from a statement by the hon. Minister of Public Works. I understand him to say that this is a local matter serving a few people in that neighbourhood. I have no objection at all to it because it is in Nova Scotia, but, I have noticed in other years that the public expenditure has proceeded upon the same lines, not in Nova Scotia alone, but in my own province and, I believe, in all the provinces of the Dominion. I may be wrong, but it appears to me that the practice of expending the money of the Dominion of Canada upon small undertakings which are in their nature local is not a fair expenditure of the money of the Dominion. It may be a perfectly legitimate expenditure by a province or it may be a perfectly legitimate expenditure by a local municipality. But, unless it serves the interests of Canada as a whole, it is not an honest or judicious expenditure of the moneys of this country. We should not, as a federal parliament, vote the moneys of the people of this country for the promotion of what is merely a local concern. Now, whenever an hon. member of one province opposes an expenditure of this kind, if it is in reference to another province, it is likely to be suggested that he is sectional in his tendencies. But I do so now because this is the first opportunity I have had this session of drawing attention to the matter. I speak of it not in reference to Nova Scotia, but I speak of it in reference to every province of the Dominion, and from my point of view—I do not know what the opinion of the committee is—unless it is shown that there is through traffic to be provided for and that this work in some way will serve the interest of the Dominion as a whole it is not a fair or honest expenditure of the public money and we as a parliament are not justified in sanctioning the expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose there is a good deal to be said on both sides of this question. A fine distinction must be drawn to know whether the public interest is being served in each particular locality. On the one hand you have municipal corporations which are wealthy and where the people interested in doing business are wealthy, and a wharf is built at large expenditure to serve the trade of that place, while on the other hand you have a small place where the people are engaged, as in this instance, in fishing, farming and that sort of thing and who require wharf accommodation. It has been the policy of the Dominion parliament, probably ever since confederation, to construct these works. I am not prepared at the present moment to make any announcement as to a change of policy. There is no doubt very good service is done the country and that the development of the country is promoted by affording these facilities to the smaller places. We cannot forget that the fishing industry brings a large revenue to the country. It gives employment to a great number of people, although perhaps in an humble way, and it is quite open to discussion whether or not in a locality such as this a small expenditure is not perfectly justifiable. I am not prepared for myself and the government to announce a change of policy at the present moment. Parliament has already approved of these works and I do not think that we would be at liberty to stop their progress. The depth at this point is eleven feet at low water.

Mr. INGRAM. There was no discussion on this item last year. I do not know where this place is or anything about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have to send my hon. friend to school to learn the geography of Nova Scotia.

Mr. INGRAM. It would be pretty hard to find in any geography some of the places in Nova Scotia you build wharfs in.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) is Minister of Public Works he will find that he has a good deal of geography to learn. This is situated in Cape Breton county.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it let by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is built by day labour, under the supervision of the government engineer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it the duty of any particular officer to see that the wharfingers all over the country make returns of the revenue received from these wharfs, or whether, as I am informed, there is a rather lax system in regard to this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The system is that when a wharf has been transferred from the Department of Public Works to the Department of Marine, a wharfinger is appointed and he is bound to make returns and as a rule he does. From some of them there is a very small revenue. The system requires that returns should be made and I will call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the statement of my hon. friend.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is it not the law that where the expenditure is over a certain amount the work has to be let by contract.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For eighteen or twenty years in the case of a work costing less than $5,000 it was supposed that it could be let by an Order in Council without tender. This was found to be ultra vires and now all works are let by tender unless done by day's labour under the department.

Mr. CLARE. It would appear that this wharf cannot be of very great importance because it is three years since we began to vote money for it and it has not yet been commenced.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has come under my notice that the delay in commencing these public works is sometimes caused by the difficulty in getting a site, and sometimes the estimated cost of the work turns out to be more than the vote and the work is not gone on with until we get a further vote.

Big Pond wharf, $3,100.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year $900 was voted for this work, and according to the Auditor General's Report, none of that money was expended. Now we are asked for $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The $900 was voted last year, but owing to the heavy storms and damage done it was found that it required $2,500 more to renew the superstructure and put it in proper shape. The $900 was spent, but not having been expended before the 30th of June last, it does not appear in this year's Auditor General's Report.

Mr. HACKETT. In what county is this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Antigonish county.

Mr. LENNOX. Are we to understand from the hon. Minister of Public Works that he knows as a matter of fact that a storm swept away this pier and that this accounts for this very large additional amount being required; or are we to understand simply that may be a way for accounting for it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend has drawn a little on his imagination. I did not say that the pier had been swept away. This is a large wharf, having cost some $35,000. Our information comes from the local engineers who made an estimate of the amount required to put it in repair, and I do not think he would report that it is necessary to repair it unless it is really so.

Bailey's Brook—breakwater wharf, $3,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was $2,000 asked for this wharf last year—a new wharf. That was the estimated cost at the time. I do not see in the Auditor General's Report any account of that $2,000 having been spent. Now my hon. friend asks for $3,000, I presume to complete the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. As none of the $2,000 was spent previous to the 30th of June last, no account of it would appear in the Auditor General's Report of this year. This wharf breakwater is in Pictou county, Nova Scotia, and the estimated cost of the work is $5,000. $2,000 will be spent during the present year and we are asking for $3,000 to complete the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of the proposed expenditure?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This wharf is on the southern shore of Pictou county. It is to provide accommodation for the fishermen and the people in that locality. There was a wharf there previously, but it was very much destroyed, and this expenditure will practically make a new wharf. It is at the mouth of the river, and really acts as a breakwater as well as a landing wharf.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the work done by contract or by day labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By day labour.

Mr. INGRAM. Do we understand that hereafter all new works are to be done by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. In almost every case except repairs and very small works, they are let by public tender. I would not say that in some cases repairs are not let by public tender. The policy of the department is to do most of the repairs and to build some of these small wharfs by day labour under the supervision of the resident engineer; but wherever a wharf can be built by tender, that is done.

Big Pond wharf, $3,100.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this for a new structure, or for repairs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A new structure. The work has not been commenced. The estimated cost is $3,100.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the purpose of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A small wharf is being built for the accommodation of fishermen residing in that district. Their nearest railway station is Grand Narrows. Freight is forwarded from that station by steamer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any anticipated revenue ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can hardly answer that question. Some of these small wharfs yield quite a revenue and others do not give enough to pay the wharfinger's fees. It is difficult to know until the wharf is built and placed under the jurisdiction of the Marine Department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister can no doubt tell us from his experience in the Marine Department something about the system of returns from these wharfs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When a wharf is completed it is handed over to the Marine Department and that department finds a wharfinger. In the case of these small wharfs, the wharfinger is generally allowed all the revenue up to $20. Where the revenue is more considerable, the wharfinger receives 25 per cent and makes a regular return to the department according to printed form sent him.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is this work to be let by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a small work which will cost altogether $3,100, and will probably be done by day work under the supervision of the government engineer. It is divided up into a great many items and will probably be better done by days' work, under the supervision of the engineer, than by contract.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would not a small contract like this draw more competition than a large one as there would be more men capable of undertaking it ? In this way the work would likely be done cheaper by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have to depend a good deal upon the advice of the local engineer. While it might appear to us that it could be done cheaper by contract, still in places distant from any village, town or settlement, and where the lumber has to be purchased and perhaps floated down during certain seasons of the year, on the whole, taking into account the delays, it would be better to have it done by day work under the supervision of our own engineer.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this $3,100 to be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that is the total estimated cost.

Bridgewater, N.S., dredging, $5,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why was this money not spent last year ? I see it is a revote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The department has no dredge to do it, and I am sorry to say there is none to be hired. In a good many places like this, dredging is very much required, and it may be some time before the dredge now under construction may be completed. This is a matter that will have to receive the serious attention of the department.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there any chance of getting the 'J. Israel Tarte' dredge on this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That dredge is doing important work on the St. Lawrence at present.

Mr. LOGAN. What preparation is the hon. minister making for increased dredging facilities in Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a large dredge under construction, but I regret that it could not be ready this season. The department will have to seriously consider what arrangement may be made for the present season as in many of these places dredging is urgently required

Mr. LOGAN. I trust the department will look into this matter of dredging very seriously, at once. In a large part of Nova Scotia dredging is absolutely necessary. I have in mind just now one harbour, the harbour of Wallace, where I have been endeavouring for two years to get the department to send a dredge. A part of that harbour is becoming absolutely unnavigable for the want of a small amount of dredging, and it is very important that entrance into the harbour should be improved as a considerable amount of shipping use it. The department would be justified in making

extraordinary efforts to provide increased dredging facilities particularly for the harbours in the maritime provinces.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). No doubt the province of Nova Scotia is suffering for the want of dredges to do work absolutely necessary. There is a harbour in my county which was deepened in 1882 and on which $82,000 was spent, but which is now beginning to get shoaly for the want of dredging. During the last two years it has required dredging very badly. We were told by the ex-Minister of Public Works that a new dredge was being built, but from recent inquiries I am afraid it will take as long to build that dredge as it took to build the Temple of Jerusalem.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. All those who have followed with some degree of care the shipbuilding that has been going on in the world during the last couple of years, know that material has been very difficult to obtain. Railway men and ship-building men have been unable to get the material they require, and the department, no doubt, has been hampered by the same difficulty. When I left the department a large dredge was well under way at the government shipyard at Sorel, but some time ago I heard that it is not yet completed. I am not surprised, but I fully expected it would be completed in the month of July or August. Of course during the last five months I have not followed up matters in connection with our public works, but that dredge which is under way now in Sorel will have a greater capacity than any of the dredges working in the maritime provinces now. Just as the dredge that bears my name has a greater capacity than nearly all the dredges on the St. Lawrence. That dredge, with the changes that have been made, if I am well informed, will have a capacity of 1,000,000 cubic yards a month. There was never a dredge of that kind built in this country before. The dredge that was intended for the maritime provinces is a suction and also a dipper dredge. It will be a large, sea-going ship. So far, we have imported dredges for the maritime provinces from England. We are now building our own dredges with Canadian hands and on Canadian soil, and, as far as possible we are building them of Canadian material. But, unfortunately, we have not been able, up to this time, to secure Canadian steel plates; but I hope that the time is not far away when our country will be able to produce the plates. The reason why delays took place while I was in office was that we could not get material. We are not the only ones that have been delayed, however. All the railways, not only in this country, but in the United States, have been hampered in their work because they could not get material. We must take the times as they are—we are in the growing time, in every part of the world. But let me say that the Department of Public Works has built a good many dredges during recent years, and it will be necessary to build more, if we wish to grapple with the difficulties and progress with the times. Of course, this country cannot expect to build dredges without providing the money for them. I do not know what my successor's plans are, but I know very well what it is necessary to do in the public interest at this time. We should not hesitate one minute, in my humble opinion in providing all the money that is necessary to equip our waterways in first-class shape.

Mr. FRASER. There are a number of places in Nova Scotia—indeed in all the lower provinces—where, though the members from Ontario and the west may not understand it—it is absolutely necessary that dredging should be done and wharfs built. I have in my mind one instance in a county represented here not by a gentleman supporting the government, but by one on the other side of the House. I refer to the East river in Pictou county. From the harbour at Pictou up to New Glasgow, there are the large works of the Nova Scotia Steel Company. There is need of dredging there. And I trust we shall never assert the rule, that, simply because the county sends a man to support the opposition, therefore no public work shall be done in that county. I understand from those who know that in a number of places in Nova Scotia and in the lower provinces generally dredging can be carried on in winter. In northern Europe, I understand, excellent work is done in dredging during that season. The ice is cut and the material is taken up and put at some distance on the ice. It is carried away by the ice in the spring or sinks at the side of the channel. There are estuaries and rivers in Nova Scotia also, I believe, in Quebec, where work can be done all winter. What can be done elsewhere can be done in Canada, and I am told on very good authority that that work is done in Europe. I am informed that in this way a dredge could be utilized both winter and summer. There are many places where a dredge could not work in winter, for the dredging is carried on in harbours during the fine weather, but when the fall comes and the sea gets rough, nothing can be done. Thus a dredge could work all summer in the harbours, and then, in winter, be taken to East river or some similar place and be utilized all winter. We are only beginning what we have to do in this respect, for we need breakwaters for the security of their boats and we need the dredging in the interests of navigation. I would suggest to the minister that he make inquiries whether or not this winter dredging can be carried on.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am afraid that it would be very difficult to carry out the suggestion that has been made. My hon. friend

(Mr. Fraser) knows better than I do that most of the harbours in the maritime provinces are very much exposed. Particularly with the dredges that we have to-day, I think it would be very difficult to carry on anything of the kind.

Mr. FRASER. I am speaking of rivers.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My experience is that in the months of fall, it is very difficult indeed to get the crews to do any work. In the St. Lawrence river, when November comes it is time to lay up the dredges for a rest. Permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that it would be in the public interest to equip our country just now, with all the dredges that are necessary. If you look carefully at the reports showing the results of the dredging in the past, you will find that the modern dredges supplied by the government do their work for three or four and five cents a yard, work that, in the past, would have cost twenty-five, forty or fifty cents a yard. The dredge that bears my name, which is the most modern dredge that has been built in this country, during one of the months last season made 600,000 yards in a month. Well, that dredging did not cost much money.

Mr. CLARKE. That was working day and night.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes. But the dredge has a greater capacity than that. With the changes that have been ordered, the capacity of that dredge is 1,000,000 cubic yards a month. Dredging in so large a quantity, with the same crew of twenty-four men, the cost per cubic yard would be very little indeed. For dredging in the port of St. John, we were asked $1 per cubic yard for dredging, if I remember well. That dredging will not cost us, I am sure, if it is made by one of the government dredges more than five cents or six cents a yard. It is particularly in the public interest to build dredges and to build them in the most modern way. And we must build them without any delay. There is no doubt that we have been late. I do not say that to throw blame on those ministers before me. Now, I may say that when I took office the Department of Public Works had scarcely any dredges worthy of the name. We had only two tubs. It is not then surprising that we are behind the times, that we have many ports that have not been dredged that should have been dredged. But, with the modern implements that we have, with the ship-yard that we have built in Sorel, with many other private ship-yards that we have in Ontario, we can make up for lost time. I would earnestly invite the Minister of Public Works to go on without any hesitation. The country will certainly support him. Our waterways must be equipped now, if we do not want to lose our trade. Our American friends are not losing time. I will not say any more now on this item, as perhaps we shall have another opportunity to discuss the great question involved.

Mr. LENNOX. How much is proposed to be expended on the building of the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can hardly give the hon. gentleman an estimate as to the amount of dredging that may be required at that point. It was thought that $5,000, would do a great deal of useful work in the river, but I do not think it will complete all the dredging that will be required.

Cheverie, breakwater extension, $1,600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was expended in 1901-02, $768, and in the succeeding year, $175. This amount is required to complete the extension. The cost altogether will be $5,243, including the present vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity of the extension ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an extension into deeper water. It is also used as a landing pier as well as a breakwater.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why do you make a distinction between a breakwater and a wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have never been able to find out exactly where the distinction is made.

Mr. FRASER. There may be a breakwater and a wharf combined. Suppose you have 200 feet of a breakwater, you build that up with stone until you get out to a certain depth where schooners can come up. Then the stone is covered with cement or wood, so that you can go out upon it just as well as on a wharf. But it serves at the same time as a breakwater for the shipping. It serves as a wharf on which you can receive goods at the end of it and deliver goods. Sometimes the wharf is not used at all, because vessels can come inside of the breakwater, which prevent the dashing away of the vessels. But sometimes a breakwater is used to give a certain depth of water to the vessels.

Church Point, repairs to breakwater, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year $1,800 was voted and spent on this work, which will require $3,000 to complete. It is in Digby county.

Mr. CLARE. Has the $1,800 been spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Cow Bay (Port Morien), repairs to breakwater, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This was originally built of wood, and the wood is to be replaced with concrete blocks.

There has been expended on that work, $334,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is this expenditure like those the hon. gentleman and his friends used to accuse us of making, to buy up constituencies with the people's money ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a very old and expensive work. It was built many years ago, and has cost nearly half a million dollars. It will necessarily cost a considerable sum every year if it is to be kept up.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is it worth the money?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is. There is a large coal mining enterprise carried on in that region, with every promise of great development. I think the country could hardly afford to let the work go down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose it answers some purpose in connection with coal mining now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the Newcastle Company are operating at that place, it is a service to them. It is a breakwater.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that work let by tender, or is it done by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is being done by day labour. 260 feet of this breakwater was carried away, and in order to have a permanent work there that would stand the storm, it has been decided to build it with concrete.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any reason why this should not be done by tender and contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is very difficult to make specifications on which to receive tenders for repairing an old work.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why should it be difficult ? If it was repairing an old wharf, I could understand it, but here you are providing for a new breakwater.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not a new work. A good deal of that was swept away and we are now going to repair the old pier. As I said, it is difficult to make specifications, because, until the wood work is torn away and uncovered, we do not know how much work will have to be done. In making the concrete, if it is properly looked after, the work ought to be done as cheaply by day's labour as by contract.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not quite hear the explanation that the hon. minister made when he first was dealing with this matter, but I understand that the $10,000 voted last year has not yet been expended. Is that right ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Part of it has been expended and the balance is now being expended. The estimate of the engineer is that it will be all expended before the 30th June next.

Mr. LENNOX. Then I assume that the expenditure has been since the 30th June last, because it is not in the public accounts. That is an expenditure of $10,000 last year and a contemplated expenditure of $25,000 additional this year. This is a very large expenditure. It may be quite justifiable, but it does appear to me that where there is an expenditure of probably $35,000 within two years, the suggestion that the work cannot readily be let by contract does not appear to be reasonable. It may be difficult ; all these public undertakings are difficult, more or less, but it is hard to conceive that it is impossible. When it comes to an expenditure so large as this, I think a very serious effort ought to be made to carry out the principle that we are endeavouring to work on in regard to the expenditure of public moneys for large public works in this country, that is, that the work shall be done by tender and contract. Although the hon. minister says that the work to some extent is patching or repairing, I cannot understand why it cannot be done by contract. Both parties to the work would understand it to a large extent. The engineer of the government would understand it on his part, the contractor would be able to estimate it on his part, and it does not appear to me to be a very reasonable ground for departing from what the true intention is, and to say that this work cannot be done by contract. With a work of the magnitude of $25,000 or $30,000 it seems to me it is almost quibbling with the law to say that it cannot properly be done otherwise than by day labour. It is very much like the case of some towns where they have fire limits. When a structure is destroyed you cannot put up a new one unless it comes within the provisions of the fire by-law, but if the structure is only partially destroyed, and you repair it, you may escape the provisions of the by-law. It seems to be a mere distinction in name, because repairs of such an extensive character as to cost $35,000 practically amount to a reconstruction, and they come within the spirit, if not within the letter of the law, which requires public works to be let by tender.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can hardly agree with the hon. gentleman in regard to a work of this description. This work which is being carried on by day labour would give the department much less trouble if it were let by tender. On the report of the local engineer, approved of by the chief engineer at headquarters, this work is undertaken by day labour, because, in consequence of the peculiarity of the work, they cannot prepare specifications by which it can be let by tender. Any one

who has had any experience of contractors, either in his own business or in connection with the government, will know the great difficulty of letting a work of this kind by contract. It is almost impossible to avoid difficulties and disputes, and when these arise with the contractor, we generally get a good deal the worst of it. There is not the slightest doubt that owing to the peculiar conditions existing at this particular work it can be much more economically carried on by day labour than by contract. I quite agree with the views of the chief engineer, after hearing the explanations which he has given me that the work can be carried on much more economically under proper supervision by day labour than by advertising for tenders and making a contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood from the hon. minister that 260 feet have been completely carried away. One would suppose that would be a portion which might be reconstructed by tender as it was originally constructed, I suppose by tender.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If it is decided to rebuild that 260 feet certainly the work shall be let by public tender. What we are doing now is repairing and replacing the concrete on the part of the pier which has not been carried away. A great deal of money has already been spent on this work, and in the opinion of the chief engineer, so far as he is able to judge, $25,000 will complete it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $25,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. For what ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the portion that is being repaired, but not adding the 260 feet. That would cost $200,000 and $300,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the length of the portion that has not been carried away ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 1,374 feet is the length of the part now under repair.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that portion servicable for the purpose intended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I understand from the report that it renders great service.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand the hon. minister to say that the balance of this work will cost $200,000. Has that been stated ? Does the government intend to spend $200,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No decision has been come to in regard to extending this pier to the original length. with this vote it is hoped to complete the 1,374 feet.

Mr. INGRAM. With an additional expenditure of $200,000 would this pier be all right ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This pier will serve a very good purpose. I do not say that the breakwater will be as serviceable as if extended to the original length of 260 feet, but it will answer the purpose very well.

Mr. INGRAM. What trade is carried on there ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Coal.

Mr. INGRAM. Are large quantities of coal shipped from it ?

Mr. KENDALL. The amount provided for this work looks like a large amount but this work is one of the very largest we have in the maritime provinces and has during the last thirty years been of great service. Probably, a great many million tons of coal have been shipped at this point. A few years ago two of the mines formerly operated at this place were closed, and even after they were closed the breakwater was of great importance, because it is the only haven between Louisburg and Sydney, and is frequented by a large fleet of coasting and fishing vessels. During the last two or three years an English company has undertaken to develop the coal areas under the water in the bay, and at present they have driven levels to a distance of some 1,200 or 1,300 feet. It is estimated that by July they will have opened up a great submarine area of coal and will probably produce not less than 1,200 or 1,500 tons of coal a day or probably 300,000 tons a year. It has been demonstrated also within a short time, that certain coal seams which were not considered to be contiguous with the Cow Bay Basin coal seams, have been located on another point in this territory and it is quite likely that before long—I say this on the advice of scientific men—that several marine areas which we never hoped to be able to operate will be operated at a point not very far away. Although we are making these large expenditures now, I am afraid that we can scarcely assure the House that we shall not ask for more money than this. We must recognize the fact that the coal areas we have down in Cape Breton probably occupies the most commanding position of any coal fields on the whole Atlantic Ocean east or west. We are able to boast of the fact that we can put coal on the sea board for fifty cents a ton cheaper than any other colliery either in the American or Eastern hemisphere. To-day we see our coal going to Norway, Sweden, the Mediterranean, South Africa and West India, and we may look forward to a very great development in the coal industry. Astonishing as that development has been during the last few years, we expect a proportionate rate increase for the future. I

may state that for many reasons I would prefer that this work should be done by tender and contract, but I believe that in this case it is impracticable for the reasons which have been stated, and for another which I shall add. That it is the face of the structure is so bad that even if estimates were made to-day for repairs, storms might occur and new gaps made that would have to be repaired during the season.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the new enterprise of which the hon. gentleman speaks, have this harbour as its shipping place ?

Mr. KENDALL. Yes; no other.

Digby pier—renewal repairs, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for minor general repairs to the pier and building.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There seems to have been $3,700 spent last year. Was that for general repairs also ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes; it was very much out of condition and there had to be a great deal of work done on it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the total cost of these repairs likely to be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the total cost so far as we know at the present time required for next year. During the present year there will be expended $3,700, and $2,000 is estimated to complete all the repairs necessary next year.

Drumhead breakwater, $4,500.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is now under contract. The total estimated cost is $7,000. Although there was $7,000 voted for this work last year I find that the contract price was $4,865, so that we are only revoting $4,500 of the $7,000 granted last year.

Mr. INGRAM. Is $4,500 the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be a small amount this year to spend, and the total cost is estimated here at $4,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the purpose of this pier ?

Mr. FRASER. It is altogether for the fishing boats small and large along the coast. They are going out now further than they did formerly and they are building in fact small schooners. This is a breakwater at Drumhead which is about six miles to the south-east of Isaac's Harbour and serves that whole district.

Mr. BELL. Is it near New Harbour ?

Mr. KENDALL.

Mr. FRASER. New Harbour is a good deal further east I may say for the benefit of the hon. member. It is between Isaac's Harbour and New Harbour and serves the fishing industry.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is a harbour of refuge.

Mr. FRASER. It will not be a harbour of refuge for large vessels but it will be for the large boats that go out fifteen or twenty miles deep sea fishing. However, it is largely in the interest of the inshore fishery and smaller boats.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How far is it from New Harbour ?

Mr. FRASER. It is fifteen or twenty miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it a wharf breakwater or a breakwater wharf ?

Mr. FRASER. It is a breakwater.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will it answer the purposes of both ?

Mr. FRASER. No, it will not be a shipping pier.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year the estimate was $7,000, and this year it is $5,500. What is the explanation of the difference ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only explanation is that the estimate of the department was higher than the lowest tender.

Mr. BELL. There was no work done last year ?

Mr. FRASER. No, it is under contract now, and will be done this year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During the present year we expect to spend $1,000.

Mr. INGRAM. I think this case demonstrates pretty well that there is no genuine system in the department of estimating the cost of these public works. The estimate of $7,000 was evidently simply a rough guess, because when the tenders were called for it was found that the work could be done for $5,500. In Nova Scotia we have some 49 different items of harbours to accommodate fishing smacks and such like, and in that number there are only five harbours calling for double figures. I think it should be the duty of the department, when petitioned for a harbour, pier or any other improvements, before asking for any money from this parliament, to have a proper estimate made so that the minister would be prepared to state to parliament what the total cost of the work would be. I want to know whether there was a systematic estimate made by the department of the cost of this work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can hardily agree with my hon. friend

that there is any reflection to be cast on the engineer's branch of the department. In the large number of works that have to be constructed by the department, I think the estimates will be found to be fairly correct. If my hon. friend had experience, he would know that it is often very difficult to estimate the cost of a work, owing to the variation of prices in different localities. There is also a great difference in the tenders of contractors. It is true, we sometimes have a great deal of trouble owing to contractors undertaking to do work at too low a price. I think the minister should have more latitude to refuse contracts at figures which he knows to be lower than the actual work can be done for, because in such cases the public interests suffer in the end. But I do not think that, because in one particular case the estimate exceeds the costs, that should occasion a serious reflection on the ability of the officers of the department to estimate pretty correctly the cost of these works. I am sorry to say that in some instances the estimates of the officers have been below the cost. I have been encouraging them to be most careful in their estimates, and to give me the outside figures, because it is not in the public interest that we should ask an appropriation for a work, and when we came to take tenders we find that it costs a great deal more than we expected. It is better that our estimates should be on the high side, because if the money is not spent, there is no loss to the country.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not condemning the engineer's department at all. My remarks had no reference to him. The hon. gentleman said that if I had experience, I would know differently. I can guess the experience of the hon. gentleman, and I think it is something like this. A man who wants a pier or a breakwater in his constituency goes to the minister or takes with him a petition, and asks for the work. The minister asks him what it will cost. He says about $7,000. The minister says: 'Well, we will put $2,000 in the estimates this year, and that will do for a beginning.' I have no experience of it, but I can guess that the thing is done in that way. Now, before any work is done, I think the department should send the engineer to make a proper estimate of what the cost of the work will be. Then the minister would come here prepared to say, 'the engineer estimates that the work will cost so much, and we are asking for so much this year.' That would be the proper way, instead of taking the other plan simply to satisfy a supporter of the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In every case before a work is advertised, a very careful estimate is made by the officers of the department.

Mr. CLARE. I see in the estimates for 1902-3 there was a vote for $2,000 for this very work, and now you ask for $7,000 more. That $2,000 has not been expended, and it was a revote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that my hon. friend refers to the appropriations for 1901-2. Nothing was done that year, and the $2,000 was revoted with $5,000 more, making $7,000 for last year.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is any well-defined principle accepted for the guidance of the government in making these grants, distinguishing between public interests and private interests. I understand that while there is no revenue derived from these wharfs and piers, and so on, some of them may benefit some individual or private corporation to a very considerable extent. In some cases 90 per cent of the benefit derived from these wharfs will go to some private enterprise, as for instance the owner of a mine or quarry or mill or some other industry for which a wharf is required. The wharf may perhaps be of very little use to the general public. Upon what principle does the government act in calling on parliament to vote moneys for such public works? Has the political complexion or political pull of the parties mainly to be benefited anything to do with the policy of the government, or do the government proceed on any fixed principle of public utility ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no question of party politics in this matter that I am aware of. These votes are asked for in the public interest, but of course while the work is in the public interest it is quite possible that some corporation may use it to a greater extent than the general public. But even in this case, as these large corporations give employment to a considerable portion of the community, indirectly the whole community is benefited. But in so far as any of these votes are concerned, I am not aware that there is any one of them which benefits any private corporation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. In the estimates last year, the attention of the government was called to the expenditure of a large amount of public money on a wharf which was particularly in the interest of some party or corporation that owned a mill in the vicinity. In this way an individual or corporation may owe a considerable part of its income to the expenditure of public money. There should be some guiding and distinct principle laid down defining what are public and what are private interests.

Mr. FRASER. So far as the item under consideration is concerned, it is for the benefit of fishermen irrespective of their political views. It is the fishermen whom this breakwater will serve. There is not a mill or manufactory of any kind in the vicinity. Take for example the vote for expenditure at Bridgewater, in that case the sum of

$5,000 is voted to be spent in the county of Lunenburg which does not return a supporter to the government. I rose chiefly to say that the vote under consideration is intended to serve a large section of fishermen by providing them with a harbour for their boats and has nothing to do with their political views.

Mr. RICHARDSON. My inquiry had no special reference to this or any particular item but only as to expenditures of this character.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As respects all these items we have had under consideration to-night, I can only recall one in which any corporation may be interested, and that is the item for expenditure in Cow Bay, where there is a coal mine. But in that case the work was done by our predecessors, who spent $200,000 there, and did so wisely and well. That is the only case where there is any large enterprise concerned. All the others are for the benefit of fishermen, who are not likely to have any trade union or corporation or anything of that sort which could be particularly interested. Whatever benefits there are from these expenditures are distributed among the poorer classes.

Economy, N.S., wharf extension, &c., $2,500.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is the first time we find economy in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This $2,500 is for the purpose of extending the wharf 150 feet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of the extension ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to give deeper water.

Fort Lawrence landing pier, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimated cost of this work is $13,500. The reason we are only asking for a revote of $5,000 is because the engineer does not expect that we will be able to spend more than that on the contract this year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, by public advertisement.

Friar's Head, N.S., boat harbour, $500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost of this is $3,252. This completes the work.

Glace Bay, harbour improvements, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has not been any work done here yet. The specifications and contract are not fully completed. The estimated cost is between $50,000 and $60,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to state what is the need of this expenditure.

Mr. FRASER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Glace Bay is the very centre of the coal mining district of Cape Breton. The town of Glace Bay and the neighbourhood immediately surrounding it, I suppose, contain now 10,000 or 12,000 people, and this centre serves a population of some 20,000. Some years ago it was an important shipping point, but when the Dominion Coal Company consolidated the mines and built a very large pier at Sydney, the operations at Glace Bay were suspended and the harbour has largely filled up. As there is a large local trade and the town has increased in numbers, a proposal has been made that the Dominion Coal Company might be induced to contribute something to the benefit of the harbour if the Dominion would do likewise. The town council had a deputation here recently, and I think it is their intention to make further representations in the hope that a scheme may be arranged whereby, with the co-operation of the government and the coal company, that harbour may be opened up and utilized for a smaller class of vessels. Sometimes there is a complaint that these smaller vessels cannot obtain attention at the great pier, and it is thought that by opening this harbour close by, they could do a good deal of the coal business as conveniently as at the pier at Sydney. And, with the large population to be supplied, there would be an advantage in obtaining supplies by water as well as by rail. The hon. Minister of Public Works has not committed himself as to how far he will go with the scheme. But, I think that if $60,000 were to be spent, a considerable sum would be contributed by the coal company. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) is aware of the proposals that are made, and may have a few words to say on the subject. The government have not gone further than to say that the matter is a fair one for consideration; and, when it comes up in detail it will be fairly considered. But, we have no intention of spending $60,000 without giving the House further information about it.

Mr. BLAIN. When a town council contributes money to be expended in connection with the money of the government, would the government control the expenditure of the whole ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In this case it would not be the town council that would contribute it. But the council are interested in inducing, if they can, the Dominion Coal Company to co-operate with the Dominion government in the matter. Part of the harbour, I am not sure but the whole harbour, is the property of the Dominion Coal Company, and that would make it necessary to enlist the co-operation of the coal company before the government would undertake the expenditure of the money.

Mr. BLAIN. Do they each spend their own money ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No arrangement has been come to. The matter is only at the first stage. But it is only right that the House should be informed that a project of that kind has been brought forward, involving a considerable expenditure, a portion of which would be by the coal company.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the government expend money on private wharfs and in private enterprises ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not aware of any such case. This would not be a private enterprise if the wharfs were constructed. It would be a public wharf, open to all who wished to use it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not a wharf, it is a harbour improvement ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was going to ask whether this was an experimental vote or something distinct from the expenditure of the $60,000 referred to by the Minister of Finance ? This is a vote of $10,000. Is it for a portion of the work, or is it a preliminary of the whole ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the work goes on as suggested, its total cost would be $60,000 I think. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) understands the project, and seems to think it could be finished for $50,000, but that would be divided between the government and the company. That view was expressed by the town council. I have no right to say that the coal company agreed to that. It is easy to make improvements in the harbour, but unless some such arrangement as I have suggested is made, it would be hardly wise to go on with the expenditure of so much money. The expenditure of this sum would furnish accommodation for the people of Glace Bay, and the government desire to co-operate to help them. I think it would not be wise to go on with the expenditure unless some arrangement were come to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this for dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For dredging and docks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose it affords an opportunity to load schooners at once, instead of having them wait at Sydney. Steamers come first in loading at the pier at Sydney, I understand ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This would decrease the necessity for delay. Perhaps the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) would give us a little more information about this. I am not criticising the item, but I want to get a little more information.

Mr. KENDALL. When the Dominion Coal Company opened its big piers at Sydney and Louisburg, it abandoned Glace Bay. This is simply an indentation, and the harbour is practically an artificial one, the only one of that kind we have on our coast. An enormous amount of money was expended there—I think some three or four hundred thousand dollars—in dredging and equipping the harbour. That was many years ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was this money spent by the government ?

Mr. KENDALL. No, mostly by the coal companies using the harbour. A small amount, was, I think, spent by the Dominion government in dredging. The Dominion Coal Company refused point blank to reopen the harbour. It fell into a state of disuetude, and the citizens complained that they were charged, as they thought, excessive rates on heavy freights such as lumber, hay, agricultural implements, building material and so on. There are twenty thousand people within three miles of Glace Bay, and my impression is that it would be in the public interest to have this work done. The Dominion Coal Company, through its agent Mr. Shields, has stated that if the government will make an appropriation of $25,000, the company will be prepared to give the same amount, and undertake to open the harbour and supply the improvements.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We pay $25,000 and the company as much ; who would be the owner of the work ?

Mr. KENDALL. With the arrangement, as I understand it, the company will still own the property, but ample provision will be made to safeguard the interest of the town.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Of course, I have not studied the question, but that seems to me a pretty doubtful thing. I recognize the difficulty the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) speaks of ; but what would the hon. gentleman do in the situation ? Here are twenty thousand people who are suffering from the lack of accommodation, and, for a very moderate expenditure, considering the interest involved, provision could be made for safeguarding the public. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) asks me what to do. Of course, I am no longer responsibile for what is done on the treasury benches. But if it is really necessary to build a harbour there, I would rather build it and charge the Dominion Coal Company the usual rates. I do not believe it would be wise—of course I do not wish to be bound by what I say now, for I have not given much attention to the question—I do not think it would be wise to spend $25,000 in these works. It is a pretty doubtful arrangement. We have never done it before——

Mr. KENDALL. Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not think we have done it before at any time.

Mr. KENDALL. Depot Harbour.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, in that case we did nothing of this kind. We simply did a piece of work which will be government property. I feel sure the hon. gentleman will not find a precedent for this, and I think it is a very doubtful arrangement.

Mr. KENDALL. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that it is impracticable for the government to get control of that harbour.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Why ?

Mr. KENDALL. Well, the amount involved would be too large.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much would it cost ?

Mr. KENDALL. I do not care to state the reason openly, but I may say the amount would be very large.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as the harbour improvements are concerned, I do not see any difficulty. It is impossible that the Dominion Coal Company or any other company should have such a control of the harbour as to interfere with the rights of navigation. This harbour is a navigable water. The Dominion Coal Company, by holding mining areas covering that country, cannot interfere with the right of navigation. This expenditure may be divided into two classes. One is the improvement of the harbour by dredging it so as to increase the depth of water. The Dominion Coal Company cannot have control over that. The other class of expenditure is for the wharf. So far as that is concerned, it depends altogether on the arrangements made with the Dominion Coal Company. Of course if you go and build a wharf on property belonging to the Dominion Coal Company, one result might be that the company would own the wharf. A matter of that kind must be covered by some arrangement with the Dominion Coal Company before the money is expended. The government ought to retain the ownership and control of the wharf but it would be justified in making a generous arrangement with the company as to its use. I would think that if government money is expended to the extent of one-half the whole expenditure on property of that kind, the property ought to remain under the control of the government, because otherwise the vote is made a means of granting a subsidy for a wharf which afterwards becomes the property of a private corporation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am satisfied that no such proposal would be made. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that any thing of that kind should not be allowed. I have been asked by the people of the district to interest myself in a friendly way in the matter. I agree with the general view expressed by the ex-Minister of Public Works as to the undesirability of a government being mixed up with a private enterprise of that character. But there are exceptions which prove the rule, and if we could make adequate arrangements with the company whereby they might use the property under a tariff of freights which would be fair and reasonable to all, there could be no objection. Assuming for a moment that that can be done, I do not suppose that any one would object under such conditions to dividing the expenditure between the government and the company ; although as a rule it is a bad practice, and to avoid trouble it requires to be carefully guarded. If any such arrangements are made they will also be made upon terms which will protect the public interest in every way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If government money is expended I would suggest that the control be retained in the Crown, at the same time granting to the Dominion Coal Company in a generous way the use of it for the purposes of the business, which is of interest to all in that community.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I understand it would cost about $50,000 or $60,000 to build a wharf. I would not hesitate to say that the government should rather build that wharf altogether and remain the owner of it, than to contribute $25,000 to the Dominion Coal Company and not be the owner of the wharf. I think the House would sustain my hon. friend if he were to ask for the amount necessary to build the wharf there. Otherwise I think it would be a bad precedent indeed, it would be a subsidy in disguise. The Dominion Coal Company is too powerful a company to ask for a subsidy of that kind. Let us build the wharf and let us pay for it. The House will sustain my hon. friend in asking for $50,000 for that purpose. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall) tells us that there is a population of 20,000 or 25,000 to be served by that wharf. I would not hesitate, if the work is necessary, to ask for the money to construct this work and remain the owner of it.

Mr. KENDALL. The hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension. The Dominion government does not own this harbour, does not control it in any way. It was formerly dredged out and owned by the old coal companies, and that harbour was constructed by the old companies. It is an inland harbour altogether, built on land formerly owned by the coal companies. It does not belong to us.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Then we are simply being asked to contribute $25,000 to build a work on a piece of property which is not our property. The case is worse. Let the Dominion Coal Company give us a

deed for the land, a thing that is being done every day, and let us buy that piece of land. But it would be an unwise thing to spend $25,000 on that piece of property which does not belong to us, and over which we would have no control. It would be a bad precedent. I am sure that if the Dominion Coal Company was approached in a proper way they would consent to sell us the land. The government would then build the harbour works and would own them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that my hon. friend is mistaken about the absence of a precedent. But I do not want to raise that point. I think there are precedents, and that they have occurred even in his day. However, that is not the main point. I think the main point is that if any public money is to be granted for this enterprise we must take great care to safeguard the public interest. I would like to have it understood that the Dominion Coal Company are not seeking this work at all. They have not given it a thought, until it was brought to their notice by the municipal council of Glace Bay, who are doing their best to interest the Dominion Coal Company to some extent and the government of Canada to some extent. I have no communication from the Coal Company, but the representatives of the municipality have told me that they hoped to be able to induce the Dominion Coal Company to take an interest in it. I would not like the House to get the idea that it is a case of the Dominion Coal Company seeking a grant. They are not asking anything, and they won't care if we do not spend a cent on it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would suggest that the Dominion Coal Company be approached and asked to give a deed of land to the government. Then if it is necessary to build a harbour there, let us build it and let us own it.

Mr. CLARE. If this money is voted and expended, we do not know whether the work will be the property of the Dominion government or of this coal company. From what the Finance Minister has said, an arrangement may be made with the Dominion Coal Company and the Glace Bay municipality. If that is the case, the money should not be expended at all until that arrangement is made. I would suggest that the estimate be withdrawn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend lived at Glace Bay he would not take that view. If we were to withdraw this item after what has occurred, it would be interpreted as an unfavourable act. I would suggest that the House let the item pass—we have had a full discussion—and hon. gentlemen may be assured that this money will not be spent except upon terms which will thoroughly safeguard every public interest.

Mr. WILSON. Do you own the land ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is owned by the Dominion Coal Company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We might let the vote pass on the understanding that if any arrangement is entered into before the close of the session it will be laid on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly, that is fair.

Mr. BELL. If this is a private harbour and not under the control of the Dominion government, is there any possibility of the harbour owners charging dues and acquiring a revenue ? It must be a very extraordinary piece of property if it is a navigable water and is still a private property.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose a canal constructed by the company would be a navigable water, and still it might become a highway, yet remain private property. I would not like to answer my hon. friend's question, that would be a legal question. But it seems that this harbour was built, or was dredged and constructed years ago by some companies owning the mines in those days, and all the rights of those companies passed under the Dominion Coal Company. It is evident that they own the land.

Mr. BELL. What they did was to improve an inlet, if I am not mistaken. They excavated and dredged an inlet, but there must be some property vested in the government of Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman may be correct.

Grand river—to improve entrance, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote of $1,000 to complete the improvement of the present entrance of Grand river and to remove a large rock that obstructs the channel.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is this Grand river ? There are several of them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Richmond County, Nova Scotia.

Grand Narrows—repairs to wharf, $400.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is just for small repairs.

Mr. BLAIN. Who owns that wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. What were the receipts from that wharf last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These improvements are being made at the request of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but I have no record of the fees received.

Grand Etang—bridge works at entrance to pond, $1,000.

Mr. HACKETT. May I ask what this is intended for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is intended to complete the work.

Mr. McLENNAN. The government, in opening out the harbour of Grand Etang, took away the highway bridge and it is therefore bound to replace it. It was thought by the resident engineer that $1,000 would suffice to repair the old bridge, but it was found on examination that it was of no use whatever, and the engineer, upon re-examination, came to the conclusion that it was necessary to have an absolutely new bridge. Hence, the $1,000 additional to build this bridge.

Mr. HACKETT. I come from a province where the people have to build their own bridges even when the government takes away a part of their rights. I think it is strange on this occasion that the people of Canada should be asked to supply a bridge where the government of Canada have taken rights away from the people of the province. At present, in the province of Prince Edward Island, the people are contributing $12,000 towards the construction of a bridge across the Hillsborough river where their rights have been taken away by the Dominion government and the property is owned by this government. I think it is strange that we should be asked to contribute towards the construction of a bridge across the Grand Etang in Nova Scotia. It is true that under the British North America Act where a bridge connects two provinces the cost of that bridge is borne by the Dominion government, but where it is a private and local matter the costs should be borne by the province and not by the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McLENNAN. This harbour has become a public harbour and the bridge is stretched across the middle of the harbour.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is a bridge across one of the best harbours on Lake Ontario, Presque Isle, and the cost of that bridge was borne by the municipality. I have never given a vote against the expenditure of money properly by the Dominion government in any province of the Dominion. I do not care where the money is going to be expended as long as it is for the benefit of the Dominion of Canada, but it must be confessed, if I understand this matter aright, that we must have a large amount of the money of the people expended in wharfs that are not necessary or the government is defrauded out of the revenue from them. Looking over the province of Nova Scotia, I find that there are twenty-four wharfs that have been built out of the Dominion exchequer and that there is not one cent of revenue from them. You may take whichever horn of the dilemma you have a mind to. If the wharfs are necessary they must do some business, and if they are doing some business the government is receiving no benefit from the expenditure of that money. We are given to understand that the people require this expenditure because they are exporting the commodities and the produce of their farms, There must be some revenue if the people require these wharfs. I find by referring to the Auditor General's report that there are twenty-four wharfs in Nova Scotia that do not pay one cent of revenue and there are nearly a dozen wharfs that are only paying a few cents. I might read the list but I do not want to detain the committee. It will be seen at page P—172, 173 what the receipts of the government are from the expenditure of these enormous sums of money. To my mind there must be something radically wrong. I do not see how we can come to any other conclusion. If these wharfs are necessary, and I want to repeat it with some emphasis, because we have always been ready to believe that they were required for the use of the people, there would be some evidence that business was done upon them. I am not so narrow minded as to say that if there is a community that requires a wharf that because it does not benefit the Dominion as a whole there should not be some expenditure of money, but, in these cases to which I am referring, if the people exported or imported anything there must be a revenue and if there is no revenue it is quite evident to any fair minded man that this money was expended when it was really not necessary for the benefit of the community in which the money was expended. I would like an explanation of the fact to clear my mind of suspicion.

Mr. McLENNAN. I forgot to mention that this is merely the rebuilding of a bridge constructed by the late government supported by hon. gentlemen opposite. The bridge was constructed by the late government and taken over from the provincial government and the municipality. The present government in seeking to vote this money is merely rebuilding the bridge constructed by the late government across that harbour.

Mr. COCHRANE. I asked for information and that is no information at all. I was not talking about the bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That happens to be the subject under discussion.

Mr. COCHRANE. In the province of Ontario a bridge is built across Presque Isle harbour, one of the finest harbours on Lake Ontario, a bridge similar to the one we have under discussion here and it was built by the municipality of Brighton. In the Auditor General's report I find that the revenue of Avonport was $2, which was an in-

crease of seventy-one cents; Bear Point, thirty-four cents; Canada Creek, $2.83; and Chipman's Brook, $1.26. I might go over a dozen like that and then there are twenty-four from which there is no revenue at all. If the people amongst whom these wharfs are built have anything either to import or export there must be a revenue, and if there is no revenue, it is plain to my mind that the wharfs are built at places where they are not necessary.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I may be allowed to explain to my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane), because I know he is in perfect good faith, that I have visited the maritime provinces twice and I have come back with the conviction that the fishermen are a class of men that deserve special attention. We must not expect that they will pay dues for the use of small wharfs we are building. They are carrying on a large and profitable trade for the Dominion, and it is because I acquired that belief after having visited the maritime provinces, that I am responsible for the very many wharfs that appear to-day in these estimates. If my hon. friend would give himself the pleasure of visiting the maritime provinces he would appreciate the importance of these works. The fishermen are carrying on a most profitable trade for the Dominion and they deserve to be encouraged. When my friends on the other side will be in power they will build wharfs as the present government is building them to-day. This is not a party question by any means; it is a large public question and I invite my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) to think twice over what I have said in my very humble way, before condemning that expenditure of money.

Mr. INGRAM. Nova Scotia seems to be well served in this matter. There are fishermen in my own constituency who have paid their licenses for years and have never received any assistance to improve their harbours. In fact, they have had to find the money for that out of their own pockets.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is wrong then.

Mr. INGRAM. They applied for $1,000 or $2,000 to enable their boats to go in and out of the harbour, but they were refused. I myself have applied to the Marine Department and was refused and told to go to the Public Works Department. The government issue licenses to the fishermen and if they can render the harbours serviceable at a reasonable cost they are doing right in making these expenditures. But what we complain of is that the government puts an item in the estimates the first year and then for several years afterwards they come down asking more money for the same work. That is not right. When we pass an appropriation here to commence a work we should know the full cost of that work so that we may understand what we are doing. The system of applying for these works is either by petitioning the department, or getting a member who supports the government to apply for the improvements. He is asked what the work will cost, and he says $5,000 or $6,000 or $7,000, and the minister says: I will put an item of $2,000 in the estimates this year and next year we can get some more. I quote the 'Hansard' of 1902, page 1002, to show that what I state in this matter is correct:

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On several occasions votes have been placed in the estimates without the department having full information as to the cost of the work to be carried out; and I must say that that is so in this case.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should it be so?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a little difficult to say why, to be frank. Petitions are put in asking for works, and then a certain amount is placed in the estimates. Any man who has passed through the Department of Public Works knows that we have so many works that it is quite impossible to have surveys in every case.

Some hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia may go back to their constituencies and say that the opposition is objecting to all these items. We don't object to these improvements, but we object to the system pursued by the government, which keeps the House in the dark as to what the ultimate cost of these works will be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) but he must remember that in no case to-night were we unable to estimate almost in detail the total cost of any work we asked a vote for. I hope in future to stick to that rule. There may be exceptions to every rule, but so far as I am concerned, I think it is a good rule, and I shall have a report and an estimate made on every work for which we ask a vote when that is possible. It is quite probable that it may take more than one year to do certain works, but I believe that the House should be in possession of full information as to what the probable cost of a work will be before we undertake it.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are pursuing the rather unusual course here of voting money for a bridge, and I would ask my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) who is conversant with this matter, if this is a swing bridge.

Mr. McLENNAN. There is a draw on this bridge.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend stated that this bridge was originally constructed by the late government. In what year was the money voted for it.

Mr. McLENNAN. The money was voted in 1895 and it was built in 1896.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has treated this as a bridge over a natural channel, and he cited the case of a bridge in Ontario which was constructed

over a harbour, and where the municipality had to build it. I do not understand that in that case there was any interference with the natural conditions. In this case the Dominion government for its own purpose in making a harbour, cut through the public highway and rendered a bridge necessary where there was no bridge required before, or perhaps only a small culvert. If the Dominion government had not touched the place there would be no necessity for the local authorities to put in a costly bridge at all. But if the Dominion government cut through the public highway and made a waterway across, then there was the same reason why the Dominion government should build a bridge over that as they would over a canal. I happen to know something about this, because I was in the government of Nova Scotia when the question was raised between the Dominion and local authorities as to who should build that bridge, and after full discussion, it was concluded that inasmuch the need for the bridge was caused by the construction by the Dominion government of what was practically a canal, they were as much obliged to provide a bridge over that waterway as they would be to provide a bridge over a canal in any part of Ontario. That is the principle upon which this bridge was constructed by the Dominion government.

Mr. HACKETT. I am not quite satisfied about this bridge yet. This is called a pond, but we have many of these ponds in the maritime provinces which may be called harbours, and this bridge at the entrance to this pond is going to cost $1,500 for repairs. I cannot yet see for the life of me why the people of Canada should pay for the building of a bridge to the entrance of that pond. I have known cases in Prince Edward Island where the Dominion government by deepening the water have caused the local authorities great expense to build bridges to accommodate the travelling public. This is merely an ordinary traffic bridge. It is simply a local bridge. A good deal has been said with regard to the amount expended in Nova Scotia for these public works. I have no fault to find with that expenditure. I speak in no carping spirit of the money spent on these improvements, and I can appreciate the needs of the fishermen of Nova Scotia in prosecuting their precarious industry, but we have a right to have these matters fully discussed in parliament, and when we find the public money is being diverted from its proper use, to have it explained by the government.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to say that the channel which this bridge covers was excavated by the Dominion government? What does pond mean? In our section of the country it means a body of still water. Is it utilized for a harbour?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This channel was constructed into a harbour.

Mr. COCHRANE. What was it before?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no navigable channel before.

Green Cove—boat harbour, $6,600.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the minister explain this?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) That work is in the county of Victoria, and is now under contract. The object is to have a harbour for the shelter of fishermen's boats.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost of this work is $6,600. It is now under contract. The amount of the contract is $6,275.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What sized boats will it accommodate?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Sailing boats belonging to the fishermen who go out quite long distances from the shore when the navigation opens, and continue till the fall of the year. Formerly they could not use larger boats because they had to haul them up in stormy weather. When this is built, the boats will be comfortably moored from the beginning of the fishing season till the fall of the year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will it enable the fishermen to use larger boats?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Yes, that is the object of it.

Mr. BLAIN. What system of collecting these small amounts from wharfs do the government adopt? Have they officials for that purpose?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Whenever a wharf is completed and turned over to the Marine Department, they appoint a wharfinger who collects the fees and turns them over to the department. In the case of these small wharfs which are built to provide shelter for fishermen, I doubt very much if fees are collected. In some cases wharfs are not turned over to the Marine Department, but are kept under the control of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BLAIN. For instance, at Avonport, there was a revenue last year of $2. How would that be collected?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would be collected by a wharfinger.

Mr. BLAIN. What salary would be paid to the wharfinger?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The general rule is to allow the wharfinger 25 per cent of the receipts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My impression is that where the collections do

not reach the amount which the wharfinger is to be paid for his services, he is not obliged to make a return, and that may be the reason why some of these wharfs do not appear to pay any fees. I would not be positive as to that, but even in such cases I think the wharfinger ought to make a return to show what he receives and what he keeps. That is worth looking into.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice a number of wharfs returning from 37 cents up to $2. Can the minister tell us how these fees were collected, and what percentage of salary was paid to the persons who made the collections ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is information to be obtained from the Marine Department. There is no doubt that the small return made to the department is the amount over and above the salary or percentage allowed to the wharfinger for collecting the fees and attending to the wharf.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand that the man making this return of $2 will receive a percentage on more that that amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He may or he may not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That may be the net revenue after paying his fees. I will look into that.

Mr. HACKETT. What are the duties of a wharfinger ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To take care of the wharf and collect the wharfage rates.

Mr. HACKETT. What do you mean by taking care of the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. His chief duty would be to see that every person who used the wharf would pay a proper wharfage rate. He would also see that no damage was done to the wharf.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree with the Minister of Finance that in any case there should be a return made of the amount collected. When there is no return, you may assume that the wharfinger has not collected the amount of his remuneration, but you have no guarantee of that.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is understood by a boat harbour ? I understand that it means a harbour for fishermen ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. It would be convenient if that term were applied to all these harbours which are built solely for fishermen, so that when we came to them we would not expect any revenue. In several cases to-night we were told that a wharf was necessary. As I said before, I am prepared to vote the money if it is necessary, but it must be necessary for importing or exporting something, and if so there must be some revenue. Does the wharfinger take any of the receipts of the wharf for repairs?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not Without special order.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the wharf is necessary for the people in order to serve in the export for their commodities and the import of what they require, there must be a revenue from it, and that would appear in the Auditor General's Report. If there is no revenue then the wharf is not necessary or the wharfinger is pocketing the money.

Hawk Point Inlet, N.S., boat channel, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to permit a larger class of boats going in than now pass through. This will complete the work.

Herring Cove, breakwater, $9,800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By tender, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the work is let to the lowest tenderer. It is in Halifax county.

Janvrin's Island wharf, $2,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the total estimated cost is $2,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Has anything been done up to this time ? It appears to have been standing some years and nothing spent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, nothing has been spent.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the idea of voting this year after year and not spending the money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A considerable number of votes were taken for small works down in that province and the engineer in charge with his staff has not been able to look after them all.

Mr. INGRAM. It is not very pressing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The people there seem to think it is important. I shall try and see that it is attended to during the next few months.

Mr. CLANCY. What year was the first vote taken ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the records.

Mr. CLANCY. Was it before the last election ?

Mr. MATHESON. The vote was taken last year.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. If he will look at the estimates he will find that it was taken before last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, last year was the first time this vote was taken.

Judique, repairs, &c., to breakwater, $400.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $1,300.

Kingsport, reconstruction of pier, $3,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity for this ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is a government breakwater which was constructed some twenty or thirty years ago and on which probably $30,000 of Dominion money has been expended. A year ago last autumn, as the result of a very severe gale, a portion of the pier was injured very seriously, and this money is for the purpose of repairs.

Mr. INGRAM. How long is the pier ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About 500 feet.

Mr. INGRAM. What proportion was torn down or blown away ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The upper portion of the pier was twisted over down to within a few feet of the bottom. It is a tidal pier and when the tide is out it is dry land, but there is about thirty feet of water when the tide is in. This storm came while the tide was in, and the force of the waves carried probably forty or fifty feet of the end of the pier over.

Mr. INGRAM. Will this put it in good shape and be all the money required ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer estimates that this will complete the work and put it in good shape.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see by the Auditor General's Report that last year there was expended on this work $9,208.70 and now we are asked to spend another $4,000. On page V—208 I find that Mr. Alfred Totter was conductor for 181 days at $2.50 per day and that Mr. Eben Cox was foreman for sixty-four days at $2.50 a day. I notice that on all these constructions of piers and wharfs there is a conductor at $2.50 or $3 per day, but in this case there were both a conductor and a foreman at $2.50 per day—and all for an expenditure of $9,000. What are their respective duties ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The conductor is the man who buys the material and generally conducts the work. The foreman of construction is a mechanic who sees that the work is done properly by the men engaged.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much will the work cost altogether ?

Mr. CLANCY.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost will be $41,790.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). One would suppose that a practical man could both superintend the work and buy the material. That is merely a suggestion. Perhaps, for some reason he cannot do it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In some circumstances, that might be so. But this is a considerable work, and if he went away to look after material, leaving no one to take charge of the men, it might not be an economical arrangement.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is it built of ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Timber.

Mr. COCHRANE. In our section to do work with timber economically we would have the timber cut in the water, when it could be hauled cheaply and then built in the summer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was done with many works.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, you would not need two men. One man capable of buying timber would also see that the work was done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are two men named, but they are not both on all the time.

Larry's river, breakwater, $14,250.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract. The amount being $15,840. The contractors are Reid & Archibald, of Halifax.

Mr. INGRAM. What is this work and what constituency is it in ?

Mr. FRASER. In my constituency. This is a small fair harbour. Two years ago there came a terrific storm by which the mouth of the harbour was filled up.

Mr. COCHRANE. With suckers ?

Mr. FRASER. No, largely with rocks. The people there own quite a number of schooners, and this vote is to make a breakwater.

Mr. KAULBACH. How many schooners ?

Mr. FRASER. I do not know how many—but quite a number of schooners ply between there and Halifax and go to the fishing grounds. This is a very necessary work.

Mr. INGRAM. What did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) do in order to get the department to undertake this work ?

Mr. FRASER. Nothing, except to ask them to send the engineer. The need of the work was so apparent that the engineer reported in favour of it without another word from me.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman say what time the engineer reported ?

Mr. FRASER. I think it was last year.

Mr. INGRAM. Before the session of parliament ?

Mr. FRASER. I am not sure of the date of my report. The first vote was given last session.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) will refer to page 1002 of last year's 'Hansard' he will see that the hon. minister says there was no report.

Mr. FRASER. There may have been no report at that time. The engineer was there. But I may say about the engineers in Nova Scotia—and I am speaking in the presence of the hon. minister—that last year I think I had four reports to be made in my county, and one of them is not made yet. The engineers have so little help, at least that is what they say, that they do not make reports. They were ordered to make this report before the vote. There was a report came in before any contract was made.

Mr. INGRAM. That is what we complain of on this side—that the department was induced to put a sum in the estimates last year without a report, for the minister was asked what the probable cost would be and he said he had no idea, for there was no estimate to show. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite can quite understand that we are justified in complaining about estimates so made. This is not a business way for a business administration to do—to bring down votes without preparing an estimate, so that both sides may know what they are doing.

Lingan, beach protection, $1,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Why is this money asked this year for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This makes a total of $1,600 for this work—$600 last year and $1,000 this year. This is brush and stone work, to repair damage made in beach protection work.

Mr. INGRAM. But we were told that the $600 voted last year would complete the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This damage may have occurred during the interval. It may be that the $600 is for repairs then required, but that since then the necessity has arisen for spending this money.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hand of Providence seems to have been very hard on these works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It does seem to have been stormy in Nova Scotia.

Mr. INGRAM. But there must be some reasonable excuse for this vote if it is worthy of our consideration.

Mr. COCHRANE. In all seriousness, what is this vote for ? What do we understand by 'beach protection ?' There must be something inside the beach in which the public is interested in order to justify this work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I understand it, these are small natural harbours which are injured by the waves of the seas, and, to protect them, brush and stone are put down to make a shelter to protect the points of beach from washing away. It is much cheaper than building wharfs.

Mr. COCHRANE. So this is to protect some point that might otherwise be washed away ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Lunenburg, dredging harbour, $5,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. This is a revote of a sum that has been standing in the estimates for a number of years—and why it should be there, without being appropriated, I cannot understand. My friends say it is to please the people. My own opinion is that they would be better pleased with a vote of this kind if it were expended. I was told last year it was for the want of a proper dredge to do that work, as a large amount of work had to be done. The government is right in saying it is an immense work for it is required for the benefit of the shipping of these ports. I speak without boasting when I say that the ports of Lunenburg and Bridgewater are two of the most important ports in the whole province. Lunenburg owns a larger amount of shipping than the whole of Halifax. Bridgewater has a very large amount of shipping also, and of heavier tonnage going in and out of that port. And why both of these ports should be hampered in the way, and that for years for want of a proper dredge to do the dredging, I can not understand. The Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance were at these ports three or four years ago. They came in a steamer measuring about fifty tons.

They happened to be there at low tide, and had they remained fifteen minutes longer they would have been compelled to remain until the return of the tide, some twelve hours. The boat turned up the mud as they went out of the harbour, so shallow was the water near the pier, and that shallowness of water extended all over the harbour. The banks of the harbour are alluvial, and the wash from the repeated rains carry the debris into the harbour and fill it up from year to year. Now to show the necessity for that dredging, I will say that last year, had we not used smaller vessels, we would have been deprived of the opportunity of importing salt from across the ocean in large steamers for the want of a sufficient depth of water. We are compelled to confine ourselves strictly to smaller vessels in order to bring in that

supply. The shallowness of water also deprives us of the industry of ship building of heavy tonnage. This year we built something like thirty odd vessels of a fair size, averaging from one hundred to three hundred and fifty tons, and they require a considerable depth of water to float them. Now these amounts have been in the estimates for a long time, and has not been expended, I would ask when is this going to end? By delay they are discouraging the industry of shipbuilding. I venture to say that the coming year there will scarcely be any vessels built, for they will not be able to come into those ports on account of shallow water. When that industry of shipbuilding is interfered with the consequence is an interference with the industry of the woodsman supplying the timber and the carpenters as well engaged in construction. It interferes largely also with the traders.

Now, when told last year that for the want of a dredge this money was not expended in either Bridgewater or Lunenburg, I took it for granted that I had an indirect promise that dredges were being built, and that in a little while these dredges would be in service, and would be placed at work in those two ports. A dredge was built, as I understand, and has been in use the past year. Will the Minister of Public Works say that there has been no dredge in Nova Scotia during the past year? I do not think he can say so, for I have learned that a lot of dredging has been done during the past year; but why Lunenburg and Bridgewater should be overlooked and other ports of less consequence cared for, I cannot for the life of me understand. I am here to represent the interests of the people, and I claim that work as a right. I feel satisfied that the government are doing themselves a serious injury, they are injuring the industry of ship-building, and are indirectly hurting other industries as well by not giving us those dredges. Bridgewater requires a large amount of dredging, because it is a navigable river for about twenty miles. The bar requires dredging as well as the upper parts of the river, where there has been a large amount of sawdust deposited as well as refuse from the banks of the river. But I ask the minister in all seriousness that he will not look upon this request as of small moment, but that he will give it the recognition it deserves. I hope that this year dredges will be placed in service at Lunenburg and Bridgewater and Mahone Bay, and I feel satisfied that if the minister will consider the case for a moment, he will be convinced of the absolute necessity of this work, unless he wants to stop the navigation of those waters entirely.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We passed a similar item to-night with regard to an appropriation for Bridgewater. We pass these appropriations from year to year and still we have no assurance that any work will be undertaken this year any more than it has been done in the past. I think we should have some assurance from the Minister of Public Works that something will be done, that these harbours will be dredged. It seems to be useless to pass these votes from year to year without we have an understanding from the Minister of Public Works that some progress will be made.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am waiting for an answer from the Minister of Public Works with respect to the request that I have made for an expenditure at those two ports.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Before my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works answers, I want to say a word on the subject myself. If the presence of this vote in the estimates is offensive to my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), we will get over that matter very easily by striking it out. When he alluded a moment ago to the policy of keeping this vote on the book in order to deceive the people, and so forth, if he is serious, I think we will accommodate him by striking it out. But I venture to say that if we did strike it out he would be the first to complain, and to ask why we did not revote it. It is a fact that all along the Atlantic coast of Nova Scotia we are experiencing difficulties in the matter of dredging. We have one or two little dredges of an inferior pattern which are doing a little work, but we are not well equipped with dredging plant. In the case of the great lakes, where the government have no dredges available, it is sometimes found possible to hire private dredges. We are willing to hire dredges for the coast of Nova Scotia if they could be found. When I interested myself in the matter, and asked the late Minister of Public Works to make an inquiry whether we could obtain dredges, I know he did make an inquiry, and he was not able to obtain dredges from any quarter. They are not to be found, they are not available. We are now building a couple of dredges, but they are large works, and the construction proceeds slowly. But as soon as these dredges are completed, we hope that some of these important works can be attended to; but if we cannot get the dredges, if we cannot hire them or get them constructed in a short time, then it would be useless for us to make a promise to my hon. friend that we will do this work. I am as anxious as he is to have the work done. I appreciate the importance of Lunenburg and Bridgewater, and I heartily agree with him that Lunenburg is the most important point on the whole coast as regards the deep sea fishing industry. I sympathize heartily with him, but I do not think his case was as urgent as some other cases, for Lunenburg has a fine harbour. It is beginning to suffer, and I appreciate his desire that it should be dredged. If dredges are used in some other cases, it is because the work for the moment seemed more urgent. There are some cases

where the work was more urgent for the moment, though not of more importance. Then with respect to Bridgewater particularly, there is no dredge that we have in the maritime provinces which is at all suitable for that work. If it is a question of transferring a dredge from one place to another, I am sure that I am correct in stating in the hearing of the late Minister of Public Works and of the present minister and of the engineers of the department, that we have not a dredge in the lower provinces which is capable of doing the work at Bridgewater. We do not want to withdraw the vote, my hon. friend would not desire us to do so. Even though we are not in a position to guarantee the doing of the work, we leave it there as an evidence of good faith ; and if we can buy, or build, or hire dredges, we are as anxious as he is that this work and other works along the coast of Nova Scotia shall be provided for.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What is the depth of water at Lunenburg ?

Mr. KAULBACH. At low tide it would be little more than nine feet, and our smallest schooners draw that amount of water. In regard to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I know he is inclined to be generous, but, still at the same time, I did not like to hear a remark made by him in regard to the withdrawal of the vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think my hon. friend is serious in pressing it.

Mr. KAULBACH. I did not refer to it in any disingenious way at all. If there is any difficulty in obtaining dredges for work of that description I will ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he will permit me to get parties to construct dredges and place them at the service of the government at a certain rate per cubic yard. If so, I will be prepared to get parties to construct dredges that will do all the dredging required.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know the hon. Minister of Public Works does not hear my hon. friend's question as he is engaged in conversation at the present moment, and under these circumstances I will presume to answer it. I think my hon. friend is mistaken when he says that he can obtain dredges so readily. The construction of a modern dredge is not by any means so simple a matter as some suppose. I do not think my hon. friend can get any dredges, but if he knows anybody who has a dredge available and suitable to the work along the Atlantic coast and would place that party in communication with the hon. Minister of Public Works I am quite sure he will have ample employment at dredging at fair and reasonable rates. As to the particular places to which the dredge should go first, I am sure my hon. friend will agree with me that while he mentioned Lunenburg and Bridgewater they are not the only places that are complaining. If he knows anybody who is prepared to place a dredge at the disposal of the government on the Atlantic coast at a fair and reasonable rate, I am quite sure he will have an ample opportunity for employment.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am not anxious to encourage the introduction of dredges from across the border, but I can get dredges in the United States that will go to work in the course of a very little while and do the work necessary at so much per cubic yard and I think it can be done quite as cheaply as by constructing dredges by the government and employing parties to do the work. I do not approve of going across the border and bringing workmen or dredges here, but at the same time, I approve of the government insisting that this work shall be completed at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is really unconstitutional to go into supply at all on Mondays but I have not objected to it. We had better stop now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am pleased with the progress we have made and I shall be glad to meet the views of the Committee.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There were some papers to be brought down in connection with the Redistribution Bill—correspondence with the government of New Brunswick.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I have the correspondence here but it is in such shape that I would hardly like to put it on the Table of the House. I will have it arranged and bring it down to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will we take up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We may take several bills including, I think, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister intended, the Redistribution Bill for the second reading, and if we get beyond that, Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister mentioned that matter to me personally. I do not know whether we will have these documents down sufficiently early to enable us to go on with the Redistribution Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did my hon. friend mention it to the Prime Minister ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did, and he said that if any difficulty of that kind arose he would not insist upon it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Whatever arrangement the hon. gentleman has made with the Prime Minister will be carried out. In that case we may take some of the Bills on the Order Paper and then supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We really want to look at this correspondence before the second reading, because, if any discussion arises in regard to this matter, it will be on the second reading. Therefore, we should have these documents a reasonable length of time beforehand. I hardly think at present we will be justified in going on with the discussion to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend has had an understanding with the Prime Minister I have nothing to add. It will be carried out.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 7, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) moved:

That the second report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present session, which recommends that Mr. S. A. Mackay be paid at the rate of $4 per day from the 20th May, 1902, to 3rd April, instant, for services rendered as temporary substitute on the staff of the translators of the debates be adopted.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). (Translation.) Before this motion passes, I think it desirable that the chairman of the committee should give us a few words of explanation. Did this Mr. Mackay, who has been employed on the translating staff of the Debates ever pass his qualifying examination ? If not, I should like to know the reasons which have induced the committee to depart from the rule which has been so strictly adhered to within the last two or three years, in the case of the translators of our 'Debates.' If Mr. Mackay did not pass the required examination, why was he given employment in that capacity ?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. (Translation.) I think it will be sufficient in order to satisfy my hon. friend, to state to the House the facts of the case, such as they have been brought to the notice of the Debates Committee. The facts will show that the claim put in by Mr. Mackay is a just one. Let me, then briefly review the facts in connection with that claim. At the beginning of last session Mr. Mackay was engaged as a translator by the committee, at the rate of $4 a day. That appointment was necessitated by the fact that Mr. Beaulieu, one of the officers of the regular translating staff was incapacitated owing to his poor health, from doing his work. Mr. Beaulieu, as my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville reminds me, was the former chief of the translating staff. As I said, the committee, finding it necessary to employ temporary assistance, sceured Mr. Mackay's services and recommended that he be paid at the rate of $4 a day, which was equivalent for the work resulting from the session, to the sum of $1,000 which was the salary then paid to the officers of the regular staff. Later on, and while Mr. Beaulieu was still unable to discharge his duties, the position of the other officers of the permanent staff was changed, so far as their salary was concerned. Towards the close of the session of 1902, the House of Commons, acting upon the recommendation of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of this House, thought it proper to raise the salary of the officers of the translating staff from $1,000 to $1,500. Up to that time, they had received $1,000 per session ; but the House deemed it desirable to grant them a salary of $1,500 per annum, instead of $1,000 per session. But it was not within the power of the committee to interfere with Mr. Mackay's position so far as the payments for his work was concerned. That gentleman, therefore, continued being employed temporarily on the staff, as the Hansard Committee was in hopes that Mr. Beaulieu would soon recover his health and resume his former occupation. The fact is that Mr. Beaulieu died three months after the close of the session, in the month of August, I think. Mr. Mackay being engaged only temporarily, we did not think it within our power to increase his salary, as the House had deemed it proper to do, upon the recommendation of the committee in the case of the officers who compose the permanent staff, to whom the House had granted, for the future, a salary of $1,500. When the matter came up before the committee, and after the facts I have just referred to had been stated to them, namely, that Mr. Mackay had been engaged temporarily, they came to the conclusion that he was entitled to ask for the same remuneration as was paid to the other translators. After taking all the facts of the case into consideration, the committee deemed it but fair, and I think the House will agree with them, that Mr. Mac-

kay should be put upon a footing of equality with the rest of the translating staff.

My hon. friend from Labelle was anxious to know whether Mr. Mackay had gone through the test of an examination, thereby calling in doubt the competency of that gentleman. I must say that Mr. Mackay did not pass the examination which has been required within the last few years from all candidates who aspire to an appointment on the regular translating staff. The reason why the committee did not deem it proper to enforce the rule with that rigour the hon. gentleman seems to take exception to, is that Mr. Mackay was only appointed as a temporary substitute on the staff, in order to fill the vacancy created by Mr. Beaulieu's illness. I may further say, for the information of the House, that the committee did by no means depart from the rigour they have brought, within the past three or four years, to the discharge of their duty, in the matter of appointing translators on the regular staff, to fill such vacancies as may occur in that office. As concerns those appointments, there was no change made at all. Now, in the case of Mr. Mackay, his appointment was but a temporary one, the committee did not think it necessary to insist upon his passing such an examination as is required from candidates who aspire to be appointed on the regular staff. As I just remarked, the committee was then in hopes that Mr. Beaulieu would soon recuperate his health, and that explains why a permanent appointment was out of question. Under such circumstances, we deemed it fair and reasonable, seeing that Mr. Mackay had been discharging the same duties and doing the same work as the other translators, to ask the House to grant him a similar salary.

Such are the explanations I wanted to give to the House, and I hope they will prove satisfactory to my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). At all events, I may say that the members of the Debates Committee, after taking into consideration the facts I have just stated, have, without a dissentient voice, reached the conclusion that it was but fair and reasonable to make this recommendation to the House.

Mr. BOURASSA. (Translation). I may venture to suggest that, unless I am mistaken, when Mr. Mackay was appointed last year, as temporary substitute on the staff of the translators of the Debates during Mr. Beaulieu's illness, there were other candidates to that position who had passed their examination and had secured a certificate of competency. What I complain of is this, that the committee should have selected a man to fill Mr. Beaulieu's place who had not stood the test of an examination. I would be the last man to cast any blame upon the Hansard Committee for rigidly enforcing that rule, should they enforce it indiscriminately in every case. I may add that, whenever the committee stand in need of extra help for the translating staff, they should make their appointments from the ranks of those who have passed their examination, instead of going out of their way to select men whose only recommendation is that they have some pull and political influence at their back.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. (Translation.) Let my hon. friend allow me to tell him that were the statement he has just made borne out by the actual facts, he would be fully justified in taking exception to such a condition of affairs, but the fact is that Mr. Mackay was engaged temporarily, before the committee had decided that any examinations should be held. In other words, Mr. Mackay was appointed on the translating staff temporarily, previous to the time when the examination was held. The examination only took place three or four weeks after Mr. Mackay had been appointed temporarily on the translating staff.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

That after the Easter Recess to the end of the session, government Orders have precedence on Wednesdays, immediately after questions to be put by members.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). While there is not a very large list of items on the Public Bills and Orders, still there are some measures of considerable importance and as the government has taken Thursday so recently it is hardly necessary to take Wednesday at so early a date. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that we should have one or two Wednesdays more, I would prefer two.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend would agree, I would be willing to give him one Wednesday, and the motion will then read 'On and including Wednesday the 22nd inst.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have been considering the matter since I spoke to the hon. gentleman on the subject, and we would prefer to have two Wednesdays more.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well. If it be the wish of my hon. friend I will amend the motion so as to read 'On and including Wednesday the 29th inst.'

Motion agreed to.

BUDGET SPEECH.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Might I be permitted to say, that if nothing arises to make it inconvenient, I would expect the delivery of the budget speech to take place on the Thursday after the Easter recess.

EASTER RECESS.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday next, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 14th inst.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the members on both sides would like to know whether or not the usual practice will be followed of adjourning at 6 o'clock on Wednesday.

The PRIME MINISTER. I suppose we had better.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 13) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—The Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). This Bill was considered in committee before and it stood to enable the hon. leader of the opposition to look into it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In one section of the present law the judges are empowered to extend the time of the trial of an election petition upon special grounds shown by affidavit. Possibly the first section of this Bill would mean that, but I would prefer to have it made perfectly plain that the grounds should be disclosed to the judge on affidavit.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have no objection to that. Perhaps if we added the words 'upon cause shown' that would meet the case. The committee might rise with the understanding that the amendment suggested by hon. friend would be made.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The ordinary powers which a judge has are extended to enable him to detain a witness in custody until the time arrives for him to give evidence ; that is the only change the clause makes in the present law.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There may be a case in which such a proceeding is necessary. It appears that the necessity for such an amendment arose, because it was suggested to me by the chief justice of Manitoba.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see any objection to it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would invite the consideration of the Minister of Justice, as to whether it would not be desirable to have the witness placed at times in the custody of a jailer rather than held by the officer. It may be that there would be an adjournment, and in the meantime it would not be desirable that the officer should continue to have the party in charge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It says 'or otherwise' in the statute.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Upon the understanding that I shall have the Bill amended for the purpose of meeting the suggestion of the leader of the opposition, I would ask that the committee rise and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved second reading of Bill (No. 49) to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act. He said : This is a Bill based upon resolutions which we considered in Committee some time ago. It deals with fractions of a year.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

MILITIA PENSION ACT.

Bill (No. 78) to amend the Militia Pension Act, 1901 (Minister of Militia and Defence), read the second time and House went into Committee thereon.

On section 1,

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFNCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). The object of this Bill is to make the pension law for the permanent force similar to the law passed last year for the North-west Mounted Police ; that is to say, to enable a civil servant who is entitled under the Civil Service Superannuation Act to a pension, to participate in the benefits of the Superannuation Act for the time that he has been a member of the Civil Service and to the extent of the money which he has paid into the superannuation fund. It will be noticed that at the end of this proposed subsection 7, there is a reference to subsection 2 of section 5 of the Militia Pension Act. By that subsection it is enacted that in case an officer has not served the full length of time to entitle him to full superannuation, that is, in case he has not paid into the pension fund for the full length of 25 years, he will receive his pension subject to a deduction of 5 per cent per annum for the time he has not paid. This Bill provides that in case he has been a civil servant, he shall get the benefit of the 2½ or 3 per cent, or whatever the rate may be, that he has paid under the Superannuation Act for the time that he has been a member of the civil service. To illustrate : suppose a man has been a civil servant for ten years, and has paid into the superannuation fund regularly during that time his 2½ or 3 per cent, and is then appointed an officer in the permanent force or on the staff,

where he becomes entitled to a pension under the Militia Pension Act. This Act will enable him to receive the full benefit of that payment for the ten years that he has been in the civil service, but he will be charged the difference between the amount he has paid into the superannuation fund and the 5 per cent charged under the Pension Act. The House passed precisely the same legislation last session in connection with the Pension Act for the North-west Mounted Police.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I understand that he does not get anything under the Civil Service Superannuation Act ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Nothing at all, and he would lose that but for this provision.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I did not clearly understand the hon. minister. Under the Civil Service Pension Act an official pays two and a half per cent per year. Under the military system he would have to pay five per cent per year. On retiring from the military service, he gets the benefit of his civil service and military service, provided he pays the difference between the two percentages.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the government loses the interest on the payments of the extra two and a half per cent during ten or fifteen years.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, the government has the money.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. At the end of the term, the official pays the difference between two and a half and five per cent. But if he had been all the time in the military service, he would have paid five per cent per year. Therefore, when he pays it in a lump sum at the end of the term, the government loses the interest, which may be quite a large amount.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That may be.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite understand how the concluding words of this section. 'Subject to the provisions of subsection two of section five,' can apply.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Take two cases. Suppose an officer has served twenty-five years, fifteen of which were before there was any Pension Act. During those fifteen years he paid nothing, but he will get his pension for the twenty-five years less deduction made of the premiums during the fifteen years, when he did not pay anything. Take another case. An officer has paid during ten years two and a half per cent into the civil service superannuation fund. During the next fifteen years he has paid five per cent into the military service pension fund. Under this Bill, the intention is only to charge him the two and a half per cent during those ten years instead of the five.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty is this. Subsection two of section five of the present law provides for the case of an officer who in years gone by had no deduction whatever made from his pay. You strike an average of his pay and then make a deduction from his pension of five per cent on that average for every year during which he paid nothing. But how can you make this subsection apply to the present case, for you are not making a deduction of five per cent but only of two and a half per cent. You are applying a clause which deals specifically with one case to another and a different case.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I see the difficulty now, and will consider the matter. The five per cent is mentioned; and therefore, I think it would be desirable to draw up a clause long enough to state exactly what is intended.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that would be the safer course.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before the Committee rises, I would like to understand the practical use of this amendment. I cannot understand a civil servant who has been eight or ten years in the service getting an appointment on the staff or going into the permanent corps. Is it intended to have some ex post facto effect ? Is it to cover the case of some officer who has been in the department?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No. No particular case is aimed at, but I will give the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) a case such as would be covered by this. It is intended, in the near future, to transfer the stores branch of my department to the military side, making it an ordnance branch and putting it under military supervision. Now, we have in the stores branch civil servants who have been paying for years to the civil service fund. For instance, there is the head of that branch; and it would certainly be manifestly unfair to deprive him of the benefit of the money he has paid into the superannuation fund.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was passing through my mind was the question whether the converse will happen, and some officer will go from the permanent corps to the civil service ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not likely. The Pension Act is very much better here.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—ACCOMMODATION FOR IMMIGRANTS.

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

Mr. NATHANIEL BOYD (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to draw your attention, and the attention of hon. members, to a matter that I believe, is of great importance and one to which the House should give very careful consideration. I refer to the immigration which is now coming into Manitoba and the North-west Territory. I have here a copy of the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' of Saturday last. There is an item in that paper which, together with the headings, is as follows :

SLEEP ON FLOOR OF WAITING ROOM.

Hundreds of Immigrants Here Without Accommodation—Facilities Inadequate.

The Canadian Pacific Railway depot and the immigration offices were crowded all day yesterday with hundreds of new arrivals.

Everything appeared inadequate for the requirements. The Canadian Pacific Railway depot is lined all round with trunks, valises and packages of every description of the incoming immigrants, the waiting rooms were crowded, and the immigration offices were far too small to accommodate the inquirers at the counters. Some of the officers were outside, and others surrounded at their desks giving information to the anxious inquirers.

So great was the number of arrivals on Thursday night that it was impossible for them to secure accommodation in the immigration hall or at the hotels. The Canadian Pacific Railway officials threw open their waiting rooms and hundreds slept on the floors.

The second section of the transcontinental express brought in 615 immigrants, and this made up for the number that had been sent out during the day to their locations throughout Manitoba and the west. The situation was not, therefore, relieved in any way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree with me that that is a rather sad condition for the country to be in to receive settlers at this time of the year, in a climate such as ours. Some provision should have been made to receive these people and take care of them. It cannot be said that this rush has come upon the government unexpectedly. It is not that the government have not been warned of what is likely to occur. For, Sir, I have but to refer to the reports of the Department of the Interior of 1900-01 and 1901-02 to show the contrary. In the report of 1900-01, Mr. Smith, the immigration agent at Winnipeg, spoke of the influx then anticipated in this way. I quote from page 127 :

Over 5,000 American visitors attended the Winnipeg fair on Americans' day, and those presenting themselves at our information bureau at the fair were freely supplied with literature which has undoubtedly helped towards securing the increased immigration of United States citizens apparent during the fiscal year.

And he goes on, further down on the same page :

Nothwithstanding the increased convenience and shelter for immigrants at the East Selkirk building, the demands upon the accommodation of the hall here are very great, and are almost continuous. Large numbers of people daily visit the office on all conceivable kinds of business, and innumerable inquiries upon a great variety of subjects are answered by the staff of officials.

In the succeeding report of the department, that of 1901-02, we find Mr. Smart, the deputy minister speaking of the anticipated immigration. This is the report made by him on his return from England. At page 40, he said :

I may say that from all I have been able to gather I feel satisfied that the present year will see a very largely increased number of people remove to Canada from Great Britain and Ireland.

And in that same report, at page 125, we have Mr. Smith reporting as follows :

With the very large increase in the number of people passing through the hands of the staff connected with this office the duties of each official have been very materially increased, and I am pleased to know that the work has been carried on efficiently. With the possibility of a much greater increase of work, I beg to recommend the immediate erection of much larger office premises, and improvements in the buildings at Winnipeg, which are required to enable us to carry on our work with accuracy and rapidity.

So, Mr. Speaker, as far back as two years ago the reports of the officers of the department showed that they anticipated this influx of people into Manitoba and the North-west. And yet, what do we find ? Were any improvements ordered or any preparations made to receive these people ? Was any vote put in the estimates to provide money for buildings for their accommodation ? Why, Sir, in the estimates voted last year you will find that for public buildings for Manitoba there is the sum of $5,000. The votes for some of the other provinces are as follows : Nova Scotia, $61,500; New Brunswick, $33,000; Quebec, $103,000; Ontario, $222,800. And just $5,000 for public buildings for Manitoba, notwithstanding that officers of the Crown who were passing from one part of the empire to the other inducing people to come here, and notwithstanding that that officer of the department told the government what might be expected and warned them of what would be required to accommodate the people. Here the influx is upon the government, and the new-comers have to lie upon the floors of the station in Winnipeg.

I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, who I have no doubt sympathize with these people, if you consider the government have done what they should do in this matter, if you think they have placed a sufficient sum in the estimates for public buildings in Manitoba, under those conditions. I think, Sir,

you will agree with me that the members of the government who are responsible for this, when they lie upon their downy beds sleeping the sleep of the just and the righteous—whatever opinion we may have of them on this side of the House—I think you will agree with me that they must feel some remorse when they think of these poor people whom they are inducing to come into that country, and whom we are anxious to see come there; and that they should have made some provision for them instead of allowing them to lie on the floor. I think the government should have some regard for these men and for their wives and children, and have made some better provision for their accommodation in the estimates, instead of spending so many thousands in various parts of the Dominion, largely for political purposes. Now, I think I am justified in bringing this matter to the attention of the government. I look across the House and see the premier sitting there, who, I believe to be a conscientious man, and who, when it comes to a matter of his fellowman, can be depended upon; I believe I can appeal to him to see to it that whoever is responsible for this condition of affairs will immediately take steps to remedy them. People are coming into our midst by the thousands, and I think it would be well for the premier, or for the minister who is responsible for that department, to see that his officers do everything that is possible to make these immigrants comfortable, so that we who come from the west may not have to make such complaints. We are delighted to see so large a number of people coming there, and we are going to do all we possibly can to make it pleasant and profitable for them. But we do not think that the government, under the circumstances, have done what they should have done, and we now lay the case before them and make a demand that they should meet the emergency and treat these people as they deserve.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The question that has been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) is, I think, one of very great importance, and one that cannot be too strongly pressed upon the attention of the government. The Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and the members supporting the government, have taken a great deal of credit to themselves for their so-called vigorous immigration policy, and have endeavoured to leave the impression throughout the country that it is largely owing to some new features in their policy that we have had this large influx of people coming to our shores the last two or three years. Now, every intelligent man is aware of the fact that this influx is largely owing to the splendid crops with which Providence has blessed that country during the last few years, it is largely owing to the fact that over one hundred million bushels of grain have been raised in that western country during the year 1902. These things have done more to give our country a world-wide reputation than all the immigration agents in the service of the government. If the government are so anxious to take to themselves the credit of these people coming into Canada, they must also bear whatever blame attaches to them if these people are not properly looked after and afforded proper accommodation for their necessities. As my hon. friend from Macdonald has pointed out, the influx of people coming to our shores was not unexpected, and therefore the neglect of making proper accommodation for them is inexcusable. My hon. friend has pointed out that the Deputy Minister of the Interior, in his report, one or two years ago, anticipated this large immigration to Canada; the minister himself in his speeches has declared that although we had been blessed with a large influx of population the last year, it was nothing compared to the population that would come in, not only from the United States but from the British Isles, during the coming year. The deputy minister has been visiting Great Britain during the past winter, and in interviews reported in the public press of this country, papers irrespective of politics, we have been led to believe that a very large population would flock into Canada during the present year. I say therefore there is no excuse for the government in neglecting to make ample provision for their accommodation. Already in the beginning of the season we see 5,000 per week going into that western country, and we who live in the west are aware that the hotel accommodation in the city of Winnipeg is entirely inadequate to meet the demands of the travelling public for the last year or two. People have been turned away night and day at the hotels and boarding houses, all places of accommodation have been more than filled; and now we find these people compelled to sleep in the waiting room of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) brought to the attention of the House the other day another matter of prime importance in connection with the accommodation afforded for these people in the railway cars in which they are travelling through western Canada. He did not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for that condition, but he largely blamed the government of the day. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are, in this instance, deserving of every credit, no blame can be attached to them, they have done their utmost to accommodate their travellers, and have thrown open their public buildings. The blame therefore rests entirely on the Department of Immigration and the minister who is at the head of that department. Now, it is stated that we may expect this immigration to continue for

weeks and months. I understand that the deputy minister, who has just returned to Canada from England, states that passages have been booked for hundreds and thousands of immigrants for the next five or six weeks. It is evident that the government should have made some preparation for these people, but when we look at our estimates for the present year we find for the whole province of Manitoba a sum of only $5,000 for public buildings. Now we have had evidence of money being spent in other parts of the Dominion, thousands and thousands of dollars are being voted for public buildings in every other province of the Dominion. We have seen L'Assomption, a little village whose post office revenue is only $964, given a post office to cost $15,000; whereas in the whole province of Manitoba only $5,000 is voted for public buildings. This is something that should not be, especially in the important city of Winnipeg, the gateway of the west, the headquarters and distributing point of all these immigrants. Something should have been done to erect public buildings, especially immigration halls, where these people would have had proper accommodation. I noticed an article in a paper the other day which stated that the Winnipeg correspondent of the London 'Mail' had sent over word that there was also a great congestion in the town of Saskatoon, in the North-west Territories. While that has been denied by Mr. Preston, who was not on the ground and knows nothing whatever of the circumstances, still even if there were no truth in that report, there certainly is a congestion in Winnipeg, as evidenced in all the papers of that city irrespective of politics. We have been spending some half a million dollars for immigration purposes to attract people to our shores, and there is nothing that will leave a worse impression on the incoming immigrant than the treatment that is accorded to him on his arrival, and which has been mentioned by my hon. friend from Macdonald. I trust that action will be taken by the government in order to provide these people with proper accommodation, immediate action for the present year, as well as some provision in the supplementary estimates for providing public buildings for their accommodation in time to come.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). I would like to endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche). I regret very much to have to criticise the action of the government which I am supposed to support; at the same time in this matter I believe they have been neglectful of their duty. What the hon. member for Macdonald has said is true enough, that this is not a new thing, it is not something that has come to the notice of the government for the first time. They have known that we were likely to have a hundred thousand people coming into the west this year. The prediction was made four or five years ago that the increase in the population of that country would double from year to year, as it has done in the United States, until possibly we should receive each year two hundred and fifty thousand people. I made that prediction myself some four years ago, and I said that it would come to pass within ten years. I still adhere to the prediction that within ten years from the date of that prediction we will have not less than 250,000 immigrants every year coming into Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The United States got this year alone, nearly 800,000 people, showing that the prediction I made is justified. When this was called to the attention of the government, a sum should have been put in the estimates to see that better accommodation was provided for these people when they arrive. The citizens of Winnipeg and of the province of Manitoba have to undergo a great deal of expense in connection with immigration. I left Winnipeg last Saturday. On Friday afternoon I attended a meeting of the general hospital board in the city of Winnipeg, and I found that on that day there were thirteen applications for private wards and many applications for the general wards of the hospital, which could not be granted, as there was not accommodation for the patients who desired admission. That institution is largely supported by private contributions by the people of Winnipeg and of Manitoba. The legislature of Manitoba a few days ago voted $25,000 for the purpose of erecting a new wing to the hospital, and the work will be commenced within the next few days. A large part of the immigration is of no great benefit to Manitoba; it merely passes through to the Territories, and the people of Winnipeg should not be called upon to take care of these immigrants. In one children's ward there were six small cots. I found that five of the occupants of these cots were foreigners, Icelandic, German, Polish, Russian and Scandinavian, who had been in the country but a short time. The support and care of those who are taken ill at the city of Winnipeg are being provided for by the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba. It is the duty of this government not only to take those people there, but to care for them after they arrive. There is nothing that will so quickly put a stop to this movement of immigration into Canada as to have the people write back to England that when they arrived on our shores they could find no place to rest their weary bones when illness came upon them. We are likely to have in the near future a very large influx of people from the British Islands. Those people who come from England especially, in my opinion, make poor pioneers. They are first class settlers, but they are poor pioneers in a new country. They are accustomed to

the comforts of a settled country, you will find them very headstrong and slow to adapt themselves to the conditions that they will find on the prairie. It is expected that quite a large percentage of the immigrants who will arive will be English colonists, and we are anxious that their first impression shall be favourable. Poor accommodation has been provided for these people as far as hospitals are concerned; in fact scarcely anything has been done by the government. It is true that although the government have somewhat neglected the matter, they are at the same time not entirely to blame. We know that as a matter of fact other institutions, other corporations and private individuals have not been equal to the emergency that has taken place. We know that there is scarcely a wholesale man in the city of Winnipeg who has accommodation for the transaction of the business which has come to him. I left Winnipeg last Saturday, and on Friday I looked around the city and I found a great many cellars being blasted out preparatory to the erection of warehouses. Such firms as Greenshields, Son & Company, of Montreal, which had no confidence in the west in years gone by, are there to-day, and in order to get ready for business as quickly as possible, they are having new cellars taken out by dynamite, and they are facilitating the work in every way. These corporations admit that they are not ready for this great rush of immigration, and it is therefore no wonder if the government find themselves in this position. The railway companies have been doing all they could to cope with this immigration, but it has come upon them with more rapidity than they anticipated. If this debate will bring out all the facts, it will have a good effect, and we will forgive the government if they have been guilty of some dereliction in the past. I think it is the duty of the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to find out what steps have been taken by the officials of the Interior Department to care for these people after they have arrived, to see that there shall be no distress among them; to see that the sick shall be properly looked after, to see that every one upon arriving will be able to write a letter back home saying that he has been well treated. The policy in the city of New York, in years past, was, that whenever a certain number of immigrants of a desirable class had arrived there a guard was put in charge of eight or ten, and as long as they remained in New York city they were well cared for, and they were immediately asked to sit down and write a letter home to the village they came from describing the treatment they had received on their arrival in New York. If some of the immigrants who have arrived at Winnipeg were to write back home twenty-four hours after their arrival, I do not think they would write very cheerful or encouraging letters or letters which would induce many immigrants to come out. This has been the condition of affairs, but it should not be allowed to continue. The movement is now upon us. There is a very large military hall in the city of Winnipeg, and I submit that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) should be asked to give that hall, which will hold 400 immigrants, and which should have cots placed in it, and there should be a bus ready to convey immigrants from the depot to the hall. When I left there last Saturday I saw a large number of immigrants around the streets, who could not get work on account of the cold weather, as work had not begun, who could not get west, and who had no place to sleep. They went to the police station, they filled the wards of the station, and the Canadian Pacific Railway did what they never had to do before, they opened up their station and allowed them to sleep, not only in the ladies' and gentlemens' waiting rooms, but in the corridors, between the offices upstairs. I trust that the government, if they have not already done so, will take some steps to look after the 100,000 people which I expect will come to the west within the next four or five months. It is a very interesting calculation to know exactly the amount of rolling stock it is going to take to convey that number of people into that country within the next four or five months. If you will calculate the number of people to each car, say fifty to each, then calculate one carload of settlers effects for each family of five, then calculate that it requires from 7,000 to 10,000 feet of lumber to build each settler's house, then calculate the amount of food stuffs required for the year, as they will probably not raise food stuffs for the first year, you will find that they will require as many cars to handle these people as have been necessary to haul out 35,000,000 bushels of wheat during the past five months, which means that the whole of the transportation facilities of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern in the west will be brought into requisition to transport 100,000 people within the next four or five months. So that the situation, if it is figured out in detail, becomes rather serious unless we get aid from some other quarters. I shall not say anything further at the present time upon the subject. Perhaps later on I shall go a little more fully into the figures, but in the meantime, I trust that the right hon. Prime Minister and the acting Minister of the Interior will give this subject their attention, and see if they cannot suggest some means of dealing with the situation as it has arisen.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, I agree with what has been said by the three previous speakers during the debate. It is a week since I drew the attention of the government to the matter of the

transportation of immigrants, and since that time those who were then in transit have arrived at their destination. The conditions which prevailed at that time were not improved during any part of the journey. They continued right through. At the end of this week there comes a second large contingent, and I hope that the hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) will be able to inform us whether anything practical has been done, whether any engagements have been made on behalf of the railway company to remedy the matter so that it will not occur again in the transportation of these immigrants who are arriving at Halifax this week. I have before me a copy of the petition that has been forwarded to the hon. acting Minister of the Interior, the hon. Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding), and the Hon. Secretary of State (Hon. Senator Scott) from the hospital board of the city of Winnipeg, calling attention to the absolute urgency of getting some assistance from this government to enable them to take care of the patients. It states :

A large number of its patients are from those who have recently arrived as immigrants in the province of Manitoba. Many of these come direct to the hospital from the immigration buildings in the city of Winnipeg.

2. For a long time the Dominion government made payments to the hospital in respect of immigrant patients on the basis of sixty cents per day for the time each patient was in the hospital and the government still requires the returns to be made out by the hospital in the same form but the grant that has been received for several years past is very much less than the amount so computed.

As a matter of fact, the amount paid by this government to the hospital per capita is growing less and less. Now, an appeal has been made for a substantial grant to help in the erection of a new building immediately. The case is urgent. There must be more hospital accommodation for these immigrants during the next few months, and as this petition has now been before the government for ten days or two weeks, I am in hopes that the acting Minister of the Interior will be able to tell us what conclusion has been come to in regard to it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The subject which has been brought to our attention now, is one of very great importance and is deserving of the best consideration of both the House and of the government. If I heard correctly the contents of the article which my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) read from a newspaper, it described the state of affairs at the Winnipeg station. That portion of it wherein it described the busy scene, the quantities of baggage, the number of immigrants inquiring for information ; all that is very gratifying. It is also gratifying to find that our country is so attractive to-day, but it is to be regretted that, as in many other instances, there is a fly in the ointment, that the service is perhaps not adequate to the requirements.

My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has referred to the state of the hospital accommodation, and also to the facilities for railway transportation between Halifax and the west. I may say that I only to-day received the petition with reference to the hospital. I did not receive it ten days ago, but only about noon time to-day, and it took considerable time to read it. I have only this moment therefore been able to inform myself as to the nature of the demand made in that petition. The petition, which is dated, I think, on Friday last, asks for a grant of $50,000 towards the immediate erection of, I suppose, additional building, and also for some additional per capita allowance for patients in the hospital. That subject will at once receive the attention of the government.

The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) called attention a few days ago to the inadequate facilities afforded by the Canadian Pacific Railway for the transportation of the immigrants. I immediately put myself in communication with the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities, and I am bound to confess that there was very substantial foundation for many of the statements made; apologetic explanations have been offered, but they are not adequate. I am in hopes that, with the arrival of the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Canada, all preventible oversights will disappear. At all events, after the Easter vacation, if there is any further ground of complaint, it will be my duty to make a frank statement to this House as to where any responsibility rests. I take no exception on this occasion that my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has called the attention of the House to the alleged shortcomings of this government. It is his duty, and he is performing a public service. But he thinks that because in former years it was stated in the report that a large influx of American immigrants was expected, that therefore facilities should be on hand to-day to meet that anticipation. I have been in this parliament for twenty years or more, and I can remember anticipations of immigration yearly held out to us that were not afterwards realized. I have more confidence in our own anticipations now, but perhaps even those will not be realized. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) anticipates 100,000 immigrants this year. I trust that his anticipations may be realized, but he tells us that his prophesy was for a period of ten years ; and if so, how does he account for it having been realized five years in advance ?

Mr. McCREARY. My prophesy was 250,000 immigrants within ten years, and it is coming to it each year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I see. It is very safe to prophesy what will happen

five years hence. As to the lack of foresight on the part of the government, I have this to say: All the gentlemen who have spoken pointed out that others besides the government have failed in foresight. We are told that the business people of Winnipeg have not the facilities for transacting the business that has been thrown upon them by this immense immigration; that the hotels are inadequate; that the boarding houses are inadequate; and we know that the railways are inadequate. Well, perhaps some little allowance may be made if the government is not wiser than those people to whom my hon. friends have referred. I am not able to speak by the book, except it be the blue-book of the Public Works department. I am not able to speak in detail as to whether the department has or has not anticipated this immigration. I am not familiar with the details of the working of either the Public Works Department or the Interior Department, and so I can only offer my explanations from such material as is to hand at the moment, and such as it is I will venture to offer it to the House by way of extenuation at least, and to show that we have not been absolutely wholly indifferent. I have here the report of the Minister of Public Works, which shows an expenditure of $1,700 during the fiscal year on immigration buildings in Winnipeg; the erection of an immigration building at Calgary; the erection of an immigration building at Lethbridge costing $4,000, another item of $1,400 for the erection of an immigration building at Saskatoon, and $1,500 for the erection of an immigration building at Strathcona. I presume that these are buildings for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the increased immigration. Therefore, some thought has been given to the future by providing these necessary buildings. I entirely sympathize with my hon. friends who urge that immigrants shall be furnished with every possible reasonable accommodation for their comfort, so that they may, with the least inconvenience, be able to start well in their new venture in life. It is of the utmost importance that these immigrants should receive a good impression of the country, and that they should find that the country, and the government representing the people, are not indifferent to their needs, but are ready to welcome them with open arms and extend to them excellent treatment. That is the duty of the government so far as it is possible to achieve it, and that duty the government will endeavour to perform. Until the House met this afternoon I was not aware that my hon. friend would bring this matter up. He was good enough to tell me of it a few moments before he took the floor, but that did not enable me to make any inquiries in the department of the Interior as to what arrangements are being made at the present time for the proper carrying on of the immigrant business. I shall make it my duty to at once take steps to inform myself on these points; and what is more, I shall endeavour in all possible way to see that the immigrants are properly cared for. I am sure the whole resources of the country will be cheerfully placed at our disposal by parliament to do whatever is necessary to meet this large demand upon us; a demand which is perhaps more than was expected. Indeed, I saw it stated in the papers yesterday that during the last week not less than 8,000 immigrants had arrived in Winnipeg—is that correct?

Mr. McCREARY. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a very large number; it is over a thousand a day. Of course they are not going to stay in Winnipeg. An effort is made to distribute them. They come with more or less definite points of the country in view. They arrive at the sea ports; they perhaps rest there for a few hours, then they are carried by rail to the west. Some of them may get off by the way and become residents; but the great bulk are pushing on to the prairies. When they reach Winnipeg, the great mass of them, as the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) says, stop there only as transients, their ultimate object being to settle on the prairies. So that the facilities required at Winnipeg are only such as are necessary to meet the present occasion. It may be that the railways have not been able to carry the arriving streams of population as promptly as is desirable, and that this has caused a temporary congestion at Winnipeg, and possibly at other points. That is incidental to our receiving such a large army of people as are now coming into the country. So that, while the government do not seek to avoid any criticism, they expect that hon. gentlemen and the public generally will take a reasonable and fair view of the situation, and not give a black eye to the movement by overstating what may be taking place. We are told that many of the immigrants who have arrived at Winnipeg have not been able to find beds, but have been obliged to sleep on the floor; and also that the hospital accommodation is inadequate. These are features of the situation to be regretted. Whilst I would not compare the hardships of the past with those of to-day, or suggest that these immigrants are having a softer time than our forefathers had, it is always well to bear in mind that there is always more or less discomfort connected with the movement of people from one country to another. I do not offer that as an apology for anything that is taking place, but as an explanation of these incidents which are more or less inseparable from the movements of people. Nevertheless, we must do all we can to afford reasonable shelter and comfort for these people, and reasonable facilities for them to get to their holdings; and that I

pledge the House that the government will endeavour to do.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I fear that the hon. Postmaster General has too much on his hands. He has to take charge of the Minister of Agriculture's Department—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). And several other departments, and he has too much to do. But I would like him, when immigrants are coming in so fast just now, to direct some of them to the province of Ontario. In that province the farmers have not sufficient men to help them to do their work. The stream of immigration seems to be all directed towards Manitoba and the North-west. Some hon. gentlemen say that the city of Winnipeg will get no benefit from the people who are going to the North-west. I think Winnipeg will get benefit from every one of them. Therefore I do not think the people of Winnipeg ought to object to putting up temporary buildings for these people. But what I would like the minister to do would be to help the farmers of Ontario to get some of this immigration. From 50,000 to 100,000 agricultural labourers could find employment and comfortable homes with the farmers of Ontario. We have great respect for Manitoba and the North-west; but they are not the only places in the world, and we expect the government to do something for us in Ontario.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, of course there may be conditions in the present situation which the government could not very well foresee; but I have not been able to gather from the remarks of the hon. Postmaster General that the government have done anything at all to provide for the condition of affairs which is now apparent at Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman states that there may have been some misgivings in the mind of the government as to the immigration that would flow into that country this year. We know that a very large immigration went in last year; and the government have officers there, and must have reasonably anticipated that there would be an enormous immigration both from the United States and from Europe during the current year. Any one who is familiar with the conditions in the west knows that delegations of farmers from the United States were going all through the western country last year for the purpose of locating lands with the idea of immigrating to this country; and in view of the magnificent crops of the past two years, a very large immigration should have been anticipated. Now, what have the government done according to the statement of the hon. Postmaster General, to meet the probable congestion in the city of Winnipeg? Have they done anything at all? Have they exercised ordinary business foresight? Take the people of any city where a large number of people are expected because of any unusual event, such as a great fair; we find them making provision to accommodate the people who are expected to come. Have the government done anything of this kind at Winnipeg? I do not gather anything from the statement of the hon. Postmaster General to indicate that they have. It seems to me that it would have been a very easy matter for the government to have anticipated some considerable congestion at Winnipeg, and to have made arrangements through their officers, so that people need not be lying in police cells, in railway stations, and around the streets, at a time of the year when, according to my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), the weather is very inclement, and these people must have suffered considerably. A great deal depends on the impressions that are made on people who are coming in such large numbers to the country. If these people write to their friends in the countries from which they have come and detail the discomfort, the inconvenience and the suffering which they have experienced, it will counteract a great deal of the work of the immigration agents, and a great deal of the splendid impression which has been made throughout the world as to the future of that country, by reason of the great crops of the past two or three years. I agree with my hon. friend the Postmaster General in regard to one thing, and that is that it is the urgent and imperative duty of the government to remedy this state of things at once; they should have done so before. While my hon. friend has been very frank in admitting the faults of the corporations and people that he is not concerned with, I think I may, on behalf of the government, admit that they are to a great extent responsible for the present condition of affairs. While it may be true, as my hon. friend says, that the conditions faced by these people may not be so severe as the conditions which were faced by the pioneers of this country a hundred years ago, that does not as an argument amount to very much at all. What we have to do is to compare the conditions which the immigrants of to-day have to face not with the conditions of one hundred years ago, but with the conditions in the United States, our great competitor. I am very glad the matter has been brought to the attention of the House. We have a magnificent opportunity at the present time to people the North-west country with the best class of settlers, and it will be a most regrettable thing, in the interest not only of the west but of the east, if anything should happen in the slightest degree to put a temporary check on the immigration now flowing into that country.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Margaree, N.S.—improvements, $800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. I see in the Auditor General's Report, page V—211 that a wharf was built at Margaree Island. Are those works close together ?

Mr. McLENNAN. They are twelve miles apart and separate works.

Meteghan Cove—restoration of breakwater, $2,300.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the proposed total expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Five thousand three hundred dollars.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will this be done by day's work or by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By day's work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why not by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because it consists of general repairs, which can better be done by day's work.

Mr. COCHRANE. How are the materials obtained ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By the foreman of the work under the superintendence of the engineer.

Mr. LENNOX. Where is the resident engineer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The resident engineer is at Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You have all through the system a conductor and a foreman. What does the conductor really do ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He buys the material and generally oversees the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He is down in the accounts for one hundred and fifty-nine days and the foreman is down for one hundred and twenty-two days. It would not take the conductor one hundred and fifty-nine days to buy the materials.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I explained yesterday that the conductor bought the material and had charge of the whole work and kept the time, &c.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this a new system ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, that has been the system ever since our present engineer has been in office. So the chief engineer tells me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the chief engineer report that it is necessary to have a conductor as well as a foreman ? To an ordinary layman it would not seem that they were both necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer thinks it necessary to have a practical man continually at the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the conductor doing all the time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is time-keeper, and he has to purchase materials. There are a great many different kinds of materials required in these repairs, and the purchase of these, with time keeping and general charge and superintendence of the work should keep him pretty busy. He makes his report to the local engineer, who holds him responsible for the general condition of the works.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think the foreman, the practical man, would be held responsible for the conduct of the work. So, outside of the purchase of the material, I should think the foreman would have nothing to do but smoke or engage in some light occupation of that kind. Possibly there may be something else he has to do, but the minister seems to be as much puzzled to tell us what it is as we are to conjecture.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Seriously speaking, I think that probably the man put in charge of the work is a practical man, probably a carpenter. He could not be away from the work for the necessary time looking after men, and also purchasing the various materials required for these repairs, and, also act as foreman. Of course, if the local engineer resides there, he could do this. But the man in charge of a work like this could hardly be the foreman, unless he had also a business capacity, and then the work would probably suffer by his absence when buying material. I have had no experience, but the chief engineer tells me that it has been the practice of the department for many years to conduct these works in this way. I shall be pleased to look into this matter. If two men are unnecessary, there is no reason why one should not be dispensed with.

Mr. INGRAM. Who is the representative of the constituency in which this work is ? I am afraid the hon. gentleman has been taking some lessons in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax).

Mr. INGRAM. Oh, no ; take that back.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I beg the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Ingram's) pardon. This is in the constituency of the leader of the opposition. If that hon. gentleman has been taking lessons in Ontario, I hope they have done him good.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know what the hon. minister refers to: I have been talking about Meteghan for the last ten or fifteen minutes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was passed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, Mr. Chairman, you called 'passed' just as I rose. You call 'passed' whenever there is an interval of five seconds, as it is your duty to do. But I have been reading from the Auditor General's Report about Meteghan, and that is what I have been discussing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a misunderstanding, then. In that case, I would say in answer to the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) that the work is in Digby county.

Mr. INGRAM. The vote of last year $3,000, and the vote of this year make a total of $5,300 for this work. According to the Auditor General's Report there is a conductor, 157 days at $2.50, and three foremen at $217.53; labourers, $1,437. No one will pretend to say that it requires three foremen and a conductor to carry on the work of that character.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No doubt, our engineer at Halifax allowed some men ten, fifteen or twenty-five cents a day more than the ordinary workmen making them foremen. But if on investigation we find that men are paid for services which they do not render, it may be well for us to consider whether we should not get somebody else to look after the work. I have not the slightest doubt, however, that the men called foremen in the accounts are practical men and give a faithful day's work for every day's pay they receive.

Mr. INGRAM. But we have an expenditure of over $2,000 say for foremen and labourers out of a total expenditure of $5,000. Will the hon. minister say that it requires that much?

Mr. COPP. There is no such thing as three foremen on this work. The representative of the county has nothing to do with the payment of the foremen. The engineer fixed the charges and appointed the men. The representative of a county has nothing to do with the wages. I have never interfered with the engineer. He fixes the wages and pays the foremen what they are entitled to. At Meteghan, there is only one foreman, Mr. Robichaud. There is also a Mr. Deveau on the work, and they give him a little extra pay and call him a foreman of the men on the work. But I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) is entirely mistaken about three foremen.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman will refer to page V—213 of the Auditor General's Report he will see the figures. If there is any fault, it is with the blue-books, not with us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is probable that one foreman was employed when the other was not.

Mr. COPP. Oh, yes. There were two different men—one left and the other took his place.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this work in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Copp's) constituency?

Mr. COPP. Yes. This work has been going on for four or five years. It is an immense breakwater. The former breakwater went to destruction in a storm.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman any idea when it will be completed?

Mr. COPP. I believe it will be completed next year. I think it will require only about $3,000 more to build the work—that is about $3,000 more than what there is this year.

Mr. INGRAM. Why not get the total sum in this year?

Mr. COPP. Because you could not spend it within a year. You can spend only about $3,500 or $4,000 on such a work as this within a year. You can only employ a certain number of men at one time.

Mr. LENNOX. There has been an explanation as regards the number of overseers, the explanation being that different men were employed at different times. But there is a matter that has not yet been explained and it is this. At page V—213 of the Auditor General's Report, we find that there has been a total expenditure on this work of $3,199.93. Of that total expenditure, $610 is spent for overseeing, independently of anything paid to the engineer. Is this a fair proportion having regard to the total expenditure, and having regard also to the amount expended on material and the amount expended on labour? Does it not come back to this proposition which we had before, that works carried on by day labour under the superintendence of the department cost vastly more than they would if the requirements of the statute were carried out and the work was let by tender? I have heard the explanation more than once on this subject of repairs. The case may be just as stated, but I must admit that I am not at all impressed as yet, with the argument that it is impossible to let these works partaking of the nature of repairs by tender. And I do submit that, these matters cropping up from time to time, whatever the department may have thought before, it is time they took this, as we say, into their serious consideration to see whether the time has not arrived when they should reconsider their position and adopt the spirit as well as the language of the statute and let these works by public tender.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how many workmen are employed on this work ?

Mr. COPP. I think about twenty or twenty-five men at one time.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman state about how long they would be employed constantly ?

Mr. COPP. They go to work as early as they can in the summer after the vote is passed, and work until about Christmas, or until cold weather. Twenty-five men are not working every day.

Mr. BELL. I observe when I come to contrast the expenditure of overseeing and the labour with the cost of the material supplied, that the percentage of cost is enormously large in proportion to the amount of material used. The material for the breakwater cost $1,152.90, the overseeing and the labour cost $2,047.03. Now, as the work was all of the roughest possible character, handling cheap material in the cheapest fashion, it seems extraordinary that it cost $1.50 to use up a dollars worth of material. There is evidently something very far wrong.

Mr. COPP. They had to tear down the old work before they could repair it. In some places they have to go down seven or eight feet in the mud in order to make a foundation. It costs as much, and in some cases more, to tear down the old work than to build up the new. That is the reason why the labour costs more than the material.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the length of this work ?

Mr. COPP. It must be 1,200 or 1,400 feet long. I think they only tear down about eighty feet at a time. There is a tremendous tide there, and they can only take out a portion of the work at a time and build it up as fast as they take it out; otherwise they would lose all their work.

Necum Teuch—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). Is this being done by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, by day labour.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why do you do it by day labour, contravening the statute ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see that it is contravening the statute.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the Minister of Public Works not know that there is in an Act of parliament a provision that requires all works costing $5,000 or over to be tendered for ? And there must be an Order in Council to the same effect.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think my hon. friend, who ought to be well versed in the Act, is quoting it correctly. At the time this work was started there was a provision by Order in Council for expending amounts under $5,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood the minister to say that he is asking for $5,000 for this year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $3,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The total is $5,000. There seems to be some new theory about the interpretation of the statute. Perhaps we might as well have it from the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I understand the law, I think there is a provision in it that if the officers of the department think a work can be more advantageously done by day labour than by tender, it can be done by day labour. The Order in Council to which I refer was, I think, in existence for eighteen or twenty years, but two or three months ago it was referred to the Justice Department and declared ultra vires. So we do not take advantage of that Order in Council any more. Perhaps if it is found in the public interest to have some provision made for expending small amounts, there will have to be some amendment made to the Act. There is a provision in the Act under which the technical officers of the department are to carry on works of considerable extent by day labour, so far as they can do so in the public interest.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no such a thing in the statute. The statute provides that in an extraordinary case, where, for instance, the banks of a canal burst away and it is impossible to let out work by tender, it may be done by day labour under the charge of the department, and the minister, on a report of council, may get authority from council to do the work by day labour in an exceptional case like that. But the statute and the Order in Council apply to all work costing over $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is a practical man, and no one in this House knows better than he does the difficulty of carrying on work similar to the one discussed a few minutes ago, a wharf 1,500 feet long, requiring two or three thousand dollars to repair it, where it has to be thrown down in order to find out what is wrong. That could not be done by contract.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why does the hon. gentleman argue contrary to the law ? Parliament in its wisdom passed a statute by which it is requisite that all sums over

a certain amount should be expended in a certain manner. That law must be obeyed until it is changed.

Mr. COCHRANE. We had better have that point settled by the Minister of Justice, so that we may not go on spending so much of the people's money without knowing what we are doing. It used to be generally understood when hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition, that the law required all sums over $5,000 to be expended by contract. Now that they are in control, there is an 'if' about it. If there is an 'if' about it, I think that we should have it understood before we go any further. To my mind it is absurd to say that you cannot get material by contract. You have a gentleman perambulating the country at a time when it is utterly impossible to get timber and material for repairing a dock at the price you could get it for if the work was let by contract, and in a season when the timber was available. That is what a business man would do in the section of the country where I live. But instead of that, as I understand the hon. gentleman, you have a gentleman running around the country buying material at a time of the year when it should be on the spot and when the work should be progressing. If it is necessary for you to get your timber by contract, the engineers must know pretty nearly what is required, and if the amount is not quite sufficient it is easy to procure the balance. But I am satisfied in my own mind that it is a wrong principle to have a man running round the country buying timber when the timber could be got out by contract and on the spot. Why has that change come about in the hon. gentleman's mind? I see the Minister of Trade and Commerce sitting there complacently. He don't say a word. He used to be very loud in his denunciation of the way money was being expended without contract when he was on this side of the House. How things have changed! He sits there complacently and sees the law violated without saying a word. His hand is not lifted with holy horror now, we hear none of those thundertones we used to hear when he was in opposition, everything now is lovely, although they are violating a statute just as flagrantly as they said the Conservatives used to do when a Conservative government was in power.

Neil's harbour—breakwater, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in the county of Victoria. The total cost of this breakwater is $18,000, and this sum will complete the work. It is a new work, now under contract.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The contractors belong to the city of Ottawa, Heney and Smith.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. BLAIN. I find that this harbour was up last session and that $14,000 was voted for it. The hon. Minister of Public Works said it was then under contract for $14,000. What is the explanation of the further vote of $4,000?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There must be some mistake, because the amount of the contract was $16,600. It was made on the 29th November, 1901. There may have been a mistake in taking down the figures in 'Hansard.'

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps the hon. member for Victoria will tell us something about that work.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Neil's Harbour is one of the most important fishing stations in my county. A large number of fishermen came over from Newfoundland and settled in that place, bringing a larger class of boats with them than our fishermen used to have. They have to go to deep water to get the cod-fish and the great trouble was that when stormy weather would come on they would have to throw out their ballast, get all the men they could together to get their boats hauled up on shore and wait until the stormy weather would be over. This breakwater is not yet completed. I used to growl considerably because the contractors were not asked to complete the work within the time which was specified in the contract, but when completed it will be of immense value to a large number of fishermen in that locality. They will be able to moor their boats inside this breakwater during all seasons as safely as if they had been in the shelter which is in the Ottawa river. It will be of immense benefit to that class of people. I may say in connection with contracts that except in perhaps one or two instances where repairs have been made, I have insisted in every case that everything in my county should be put up to tender and contract. It is a great relief to myself and, I think, in the end more satisfactory to every one.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister give us the date of the contract and the amount?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The 29th November, 1901, is the date, and the amount of the contract is $16,600.

Mr. BLAIN. We get from that an explanation of how this money is expended. Last year the hon. minister came down and asked for $14,000. It appears that at that time he had already let a contract which was to cost $16,600. That is an explanation to the committee. The policy of the government seems to be that after they have let a contract for $16,600, they will come to the House and ask for $14,000, and the House expects naturally that that sum will complete the work; yet, the government know that they have already let a contract that will cost $2,600 more than they asked

the House to vote. Surely that is not good policy. That accounts for these extra votes. We voted $14,000 last year and now the department comes forward and asks the committee for $4,000, when they knew last year what the contract price was.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has not been the policy of the government, and it will not be in future. It may be that the hon. minister explained when he was asking for the $14,000, that that was all he expected to spend during the fiscal year. There can be no reason why full information should not have been given at that time in regard to this vote, because the contract was then made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We will have it out with the hon. Minister of Public Works in reference to the meaning of the statute as to his power to have work done by day labour :

The minister shall invite tenders, by public advertisement, for the execution of all works, except in case of pressing emergency——

Such as a canal being broken down.

—in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That only applies to the staff you have on the work. Suppose the Lachine canal staff were employed all winter for the purpose of making repairs on the ground that it could be more economically and expeditiously done; that would be in keeping with the application and the sole application of the statute. You have no right to employ for a work costing over $5,000 a staff outside of the department or to hire men for the purpose of doing it. That is in direct contravention to the statute.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Where does my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) get the limit of $5,000 ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is mentioned somewhere in the Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, it is not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The limitation is in the Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Which was illegally passed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This statute applies to all work. It has no limitation at all. There is an Order in Council; I suppose that the hon. gentlemen at present governing the country have come to the conclusion that it is ultra vires, that it has no application at all, and not binding on the government. However, this clause applies to all work, it has no limitation. The limitation of $5,000 was probably in the Order in Council but the application of the clause in the statute is general.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think after the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has read the Act, those who have listened to it will agree that I gave a very fair explanation of what the Act meant. I still hold that the interpretation I put upon it is correct and that in doing work, such as most of those which have been under discussion, the day's labour plan is the only practical business way in which it can be done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We are not arguing that part of it. We are arguing the meaning of the statute.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend takes one view and other hon. gentlemen take another view.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know the other hon. gentlemen, in addition to myself, who take that view. Does the hon. Minister of Justice agree with it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Minister of Justice agrees with me. What I want to point out to the hon. gentleman is that when people differ as to the interpretation of an Act of parliament they must depend on the highest court of appeal and the hon. gentleman will find that the Auditor General takes that view and we will have to abide by his decision. If he comes to the decision that my hon. friend puts the proper interpretation on the statute we will then have to have legislation.

Mr. LENNOX. I think if the hon. Minister of Public Works will look at the overrulings of the treasury report in the Auditor General's Report, he will find that the Auditor General does not take that view.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Auditor General was acting on an ultra vires Order in Council.

New Campbellton—ballast wharf, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote. The coal company owns a wharf there which is in a very bad state of repair and it was represented that the department should repair that wharf. The department would not spend money on the property unless it was transferred to the Crown, and as that question was not settled no expenditure was made. I understand that now the manager of the company is willing to transfer the old wharf to the Crown if we will take charge of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the total expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer estimates that to put the old wharf in good shape it will cost $11,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity for the work ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). This is a large coal shipping station and the practice of vessels coming there has been to throw out their ballast in places where it was calculated to injure the harbour. This ballast wharf will not only give deeper water but it will afford a good deal of shelter and will enable vessels to put their ballast in the pier. Something of that kind was done at North Sydney a year or two ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would seem rather to be an expensive way of preventing vessels throwing out ballast in improper places. In most ports, vessels in discharging their ballast, are subject to a harbour by-law and are punished for violating that law. Is there a real necessity for this work for the purpose of shelter.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). As a rule this is a fair harbour, but in south-east and southerly winds this pier will afford shelter to a small class of vessels which would be on the inside.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are there coal mines near there ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). There are coal mines there in active operation and they have been shipipng for years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this work being done by tender and contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No action has been taken yet, but it will be done by tender.

New Harbour—breakwater repairs, protection slopes, &c., $1,500.

Mr. BENNETT. It is hardly to be expected that the minister can supervise every expenditure in a large department like that of Public Works, but the Auditor General's report shows that this is a case that out Herod's Herod, and one that is calculated to make the members of the Ontario government feel ill at ease in thinking that other people can surpass them in this kind of thing. The Auditor General tells us that there was an expenditure last year of $3,700, and that it cost $368 for overseers and timekeepers to supervise an expenditure of $1,200 in wages. There were about a dozen workmen on the job. We first had Mr. Patterson engaged for 47 days at $3 a day, to overlook these dozen men, and as if Mr. Patterson was not enough, a gentleman named Gillis was appointed to help him as overseer. One would think that these two could look after the dozen workmen, but it would seem that the department wanted a third man to superintend the other two superintendents, and so a gentleman named Sangster was brought in as book-keeper. But that is not all. There was a small quantity of material to be purchased, and a gentleman named Kirk was commissioned to do that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will look into that account he will probably find that these gentlemen were not all occupied at the same time.

Mr. BENNETT. The Auditor General's report shows that Mr. Patterson is a foreman and that Mr. Gillis is a sub-foreman, so that there could be no conflict of authority between the two, and one gets paid for 47 days and the other for 44 days. Mr. Sangster was also occupied for 44 days, so that the evidence is that the three were occupied at the same time. The whole thing seems to have been carried out on a scale that would do credit to a Tammany ring. There was a foreman, a sub-foreman, and a time-keeper to watch twelve workmen, and as if these three men could not find time to buy the materials, Mr. Kirk got a commission of 5 per cent to do so. In what riding is this ? Who represents it ? Who is this Jack the Ripper or Dick Turpin of Canadian politics who is making such raids on the public exchequer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The criticism of my hon. friend is hardly fair. I am willing to admit that probably it is difficult to explain the items as they are given in the Auditor General's report. If any such state of affairs existed in the carrying on of these works as the hon. gentleman describes, it is time we had a change in the men who had charge of this department. I am satisfied that it is quite a mistake. The work is in the county of Guysborough.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. INGRAM. The only gentleman who came to the rescue last year in connection with this vote was the hon. member from Guysborough. Here is what the Minister of Public Works said on this matter then, and it is interesting :

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We had some little doubt about this place a couple of years ago. I must admit it was difficult for us that night to put our finger on the very point where New Harbour was located. The coast of Nova Scotia is very wide and long and my colleague and myself had some trouble before we could lay our finger on that spot, but we found it easily after the money was voted and spent.

Mr. BENNETT. There ought be some explanation of this. There is no doubt that from the Auditor General's Report the two foremen and the time keeper were employed at the same time and practically during the same number of days. Here we have a cost of $7 a day for superintending the expenditure of $20 a day in wages. Surely one of these men might have been

spared to go and purchase $1.80 worth of galvanized buckets or five kegs of nails and spikes; yet the department employed this man Kirk specially to make these little purchases. I think the minister should tell us that he intends to keep both eyes on this riding of Guysborough this year. It was only two years ago that an expenditure was to be made in this same riding, and they were unable to find the place; and you have the fact staring the House in the face to-day that about as many men are employed to look after the employees as the men employed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will see that there was a good carpenter employed at $2 a day, though he is called a sub-foreman.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the policy of the department to pay five per cent on these purchases ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No commissions are allowed.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister will find, at page 214 of the Auditor General's Report, that commissions have been paid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would not be an unreasonable rate of commission if this man was employed to purchase something for the department and turn it in at cost price. But certainly that is not the general policy of the department.

Mr. BENNETT. It does not appear that this is the case at all. I assume that the prices for the things purchased were fair and reasonable. I do not know who this Mr. Kirk is; but his purchases extend from buckets to cement and spruce, so that if he deals in all these things he must be engaged in a large way in business. The inference is that he purchased them and was allowed five per cent commission on them.

Mr. FRASER. I will explain the matter. Mr. Kirk lives in the county of Antigonish, about sixty miles from the place where the articles were to be delivered, and it is difficult to get them delivered at this point, which is on the sea coast. I have no doubt the department got this man to make the purchases, that they were made at as low a rate as they could be got at, and that they allowed him a commission of five per cent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that what took place was that certain articles were purchased from Mr. Kirk, and that he purchased a number of articles which he had not in stock, and was allowed five per cent upon them. I know that what my hon. friend says is correct, that Antigonish is at a considerable distance from this point.

Ogden's Pond—to complete channel protection work, $650.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Petit de Grat—reconstruction of protection work and dredging, $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does this complete the work, and is it let by tender or contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have just advertised for tenders for this work; it will be done by contract. The estimated cost is $6,600.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is it—a work to make the harbour more efficient and more sheltered ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a new channel to be opened up, protected by cribwork, instead of the present channel. It is a protection harbour, principally for fishing boats.

Poirierville—wharf, $3,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is now under contract. The amount of the contract is $4,388. This vote will complete the work. It is to provide a safe harbour for a thickly-settled district.

Port George—breakwater, $3,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not a new work. It is an extension of the pier and breakwater. It is done by day labour.

Port Hastings—wharf, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote. No site has been procured yet. The question of a site has been under negotiation. The work will be done by tender and contract.

Port Hawkesbury—wharf, $8,200.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As to both of these wharfs, the one that has just been passed and this one, I would like the minister to state why it is necessary for the government to build these wharfs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This harbour is open very much longer in the year than any others on that side of Cape Breton. It is frequented during the season by seventy-nine sailing vessels on an average, averaging 80 tons each.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are there not private wharfs at both these ports ?

Mr. McLENNAN. There are no private wharfs at Port Hastings. I may say that that is the only point where large steamers along the eastern Nova Scotia coast can at all seasons secure bunker coal. A case in point is that of the steamship 'Bruce' on the Newfoundland and Sydney route, which was obliged to come all the

way around eastern Cape Breton, leaving the Sydneys and Louisburg, and come to Port Hastings in order to secure bunker coal at the Inverness Railway Company's terminus. At such a port the public would naturally seek wharf accommodation. There was but an old government wharf there, built by the government of Nova Scotia before confederation. The Dominion government took this wharf over, but when the Inverness Coal and Railway Company was building its terminals at this point, it very largely covered over this wharf, and practically rendered it useless to the public. This rendered imperative either the extension of this old wharf or the construction of a new one. Hence the present vote. With regard to Port Hawkesbury, this is also a most important port. It is frequented by a large amount of shipping, both foreign and domestic, being a most capacious harbour. There are private wharfs at Port Hawkesbury, but very large steamers frequent the port, such as the Plant Line, which cannot properly be accommodated at any of the private wharfs now available. The public, therefore, have urged upon me to impress upon the government the necessity of building a public wharf, which would not only accommodate the public, but also this very important line of steamers which make Port Hawkesbury their only port of call from the time they leave Halifax until they reach Charlottetown, P.E.I., and further I believe that the revenue to be realized from that wharf would more than repay the government for the interest on the cost.

Mr. BLAIN. What would be the probable revenue from the wharf ?

Mr. McLENNAN. Between $700 and $800 a year. There would be $500 from that line of steamers alone.

Mr. BLAIN. How much revenue was there last year ?

Mr. McLENNAN. The wharf is not built yet.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood from the hon. gentleman that one of these wharfs was owned by the government and that it was taken possession of and covered up by a railway company. Is that correct ?

Mr. McLENNAN. Very largely.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the government collect from the company anything for the filling up of that wharf ?

Mr. McLENNAN. No doubt the Department of Railways and Canals will see to that matter.

Mr. BLAIN. Have they already done so? Did the government allow a railway company simply to come in and cover up a government wharf without any arrangement having been previously come to between that company and the government, or if any amount was paid to the government, when was it paid and how much?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no information with regard to any claim against the company. Probably this wharf had not been kept in repair and was not very valuable.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that the government purchased a wharf, and expended a very large amount of money on it and then, after some years had elapsed, simply allowed a railway company to come and take possession of it and fill it up. The hon. member for Inverness made that statement.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend said that the province of Nova Scotia, previous to confederation, had a wharf there. I did not understand him to say that this government had ?

Mr. BLAIN. I understood him to say that the Dominion government took the wharf over.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall have an inquiry made into the matter and bring down all the particulars.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps the hon. member for Inverness will repeat what he did say.

Mr. McLENNAN. I said that the government of Nova Scotia had built this wharf before confederation, and that the Dominion goverment took it over, and that subsequently Messers Mackenzie and Mann built their railway and terminals over and across the wharf, and thus rendered it useless to the public.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this in the hon. gentleman's constituency ?

Mr. McLENNAN. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Did the hon. gentleman draw the attention of the department to what this railway has done ?

Mr. McLENNAN. I considered that the Department of Railways and Canals would no doubt see to that matter.

Mr. INGRAM. Then the hon. gentleman did complain to the department ?

Mr. McLENNAN. I did not say that I complained to any department, because I did not, but I said that I had no doubt the Railway Department had entered into some negotiations with this railway company.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the railway company went in and took possession of government property without any arrangement at all between it and the government, and after that had been done, the hon. member representing the county drew the attention of the government to the fact. Is that what happened ?

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has said that he has no doubt the department will make the railway company pay for the damage they have done to this wharf, but he says he did not report the matter to the department. How then can he say he has no doubt as to what the department will do ?

Mr. McLENNAN. The Department of Railways had steam communication between Mulgrave and that wharf, and in fact had this wharf as one of the terminals of the Intercolonial Railway until the Inverness and Richmond Railway was built, and I have no doubt that before the Department of Railways allowed this wharf to go to any private corporation some consideration was secured.

Sandy Cove—breakwater, $13,200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract. The amount of the contract is $13,000 and the contractors are Hayden & Oliver, Digby. It is estimated that the work will cost $14,300.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are piers for the benefit of the fishing people of the district. It is well known that this is one of the best fishing districts in the province, and there are many men with a large fleet of boats engaged in this industry. The bait freezer has been erected at this place recently.

Short Beach—breakwater, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Yarmouth county. The work is under contract for $8,095. The total cost is $9,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this for the purpose of creating a harbour of shelter ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. A harbour of shelter for fishermen.

South Ingonish—wharf, $1,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract for $2,485. The total estimated cost of the work is $2,800.

Three Fathom harbour—restoration of beach protection works, $1,200.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What county is this in ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is estimated that this will complete it.

Tiverton—breakwater, $17,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the lowest tenderer accepted in this case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this was let to the lowest tenderer.

Washabuck Centre—wharf, $5,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new wharf. The amount of the contract is $5,860 and $6,500, it is estimated, will complete the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity for the expenditure ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). This wharf is built for the convenience of a large class of farmers on the Bras d'Or lakes. The steamer passes up and down in front of this place three times a week, from Whycocomagh and Baddeck to the Sydneys. This will enable the farmers to have a port of call there for the steamer, to ship their produce and receive the goods that they get in. This has been promised them for many years, but I happened to be the one who was able to bring the promise into effect.

West Baccaro—boat harbour protection and channel, $3,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the protection of shipping.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the channel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to have a depth of three feet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does it connect with ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It connects with the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know; but what does it connect the Atlantic Ocean with ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid my knowledge of the locality is somewhat limited, I shall have to ask the member for the riding to explain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All along that coast there are small ponds shut off by beaches from the sea, and by making channels you are able to let the fishermen take in their boats and so assure them of protection during the storms. This is a fishing settlement a short distance from port Latour. The whole district is a fishing district. It is some years since I was there, and the young men pointed out the disadvantage they laboured under owing to the destruction of their boats during the storms. For a small sum of money, you can give them protection for their fishing boats.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has any investigation been made as to the depth of the pond with which the channel is to connect ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I presume that the engineers must have a report.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this a local work intended for the protection of local boats ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, fishing boats.

Mr. HACKETT. Why not apply the same principle all over the maritime provinces and build local works for the protection of local boats wherever required ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Wherever any case of that kind——

Mr. HACKETT. I made out some very good cases in this House. And I contend that where you build a harbour for the protection of local fishermen in the province of Nova Scotia, you ought to do the same in the province of Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Or Quebec.

Mr. HACKETT. Yes, or Ontario or any other province. The case I have made out in this parliament was of ponds or lakes around the coast of Prince Edward Island that would afford accommodation not only to the fishermen of the locality, but also the fishermen of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick plying their avocation on those shores. But I think it strange that a sum of money should be voted by parliament for the purpose simply of making a harbour for local fishermen.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I agree that there should be no sectionalism in the matter. If this is a sound policy in any place, it is equally sound in any other. There is nothing new in the case. We are doing here a work such as has been done in Nova Scotia for many years, and it is a most useful class of work, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen may say to the contrary. In no way can you render more useful service to the fishermen along the Atlantic coast than by providing them with harbours for their boats. If we neglect this these men will be driven away from the coast and will be unable to carry on their operations. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) who represents a great fishing county, understands the matter well, and I am sure he will agree with me. Of course, if there is any other portion of the coast under similar conditions in any other province, it has the same claim and the same right to consideration.

Mr. BENNETT. There seems to be varied requirements in the maritime provinces. As I understand it, in the province of Nova Scotia, if a pond is adjoining the ocean it is deemed advisable to make a strait or canal to connect the two so that it may be made a harbour of refuge. When you come to the adjoining province of Prince Edward Island we find directly the reverse, because we find at Cascumpec harbour that an opening through the beach is closed. It would seem that in Prince Edward Island there was a pond inside, but there was the wild raging ocean outside, so the department are going to close up the breach so that the rough tide cannot get into the still waters.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Both these cases are eminently proper. In the one case a break in the beach would do great harm, and you close the beach in the interest of the protection of the people who are engaged in fishing. In the other case, owing to the storms, you need to cut the channel to allow boats to have access to shelter. Both cases are right and reasonable.

Mr. INGRAM. There is one case, Port Bruce, where they have asked for the same favour and were refused.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have never heard of such an application ; of course it would not come before me. All I can say is that in my judgment there should be no sectionalism. If there is a case of a similar kind in any part of Canada where we can protect our fishermen and keep them at home, these improvements should be made in their interest. If these small expenditures will help to make their lives easy and help them in their business, I am in favour of making them.

Mr. INGRAM. The fishermen at Port Bruce are paying a license to the department, and when they asked for this improvement the Public Works Department tell them, 'No, go to the Marine Department.' It is not a benefit for the accommodation of the fishermen only.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the minister say whether there has been any investigation made to ascertain the depth of the pond ? Of course it would be of no use to cut a channel to this pond unless you know something about the depth of the water.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A memorandum furnished me says there are three feet of water.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Three feet of water will carry fishing boats easily.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that at high tide or low tide ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At low tide.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That seems pretty small but I suppose it may be of some little service.

Mr. KAULBACH. I agree with the Minister of Finance regarding expenditures of this kind. Along the shores of Nova Scotia particularly, there are places of this sort where expenditures like this are needed for the protection of boats. I know that along the shore of Halifax county with which

I am familiar, as well as in my own county and the adjoining county, there are places of this sort.

Mr. HACKETT. With regard to Cascumpec harbour, I wish to say that it is the resort of shipping from all parts of the gulf of St. Lawrence and from the Atlantic ocean. It is a deep water harbour. This channel opening through a sand hill was made by freshets and high tides, and the engineer no doubt felt it his duty to have this closing filled up in order that a greater volume of water might flow through the main channel. Cascumpec harbour is one of the most important harbours on the north shore of Prince Edward Island. It does not accommodate merely the people of the locality, but as I say, is a resort for shipping from all parts of Canada and the world.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Belfast pier—dredging, $1,750.

Mr. HACKETT. This is a revote. May I ask the hon. minister why this amount was not expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The reason this work was not done was that there was no dredge available. There is one small dredge which the department has for that purpose, but it was working in another part of the island, I understand, all last season. We hope we may be able to go on with this work.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the dredge be placed there next year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know whether I will be able to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) a definite promise, but I hope to be able to arrange for the work going on during next year.

Cascumpec harbour—closing opening through beach, $1,500.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask the hon. minister what has been done in that connection within the last year, or what is going on now in regard to the closing of the outlet from the main harbour to the ocean.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is now going on, the materials have been procured and it is proposed that this work shall be completed before the 30th June next.

Mr. HACKETT. Is it being done by contract or by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is being done by day labour.

Mr. HACKETT. Who is the foreman of the work going on now and what is the quantity of material which has been placed there—how many loads of brush and stone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the name of the foreman, but I shall be very pleased to bring down a statement showing who the foreman is who is in charge of this work.

Mr. LENNOX. I think this is an item which does not come under the class of work described as repairs. The hon. minister ought to be in a position to explain to the committee why it is that this cannot be let by tender. It looks to me as if it could be very well let by tender.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are two openings here, and it is desirable to close one of them. The hon. member for Prince West (Mr. Hackett) will know the locality and the reasons for this expenditure better than I do myself. I have the report of the engineer of the department and it shows that this work is necessary to provide better harbour accommodation.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this the total estimated expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This finishes the work. It is all to be completed, we hope, before the 30th of June next.

Mr. HACKETT. We have had the same statement for some years and yet the thing is going on. I suppose the hon. minister is quite sincere in his statement now that this will conclude the work, and that before an election takes place there will be nothing going on in this direction. My experience has been that around election time we will find work of this kind going on. We have the money voted year after year, there is nothing done until just about election time when the money is placed in the hands of parties who will carry out the desires of the government. I think this is wrong especially in the province of Prince Edward Island where these works are of a very important character. They should be attended to without party spirit or party influence of any kind. I trust the hon. minister will see that this work at Cascumpec that has been hanging on for so many years will be completed in a short time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It may be possible that governments are guilty on some occasions, but I do not think on this particular occasion they are guilty of using this work for political purposes. That appropriation, I think, was made for the first time after the election in my hon. friend's county so that it could not have been to purchase his support there. I am speaking from the report of the engineer of the department. The material has been purchased, the work will be proceeded with and the greater part of it will be completed, I have no doubt. I have no reason to believe that statement is not correct.

Mr. HACKETT. This matter has been under consideration for a number of years. We have discussed it here before. This opening through the sandhills from Cascumpec harbour occurred some years ago and an estimate was made for closing up the channel. Year after year we have been discussing the necessity of closing this channel and I trust now that the hon. minister will see that the matter will be concluded and that we will have no more of this difficulty.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will try to see that the work is proceeded with quickly.

Cove head harbour—improvement of entrance channel, $4,000.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the meaning of that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote of $4,000 of the previous vote and with the amount to be expended before the 30th of June it will make the total cost $7,300. This work is now under contract.

Mr. INGRAM. When was this contract let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was let on the 13th of March last.

Mr. INGRAM. This is an entirely new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Creosoted timber for piers and breakwaters, $2,000.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask the hon. minister where these piles are purchased, what they cost and who provides them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a general vote for creosoted wood required for piles throughout the province of Prince Edward Island. The wood is purchased at Norfolk, Virginia.

Mr. INGRAM. What amount was purchased last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was no creosoted timber purchased for Prince Edward Island last year.

Gaspereaux—harbour for fishermen in Graham's Pond, $500.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the meaning of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for necessary repairs to the harbour during the year.

Mr. HACKETT. What kind of a harbour is it ? It is for local fishermen ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it seems to be for the use of fishermen particularly.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the value of the improvements made there ? Have you improved the harbour very much by the expenditure provided by this parliament ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does my hon. friend mean the public expenditure to date, or the amount that we require now ? This $500 is all that we are asking for

Mr. HACKETT. Did you not spend an amount there before ? There was money spent there before.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that $500 was spent there during the past year and this $500 completes the work.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the improvement made by this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to protect the channel opened from the sea to Graham's pond, to permit the fishing boats to enter the pond at all times of tide.

Mr. LENNOX. The total expenditure on this work will be, I understand, $1,000. I submit that this is not the class of work that this parliament should engage in. When a work is of such trifling character as only to amount to $1,000 it cannot be within the province of this parliament to expend that money.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You must not expend anything as small as $1,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Probably not, and I will explain it from my point of view, which may not be that of the Postmaster General. I submit I will have the judgment of the majority of the people of this country; the people who ought to be our masters; the people who contribute the money for us to expend, when I say that a trifling work like this, is a matter for the municipality, or at most, for the province, if it is a public work at all. Where is the line to be drawn ? If we are to pick out here and there through Canada trifling little works in which any man of enterprise would engage as a private venture upon his own capital, where are we going to draw the line, in asking the parliament of Canada to vote for such works If this be the rule, then there are thousands, nay, there are hundreds of thousands of spots in this Dominion which are entitled to the expenditure of public money, and it would be better, far better because it would be far more honest if the federal government would in that case take upon itself the entire expenditure of all the moneys that are required by the people of this country. Surely there is some line of demarcation between what is the duty of the provincial legislature and what is the duty of the federal administration. That is the point I want to make notwithstanding the interjection of the Postmaster General.

These small works, if they are of a public nature at all, must be within the expenditure of the local municipality or within the expenditure of the province. I do not mean that federal works must permeate every part of the Dominion, but they must be, to some extent, of that large national character, as distinguished from a local character, before they can be entitled to draw contribution from the people of this entire Dominion. Notwithstanding the jocular interjection of the Postmaster General, I submit that such an expenditure as this is not justifiable. When this matter comes to be considered as it will be considered; when it comes to be discussed as it will be discussed on the hustings, it will be the almost universal voice of the people of Canada regardless of political affinities that that is the true basis upon which we must proceed as trustees of the money of the people of this country.

Mr. HACKETT. This pond is one of great importance I believe to the fishermen. About the year 1900 operations commenced there for the opening of the harbour, and at the same time the operations commenced at Skinner's pond in Prince county a month before the election, and a large number of men were employed. The Skinners pond work has been dropped because the people there voted against the government. I now ask the minister is it his intention to continue the work at Skinner's pond in Prince county, the same as at Gaspereaux, in King's county, or is it the intention of the government to let it lie until the election approaches ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Skinner's pond has not been brought to my attention and evidently there was no work done there previous to the election. I can hardly agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) about these small works, because they must be of great importance to the community or else representations would not be made by the people and their representatives in these districts to have these works carried out. It is not fair to say that they are private works because as a matter of fact they are for the benefit of the fishing community who are engaged in an important industry in this country. If my hon. friend were to visit the maritime provinces I am quite sure he would change his views. I am not prepared to say that because we spend $100,000 or $200,000 on a pier to accommodate extensive shipping, that the fishing industry of Canada should not be provided with facilities to carry on its business. It is necessary to afford shelter along the shores of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and it is the province of this parliament to provide for that.

Mr. LENNOX. Let me point out the fallacy of that argument. The revenue of the fisheries has been given to the provinces by decision of the Privy Council. No doubt the minister is perfectly correct in saying that this work is of great importance to the fishermen in that locality, but where is there a public work of which it cannot be said that it is of special importance to a particular class of the people. It would be of great importance to a large section of the people of Toronto if a pier was built there, and I am told there is no government pier in Toronto. Now, I would argue against doing such a work in Toronto in the same way, if it could not be shown that the influence of that expenditure extended beyond the city of Toronto. The moneys which this parliament administers are to be administered in the interests of Canada as a whole, and when you talk of a work being of vast interest to a particular body of fishermen, you are speaking only of a number of people in a small locality. When you talk of this being of advantage to a body of fishermen, you speak of a work for a small locality just as you would speak of a work for a township or a county. I submit that if the benefit of an expenditure does not extend beyond the radius of a small community, even though it is somewhat densly settled, there is no justification for it. Go to the city of Hamilton or the town of Barrie or the village of Bradford, which is represented by the hon. Postmaster General. There are many people in the village of Bradford and in the locality of Lake Simcoe who would be vastly benefited by the dredging of the Holland river. They would tell you that it would serve a large number of farmers on either side of the lake, and that it would increase the commerce of the thriving village of Bradford. We have not had any request for such an expenditure. Whether we shall, on the eve of an election, God only knows ; but we have not had it yet, and I submit that an expenditure would be as justifiable in the one case as in the other. I will not trouble the committee any more on this question for the present; but I have endeavoured to point out that there is a broad distinction between an expenditure which may be said to be in the general interests of the people we represent, and those purely local concerns which should be aided and assisted, if at all, by the local government.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the distinction between Skinner's pond and Graham's pond ? In the year 1900 there was a vote for improvements at Graham's pond, and in the same year certain improvements were made at Skinner's pond without any appropriation, but after the election nothing more was done. Now, I find that the government are prosecuting the improvement of Graham's pond while leaving Skinner's pond without any appropriation at all. What is the reason of this ? Is it because the people in the neighbourhood of Skinner's pond returned an opponent of the government, while the people in the neighbourhood of Graham's pond supported a man to uphold the government ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We would not do anything like that.

Mr. HACKETT. I am sure you did. The work was commenced about a month before the election of 1900. When I found in going through the country that the work was commenced, I was astonished, because there was no appropriation for it by this parliament; but I was told that the money was taken from the general appropriation for public works. I had to fight against that. The government purchased many votes by this work. But after the election, the work was dropped, and no work has gone on since at Skinner's pond. I ask, in the name of the people of Prince county, that the government will prosecute the work at Skinner's pond just as they are doing at Graham's pond.

Higgin's shore pier—works of reconstruction and repair, $1,000.

Mr. HACKETT. May I ask the hon. minister to explain this item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote. It is for the purpose of repairing the wharf.

Mr. HACKETT. Why was the money not expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were some representations made in regard to the change of site, but the engineer thought it best that the old pier should be repaired. That is the cause of the delay.

Mr. HACKETT. I want to say in all seriousness that the expenditure of $1,000 on the old pier would be simply a waste of money. A new pier should be built about 100 yards east of the old pier, and I would ask the hon. minister if, in addition to this vote, he will place an appropriation in the supplementary estimates to build a completely new pier.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the report of the engineer it is estimated that this $1,000 will put the work in good shape. We have a detailed estimate of what is required. But, in view of the representation made by the hon. gentleman, I will ask the engineer to make a further report on the work.

Mr. HACKETT. Has the hon. minister received a petition from that part of Prince county on this subject ? If he wants to give satisfaction to the people of the locality he will build a new pier.

Lower Montague—Aitken's wharf, $2,800.

Mr. HACKETT. What is being done there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for completing the work. The total estimated cost is $4,500.

Mr. HACKETT.

New London—repairs to breakwater, &c., $500.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to draw the minister's attention to page V—225, which states that the contract here is completed. If so, what do you want this money for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will see that this vote is for repairs required during the next year. In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say that the engineer estimates $500 will be required for the repairs of this pier and that is why we are asking the money. Every hon. gentleman must know that these piers are liable to injury through storms and ice and so on, and require considerable repairs to keep them from going to pieces.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year this breakwater appears to have been thoroughly repaired and there would seem to be some particular cause for this new expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some $446 were spent on repairs on this wharf last year, and the engineer reports $500 are required to keep it in repair for the coming year.

Mr. INGRAM. There were spent last year $5,761.61 for completing the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was for building the breakwater.

Mr. INGRAM. No, for repairs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That must be a misprint.

Mr. HACKETT. If the work were built last year why should it require repairs this year ? That appears to be too quick altogether. It may be that the expenditure last year was for repairs, as the structure was standing some years, but if we built a new work last year we should not be called on to repair it this year.

Mr. LANCASTER. I desire to point out that this work last year was all repairs, as the hon. minister will see by referring to V—225 of the Auditor General's Report. It is headed 'repairs to breakwater, &c.' and includes $5,493 paid T. B. Cullen to complete contract, but that was a contract, not for building but for repairs. Then there are payments to the inspector of work and for advertising, &c., and the total is carried to page V—7 under the heading 'repairs to breakwater, New London.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend will look on page 62 of the report of the Public Works Department, he will find a full explanation of this work. This $500 is for repairs necessary owing to damages done to the pier by storms since the reconstruction was completed.

Repairs to piers and breakwaters, Prince Edward Island, $6,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister give us some idea of these repairs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the annual vote for general repairs. It has been the practice of parliament for many years to vote $6,000 for general repairs to piers and breakwaters in Prince Edward Island, not provided for by special vote. Up to the first of March, 1903, we spent $1,240 of last year's vote. This money of course is not expended unless absolutely required to keep the piers and wharfs in repair, which are not otherwise provided for by special vote.

Mr. INGRAM. The Auditor General's Report shows that last year there was spent out of the $6,000, $1,554.63. This year the hon. minister tells us that $1,240 has been spent so far. That would leave the difference between $1,240 and $6,000 to be still expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That $4,760 lapses on the 30th June if not expended.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps the members from Prince Edward Island may ask for works in the meantime to be done, which will absorb this money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You cannot expend this money except for the purposes for which it is appropriated, and the department will not expend it unless it be really necessary for repairs to piers and breakwaters.

Mr. HACKETT. I may say that this money which was voted last year should be all expended because those piers belonging to the government are falling into disrepair. Hon. gentlemen may think it is a great thing to vote $6,000 and expend only $1,200 out of that vote, but the piers and wharfs along the shores of Prince Edward Island which belong to the government, are falling into disrepair because money is not expended on them to keep them in good order. I have every confidence in Mr. Hogan, the engineer down there, but no doubt his instructions are to save every dollar he can for the government. But the government are in this respect too saving. They vote the money and make the people believe that they are spending it, but instead they spend it in some other part of Canada and the island has its piers and breakwaters falling to pieces. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he intends spending the whole of this vote of $6,000 this year on the wharfs and breakwaters in Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS As I have explained, this money is spent upon the report of the engineer. I am pleased to know that we have an economical man, but sorry to hear that he would allow these works to go to pieces when the money is voted to keep them in repair. It is not likely that the engineer who represents the department in Prince Edward Island would allow the state of affairs to exist which my hon. friend represents, especially when he knows that the money has been voted to make the repairs required. If we only spent $1,600 the year before and $1,240 so far this year, it was not because the department was not willing to spend the money but because no reports came to us from the engineer that the work was necessary. The money voted for this purpose could not be spent in any other part of the island or of Canada for any other purpose. It simply lapses and is not spent at all.

Mr. INGRAM. But suppose the hon. gentleman from West Prince (Mr. Hackett) went to the department and asked to have this work done, the hon. minister might say there was no money for the purpose. But when we find that there is an unexpended balance of $6,000 that would be hardly a fair statement of facts. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would say whether he applied to the department and was told there was no money for the purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think so.

Souris, Knight's Point — strengthening of breakwater, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the placing of large stones on the seaward side of the breakwater at Knight's Point, filling in with ordinary sized ballast, depressions in the body of the cribwork, and making general repairs, &c. There will be needed two thousand cubic yards of large stone, and one thousand cubic feet of ordinary ballast. The general repairs to the cribwork will cost over $1,000; in all $10,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this under contract, awarded after calling for tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the contract price?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Seventy-four cents per cubic yard. The contractor is J. Lanigan.

Tignish--rebuilding northern breakwater, $700.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the hon. gentleman explain the meaning of this item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to be applied to the building up of a block on the breakwater which has settled about three feet.

Mr. HACKETT. This Tignish breakwater has been but lately completed, and why are we now asked to spend this amount ? And is it the intention of the government

to call for tenders, or will this be done by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose that this work being in the hon. gentleman's own constituency, he would be familiar with the conditions. A report was received from the engineer, of whom I have no personal knowledge, but whom I understand to be a very good man. I have already explained what is to be done with the money. If this work is not done the block will be very seriously affected in a short time.

Mr. HACKETT. What kind of work is intended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I understand, this is for rebuilding the superstructure of the cribwork, which originally cost $4,500.

Mr. HACKETT. Is it the intention to drive piles around the breakwaters ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, stone.

Mr. HACKETT. Before leaving the Prince Edward Island items, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what is being done in Summerside with regard to the works prosecuted there some years ago, and on which operations were being carried on up to a very late date ? And have the contractors been paid off ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall be obliged to look into that matter. There is no vote here for Summerside, and I have no particulars at hand. I would rather bring down full particulars for my hon. friend than attempt to speak from memory. I believe there is some difficulty about the matter, for I remember the subject being brought to my attention some time ago. I will have a memorandum made of the particulars and bring it down for the information of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett).

Mr. HACKETT. About what time may we expect that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman may have it when the supplementary estimates are under discussion or during next week.

New Brunswick—Anderson's Hollow—improvements and repairs to wharf, $1,800.

Mr. LENNOX. What about this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was an appropriation of $6,500 for this work. The work is now under way and nearing completeness. We are asking a revote of $1,000 on the former vote and the new vote of $800 to complete the work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was it not let by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, this has been done by day's work.

Mr. INGRAM. Was there not an estimate of cost for this work of $2,500 for last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not likely, because there was a vote of $6,500 last session.

Mr. INGRAM. But when that vote was asked for the minister said :

This vote is applied for to make provision for repairing the present pier, the estimated cost of which is $2,500 and also putting in a groin to overcome an accumulation of sand and gravel, estimated to cost $4,000.

So, the former estimate does not complete the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was short by $800.

Bay du Vin—to complete reconstruction of wharf, $500.

Mr. WILMOT. What is the total cost of that work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total is $12,847.64. This $500 will complete the work.

Mr. WILMOT. Was that done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Campbellton wharf—extension and repairs, $18,000.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister if this work has been commenced, and have tenders been asked for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that the late government had spent a sum of money on this property. It is private property, and belongs to Mr. Shives. It has been thought best by the department to purchase the property, the right of way, and have full control of this wharf. It is an important point, a great deal of shipping comes there, and it is necessary to maintain the wharf. There has been public money spent on this property previously, but I do not know how much.

Mr. INGRAM. When ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A sum of $31,000 has been spent on this property previous to 1896, I cannot say now in what years it was spent. No money has been spent since 1896. The work now requires extension and improvements, and it is thought better to take the whole property over and have it vested in the Crown.

Mr. LANCASTER. I find in the Auditor General's Report, page D—229, that $2,251 was spent on this work last year, apparently it was spent for odds and ends in the shape of labour, machines, pieces of timber and so forth. Now I think we ought to know whether a contract is going to be let, and whether this whole $18,000 is going to be spent in the same slipshod manner.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend does not understand me. I said that an extension or addition had been built to this wharf at considerable cost. The amount expended since 1896 has been for keeping the wharf in repair, that part belonging to the government. It is very unsatisfactory to have the adjoining property belonging to a private individual, and we propose to acquire that property.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is he going to do with the $18,000, how is it going to be handled ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $15,000 of this will be devoted to purchasing the property belonging to Mr. Shives, the wharf and approaches belong to him. The $3,500 is for repairs.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the property been acquired from this man yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there have been negotiations about the purchase, but we cannot make the purchase until we have the money voted. If the gentleman who owns the property will not transfer it to the Crown, of course the money will not be spent. The engineer thinks there is no binding contract, but there have been negotiations with the owner.

Mr. INGRAM. In what constituency is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the county of Restigouche.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Will there be any revenue derived from this expenditure?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be considerable revenue, but we are not depending so much on the revenue as on the advantage this wharf will be to the public.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what this land is worth, and how much, if any, Mr. Shives himself has expended on it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are negotiating for the purchase of that portion of the wharf that belongs to him.

Mr. INGRAM. We can get very little information about this whole transaction. There is no doubt the government have expended money on this property, and now they are buying it and paying a larger sum for it by reason of having expended money on it themselves. The property has been made more valuable by reason of the government money expended on it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Whether the previous government made a good or a bad expenditure of money on this wharf, I believe it is good policy now to keep the work in repair, and to purchase the property if we can get it at a reasonable price.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the minister tell us what certificate or what evidence he has that the price is a reasonable one ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The department have certificates from their officers and reports as to the value of this property and the public necessity for it. We are certainly not buying it blindly. We are not asking for a vote for the purpose of buying it because it is not in the public interest. It is because part of the wharf belongs to the Crown and part to Mr. Shives—and it is desirable that this should be made public property. That is the object in negotiating for the purchase.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman stated that the last government expended money on this property though the government did not own it. I inferred that from the hon. gentleman's remarks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is correct.

Mr. INGRAM. And now this government intends making an expenditure of money on this approach, and they intend to buy it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not on the approach, but on the part that has been previously built by the government.

Mr. LANCASTER. How much land altogether is to be purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The land is only the approach to the wharf.

Mr. TAYLOR. What quantity of land is in the approach ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The wharf is built in front of a street in the town. It is not the land that we are purchasing; it is the wharf. The wharf was built by private enterprise, and it is owned by Mr. Shives. What we want to do is to secure the approach to the government wharf; that is to the wharf owned by the government previously. The hon. gentleman will see that the government having built an extension of the private wharf they cannot get over to their own property without going over the property of Mr. Shives.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it absolutely true that the late government paid money out to improve Mr. Shives' property without having any control over it, or is it not the fact that the last government expended money on the property that belongs to the Crown, and not on the approach ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no object in keeping anything back about this matter. There is no object in misrepresenting it. I did not tell the hon. gentleman that they spent it on the wharf that Mr. Shives had already built. I said that they had built an extension. I am only

speaking from the information given to me by the officers of the department, and I explained to the hon. gentleman that they had built an extension of this wharf at an expense of $31,000, and that the approach to this part of the wharf Mr. Shives owned and it still belongs to him. We want to purchase that and have the whole property vested in the Crown and make the repairs for which we are asking $3,100.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman a plan of this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, in the department.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman have any objection to laying it on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be very pleased to bring down the plan.

Mr. LENNOX. I think we understand it as far as the facts are concerned. There is a wharf built by the government. Between that and the land there is an approach owned by a private individual.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A wharf.

Mr. LENNOX. There is an approach in which a private individual is interested. Does this Mr. Shives own the whole of the approach or only a portion of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He owns it all.

Mr. LENNOX. Now, I think it is very easy for the minister to tell us what land is covered by that approach ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be pleased to bring down the plan to show the extent.

Mr. LENNOX. Cannot the hon. minister at present give us practically the dimensions of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps the engineer has some information. The structure is 294 feet in length, 24 feet in width and there are 11½ feet of water at low water.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the portion that belongs to Mr. Shives 294 feet in length and 24 feet in width and for which there is asked the sum of $15,000 ? I have not made it up myself, but I am told that that is less than one-fifth of an acre of land. Is this a large city, or a town ? What kind of a place is it ? Do you know the population ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is quite an important place. I have tried to explain that we are not buying land, but the wharf—the structure.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know what the hon. minister means, when he makes a distinction between buying land and buying the structure, that the structure, which is called the approach, was an expensive structure to build, but I would say that when we hear of $15,000 for a work for which up to the present time we have had no claim made by Mr. Shives, it does suggest pretty strongly that this is a matter, at all events, requiring a good deal of looking into. We have had some trouble in dealing with the Expropriation Act and I think that the hon. minister ought to take very careful means of investigating this before he decides to put $15,000 into it and be very sure as to the title of Mr. Shives.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say as to the title, that that goes through the Department of Justice. I find that they are pretty strict about having a complete title.

Mr. LENNOX. I am told that the population is 2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to the value, I may say that in our experience in the past we have found, if we could make a fair arrangement according to the valuation put on property by our own officials, from the best information they could gather, that it has been preferable to going to the court and instituting expropriation proceedings. The experience of the Public Works Department is that by the time we pay the award, the lawyers fees and all the costs it would have paid us two or three times over to take the value put on the property by the officers of the department. The officers of the department have no object in the world in over-valuing these properties. They have no object in procuring them except in the public interest. If we think that a property is valued too high we can proceed under the Expropriation Act and refer it to the court. Unless we get property at the valuation put upon it by our own officials, appointed to value it, we generally apply to the court under expropriation proceedings.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much has this property been estimated at ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fifteen thousand dollars.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Have you the valuation there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The reports are in the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I understand the hon. minister correctly this pier or wharf is beside the water, so that there is no land to be acquired at all, and Mr. Shives now owns the piece of the wharf extending out into the ocean. At the end of his wharf the late government, I understand from the hon. minister, built an extension. Are we to assume that the late government went on and expended a lot of money building an ex-

tension to a wharf owned by a private individual ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, it did.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is a matter which requires investigation. Did Mr. Shives own this property when the late government made the extension.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was formerly owned by Mr. Ferguson, then by Mr. Mowatt and now by Mr. Shives, who I think has owned it for 20 years or more.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who was the owner when the late government made the extension ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would have to bring down a return to show all these dates. I have merely the facts given me by the department.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister allow this item to stand until we get the plan of the wharf.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection at all.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I visited this place and I know something about it. There was an existing wharf belonging to a private owner and the late government built a cross wharf at the end of that, but unfortunately they forgot to make arrangements with the owner of the wharf, so that in order to reach the government wharf you have to cross on private property.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They complain they are charged exhorbitant rates.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, I tried several times to settle it and my recollection is that when I left office there was a report to council in favour of arbitration.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that is the least price they will accept, and it is a question as to whether we should expropriate and pay perhaps a higher price and all the costs. We know from past experience what that means.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, I know it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should think that after the explanation given the House will see that it is in the public interest that we should secure this property. The people complain that they have to pay exhorbitant rates to get to the government wharf and as there is a great deal of shipping done at this port it is desirable that this work should become the property of the Crown. None of this money will be paid until we have secured a proper title.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would certainly like to see the plans of the dock, because I can hardly imagine that the late government made an expenditure there without having some arrangement with the then owner of the property that the people should have a right to use it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have investigated that point and I can assure my hon. friend that there was no arrangement made at the time. However, as to the price let me say that I think that it is pretty high.

Mr. INGRAM. I think so too.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is pretty high. The wharf belongs to Mr. Shives now who bought it some five or six years ago, and we are at his mercy to a large extent because our wharf cannot be used without passing on his property. For a time I contemplated building a wharf elsewhere but I found it would have cost more and so I resolved to go to arbitration. It was the last act I did on that question.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr Tarte) throws some light on this subject which confirms my opinion and bears out what I have heard. Mr. Shives acquired this property some five or six years ago. I am creditably informed that Mr. Shives is a strong supporter of the hon. gentlemen opposite and the ex-minister says that he thinks that it is a very big price to pay Mr. Shives. I think so too. This $15,000 will build an extension from the dock erected by the late government into the street, and he will have nothing to pay to Mr. Shives. I have a strong suspicion that the late government made an arrangement with the then owner of this property or they would not have been so foolish as to spend this money. It is said that in order to reach this government wharf the people have to pay toll. There is nothing extraordinary in that, for it is the case in connection with almost every wharf in Ontario. In my own town of Gananoque, if we want to ship anything we have to pay the Rathbun Company to get on their wharfs to do our shipping. Why should the government to give free wharfs in one place and make the people pay for their wharf accommodation in another. Why, the revenues of some of these wharfs in the lower provinces is not sufficient to pay the salary of the wharfinger. In some cases we do not get $2 a year from wharfs which cost us thousands of dollars. Before this item passes I want to see the plan of the property, and who was the owner at the time the late government made this expenditure.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am perfectly sure that no arrangement was made by the late government. As to that there is no possible doubt. A mistake was made. I am of the opinion that this wharf should be acquired by the government because the wharf we have built is of no use unless we make some arrangement with Mr. Shives. But I am at the same time of the opinion that $15,000 is a very high price indeed. I know

the value of the work, I have been there, and I have declined to pay it myself.

Mr. INGRAM. Would an arbitration declare that price to be unreasonable ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That I do not know. We are at the mercy of Mr. Shives. Before I left office I made a report suggesting that expropriation proceedings be taken. If we are compelled to pay $15,000, I suppose we shall have to pay it. In arbitration cases, the government usually does not get the best of it. All the same, I think an expropriation would be the safest course. Of course, my hon. friend may have new information since I left office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the matter stands very much as my hon. friend left it. As my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) did not seem to think the information I gave was correct, I will say that I have no personal knowledge of the matter myself. I have had no personal interview with the owner and do not know him. The only information I have is what has been furnished to me by the department. It only came to me as a departmental matter. The information given to me by the department is that in 1889-90 a wharf 140 x 35 feet by some 35 feet in height was built at a distance of about 110 feet from the eastern end of the return at the outer end of Mowat's (formerly Ferguson's) wharf, the outer or channel faces of the said wharfs being kept in one and the same line ; the main object being to provide a place where vessels frequenting the Restigouche river could conveniently deposit their ballast instead of throwing it into the river to the detriment of the harbour of Campbellton. In 1892-93 the ballast wharf, which is now about filled up, was connected by the Dominion government with Ferguson's or Mowat's (now Shives') wharf, by building up the gap between the two with cribwork, thus effecting a junction with the shore and the Intercolonial Railway, a branch line of which extends to Mowat's wharf. In the petition transmitted by Mr. McAllister, a supporter of the government at that time, on February 16th, 1896, the citizens of Campbellton represent that it is impossible to use the government ballast wharf as a landing pier without passing over Mowat's wharf, and that the charges for using the latter add considerably to the expense of the port, and they therefore ask the government to purchase the Mowat wharf and make it public property. That is a very concise and clear statement of the whole affair as furnished by the department. I agree with my hon. friend that it is in the public interest that we should purchase that property. As to the price, when the matter came before me, I could not do anything about it until authorized by parliament. The sum named is the lowest price the owner would put on the property, and it is for the department to consider whether they will enter into an arrangement to take the property at that price, or expropriate it. I may say that our experience teaches us that if our own officials and experts in the valuation of properties consider that the price asked is not too high, I would prefer to purchase by agreement rather than go to court, because the probability is that we would have a larger amount to pay and a great deal of costs. However, that may be, the passage of this vote does not at all preclude us from the right to arbitrate or expropriate if we think the price too high.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Mr. Shives and myself had several interviews. The reason Mr. Shives is asking so much is because he says he derives a yearly revenue of about $1,000 from his wharf. The wharf itself is not worth $15,000. I believe it is not worth more than perhaps $6,000 or $8,000. There is a valuation in the department by some of our officers to the effect that the work is not worth more than that and perhaps less. Mr. Shewen made a statement which was lower than that, but which I thought was too low. The fact remains that Mr. Shives is the owner of this piece of property, and is deriving a revenue of $1,000 from it every year, and he says, 'I do not see why I should be obliged to give you my property when I am getting so much out of it.' That is the real position of the matter.

Mr. LENNOX. This, I think, shows the great importance of having a pretty full investigation of these matters. The ex-Minister of Public Works has just told us that according to his recollection, there is in the Public Works Department an estimate by the officers of the department that the total value of this structure is not $15,000, but $6,000 or $8,000, or possibly even less. Now, I am quite satisfied, that if the present Minister of Public Works had the opportunity of investigating the affairs of his department that he will have in the future, until we come into power at the next election, probably in a year or so, he would probably have ascertained that fact, and would have told it to us just as candidly as he has given the other information. But this emphasis the importance of getting more information than we have been geting on these estimates from time to time. The Minister of Public Works said just now, as I understood him, that there were just two questions to be considered : whether the department should accept the property at the amount that was asked for it, or expropriate it. From what has been divulged, I venture to say that there is a third and very serious question, that is, whether we should have anything to do with it at all or not. We are told that the matter has been hanging since 1896, or longer, that it is not a new proposition, that a large revenue has been derived by Mr. Shives from his portion of the structure, but that a very small revenue has been derived by the government from their part. The inhabitants

of the town or village where this wharf is situated have something to do with this matter. The government is putting up a wharf there which will be available for the people of that locality. It is true the people will have to pay something by way of fees for the approach. But that happens in many instances, and I submit we should consider seriously whether we ought to make the purchase at all. But that can be considered more deliberately when we see the plans and finally pass on the item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is giving a revenue of 1,000 and over and if we go to arbitration we will probably be stuck for a good deal more than we would be by an agreement because the courts as a rule base the value on the revenue.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister should bring down a plan before this item is voted.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If my hon. friend would agree to have an expropriation proceeding, the House might let the item go.

Mr. FRASER. Is there any way of getting at the originators who built the wharf without getting the property ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have been punished.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Mr. Shives asked $15,000 and the Minister of Public Works of that day, being a conscientious, honest man, refused to pay it. Now the government want a title to this property. Would it not be better at once to face the music and expropriate the property at once and be done with it ?

Mr. INGRAM. We will see later on.

Item allowed to stand.

Caraquet wharf, $55,000.

Mr. RICHARDSON. This is a large sum. Has the contract been let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this work is under contract. The contract was let in March, 1902.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Has any work been done and any money expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No doubt.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The committee would like to know for what purpose this is required ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No doubt parliament, when it authorized the vote, took full information and considered the matter fully. It is rather late now, after the money has been voted and the contract entered into, and the work under way and $10,000 already paid out, to stop the work.

Mr. LANCASTER. When was the land purchased ? Last year we had the statement of the ex-Minister of Public Works that the land was not purchased and the site not finally located.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not find that we have to pay anything for the site.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was the site given free ? There was trouble last year with regard to where the land was to be got and what we were going to pay for it, and the ex-Minister of Public Works said that before the contract was awarded he would see that the deed for the land was in his hands.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was signed the 1st of March, 1902, long before that session was over.

Mr. LANCASTER. For the purchase of the land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The property belongs to the Dominion. I do not see that there was any land to be purchased. $20 was the cost of the right of way from the shore to the highway.

Mr. LANCASTER. Last year Mr. Ganong asked the then Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) who owned the land on which he was spending this money, and the answer was that it belonged to James Blackhall. Does Mr. Blackhall own the land or do we own it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not find anything in the memorandum of the department regarding the land except $20 for the right of way. That must be the land referred to.

Mr. LANCASTER. The then Minister of Public Works said distinctly that Mr. James Blackhall was the owner of the land.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He was merely referring to the right of way from the shore to the highway. That was conveyed to the Crown.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is the right of way, but that is not where we are spending our money.

Mr. INGRAM. This parliament is entitled to a businesslike statement before we undertake work of this character. Here is an expenditure of $55,000 and if any hon. gentleman wants to know why it is being expended, there is nothing to show the reason. It is time that the department, when asking for money for any particular purpose, should come down in a businesslike way and state what public purpose the work is supposed to serve, what amount of money will be spent on it this year, and how much is the estimated cost. But we cannot get this information, and when we go out to the country we are told that we are to blame because we did not properly criticise these items. I know that the hon. the minister is new to the department and I am not hold-

ing him strictly responsible for this, but in the case of any new work a proper estimate should be brought down, and it is the duty of the opposition to refuse to allow any vote to go through until a full explanation is given.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No new work has been voted this session regarding which I have not given the fullest information. As far as this work is concerned, it is now under contract. I am satisfied that no vote has gone through this session concerning which I have not given every detail. I think that parliament is entitled to this information, and I would not ask the House to vote any money unless I were prepared to give it. I think that is one principle that ought to be adhered to. Whatever the work is, it is the duty of parliament to make inquiries before committing itself to it. Parliament did commit itself to this work by giving a grant of money, and I suppose they received the information necessary at that time. The total estimated cost is $65,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is under contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the present contract price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is $59,990.

Mr. INGRAM. Why, then, does not the minister ask for the total cost of the work $65,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is exactly what I am doing—$65,000 asked for this year, and $10,000 of last year's appropriation expended.

Mr. INGRAM. Who will own the wharf after it is built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT. There must be something on the file which the minister has before him to prove who owns the land. Does Mr. Blackhall own it or does the Dominion government own it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already explained that the government own it.

Mr. BENNETT. From whom did they purchase it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They purchased the right of way for $20. That is all the land we had to purchase, according to the information I have from the officers of the department.

Mr. BENNETT. Last year, when the then Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was asked: 'who owns the land ?' he answered: 'Mr. James Blackhall.' Surely nothing could be plainer than that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the information given me by the officer of the department I believe that refers to the right of way which, I have explained, we bought.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I may explain the circumstances. Of course the work is completed from the shore. But between the shore and the highway there is a small piece of land, and it is for that piece of land, I stated last year, $20 had to be paid. It is the right of way. No other property was purchased, it was not necessary to acquire any for the work itself, but only to acquire means of communication with the main road.

Mr. BELL. What is the size of the right of way ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not at hand the description of the right of way. It is a small piece of land.

Mr. TURGEON. It goes through a piece of land of about an acre.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the piece of land been acquired by deed ?

Mr. FRASER. Oh, oh.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) seems in a jocular mood Is he satisfied that the government has the deed of the land ?

Mr. FRASER. Most decidedly. The hon. gentleman might as well ask if the deed is signed or if there is a seal to it. The government own the foreshore, and all they needed was a piece of land from the street to the wharf. The minister says that the money was paid and the deed got and that the government own the land.

Mr. INGRAM. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) hear that ?

Mr. FRASER. Certainly I did.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister say that now ?

Mr. FRASER. He has said it.

Mr. INGRAM. Will he say it now ?

Mr. FRASER. The hon. minister as I understood him—

Mr. INGRAM. Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER. Just wait. Hon. gentlemen are like a jack in the box jumping up every minute. The hon. minister, as I understood him, stated that the Dominion government owned the place where the wharf was built that they needed a right of way from the street, and they bought it and got a deed of it. Is not that plain ? The deed specified the number of feet in the right of way and what difference does it make whether it is twenty or thirty feet ? I am bound to assume that they got the regular right of way.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister tell us whether he has it or not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed by the officials that we have. I have given strict instructions that where we are doing work on property, the deed must be acquired, and, of course, I assume that the officials of the department will see to it that, in such a case as this, a proper right of way is acquired before the money is expended.

Great Salmon river—Groyne and breakwater combined, $4,300.

Mr. WILMOT. Where is this point ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move to strike out this item.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman state why the item was put in the estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations were made that this was a necessary work, and I believe it is. But the property is reported by the department to be private property. I do not intend to ask for the money until this is arranged. If it is arranged, I can bring down a supplementary estimate.

Mr. INGRAM. In what constituency is it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. St. John.

Motion agreed to.

Lord's Cove (Deer Island)—completion of wharf, $500.

Mr. WILMOT. What amount has been expended on this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $2,774.19.

Mr. WILMOT. Does the government own the approach to the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. This completes the work.

Richibucto, to complete protection and extension of north pier, &c., $2,500.

Mr. INGRAM. How long is this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is 703 feet in length. The amount of the contract was $22,900. Previous to this there has been spent on that work $155,000.

River St. John, including tributaries, $16,000.

Mr. WILMOT. Will the minister give some explanation of that vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been customary to vote $16,000 for work on the St. John river. Last year $6,000 was spent, and this is a revote of $10,000 to make up the usual vote.

Mr. WILMOT. There is a great necessity for work being done there in the way of dredging, in order to facilitate navigation. The traffic is very heavy and increasing, and the public suffers a good deal of inconvenience. I would especially direct attention to Oromocto Shoals.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will see that everything is done there which we have means of doing.

River St. John and tributaries—to provide for contribution to local government, not to exceed one-half the first cost of wharfs built by them in tidal waters, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the amount claimed by the provincial government under some old arrangement. The matter has been adjusted, but the Auditor General was not satisfied with the conditions on which the money was voted. This vote is asked for in order that we may pay the local government the sum due under the agreement made with them.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I had some trouble about sums of money previously placed in the estimates. The provincial government had built some small wharfs and then sent us the bill, asking us to pay half the cost. I was never able to find out what kind of an agreement had taken place in former years ; but I remember that in 1899 or 1900 I wrote to the provincial Minister of Public Works telling him that unless the plans were submitted to the department previously to building their wharfs, we would not entertain the payment of that work. New Brunswick is the only province in which this government pays for work of that kind. I do not object, but I do not think it is a very good principle. I do not see why we should be obliged to help the provincial governments in building wharfs of that kind.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister explain on what principle it is that the Dominion government in this instance is to provide one-half the cost and the local government to provide the other half ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And we do not own the work.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the minister explain the peculiar circumstances which make it right for the Dominion government to pay one-half the cost of this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. An arrangement was made by the late government at the instance of the Hon. Mr. Foster, and agreed to by parliament, to vote one-half the cost of the work undertaken by the provincial government, on a certificate from the resident engineer that this work had been done at a fair price. As my hon. friend the ex-minister has explained, we took exception to this method. However, a vote of $5,000 was taken, but the Auditor General would not pay the money to New Brunswick, taking exception to the way the money was voted. This vote is asked for to carry out the obligation assumed

under that agreement. Since my hon. friend took exception to the method in which the account was rendered and the work was done, they have furnished us satisfactory evidence of the expenditure of the money on a certificate of the engineers, to the satisfaction of the department as well as of the Auditor General. We have to ask the revote of this money, and we do it in this way, so that it may be paid to the proper parties.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I really think we should not go on with such a practice. I took exception to it and the House will take exception to it with me, I am sure. I have seen these wharfs, they are very small wharfs, costing $300, $400 or $500. They are for local purposes and these works are very near to one another. I took exception to that kind of work. The record is there and it will show. I told them that in future I should not recommend to my colleagues the payment of one single dollar unless the plans of these wharfs were submitted to us. I suppose accounts that have been incurred in the past must be paid but I would suggest to my hon. friend not to allow that practice to be continued.

Mr. BROCK. I must say that I am rather surprised with the argument made by the hon. Minister of Public Works that the practice should prevail with the present government because the Finance Minister of the government some seven years ago made certain arrangements. When so many arrangements made by the government have been completely upset why carry on this particular arrangement ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) point out any obligation of the old government that this government has not carried out ?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, I think I can remember some appointments to the Senate that were made by the late government that this government upset. What about the steamship service ? There is another point. The government of the Dominion are expending large amounts of money in the various provinces and, to keep to the items in the province of New Brunswick, there is an immense expenditure in that province for wharfs. I think we should go into the building of wharfs from a business point of view. I do not suppose the government build wharfs merely for political purposes but I take it for granted they are built because the business of the country requires it and if the business requires it the expenditure should have some kind of proportion to the amount that is earned by these wharfs. They should not spend money if it costs more to collect the tolls than the tolls amount to.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In these cases we do not collect any tolls because these wharfs are not our own property. We simply contribute the money towards these wharfs which is worse.

Mr. BROCK. All the more reason why we should be careful in our expenditure of money, but even if we do get a revenue from it we should not expend $65,000 upon a wharf that probably will not bring in $500 a year of net revenue. Therefore, I contend this whole thing is wrong and I do not think anybody is more convinced of it than the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the members of the government themselves, but they keep on and the reason given by the hon. Minister of Public Works is that this was a practice commenced by Mr. Foster the late minister of finance.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never said that.

Mr. BROCK. I understood the hon. minister to say that this was an arrangement made by Mr. Foster.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was speaking of this particular arrangement with the provincial government which was made on the recommendation of Mr. Foster. It was adopted by the government of that day, approved of by parliament and the government in good faith expended this money. That is the reason I am asking parliament to pay it.

Mr. BROCK. This government should not consider themselves bound to carry out any bad arrangement no matter by whom it is made. This is a very immoral and unbusinesslike arangement and it should be put a stop to at once.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. A stop has been put to it. I put a stop to it myself.

Mr. BROCK. Why do we find it here still ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Because the amount that is placed in the estimates is to pay an old debt. This amount, I am sure, upon investigation, it will be proved is to pay debts that have been accumulating for four years. But, Mr. Foster never made any permanent arrangement so that in the future we are perfectly free.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is hardly fair for the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) to suggest that Mr. Foster made this arrangement for political purposes. I want to be fair to my predecessor in office and to defend him against this attack made upon him from the other side of the House.

Mr. BROCK. I do not think the hon. gentleman is sincere.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not see why the hon. gentlemen opposite should get their backs up because $3,000 is to be expended on the St. John river. The provin-

cial government have agreed to pay half of this expense, but I do not think they would be awfully put out if this government paid the whole of it. We have not had all the expenditure that we have asked for dredging and for wharfs in New Brunswick. I think the government should pay for some of this work and I think the hon. gentlemen opposite should be a little more lenient in their criticisms of items of this kind.

Mr. LENNOX. There is another point that we want to have cleared up before we carry this item. It is a matter that arises out of what the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said. The hon. gentleman gives us to understand that this is for the payment of an old debt, that is overdue some years, that it is not for something in the future, and therefore, if that is the case, I should like to have that explicit statement from the present hon. Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for an old debt for work already completed.

River St. John—wharf at Oromocto, $6,000.

Mr. WILMOT. I would like to know whether that work will be proceeded with at once ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the intention of the department to proceed with this work at once. Tenders have been advertised for and the work will be commenced at once.

St. John harbour—Negro Point breakwater, $20,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the explanation of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote of $20,000 is to make good serious damage done to Negro Point breakwater by storms, chiefly those of the 9th and 10th of November, 1900, the object being to save the lighthouse at the outer end of the breakwater which will certainly be destroyed if no steps are taken to rebuild its foundations in a more permanent manner with large blocks of granite and concrete. I may say to the Committee that I had an important deputation from the city of St. John making representations in reference to this breakwater. It seems from the representations of the leading citizens of that city that the harbour is almost useless without this breakwater and they are urging the expenditure of a very large sum for the purpose of extending it. There is some difference of opinion between the engineers as to how best to go on with this work. The total expenditure upon this breakwater up to the 30th of June last was $601,173. It is situated in a very bad place and the storms wash away the wood work frame. The work we are doing now is to maintain the wharf and to protect the light house; it is of concrete and granite and will be more durable.

Mr. INGRAM. Will this expenditure prevent the wharf from being washed away ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Judging by the discussion I have had with the engineers and the deputation which waited on me, I am afraid I cannot guarantee that. The whole thing is a big work and will have to be considered most carefully.

Mr. INGRAM. Did the deputation suggest any kind of work that would be permanent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was left an open question. They wanted the engineers to have a consultation and I have asked for a report.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it proposed to replace all the wood with concrete ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report in the department shows that it would cost at least $200,000 for a revetment of concrete to protect this work in a permanent way. It is estimated that it would cost $500,000 to carry out the work asked by the deputation which was to carry the breakwater clear across to Partridge Island. Some of the shipping people have taken objection to that and the matter will have to be gone into more carefully and a report made before I will recommend it to the House. This is for the maintenance of the existing work.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it to be done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would be impossible to do this work in any other way than day labour.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that this concrete work is usually done under contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is repairing work and I do not think it would be possible for any engineer to make an estimate or specification. It is done under the direct supervision of Mr. Shewen, the engineer who has his headquarters in St. John. We would rather do it by contract if we could, because the present system takes up the time of our engineer and gives the department a great deal of trouble.

Mr. WILMOT. Do I understand that the minister is considering the advisability of closing up the western channel and extending the breakwater.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has been suggested.

Mr. WILMOT. What will be the total cost of that work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nearly $500,000.

Mr. WILMOT. I know that a great many people in St. John are in favour of that being done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And a great many objections are taken to it also.

St. John harbour—repairs and extension of protection work at base of Fort Dufferin, $3,500.

Mr. WILMOT. Last year the Minister of Public Works told us that a large dredge would this year be in operation in the harbour of St. John. There is now a great deal of difficulty experienced at the entrance of the harbour near the Beacon. Several delegations have awaited on the government urging the necessity of this work. What has become of the dredge that was promised ? Will it be at work this spring ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was in good faith when he expected this dredge to be ready, but I cannot give any promise at the present time much as I regret it, seeing that there is such pressing work to be done. The dredge will not certainly be ready this season but we will take steps to have it completed as soon as possible.

Mr. WILMOT. Now that St. John harbour is becoming one of the great winter ports of the Dominion, it is urgent that that work should be done as soon as possible. Has the minister's attention been directed to dredging Grimross Canal, St. John river? This is an important work, and would not entail any great cost. I would strongly urge this work being carried out.

Shippegan harbour—repairs to protection work, &c., $1,100.

Mr. CLANCY. Was the money voted for this last year expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to make provision in connection with a wharf 990 feet long reaching a depth of 31 feet 4 inches at low water. It is being built under contract. The amount of the contract is $12,000 and the total estimated cost $14,350. This will complete the work.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there a large amount of shipping at this place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a very important fishing centre in Gloucester county, New Brunswick.

Mr. CLANCY. Do anything but small boats go there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Boats of 14 and 15 tons.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood the minister to say that the depth of water was 14 feet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The depth of water there is not necessary for the shipping, but the work being done in deep water it makes it more expensive.

Mr. CLANCY. Why has the hon. gentleman provided for a class of ships that do not go there ?

Mr. TURGEON. At this very wharf large ships have been coming since last fall, as well as a number of fishing boats. There are from $5,000 or $6,000 paid in bounties to fishermen in that locality, and there are large business firms curing and bringing fish and bringing ships from the ocean to carry out the products of the fishermen. Last fall, during the month of October, three large ships came there to load fish to take away to the European markets. These ships generally come late in the season.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman's observation throws some light on the subject. One of the reasons he gives is rather novel, that is, that a large sum is paid out in fishing bounties. I was not aware before that it was necessary to build wharfs to pay out these fishing bounties. I thought that as soon as the bounties were earned, there would be no difficulty in finding the earners of them.

Mr. TURGEON. The large amount of the fishing bounties paid in the locality is an evidence of the large extent of the fishing industry there.

Mr. INGRAM. How far is Shippegan harbour from Shippegan wharf ?

Mr. TURGEON. About five miles. Shippegan harbour, or Shippegan gully connects the Gulf of St. Lawrence with the Baie des Chaleurs. A few years ago Shippegan harbour, by the special works which have been carried on, was dredged to a sufficient depth to enable the Caraquet fleet, consisting of some 200 or 300 vessels, going to the fishing banks, to pass that way, instead of going around Mascou Island, and thus to save some fifty miles. This is a great saving of time and hardship to our fishermen in carrying on their most patriotic industry, and the amount of money spent is nothing compared with the advantage it confers. I think this parliament never votes any money of greater public advantage than the money voted for the improvement of our coasts in the maritime provinces.

Mr. INGRAM. Did I understand the minister to say that the contract for this work is $13,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract price is $12,000. The total cost of the work is estimated to be $14,350, the sum over the contract being for superintendence and contingencies.

Upper Salmon river—Alma pier, $4,000 .

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract. The total cost is $5,750. We only expect to pay out during

the present fiscal year $1,750, so we are asking a revote of $4,000. The contract was let on the 6th August, 1902.

Harbours and rivers. Maritime provinces generally—generally repairs and improvements, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that the usual vote of $15,000 for the maritime provinces is too small as it has obliged men to go without pay and accounts to be carried over to the next year. I think it is better to ask for the amount really required, and for that reason I ask that the vote be increased by $5,000.

Mr. CLANCY. What class of work is intended to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for emergency repairs on the report of the engineers, caused principally by damage from storms—unforeseen accidents of one kind and another, which my hon. friend will know are very general in those waters.

Harbours and rivers, Ontario—Amherstburg—dredging, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote, for the same reason that exists in some other cases, that we had no available dredge.

Mr. INGRAM. Where is this dredging done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has not been done because we had no dredge to do the work. This year we hope to have a dredge.

Mr. INGRAM. Where in the Detroit river do you propose to do the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From the main channel into the wharf at Amherstburg.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And it is a work of great importance.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this is a revote, because the department has not been able to get a dredge to do the work. But there is a very good dredge which could be had and which did work last year and the year before for the Department of Public Works. The Chatham Dredging Company have a dredge which did good work at the mouth of the Thames and also at Rondeau harbour, and I think there is little doubt that it can perform the work satisfactorily. And the company are prepared to do it cheaper than the department can have it done for by its own dredges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am pleased to have that information. We will have the matter inquired into and ascertain whether the dredge which the hon. gentleman refers to is capable of doing the work.

Mr. CLANCY. This same dredging company did work very satisfactorily at Rondeau and at the mouth of the Thames. I appeal to the ex-Minister of Public Works whether that was not the case.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No doubt the dredge referred to did good work, but I am not quite sure that it would be capable of doing the work at Amherstburg. I think that the bottom there is very hard. The American government are carrying out large dredging work in the river just opposite Amherstburg. I may say that Amherstburg has lost a very important coal trade because the depth of the water is not sufficient, and I would urge upon my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works the great importance of having this dredging done. There are American dredges available, but when the government employ American dredges reproaches are levelled against it. I think, however, that when a work is urgent we would be justified in employing foreign dredges and admitting them in bond. Of course the work to be carried out at Amherstburg would cost a larger amount of money than the $5,000 in the estimates. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to give his special attention to this Amherstburg work. I have visited the place and know the facts well.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like the Minister of Public Works, in view of what the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has said, whether he has a report of the engineer as to the character of the soil or the material to be removed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Clay, hard-pan, boulders and rock. This work my hon. friend says will cost $25,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think that $14,000 or $15,000 would dredge the channel along the wharfs and be sufficient for the needs of the moment, but to complete the work and make it a good job, it would be necessary to spend $25,000 to $30,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Has anything been done to remove the boulders spoken of last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Barrie, Ont.—construction of wharf, $3,000.

Mr. LENNOX. This is an item which has been in the estimates for a number of years. I am not going at all to discuss the policy, but I wish to call the hon. minister's attention to this fact. The town of Barrie is not in the riding I represent, and I see that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is not present, but I have what appears to me good and sufficient reasons for calling not only the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works, but incidentally the attention of the ex-Minister of Public Works to this item. About a year ago there

was a good deal of correspondence between the mayor of the town of Barrie and the hon. member for North Simcoe on this question. I do not mean to say that many letters passed between them, but such letters as did pass and were published in the press were long and moderately warm, and the position was this. Each one was blaming the other for the delay that had occurred. I think I am entitled to rise to a question of privilege upon this matter, because I was dragged into it also. In my innocence of parliamentary procedure, having an office in the town of Barrie and having been a ratepayer in the north riding of Simcoe for many years, and having been asked frequently by a number of residents in the town, with reference to this wharf, I ventured to write to the then Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) asking him to have it built in the near future. In that hot and fiery correspondence which passed between the mayor of Barrie and the hon. member for North Simcoe, I noticed that the hon. gentleman considered that I should not have taken the course I did of asking when we might expect this wharf to be built. But I consider it my duty to say now, in the absence of the hon. member for North Simcoe, to the Minister of Public Works that I think it is certainly time, if that work is to be done at all, that it should be carried through. A difficulty appears to have arisen as to the point at which the wharf should be constructed—whether at Bayfield street, or at the foot of Metcalfe street. Whether that be the only difficulty or not, I do not know, but it was also suggested that there is a difficulty about the title to the land. I know as a matter of fact that the council of the town of Barrie wrote the department saying they were ready to vest the title in the government if it was not already vested. And I can say, speaking from current report in the town of Barrie, that the almost universal feeling in the town is that the wharf should be constructed at the foot of Bayfield street. That is not the unanimous opinion. But the current of opinion is very strong in that direction. This is borne out by several resolutions that have been carried in the town council. I am not sure whether resolutions have been carried in the board of trade. Copies of the resolutions, I understand, have been sent to the department. So without at all receding from the position I have taken with regard to these local public works, I submit to the government, that, if this work is going to be carried out at all, it should not be left until another general election. I believe it figured in the last general election, and I do not know whether it figured in the one before that or not. But, if it is going to be carried out, it should be carried out now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The difficulty in carrying out this work, so far as I know, is that we are waiting for the municipality to transfer the property at the foot of Bayfield street to the Crown. When that is done, the wharf will be built without delay.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. minister understand that that has not been done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am so informed.

Mr. LENNOX. I certainly understood from the mayor of Barrie and also from what I heard some months ago, that that transfer had been made. At all events, it is understood by the department is it not, that they are quite ready to make the transfer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understood that a resolution of the council had been passed. But I stated some time ago that the principle on which I wished to proceed is that we must have the title of the land before we start spending the money. We will start to-morrow if they will confer the title.

Bayfield—extension of southern pier, $5,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Why has not that work been done ? There is a revote here of $1,600. What condition is the work in, that it has not been gone on with ? This is not dredging, is it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the cribbing is completed, but the superstructure is not yet completed. The total contract is for $6,440. This vote is expected to complete the work.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there much business done at that wharf or is this one of the skeletons that we are keeping alive ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. The work is nearly completed.

Mr. CLANCY. But it will be pretty near dead before it is completed, will it not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Which ?

Mr. CLANCY. The wharf and the business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) committed himself to the vote one or two sessions ago. That was the time to criticise.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the department any idea of doing dredging there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not provided for in this vote.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no boat of any depth that could pass there—not even a fishing boat. This is another case of resurrecting works for which there is no real demand.

Mr. CLANCY. Has there been a report as to the work on this pier not being completed without dredging being done ? Has the hon. minister some comprehensive plan

with regard to the harbour to justify the expenditure of this money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is under contract and is nearly completed. I did not go into the details myself personally, and the matter was in this state when I entered the department.

Mr. CLANCY. Has there not been a report as to the depth of the water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There ought to have been at the time it was asked for. The officers of the department inform me that they have a full report and surveys.

Mr. CLANCY. What would be the cost of dredging to make the pier more valuable ? There is no use in building the pier, unless there is water to enable the vessels to come in.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot understand the object of building a wharf where there are no vessels. Of course, I have no personal knowledge of the matter. But I shall be pleased to bring down the report regarding it, made before the work was undertaken.

Mr. CLANCY. The opinion I have is that this money is being expended on a pier on which there is not water for even a small draught vessel to get in. And, even if the work is completed, no captain would think of bringing a vessel there. If that be true, surely the hon. minister is not warranted in asking this House to spend a single dollar until some solution of that difficulty has been found.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The money has been spent. And I see by the report that the work is going on in sixteen feet of water. So, there appears to be some mistake in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clancy's) information. I speak on the information before me. Parliament voted this appropriation, and the work is under contract and almost completed.

Mr. INGRAM. That sixteen feet was when the original pier was being built.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the present work. Of course, I will not undertake to say that there is sixteen feet of water there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have left the Chair, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Campbell) to give information in this matter. I do not live in this riding, but in the next. But I know Bayfield as well as I know my own home. Some years ago there were very good wharfs there, but, unfortunately a storm carried most of them away. A few years ago, Mr. McMillan, who represented the riding, urged upon the government to build a wharf. This is quite a fishing centre of Lake Huron. Owing to the storms the opening was filled up with a sand bar; and this pier was commenced two or three years ago and partly constructed, and sunk to about fourteen feet of water. When this is completed the dredging of the sand bar which now prevents the fishing boats from coming in will make it possible for fishermen to reach the dock. I think it is a work very much in the interest of the fishermen. Sometimes a schooner comes in but hardly any large vessels come in there. This is quite a fishing centre, but, if the fishermen have no place to shelter their boats in a storm, it would be impossible to carry on that industry.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, according to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Deputy Speaker's) statement, we have a pier intended for the fishermen, yet the fishermen cannot get at it until the bar is dredged. But there is no money for dredging purposes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the minister to say that the dredging would take place as soon as the wharf was finished.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I was not asked that. However, we have a general dredging appropriation, and now that the pier is there the dredging can be done.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. minister is going to build wharfs and do dredging for the fishermen of Bayfield, I can draw his attention to Port Bruce which is quite as important. We have just as many fishermen at Port Bruce as they have, and I question if we have not more, and the revenue is probably larger.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is always calm weather at Port Bruce.

Mr. CLANCY. We all know that a good many works of this kind were commenced under very different conditions from those which prevail now, at a time when there was a considerable shipping business at these points. We must recognize that many of those works have fallen into disuse, and I think no more money should be spent on them. I acknowledge that both parties have offended in that respect. But this is a notable case, and I appeal to the hon. gentleman whether we should enter upon a course of that kind in view of the increasing demands from all quarters of Canada for public works far more necessary. It is a question whether we should spend any more money in keeping up breakwaters and docks that were built many years ago, when the original need of constructing those works has entirely ceased to exist. Of course there will always be a pressure to keep them up, and there will always be these recurring accidents of the harbours filling up with sand, and small fishing vessels may still require to come into those harbours. But I submit that we have reached the period when we might consider on both sides of the House whether it is

wise in the interest of the country, to continue to build works of that sort. I suppose the hon. gentleman will be prepared to tell the House what it will take to dredge out that pier and make it of some use. What sum will be required in addition to the sum already spent in the construction of this pier ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will ask for a report in regard to the dredging of the river.

Mr. CLANCY. Had not the hon. gentleman better let this stand ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is the use of allowing it to stand ? When you make an appropriation and enter into a solemn contract with a man, and he has done the work, you must pay him for it.

Mr. CLANCY. It would be better to pay him incidental damages then to commit the country to finish that work and the additional work that will be necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The incidental damages would be a good deal more than the $16,000 that we are now asking to complete.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood last year that the object of spending this money was to extend the pier so as to accommodate the fishermen, and that the dredging would not be necessary.

Belle Rivière—repairs to sheet piling, $1,400.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How far do you intend to go ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let us finish this vote for Ontario.

Mr. CLARKE. We will establish a bad rule if we sit later than eleven o'clock.

Mr. CLANCY. I think we have made very good progress. It would be unreasonable to expect these items to pass without some information in regard to them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I desire to furnish all the information it is possible to get. The next vote is a vote which is under contract; the total amount is $9,310.75. This is simply a balance.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the necessity for Belle Rivière?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think last session a full explanation was given of the necessity for this work. It is a very serviceable work. The contract has been let and the work is nearly completed.

Mr. CLANCY. We can scarcely be expected to carry in our minds just what was said last year. No doubt the hon. gentleman satisfied the House last year that the work was justifiable; but he is asking for an additional sum this year for this work. It may be entirely meritorious. But the hon. gentleman should be patient and give the information that he is asked for, instead of saying: Well, the vote was taken last year, and that should be an end to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never said that. I did say that an appropriation was made by parliament, that a contract had been entered into, and the work was almost completed, and under those circumstances we were unable now as a parliament to go back on that work. There may be a difference of opinion as to the expediency of undertaking this work in the beginning, but after the work is done it must be paid for. Of course the Committee is entitled to all the information, and I am ready to supply all the information at hand.

Mr. INGRAM. We are not complaining of the courtesy of the hon. gentleman at all. But last session several of these items passed without any discussion or question, the Committee, so to speak, gulped a lot of these items down without any explanation, but I do not think that we ought to do so at this stage of the present session. We ought to get information about this Belle Rivière business, I think we are quite within our rights in asking for more information about it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Blind river.

Mr. INGRAM. Bell river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS No, Blind river.

Mr. INGRAM. I must confess that I do not know whether there is very much necessity for doing this work or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS It is Blind river.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not want to be responsible for leading hon gentlemen on the other side of the House astray by late hours, and therefore I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 8, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

BROCKVILLE AND NORTH-WEST RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CALVERT, on behalf of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment), I beg for leave to introduce Bill (No. 89) entitled an Act to incorporate the Brockville and North-west Railway Company.

Mr. TAYLOR. I beg leave to call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the petition for this Bill was only presented to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think everything is all right. The Bill has been reported.

Mr. TAYLOR. The petition was just read now.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have a note from the Examiner of Private Bills that everything in connection with this is correct. I take it that the petition has been duly received.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Mutual Fire Insurance Company of the city of Montreal and to change its name to the Montreal Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. LaRivière.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Niagara Welland Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Niagara Welland Power Company.—Mr. Guthrie (by Mr. Calvert).

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Dominion Gas Improvement Company.—Mr. Belcourt, by Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Dominion Guarantee Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Shipping Federation of Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 94) respecting incorporated Companies.—Mr. Bickerdike.

CONCILIATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. PUTTEE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 95) to amend the Conciliation Act, 1900.

Mr. INGRAM. Explain.

Mr. PUTTEE. The Bill is similar in all respects to the Bill introduced by myself last session, and explained then. It simply seeks to increase the utility of the Conciliation Act of 1900.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). A few days ago the House adopted a resolution which requires some further proceedings in order that it may be transmitted to the proper quarter. I therefore beg to move :

That the Address adopted by this House on Tuesday, the 31st ult., to His Most Gracious Majesty the King be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that he will be pleased to transmit the Address adopted by this House on Tuesday, the 31st ult. to His Most Gracious Majesty the King, in relation to affairs in Ireland, in such manner as His Excellency may see fit, so that the same may be laid at the foot of the Throne.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That the said Address be engrossed and be presented to His Excellency by such members of this House as are members of the Honourable the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

FISHING RIGHTS IN JAMES BAY OR HUDSON BAY.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Who are the parties to whom exclusive fishing rights in any portion of James Bay or Hudson Bay were recently granted ?
2. By whom was the application for such privilege made to the government or any department thereof.
3. What is the date of the first application ?
4. What is the date of the lease or privilege ?
5. What is the duration of such lease or privilege ?
6. What is the rental to be paid by the lessees.
7. Has the said lease been transferred. If so, to whom ?
8. When was the transfer of the lease consented to or sanctioned, and by what department ?

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

1. Archibald McNee.
2. Archibald McNee.
3. 22nd February, 1900.
4. 13th November, 1902.
5. Twenty-one years.
6. Ten dollars per annum.
7. No information.
8. 28th November, 1902. By the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

OROMOCTO SHOALS, N. B., LIGHT-KEEPER.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. Has Miles McMonagle been dismissed from the position of keeper of Beacon Light, Oromocto Shoals, N.B.? If so, when, and for what cause ? Is it known to the department that Inspector Kelly stated that McMonagle was the most efficient light-keeper on the river St. John ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. J. Raymond Préfontaine). Mr. McMonagle was superseded by Mr. Robert Brennan, on the 25th March last, as he took an active part in the elections. The department is not aware of any report made by Inspector Kelly in regard to Mr. McMonagle being the most efficient light-keeper on the River St. John.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

Who recommended the dismissal of Miles McMonagle, light-keeper, Oromocto, N.B.?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. J. Raymond Préfontaine). In this department all such recommendations are made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as usual.

AYR POSTMASTER.

Mr. CLARE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

Did Michael Robson, formerly postmaster of the village of Ayr, resign, or was he dismissed? If dismissed, why ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). Mr. Michael Robson resigned the postmastership of Ayr.

THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

Mr. BELL—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has any member of the government received the following telegram ?

Oppose any attempt to pass Order in Council or Act of parliament that will in any way confirm Treadgold concession. Are having monster petition signed and reliable data prepared to forward Ottawa asking government to aid in furnishing water for mining purposes. People are a unit in making demand, and will insist upon government protection from monopoly of Treadgold octopus.

THE DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE.
H. C. Macaulay, President.

2. Is the government aware that a petition, a copy of which is hereinafter given, is being forwarded ?

PETITION.

To the honourable the House of Commons in parliament assembled;

The petition of the undersigned residents of the Yukon Territory humbly showeth :

1. That by Order in Council of April the 21st, 1902, certain privileges are granted to Malcolm Orr Ewing, A. N. C. Treadgold and Walter Barwick, in connection with the proposed establishment by them of a system of water supply for washing out gold-bearing gravel in the district therein described, including the Klondike river, Bonanza, Bear and Hunker Creeks and their tributaries.

2. That the benefits conferred upon the grantees are of incalculable value and involve an enormous exploitation of the public resources of this territory for the benefit of a few favoured concessionnaires.

3. That in the opinion of your petitioners, the accumulation of extraordinary powers in the hands of a single corporation, such as is effected by the above Order in Council, will lead to the paralysis of the independent commercial and industrial life of the community, and will prove in the highest degree oppressive and injurious to the public welfare, since the grantees are thereby enabled to crush out competition and to reduce to a position of practical servitude the individual miners in the extensive district affected, which includes the richest portion of the Klondike.

4. That the need of this territory is not the creation of monopolies, but their prevention, and the encouragement of the individual miners by securing equal privileges and opportunities to all as far as the law and the administration can provide them.

5. That for the promotion and development of the mining industry of the Yukon a cheap, abundant and effective water supply, furnished at a minimum of cost by the government at the earliest possible moment, is absolutely essential.

Your petitioners therefore pray :

(1.) That the Order in Council of April 21st, 1902, may be cancelled completely, and that no special privileges shall hereafter be granted within this territory with respect to wood, mining, water or any other class of rights affecting the general public ; but that all persons shall be restricted in such matters to the rights conferred upon every member of the community by the mining regulations.

(2) That the supply and distribution of water for general mining purposes within this territory shall not be controlled by any private person or corporation, but either that it shall be undertaken by the Dominion government as a public work, or that power shall be given to the commissioner of the Yukon territory in Council to construct such a system and to raise the necessary funds by bonds guaranteed by the Dominion.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

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

1. Several members of the government have received this telegram, amongst others the Prime Minister, who answered that there would be no attempt to pass an Order in Council or Act of parliament in the manner suggested in the telegram.

2. The government has been informed that such a petition, or one similar to it, is to be addressed to the government. I may say, in addition, that this matter has been brought to the attention of the government by the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Ross) ; but all consideration has been suspended until this petition has been received.

NESBITT, MANITOBA, POSTMASTER.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Is the government aware that Mr. John Watson, postmaster at Nesbitt, Manitoba, is the president of the South Lambton Liberal Association ; and the Liberal candidate for that constituency in the ensuing elections in that province ?

2. Will his services be continued by this government while he is engaged in party politics?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The department has no information whatever as to whether Mr. John Watson is the President of the South Brandon Liberal Association or the Liberal

candidate for that constituency in the ensuing elections in that province.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. DAVIS asked :

1. What is the total amount of the lands granted in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to railway companies by way of subsidies to date ?

2. Were any lands granted by way of subsidies to railway companies since 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Total area authorized by parliament to be granted by way of railway subsidies, 56,087,072 acres.

Total area earned on account of construction to date, 29,986,826 acres.

2. No.

MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. DAVIS asked :

What is the total cost (capital account) of the Intercolonial and other government railways ? What is the total amount of money paid by the federal government as subsidies to railways in each of the following provinces :— Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, North-west Territories, and British Columbia, since confederation ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

The total cost (capital account) of the Intercolonial and other government railways to February 28th, 1903, is as follows : Intercolonial Railway, $69,418,275.54; Prince Edward Island Railway, $5,112,435.27.

The total amount of money paid by the federal government as subsidies to railways in each of the following provinces since confederation to the 28th of February, 1903, is as follows :

Prince Edward Island.... ..	Nil.
Nova Scotia....	$ 1,872,503 83
New Brunswick....	1,292,783 57
Quebec..	10,091,552 63
Ontario..	18,750,228 48
Manitoba..	3,259,150 00
North-west Territories.. ..	7,457,500 00
British Columbia..	9,682,251 00

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. DAVIS asked :

What is the total amount of money spent by the federal government (capital account) on public works of all descriptions, not including canals, from the year 1892 to 1902, respectively, in the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, North-west Territories and British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). I would ask the hon. member to move for a return.

MR. S. JONASSON.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Is Mr. S. Jonasson an employee of the Department of the Interior, in the province of Manitoba, as forest ranger, or homestead inspector ?

2. If so, is the government aware that he is the Liberal candidate for the constituency of Gimli, in the ensuing provincial elections ?

3. Will his services be continued by this government while he is engaged in party politics?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock):

1. Yes.

2. The government has no information that Mr. Jonasson is a candidate for Gimli.

3. If he is a candidate, he will not be continued as a salaried official of the department.

BANANAS IMPORTED.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin) asked :

What quantity of bananas were imported into the Dominion during the year 1902 ? What was the value of the bananas imported during the year 1902 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson) : 765,767 bunches of bananas, valued at $738,168, were imported into Canada during the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1902.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. SCOTT asked :

1. What is the total sum of money which has been paid as subsidies to aid construction of railways in Canada, between Lake Superior and the eastern boundary of British Columbia ?

2. Was such sum wholly paid on capital account ; and if so, what is the annual interest charge paid by the Dominion on the amount ?

3. What is the total sum paid by the Dominion, since confederation, to aid railway construction, including the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

4. What is the interest charge annually ?

The MINISTR OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. The total sum of money paid as subsidies to aid construction of railways in Canada between Lake Superior and the eastern boundary of British Columbia is,— $12,465,341.

2. Railway subsidies are charged in the public accounts as a special item. It is not designated as a capital account but practically it amounts to such, inasmuch as it is not charged against the ordinary income of the year.

3. The total sum paid by the Dominion since confederation to aid railway construction, including the Canadian Pacific Railway, is $152,922,163.25.

4. There is no special rate of interest applying to railway subsidies. They are paid out of the general treasury. Moneys are not specifically borrowed for railway sub-

sidies. Loans have been issued from time to time, part of which have gone into railway subsidies. The rates of interest have varied.

B.C. FISHERIES REPORT.

Mr. EARLE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when we may expect the report of the commission appointed to investigate into the fisheries on the British Columbia coast.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In a few days.

CATTLE-GUARDS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals inform us when the report of the commission respecting cattle-guards may be expected ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The tests are going on from day to day as rapidly as possible, but I do not think any report can be made for ten or twelve days. There were sixty-one devices to be tested on Thursday and one or two more have come in since.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was under the impression that the commission had been disbanded and that some members had retired from it, and that was why I thought a report might be expected.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The commissioners have travelled over the principle railways in the United States and Canada and have examined the cattle-guards in use. After their return to Ottawa, the commission disbanded, and Mr. Holt was to carry on the tests. At that time there were only a few guards to be tested, but a number of others have been brought forward and the tests have been continued from day to day.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The announcement is made in the press of the appointment of a commission on the transportation question, mentioned in the speech from the Throne. Has the right hon. gentleman any announcement to make ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not to-day. The commissioners have not yet been appointed.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. J. CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend chapter 8 of the statutes of 1900 authorizing the granting of railway subsidies.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The third reading was postponed the other day. Is this Bill intended to apply to any particular road ?

Mr. CHARLTON. It will apply to any road which happens to have a total subsidy of less than $60,000. The object is to place roads of that category on the same level as larger concerns. A road with less than a subsidy of $60,000 might be almost completed, and might be better deserving of the payment of a subsidy than the larger concern; but it is barred by the statute as it exists. It is for the purpose of correcting this discrimination, if we may term it so, against the smaller road that this is introduced.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought it had some application at the present moment, as the Minister of Railways and Canals said he was seriously contemplating bringing in a Bill to abolish that clause from the Railway Act.

Mr. CHARLTON. This Bill would not be before the House if the provision of the law had been abolished.

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

ELECTORAL CORRUPTION.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 3) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—Mr. Charlton.

On section 1.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Chairman, we considered the subsections of this section as far as 'L' when the House was in committee on this Bill before. I would suggest that you read from subsection 'L.'

Mr. INGRAM. Oh, no.

Mr. CHARLTON. However, it is immaterial to me—read all the subsections.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) made a suggestion the other day which seemed to be received with very general acceptance that a committee should be appointed representing both sides of the House to consider the whole of the election law. The government intend to proceed upon this suggestion after the Easter recess. Perhaps the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would allow this matter to stand until the committee is struck, when the whole matter can be considered.

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall be most happy to accede to the request of the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This disposition of the matter will exactly suit my views. I had thought, however, of saying a few words on the portion of the Bill which was not discussed when we were in committee before, and, with the permission of the committee, I will deal very briefly with the portion after subsection 'L.' The Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) raised the objection to some portions of the Bill previously discussed that it was merely a repetition, in point of

fact, of provisions already contained in the election law. I shall not refer to that now, as we are not to take final action on the Bill at the present time. Subsection 'L' is designed to deal with the question of political assessments, an evil which has not attained any great magnitude in Canada, but has become a very great evil in the United States, a method which was most effectual in securing election funds, but which inflicted great hardship upon civil service employees. This subsection puts this offence in the same category as the others, and makes the offender subject to fine and imprisonment. At the conclusion of subsection 1, after subsection 'L,' provisions are made with regard to punishment and the provisions of the law in that respect are changed. All of these offences--and subsection 112 is embodied in this list of offences—are made punishable by a maximum term of two years' imprisonment, and a fine of $500. The penalty is within the discretion of the trial judge. Of course there will be varying degrees of turpitude and variations of guilt in connection with these matters ; and, it must be, I imagine, left to the discretion of the judge. It is the intention of the law that the fine shall be, either entirely or in part payable to the informer ; and reliance is placed upon this feature of the Bill to secure information and put an end to this nefarious system of corruption by purchase of votes. I think that, perhaps the most important feature of the Bill, the feature that we may most rely upon to end these practices, is section 108a. This is copied, I may say, from the penal code of the state of New York. In that state, many years ago, the evil of bribery of electors was a very great one, and good men there at that time, as good men now in Canada, felt that it was an evil that must in some way be coped with and stamped out. It was found very difficult to reach it. Finally, this provision was adopted, making it the right of any person to inform, and placing before that person the inducement to inform of sharing the fine. When the information is laid, any person can be subpœnaed, and testimony given by the informer, or by any witness, exonerates the person giving it from all legal proceedings. He can plead the evidence given in this regard as a bar to indictment or proceedings at any time in the future. The operation of this section is to place every man who is handling election funds and buying voters, at the mercy of the scalawags and electoral prostitutes with whom he deals ; and the business is so perilous that no man of common sense will engage in it. It has put an end, in the state of New York to this practice. In contrast with this condition of things in the state of New York is the condition existing in some of the smaller states, where no law of this nature exists. I noticed the other day an article in one of the American magazines upon political corruption in the state of Rhode Island. There are no laws there for the suppression of bribery, and bribery has become so general that it is deemed by a very large proportion, probably more than half the voters in the state, a legitimate and welcome source of revenue. And public opinion is so strong in favour of the practice that it would be worth a minister's position as pastor to denounce it from the pulpit. On one occasion in the last election in the state of Rhode Island, at a place called North Smithfield, the 'floaters'—the floating vote—were manipulating and balancing for the highest bids from the managers of the two parties ; and, finally to settle the question, the whole batch was put up at auction at a place near the steps of the city hall and bid off at $25 a head. The price received by the voters in Rhode Island, I think, has been exceeded by some in Canada at some of the late elections. We have not arrived at the stage where a public auction of votes is held, but we have private competition which is as effective. The tendency of things in this country is rapidly approaching that position when public virtue, the sense of the sanctity of the ballot and the deep obligation resting upon the citizens in the exercise of the franchise will be dissipated and gone. We require some legislation in this country, some method by which an end may be put to this practice ; and I rely upon this section 108a to accomplish this work perfectly. In addition to this, we must have better provisions for enforcing the law. It ought not want to be as expensive as it is now. The probability is that the committee that is to be struck may decide upon some official to act as public prosecutor in the ridings, whose business it will be to look after violations of the electoral law and acts of electoral corruption, in which case the law will be in such a shape that justice can be speedily administered, and we will get rid of the mockery of saw-offs and all these arrangements which make a mockery of the law with regard to electoral corruption. I shall not detain the House further in a discussion of this question than to again express my belief that the section incorporated here from the penal code of the state of New York, looking at the effect it has had there, will be surely effectual in putting an end to this practice.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he has adopted some penal clause of the election Act of New York

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, I will read it to the hon. gentleman. It is copied from the Penal Code of New York.

A person offending against any provision of the next preceding section of this Act——

That is, a provision against the purchase or sale of votes.

—is a competent witness against another person so offending, and may be compelled to attend and testify on any trial, hearing, proceeding, or investigation in the same manner as any other person. The testimony so given shall not be used in any prosecution or proceeding, civil, or criminal against the person testifying. A person testifying shall not therefore be liable to indictment, prosecution or punishment for the offence with reference to which his testimony was given, and may plead or prove the giving of testimony accordingly in bar of such indictment or prosecution.

Now, they have had several years experience of this law in the state of New York, and the result of it in practice is that that class of persons who handle the funds to purchase voters lay themselves absolutely at the mercy of that conscienceless class of men with whom they deal. There is no statute of limitation to one year or three years, it is an offence that never outlaws.

Mr. FRASER. Does not the hon. gentlemen think that there ought to be a correlative punishment, and that the man who took the bribe should be punished as well as the man who gives it ?

Mr. CHARLTON. The man who takes the bribe is equally liable to punishment, unless he happens to be in the category of persons turning state's evidence.

Mr. FRASER. I thought he said the man who took a bribe might go and lay the information and go scott free.

Mr. CHARLTON. Any person that has taken a bribe or given a bribe is liable to punishment.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood that in the Weldon Act, which was embodied in our Election Act, the party who took the bribe was liable to a punishment as severe as the man who gave it. I do not understand that he could go into court after the lapse of time and make a prosecution.

Mr. CHARLTON. The section as it stands leaves the matter open for any person who has offended in any particular against the law, either by paying bribes or receiving bribes, any person who has violated the law, to enter a prosecution and give evidence. However, those are matters of detail to be looked into after we come to the consideration of the Bill. I do not know what the intention of the government is, whether it will strike a committee now or to do so after the Easter recess. But I desire to express my concurrence with the views expressed by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Finance as to the method the government deems proper to adopt in dealing with this question.

Progress reported.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Statement showing the amount expended each year since the 30th June, 1890, on public works of all kinds in Toronto, including Toronto harbour ; showing the nature of each class of work in respect of which such expenditure has been made.—Mr. Grant.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I move that the House do now adjourn. If it is convenient for my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I intend, when the House resumes next Tuesday, to take up the Redistribution Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that will be quite convenient.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 14, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Thompson (Haldimand and Monck).

Bill (No. 97) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons—

I thank you for the Address which you have adopted in reply to the Speech with which I opened the session of parliament.

Government House,
Ottawa, 11th April, 1903.

THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring before the House a matter of public importance, and in order to put myself in order I shall conclude with a motion. The matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House, and especially of the right hon. gentleman, the Prime Minister, is the serious condition of his honour the Lieutenant Governor of On-

tario. I have already brought this matter before this House, and my motives have been impugned. Hon. gentlemen opposite, by their derisive cheers, certainly impugn my motives now. It may be that I am wrong. It may be that I am doing something improper, or that I am lacking in good taste. But on this I take issue with hon. gentlemen opposite. I am here in the public interest and to speak for the people of my own province. A great political crisis is existing in Ontario to-day. The lieutenant governor of that province is unable to discharge the duties of his office. That statement I made some weeks ago. What I said then was true, and according to the news of yesterday, I can make that statement with still greater force to-day. I have not the slightest intention of reflecting on the venerable old man who occupies the position of Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. He is venerated in this country from one end of it to the other. But we have a constitution, and under it there is a constitutional duty which should, in the circumstances, be performed. I am one of those who believe that in our system of government, the representative of the Crown is no figure-head. The ministers of the Crown are responsible to him as the representative of the Crown. Their political conduct is subject to his revision. In view of the situation existing to-day in the province of Ontario, I believe that we ought to have a lieutenant governor in office there competent to discharge his duties. I say this purely from the constitutional point of view, and I ask the right hon. gentleman, the Prime Minister, what the government intend doing, in view of the situation existing in Toronto, with regard to the office of lieutenant governor. In one of the evening newspapers published in Toronto, I find this statement last evening:

> It is very probable that the patent to Chief Justice Moss to act as administrator, with power to give assent to Bills, will be immediately amended to give him power to perform the other duties of the officer, sign lieutenant governor's warrants, &c. Sir Oliver had all official documents signed up to Saturday last, but there are some now waiting for signature, and delay will prove a considerable inconvenience to the government.

I believe that this describes the actual situation. The lieutenant governor is unable to discharge his duties and a serious political crisis exists. The constitutional duty, therefore, devolves on hon. gentlemen opposite of living up to the constitution and seeing that it is properly administered. And, out of respect—and purely out of respect—for the constitution and of the duties of the government, as I view them, I ask the Prime Minister to take the House into his confidence, and especially to take the province of Ontario into his confidence, and tell us what he intends to do in the matter. Of course hon. gentlemen opposite have taken the position—at least some of them have—that the lieutenant governor is simply a rubber stamp. If that is the case, he being their representative, they assume his duties. They are entitled to do so, but if they do so, it is their duty to see to it that there is a lieutenant governor fully able and competent to discharge the duties of the office.

In conclusion, I have only this to say—in no way do I desire to reflect on the venerable old man who is now Lieutenant Governor of Ontario; but simply out of regard for the public interest do I raise this question. If hon. gentlemen opposite continue to make charges that I am doing this from political considerations or that my words are in bad taste, I can only tell them that a countercharge is liable to be made, that countercharge being to the effect that men in office whose conduct is called in question before the country are sheltering themselves behind the infirmities of the venerable old man in a high position. I do not wish to make that charge; and I do not think it will be made in the country if the government discharges its political responsibilities in this matter. I move that this House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have nothing to add to what I said a few days ago to my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) upon a statement similar to that which he has made to-day, which he then thought it his duty to bring to the attention of the House. At that time I told my hon. friend that if he had given me notice of his intention to bring this matter forward, I would have been able to produce a letter from Sir Oliver Mowat wherein he informs me that he is quite able and competent to discharge the duties of his office. My hon. friend has given Sir Oliver Mowat a character which we are all happy to find in my hon. friend's mouth, for it is in the mouth of everybody else. As he has voluntarily paid this tribute to Sir Oliver Mowat, I think he will, from henceforth, be satisfied to leave this matter alone until such time as we have information from Sir Oliver Mowat himself that he does not feel equal to the discharge of the duties with which he is intrusted. Sir Oliver Mowat yesterday met with a painful accident, but that is no reason for bringing this matter to the attention of the House to-day. When Sir Oliver Mowat who, as my hon. friend himself admits, is a man of exceeding candour, respectable in every possible way, informs the government that he no longer feels equal to the discharge of the duties of his office, the government will feel called upon to appoint his successor, and not until then.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I respectfully submit that the answer given by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will hardly be satisfactory to the country. If we are to believe the information contained in the newspapers yesterday concerning the lieutenant governor, the

venerable old gentleman, who has reached the ripe old age of eighty-three years, accidently, in getting into bed or falling out of bed, we are not informed which, fractured his thigh bone. Now, if this accident happened in so simple a way and without some more especial reason than appears in the information given to the public, I can only conclude that the infirmities of age have crept upon him to a great degree and that he is very feeble. If he is physically so feeble, he must be mentally feeble as well. The hon. premier tells us: When I am informed by the lieutenant governor himself that he is unable to discharge the duties of his office I shall be prepared to act. But if the infirmities of age have so affected the lieutenant governor that he is not in possession of his mental faculties as well as of his physical powers, he is incapable of giving that information. To a medical man the premier's position is most unreasonable. If the information is correct that we get from other sources—and I am rather inclined to believe it is—that it is largely because of the infirmities of age that the lieutenant governor is physically and mentally in that condition, he cannot be expected to perform his important duties satisfactorily as a representative of the Crown. To say that the premier will act only when he is instructed by the lieutenant governor himself that he is no longer able to discharge the duties of his office is to give the country an assurance with which it will not be satisfied. If he had said that he would act when he received such information from the responsible ministers of the Crown acting under the lieutenant governor, or from some other source of that kind, his answer would be much more satisfactory. But I repeat what—as a medical man I said the other day—that a man is not always the best judge of his own infirmities when he reaches the period of life attained by the lieutenant governor.

Motion (Mr. Maclean) negatived.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 66) to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it well, before this motion carries, to call to the attention of my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) one or two points respecting the character of this Bill concerning which, it seems to me, there is some misapprehension in the country, and, possibly, in the mind of my right hon. friend. The exact meaning of the Bill may not be quite understood.

We were told by the Prime Minister on the first reading of the Bill, that this proposal is the same as that which was made in Great Britain in 1884. I wish to point out to the House that what was proposed in Great Britain in 1884, was something entirely different. In saying so I do not put it by way of criticism on the present action of the government nor do I say now that what the government has proposed is lacking in fairness. I simply want to have in the mind of the House and of the country a clear idea of what the position of the government is at the present time. In 1884, in the British House, there was a conference between the political parties before the Bill was introduced at all. The conference was not a formal one; the members were not appointed by the House and had no duty of reporting to the House. Their work was altogether of an informal character. It was, in fact, a conference between the two political parties. Mr. Mills, now Mr. Justice Mills, who was in this House in 1892 made that very clear in his remarks. He said, referring to the British measure:

> The measure was submitted to parliament after the leaders of the two parties had agreed upon it. . . . The English government entered into a conference with their political opponents on the character of a measure which they were to submit to parliament, and to assume the responsibility for, and that was done prior to the submission of the Bill to parliament for discussion.

In the Annual Register which was referred to at that time there is a history of the introduction of the English measure which makes this abundantly clear. This history can be found at pages 252 and 253 of the Annual Register of 1884—at page 252 we find:

> During the next fortnight——

—that is while the conference was going on—

> —the process of arrangement was steadily pursued. Lord Salisbury and Sir S. Northcote attended the meetings of the cabinet, and conducted the negotiations with the specially selected delegates of that body. Naturally there were rumours of misunderstandings more or less serious, but as time wore on, it was clear, from the public utterances of those in a position to know the real facts, that the basis of the compromise was never in jeopardy, and that the ultimate decision on all questions of detail would have to be left to parliament.

And then, at page 253 it is said:

> At length after a week's adjournment, both Houses reassembled, and Mr. Gladstone, in a very brief speech altogether without rhetorical display and sympathetic enthusiasm, presented to the House of Commons the results of the negotiations, and moved for leave to bring in a Bill dealing with the most crucial party rights and susceptibilities which had been settled outside the arena of parliamentary conflict.

There is another fact which I would like to point out to my right hon. friend, and it is this—the conference of 1884 in Great Britain simply settled the principles to be applied in the work of redistribution, and left those principles to be carried out in the delimitation of the constituencies by a boun-

dary commission. A boundary commission was appointed, composed of eminent men, including among its members several officers of the Royal Engineers whose technical knowledge was supposed to be valuable in such work. It is true that the Bill provided that in Yorkshire, Glasgow, Birmingham and other large boroughs, a certain number of members should be allowed, just as our constitution allows a certain proportion of members for Ontario, Nova Scotia and the other provinces. But, except for this, the entire work of the delimitation of the constitutencies was left to the commission. Moreover, the present proposition does not seem in line with the position taken by my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in 1882. His motion on that occasion, to which he has drawn attention is as follows :

That Bill (No. 76) an Act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons be referred to a conference or committee to be composed of both political parties, to agree upon the lines or principles on which a Redistribution Bill should be drawn.

My right hon. friend was more in line with the English precedent at that time than he is at the present time, because his proposal then was that a committee should be appointed composed of both political parties to agree upon the lines or principles upon which a redistribution Bill should be drawn. I may say that that motion as interpreted by a prominent member of his own party, now Mr. Justice Davies, of the Supreme Court, was understood to be a motion that the committee should merely settle the lines or principles, and should leave it to the House to settle the boundaries of the constituencies themselves ; because Mr. Davies, in speaking on the second reading of the Bill, and speaking after my right hon. friend, used the following language :

My hon. friend's motion is based exactly upon that section of the constitution.

I may say in passing, that Mr. Davies was arguing very strenuously that parliament itself had no right to delimit the constituencies, but that that duty should be imposed by parliament upon some independent body. So Mr. Davies continued :

He says——

That is referring to my right hon. friend, then the leader of the opposition.

He says let us come together now and agree upon these lines, and when we are agreed upon the lines and upon the manner, then let us legislate and enact a law, and when we have carried the principle into law, let us appoint the authorities who are to apply the principles to the condition of the country and carry them out. I say that in principle, and from historic precedents, and by the legal construction of the British North America Act, this proposition of the leader of the opposition is one which I think must commend itself to the minds, at any rate, of the legal members of the House. I cannot see, based as it is upon justice and equality, how it can fail to commend itself not only to the sense of fair play, but to the common sense of all the members of this House.

Then I would like to point out to my right hon. friend that his present proposition is not in line with the view which he took in 1899, for he then said :

Whenever a county has to be divided into ridings, whenever a county which up to that time is entitled to one member, becomes entitled to two or three members, the division should take place by judicial decision and authority.

That is the second principle upon which he based the Bill that he then introduced to the House.

Therefore I submit with all deference to the Prime Minister that the proposal which is now before the House is not the same as the English proposal of 1884, it is not the same as the proposal of the right hon. gentleman in 1892, and it is not the same as the proposal of the right hon. gentleman in 1899. However, it must be admitted, Mr. Speaker, that it does not at all follow that this is not a perfectly fair proposition. All I am desirous of pointing out at the present time is that it is not any one of the proposals which have been made on the three occasions to which I have referred.

Well, what have we to say about the Bill which is before us ? In the first place, I may say a word to those who have thought it remarkable that the members of the Conservative party have not burst out into a chorus of congratulation to the government upon the introduction of this Bill. I want to point out to my right hon. friend that one very good reason why we should restrain our congratulations at the present time is that we have not the real Bill before us. As was well said by Mr. McCarthy in 1892, the whole force, the whole vitality of a Bill of this character is to be found in the details. Now we have the mere skeleton of a Bill at the present time, we have nothing except the bare formal parts of the Bill, and we are not prepared to pronounce any opinion at all upon that which we have not yet seen. I admit that a government desiring to introduce a perfectly fair Redistribution Bill—and I accept in the fullest sense my right hon. friend's assurance of that desire—I say that a government desirous of introducing the fairest possible Redistribution Bill, might adopt this course : and I say also that a government which desired to introduce a Bill that was not fair in the ordinary sense of the term, might adopt exactly the same course, and place before the proposed committee schedules which might just as well have been attached to the Bill itself. I am not suggesting that that is the intention of the government, but I am pointing out that at the present time we have not in the Bill anything but a mere skeleton, and we do not know whether the proposal of the government will be a fair

one or an unfair one until their proposal has been placed before the committee, and we have had an opportunity of judging.

Now, I think what I have said was emphasized in a very striking manner by Mr. McCarthy in 1892. In referring to the proposal made at that time by my right hon. friend he said :

> Even if there had been a conference in that way I do not see what particular benefit could have resulted because the conference, representing as it was suggested it should, the majority and the minority according to numbers in this House, would, unless they agreed, have merely reproduced the scheme of the majority. It would merely have reproduced the scheme which the government have now presented and which this House, representing in the same way the same proportion of numbers, will ultimately adopt.

That is the criticism which I would make upon this proposal in so far as it contemplates a conference or committee. If it is intended to produce an agreement such as was arrived at in 1884, if it is proposed to adopt the same principle which was acted on by the English government at that time, it seems to me that the proposal of my right hon. friend should have been a proposal for a committee composed of an equal number of members from each side, a proposal which would not reflect the numerical strength of either party in this House, instead of the present one which in the end must merely result, or might merely result in reproducing to the House the scheme of the majority, as Mr. McCarthy remarked in 1892. Now my right hon. friend has assured me that no schedules or maps have been prepared, or at least that they have not been finally prepared. Of course we have heard a great many rumours to the contrary, some of these rumours appear to be well founded ; but again I say I accept, as far as my right hon. friend is concerned, in the fullest sense his assurance, nor am I making any reservation in a parliamentary sense.

Now there is another observation I would make, which is that no principle whatever has been announced by my right hon. friend in introducing this Bill, beyond this. He says :

> The guiding principle in this redistribution should be that county boundaries should be preserved, that the municipal representation of the county ought to be the basis of the parliamentary representation.

My right hon. friend has not made any reference whatever to equality of population, although he laid a good deal of stress upon that in his speech of 1892. I would like to point out to him that in Great Britain in 1884 very full rules were laid down, and among them were these : In the first place equality of population ; in the next place retaining in the divisions any particular portion of the population which was of an urban character, that is in the divisions of boroughs ; in the third place, compactness of divisions with respect to geographical position ; in the fourth place, community of interests. I think some of those, at least, require to be regarded to a considerable extent in the work of the committee, and perhaps it would have been better if my right hon. friend had introduced some of these principles into this Bill or into his speech.

There is another principle which was laid down by my right hon. friend in 1892, and to which I would invite his attention now. In speaking upon the second reading of the Bill at that time, he said :

> What I propose to the sense of justice and every man in this House is that this application of the law should be made in such a manner that both parties shall remain with the same advantage they now possess.

I am not at all clear how it would be possible to work out a principle of that kind in framing schedules for a Bill of this character, but at all events it is a principle upon which my right hon. friend very strongly relied in 1892, and it is one which it is proper for me now to bring to his attention.

Now, I have one more remark, and it is in respect of the criticism which my right hon. friend made of the Act of 1892. In speaking on the first reading of this Bill, he named forty-two constituencies in the province of Ontario which, he said, had elected twenty-five Conservatives and only seventeen Liberals, and notwithstanding that fact, the vote for the seventeen Liberals was greater in number than the vote for the twenty-five Conservatives. My right hon. friend seems to regard that as a complete argument to show that the Bill of 1892 was unfair to the Liberal party. Well, now, I have been furnished with a list of certain constituencies in the province of Ontario which produce an exactly opposite result. Take the constituencies of West Bruce, South Brant, South Essex, Glengarry, Haldimand, East Huron, West Huron, South Huron, Kingston, West Lambton, West Middlesex, South Middlesex, West Northumberland, South Ontario, West Ontario, Ottawa, South Oxford, South Perth, East Peterborough, Prescott, North Renfrew, South Renfrew, North Simcoe, Wentworth and Brant, North York—Here you have twenty-five constituencies with a popular vote for the Liberal party of 52,098 which returned twenty-five Liberal members at the last general election. Now, take seventeen Conservative constituencies which returned Conservatives at the last general election. Cornwall and Stormont, East Elgin, East Grey, Hamilton, Hamilton, Middlesex East, East Toronto, West Toronto, Centre Toronto, East York, West York, East Lambton, Lincoln and Niagara, Muskoka and Parry Sound, North Perth, East Simcoe, South Waterloo—Here you have constituencies which returned seventeen Conservatives by a popular vote of 53,962, or some 1,900 more than the total number of votes cast for twenty-five Liberal members.

Where I have dealt with constituencies like Ottawa, or, like West Toronto which returned two members I have taken half the vote for the successful Conservative candidates which I think is a very fair way to do. Let me also point out to my right hon. friend the result in his own province. He was very strong in the position he took that the Bill of 1892 was unfair to the province of Quebec. He dwelt on that to the extent of two or three columns of 'Hansard.' I do not think that my right hon. friend, looking at the result in his own province to-day, can fairly regard it as a gerrymander in the interest of the Conservative party at least. I have been looking at the figures and I find that in the province of Quebec at the last general election the popular Liberal vote was 133,121 and that fifty-eight Liberal members were returned while the popular Conservative vote was 104,522 and that seven Conservative members were returned. Each Liberal member represents on an everage 2,300 Liberal electors while each Conservative member represents on an average 15,000 Conservative electors. I think my right hon. friend will not be inclined to rely upon the position he took in 1892 when he regarded the province of Quebec as having been gerrymandered in the Conservative interest.

There is another matter I would like to bring to the attention of the House and it is this. My right hon. friend has not said a word about the very important legal point which was raised by two of his colleagues in 1892—Mr. Davies and Mr. Mills. These were very eminent men in their profession, so eminent that they have since been appointed by this government to positions on the bench of the highest court of appeal in this country and both of these gentlemen, in 1892, laid down the position unequivocally, stating that they had no doubt upon it, that parliament was not competent to do this work at all, that it must appoint an independent authority to deal with the subject. I shall not weary the House by reading from their speeches but any hon. gentleman who has paid any attention to the debate of 1892 knows that what I say is absolutely correct, Mr. Davies as well as Mr. Mills professed himself to be without any doubt whatever on the subject, and on the Conservative side of the House, the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy, a gentleman very eminent in his profession, none more eminent in Canada at that time, professed himself to be in agreement with Mr. Mills and Mr. Davies. Now, under these circumstances, would it not be worth the attention of the government to consider whether or not that point should be referred to the Supreme Court for their decision. That is not a point that can be laughed out of court when we have in support of it Mr. Davies, now a judge of the Supreme Court, the highest court of the country, Mr. Mills an eminent constitutional lawyer, now occupying a seat on the bench and when we have also in support of it the opinion of the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy. It is something that you will not dismiss with a smile, I imagine, it is something that you will not dismiss with a shrug or a laugh, it is something that you will regard as serious when gentlemen of the standing and ability of the three gentlemen I have named have taken the position which these gentlemen did take in the House of Commons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter about which I would like to say a word and it is in regard to the legal question which I drew to the attention of the House on the first reading of this Bill. I have been very kindly favoured by the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) with a copy of the memo. which he presented to council and I am bound to say that I think he has with his usual ability made the very best possible case that he could for the position of those who think that there is no ground for the contention which has been raised by the law officers of the Crown for the province of New Brunswick. I have had a great deal of doubt in my own mind as to what the true answer to the question is. At one time when I first examined the question, I was very strongly impressed with the opinion which has been given by the hon. Minister of Justice although I reached the conclusion by a somewhat different mode of reasoning. It seemed to me, looking at the provisions of sections three and four of the British North America Act that you might say that Canada was as much constituted under the British North America Act when it had seven provinces as when it had four. That at first blush seemed to be the true solution of the case for the reason that the Dominion of Canada was not formally constituted by the British North America Act, but it was constituted under the British North America Act by the Queen's proclamation, and inasmuch as section three gave power to the Queen to proclaim the four provinces to be one union and as section 146 gave power to the Queen, upon certain conditions precedent having been complied with, to make a similar proclamation in regard to other of Her Majesty's colonies in North America I was inclined to think at first that the words 'as constituted under this Act' in section four would be just as much applicable to Canada at the present time as they were in 1867. I do not say that there is not some force in that answer to the argument which has been put forward by the law officers of the province of New Brunswick. But, let us look at the preamble of the British North America Act, which is as follows :—

Whereas, the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom :

And whereas such a union would conduce to the welfare of the provinces and promote the interests of the British empire;

And whereas on the establishment of the union by authority of parliament it is expedient, not only that the constitution of the legislative authority in the Dominion be provided for, but also that the nature of the executive government therein be declared;

And whereas it is expedient that provision be made for the eventual admission into the union of other parts of British North America.

Then follows the enacting part. Then, in section four provides:

The subsequent provisions of this Act shall, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, commence and have effect on and after the union, that is to say, on and after the day appointed for the union taking effect in the Queen's proclamation; and in the same provisions, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, the name Canada shall be taken to mean Canada as constituted under this Act.

That is rather an important provision it seems to me which is contained in the first part of section four. The subsequent provisions of this Act are to 'commence and have effect on and after the union' and it seems to me that the expression gives a certain key as to whether or not you are to regard the words 'Canada as constituted under this Act' as having the meaning which I have already indicated. Now, another important section is section eight to which I think attention was not drawn upon the first reading of the Bill.

In the general census of the population of Canada which is hereby required to be taken in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and in every tenth year thereafter, the respective populations of the four provinces shall be distinguished.

I would rather be inclined to think that there is ground for the contention taken by the law officers of the province of New Brunswick—I understand this to be their argument—that Canada as constituted under this Act meant in the first place the four original provinces, or rather the three original provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and not Canada as it might be constituted from time to time. If you once grant that, it seems to me that a very serious question arises. I am not insensible of the force of the argument which might be and which has been made by the hon. Minister of Justice, and it seems that he has overlooked one point to which he might have drawn attention and that is that the words 'parliament of Canada' at the commencement of section fifty-one must obviously mean Canada as constituted from time to time, because it is the parliament of Canada as constituted from time to time that must make these provisions. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has in his memo. gone very fully into the question of the statutes and the addresses, and in particular he has referred to the imperial legislation following the admission of Manitoba into the union. The hon. gentleman places very great stress indeed upon the statute which deals with the province of Manitoba. He says:

The terms of union and the Manitoba Act are to be looked upon and construed as in effect imperial Acts amending the British North America Act, 1867. It will be observed that in each of them it is provided that the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, except these answering a certain description which section 51 does not answer, shall be applicable to the new province in the same way and to the same extent as they apply to the other provinces of the Dominion, and as if the new provinces had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

Of course, one can see at once the force of that argument, but it does not seem to me to be as conclusive as the Minister of Justice supposes, because it might possibly be that the new provinces must be compared with the total population of Canada for the purpose of regulating their representation, and yet it would not necessarily follow that the very distinct language contained in section 51 must be so modified so far as the other four provinces are concerned. That seems to me to be the whole crux of the argument of the Minister of Justice. If you once concede that 'Canada' in section 51 means 'Canada' as it was originally constituted, then that section being regarded in the light of a treaty between the four provinces—in fact the whole Act must be regarded in the light of a treaty between the four provinces—you must have something very distinct indeed in any subsequent statutes or addresses if you are to modify the language of that section. I do not know that I would be inclined to go so far as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, in holding that you do find what is sufficient for that purpose in the addresses and the statutes to which he has called attention. Indeed, I do not observe anything in the memo. of the Minister of Justice which indicates his reasons for supposing that the population of the Territories must be taken into consideration—I do not know whether the Minister of Justice goes so far as to hold that the population of the Territories ought be taken into consideration.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It ought not to be.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend thinks that it ought not to be.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Whether it is or not, it does not affect the result.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not know whether it affected the result or not.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is a question that ought be considered some time; it must be considered.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree that it is a question which ought be considered some time; not only so far as the Territories are concerned, but I think so far as Canada is concerned. Even if the argument of the

Minister of Justice were more convincing to me than it is—and I am bound to say that I appreciate its weight—nevertheless we have on the other hand the opinion of the law officers of the province of New Brunswick, and all who are acquainted with the Attorney General of New Brunswick (Hon. Wm. Pugsley), and all who have met him at the bar, realize and recognize his eminence in the legal profession. Therefore, so long as there is a question with regard to it, I think it would be right that it should be submitted to the Supreme Court. It ought to be submitted not only to the Supreme Court, but it seems to me necessary or at least desirable that provision should also be made for having the opinion of the Privy Council upon the question. I say that for this reason: Suppose the parliament of Canada should pass this Act in its present form, and a question should afterwards be raised—and it may be raised before the courts—as to whether this parliament had jurisdiction, and the case so raised should go not only to the Supreme Court of Canada, but to the Privy Council, a very awkward condition of affairs may come to pass. It seems to me that it would be impossible to separate in such an Act as this, that portion which upon the assumption that I have made, would be good, and that portion which would be bad. May I make my meaning a little plainer—I am trying to address myself more particularly to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. Here is a statute which undoubtedly contains provisions which this parliament may pass—there can be no doubt that we can deal with the revision of constituencies throughout Canada. While that revision or redistribution of constituencies throughout Canada is part of the statute, it contains, let us say, a provision which is absolutely ultra vires of this parliament; namely, the reduction of the representation of Ontario to eighty-six and the reduction of the representation of the other provinces by one or two members. In construing a statute of that kind it may be held by the court eventually: That not only that portion which deals with the representation of the province of Ontario is bad, but the whole is bad, because the two things are so much dependent on each other and so absolutely joined together in the Act, that you cannot separate in it that portion which is good from that portion which is bad. Therefore, it seems to me that we should have an adjudication upon this question and we should not only have the adjudication of the Supreme Court of Canada upon it, but we should also have the adjudication of the Privy Council by way of appeal as well.

I do not desire, Mr. Speaker, to detain the House further. There is, however, one matter which I forgot to mention and which I know has impressed itself upon the mind of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice: That is the fact which seems to have been taken for granted in 1892: That British Columbia came into the union under such conditions that her representation although it may be increased cannot be decreased. It would seem to me that this is quite as incongruous as to the point to which the Minister of Justice has referred; namely, that under the contention which he controverts certain provinces in Canada are to have their representation increased or diminished according to the population of four provinces and not the population of the whole of Canada, while so far as the rest of Canada is concerned the representation of the different provinces is dependent, not upon the population of the four provinces, but upon the population of all the provinces of Canada. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a wise course for the government to have that question, which has been raised by the province of New Brunswick, submitted to the courts; and not only to have it submitted to the Supreme Court but to have the question determined by the highest court of appeal to which any judicial matter can be carried in this country.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am happy that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and I have been able to agree on so many things, even if we cannot agree on everything. It was not to be expected that we should have an absolute love feast and that we should see eye to eye on every question, but on the whole I am glad that the Bill has received the approval of my hon. friend, and that we shall have his concurrence in making it as perfect as possible and as fair between party and party as it is possible to make it. I have a brief reference to make to one or two observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden). He has referred to the view held at one time in this House by two eminent friends and subsequent colleagues of mine, then Mr. Louis H. Davies and Mr. David Mills, both of whom are now members of the Supreme Court. I remember very well the occasion upon which these two gentlemen strongly expressed the view that the parliament of Canada was not competent to deal with the Redistribution Act, but that the parliament of Canada could create—not only that it could create but that it should create—a power to make the redistribution although it could not do the work itself. This view was held by these two gentlemen and it was strongly supported, but as my hon. friend knows this view was not generally accepted. I do not notice that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) himself expresses an opinion, and he no doubt has one, upon this question. Whatever may be his view I shall not press to know it at the moment, but I will point out that the government thought that upon this question, though perhaps the question may not be free from doubt—I would not go so far as that probably—though the contrary view is held by eminent authorities, we thought the safest course was to follow the practice which has hitherto

been accepted and have the redistribution made by parliament itself. I have no doubt that parliament can create a power to do the redistribution, but the power is also vested in parliament, and all governments up to the present time have interpreted it in that way. I believe it was more in accordance with the public interpretation of popular government to have that supreme power carried into effect by parliament itself. The other question to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has referred is a far more serious one; namely, the method of counting the votes and distributing them. My hon. friend has stated, and rightly stated, that upon this point we are absolutely bound by the British North America Act; we are not at liberty to assign so much to this province or so much to the other province; we must follow the results of the census, according to the terms laid down in the British North America Act. But there can be a way of counting the votes and ascertaining that proportion. We have received a very strong appeal from some of the provinces, particularly from the province of New Brunswick, and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has taken the precaution to have this matter referred to the Supreme Court and to have as speedy a decision as possible. Whether or not it would be advisable to carry it to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a matter on which it is premature to pronounce. I suppose that in this we will be guided very much by the judgment of the Supreme Court. If that judgment be of such a character as to leave no doubt, either one way or the other, there would be no necessity to push the matter further. Perhaps it may be advisable to do so, but the government are not prepared to decide that point definitely at present. My hon. colleague the Minister of Justice, has taken steps to have the matter referred to the Supreme Court and have a decision as speedily as possible, and I hope that in a few weeks we will be able to announce that decision.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). In rising to make a few comments on the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my entire accord in the remarks of my hon. leader, when he said that he accepted the statements of the right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, as unreservedly as they were made. I sincerely believe that the right hon. gentleman intends by the Bill before the House to give the people a fair redistribution measure, and speaking for myself, I say in all sincerity, that when the right hon. gentleman's biography comes to be written —and I am sure it is gratifying to every hon. member on both sides to realize that that day is apparently growing daily more remote—the brightest page in that biography will be that one on which is recorded the promise of the right hon. gentleman to give this House and country a fair measure of redistribution. But while expressing my appreciation of the intentions of the right hon. the leader of this House, it seems to me that the time is inopportune for the passing of such a measure as that submitted to us. The right hon. gentleman has pointed out that the government has decided to submit to the Supreme Court a reference on the question raised as to our right to reduce the representation of any of the provinces. But practically what difference can there be in submitting the case to the Supreme Court, and submitting it to a board composed of county court judges, other than the intrinsic merits and abilities of the members of the respective courts? We know that if legislation be based on the decision of the Supreme Court and if the constitutionality of that legislation be disputed before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that body would be in no way bound by the decision of the Supreme Court. In a matter of such importance, not only as affecting the present, but as laying down a precedent and doctrine for future redistributions, it seems to me that the least the government should do would be to obtain the best opinion possible in order that in whatever we may do, we may be acting on no uncertain ground, and have every assurance that our legislation will be unassailable. I do not intend to argue that the construction of the British North America Act given by the government is wrong, although my own opinion would lead me to that conclusion. But I do not take this ground because, in the first place, it is not necessary for the argument I intend making. What I wish to point out is that if it be doubtful that this House has a right to reduce the representation of any of the provinces, if nobody can say with certainty that we have the power to pass such legislation, we ought certainly to obtain the most authoritative opinion we can before proceeding to pass any enactment. In the second place, I do not propose to argue that the government is wrong in its contention, for if I were to do so, I would be submitting to this House an argument which would be more properly made in a court of law, as this House is not so constituted as to be the proper forum before which to argue an intricate question of law. I would prefer that such a question should be argued before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

On looking through the written opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice, and speaking with all deference to his high legal attainments, if I can find statements of fact in that opinion which are inaccurate quotations of law that are erroneous if I can find arguments which are fallacious and other arguments which followed to their logical conclusion would bear out the contentions of the provinces, I think I will be justified in concluding that an opinion based on such data cannot be so clear and free from doubt as to warrant our passing an Act which later on might be declared invalid.

Looking at the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice, and without pretending to dissect it thoroughly, let me call attention to a few facts which may throw some light on the conclusion he has come to. On page 4 I find this sentence :

> The province of Manitoba has been carved out of Rupert's Land by legislation of the parliament of Canada, which also, by virtue of provision of the British North America Act, 1867, has practically the force and effect of an imperial statute.

That is a statement with regard to an important fact. But is it a fact that the province of Manitoba was carved out of Rupert's Land by legislation of the Dominion of Canada ? I find in Hodgins on Dominion and Provincial Legislation, page 9, that a predecessor of the hon. gentleman, the Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald, Minister of Justice of that day, in a report approved by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada in Council, on the 2nd of January, 1871, thus speaks of the question raised as to the power of parliament to pass an Act giving the new province the right to representation in the Senate and the House of Commons of the Dominion :

> The general purview of the British North America Act, 1867, seems to be confined to the three provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, originally forming the Dominion.

And on the strength of that and the other statements in this state paper, the Minister of Justice of that day came to the conclusion that inasmuch as it was doubtful whether the parliament of Canada had the power to carve out a province from Prince Rupert's Land, it was wise to have imperial legislation to legalize what the parliament of Canada had done.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And imperial legislation was passed.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Where then is the argument ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is this, that the imperial parliament, a year or two later, passed an Act to legalize what the parliament of Canada had done, and what the hon. gentleman says the parliament of Canada had a right to do without any imperial Act. If the statement be true that the parliament of Canada had the power to carve out the province of Manitoba from Rupert's Land, the Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald and the officers of the Crown of that day were wrong in applying for an imperial Act, and the imperial parliament and the law lords were wrong when they passed an Act of the statute to legalize what the Dominion had a right, of its own accord, to do without any imperial legislation.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But we are speaking of the present time. What was done at that time was legalized subsequently.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am speaking of the statement in the report of the hon. gentleman that the province of Manitoba had been carved out of Rupert's Land by legislation of the parliament of Canada. But on referring to the record, I find that while the parliament of Canada had attempted to do so, the Minister of Justice of that day doubted its power, and the imperial parliament passed a piece of legislation, which was not at all necessary except on the ground that the parliament of Canada had not the power to do what it professed to do. I am justified, therefore, in my contention that in an important statement of fact the hon. gentleman is not accurate, and that when he says that the province of Manitoba has been carved out of Rupert's Land by legislation of the parliament of Canada, he should have qualified that statement by pointing out that so doubtful was the power of parliament to do this considered, that an Act was passed by the imperial parliament to legalize what the Dominion parliament had done. Therefore, I submit that is not a fact on which the conclusion arrived at by the Minister of Justice can be based. Further in this report of the hon. Minister of Justice, he says, that British Columbia and Prince Edward Island came into the union under the same section 146 of the British North America Act, and that they were admitted into the union with practically equal rights. On page 6, these are the words he uses :

> Where new partners are admitted into the union with practically equal rights, one would expect to find the relation of the population of each province to that of the whole Dominion to govern this representation in the popular Chamber.

But as a matter of law is it the case that British Columbia and Prince Edward Island were admitted into the Dominion with practically equal rights ? In this very state paper of the hon. Minister of Justice I find on page 5 :

> British Columbia is entitled to be represented in the Senate by three and by six in the House of Commons, the representation to be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.

And I find that, according to the same paper, page 5 :

> The terms of union with Prince Edward Island contain a provision to precisely the same effect as clause 10 of the terms of union with British Columbia and the following provisions as to representation :—
>
> That the population of Prince Edward Island having increased by 15,000 or upwards since the year 1861, the island shall be represented in the House of Commons by six members ; the representation to be readjusted from time to time under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.

But in the case of British Columbia, the representation was to be, not readjusted, as in the case of Prince Edward Island, but increased. It will hardly lie in the mouth

of the hon. gentleman to say that the two expressions 'readjusted' and 'increased' are synonymous terms, because in 1892, when the last Redistribution Act was before the House, hon. members opposite, including the present leader of the government, admitted that under the terms of union, the representation of British Columbia could not be decreased below six. It was not contended then that the representation of Prince Edward Island could not be increased or decreased according to this method of readjustment. And therefore, Sir, we find that, as a matter of fact, as a matter of law, of the two provinces, both of which came in under orders in council, in the case of one it is guaranteed that the number of its members can never be less than six, while the other may be reduced to one or none. And yet, the Minister of Justice, in this report on so important a question, a report which if followed, may lead to a state of affairs never contemplated, and which never could be desired, says that these new provinces were admitted to the union with practically equal rights. I submit to this House could anybody on either side contend for a moment that when one province comes in with six members which number cannot be decreased, and another comes in with six members which can be decreased, it is not a mere abuse of language to say that the two provinces came in with equal rights ?

And I would refer to another part of the report of the Minister of Justice. At the beginning of his report he refers to the contention on the part of the parliament of New Brunswick that Canada under the 51st section, is Canada as originally constituted by the British North America Act, and he shows, on the other side, the contention which the government supports, that Canada means Canada as it exists to-day. We know what Canada means under the British North America Act—the original four provinces. And we know what Canada means as it exists to-day, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. And the difference between the province of New Brunswick on the one side and the Dominion of Canada on the other is which of these interpretations is correct. The fourth subsection of section 51 is the clause which is under discussion and concerning which the question arises whether it means Canada as it was constituted under the British North America Act, or Canada as it exists to-day. I find, in this statement of the Minister of Justice the clause which bears on this point and gives the information on it. He said :

> The terms of union and the Manitoba Act are to be looked upon and construed as in effect imperial Acts amending the British North America Act, 1867. It will be observed that, in each of them it is provided that the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, except those answering a certain description which section 51 does not answer shall be applicable to the new province——

And the words following are underlined :

> —in the same way and to the same extent as they apply to the other provinces of the Dominion, and as if the new province had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

And it goes on :

> Section 51 is also in each case specially declared to be applicable, subject to the exceptions which for the present purpose are immaterial.
>
> The words underlined——

Those to which I have just referred.

> —seem to dispose of the suggested view as to the construction of the Act as untenable. Suppose one of the colonies had been one of the provinces originally united, how must section 51 have then been read and construed. In the opening paragraph 'four provinces' would have been 'five provinces'; the word 'province' throughout the section would be applied to the supposed additional province as well as the other, and can it be doubted that the word 'can' in paragraph 4 would have included all five provinces.

So the hon. gentleman's argument is that as these provinces came in from time to time they became part of the Dominion on the same terms as did the original provinces, and therefore the British North America Act should be read, as each came in, as though it had been part of the Dominion when the British North America Act was passed. Then, let us see, this being admitted, how clause 5 of the British North America Act will read. Making the amendments necessary for the hon. gentleman's argument it would read as follows :

> Canada shall be divided into seven provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia.

I think the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) will admit that that is a fair reading of clause 5 of the British North America Act as amended by his argument, that as each new province came into the Dominion it acquired all the powers of the original provinces, and that the clauses of the Act were to be read as if it had been admitted as part of the Dominion originally. But this would make Canada consist only of the seven provinces enumerated. If I had not had the pleasure of meeting the hon. gentleman in the North-west Territories last fall, I would have thought that he was under the impression that a person stepped from Manitoba directly in to British Columbia. Under his argument, the North-west Territories form no part of the Dominion of Canada, for Canada consists only of the seven provinces. Under that argument, when we seek to find what each province should be arrayed against in order to calculate its representations, we find that it would be Ontario, or whatever other pro-

vince may be considered, against seven provinces, not against the Dominion of Canada. So, admitting for the purpose of argument—which I do not as a matter of fact—that the hon. gentleman's argument is correct, he has simply proved himself out of court, because he begins in the first page of his report to prove that Canada means Canada as it exists from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and he has proved that it means only the seven provinces, the territories not being included. So, when we seek to find against what part the representation of Ontario should be calculated, we find that it is only against seven provinces and not against the Dominion of Canada including the territories. What the practical effect of that would be I am not prepared to say. I do not know that it is material, for, in dealing with the law it is a question of right and wrong. However, I have had two calculations made showing the effect under each contention. Not being a mathematician, I cannot say whether they are right. But one calculation made by a competent person shows that, if the territories were excluded and Ontario were calculated against seven provinces, we should not have any reduction. The other made by a department in the city shows that, by a paltry decimal of twelve, Ontario would lose six seats, if the territories were brought into the calculation. While I believe the first figures to be correct, I am not going to commit myself to them. It is a question of the construction of the statute, and, if it does not affect us to-day it might affect us at some other time. We are entitled to a fair rendering of the statutes, and we are entitled to know whether the minister bases his argument on the ground that seven provinces constitute the whole of Canada before we are called upon to accept a calculation based upon such data.

I notice, also, that on page 6 of the hon. gentleman's report, it appears that the provinces came in with equal rights as compared with the others. Let us see how that would work out with regard to the other provinces. I have spoken of the fact that it is clear that British Columbia has greater rights than Prince Edward Island. See how section 51 would work out from the standpoint of the old provinces in the light of the hon. gentleman's contention. Section 51 provides what is to be done on the completion of the census—that Quebec shall have a fixed number of sixty-five representatives, and we understand how the other provinces have proportionate representation. If the contention of the hon. gentleman is right, when we come to read section 51, it applies not only to the four provinces, but to the seven.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, not to seven provinces, but to Canada.

Mr. NORTHRUP. And the hon. minister has shown by the argument I have referred to it means the seven provinces. I am taking the hon. gentleman's report, and not at present giving my own views. He has proved to his own satisfaction that Canada consists of the seven provinces. How then would you work out this 51st clause? If he wishes to change his opinion and make the section mean the whole of Canada, how would he work out the 51st clause according to his contention? Whatever portions compose Canada this clause provides for equal treatment. But what would you do when you come to British Columbia? Can you apply section 51 to that province? In view of the fact that its representations is never to be decreased below six members, how is it possible to apply this section to that province? Then, how about the territories, if, as the hon. minister contends, Canada consists of the whole country from ocean to ocean? It is settled law that we have the power, under the imperial statutes, to give the territories as large representations as we see fit. We can give them ten or fifty or an hundred members, as we please. So section 51 clearly does not apply to the territories. According to the hon. gentleman though, section 51 applies to the whole of Canada, it does not apply to the North-west Territories, the largest division of Canada, or to British Columbia, which is the largest province. I do not pretend to be very familiar with the geographical facts, but, if you subtract from the whole area of Canada the area of the North-west Territories and British Columbia, I am inclined to think that you will find that the greater part of Canadian territory is outside the operation of section 51, and we know that the time is not far distant when the North-west Territories and British Columbia will be, in population, the greatest part of the Dominion. So, the hon. gentleman has led himself into a difficulty there.

I only wished to call attention to a few points in the report of the Minister of Justice to argue that, when a gentleman of his attainments at the bar, and with his talents—talents which we all admire—looking into this matter and preparing a state paper, commits the inaccuracies I have pointed out, and comes to such conclusions as I have shown, the ordinary humble member of this House, such as myself and those who sit about me, may well say that this question is not so beyond doubt that we should be justified in proposing legislation until the best opinions that we can obtain have been obtained.

Now referring for a moment to the contention on the other side, is there nothing to be said for the contention of New Brunswick? I see New Brunswick's contention submitted to the Dominion government is very brief. It does not descend to argument, it merely states the case of New Brunswick. But is there anything to be said on behalf of the contention of New Brunswick? I think a great deal can be

said. It has been laid down by one of the Supreme Court judges, Mr. Justice Strong, quoted in Lefroy on the Constitution, page 42 :

> We are not only entitled, but bound to apply that well-established rule, which requires us, in placing a meaning upon descriptive terms and definitions contained in statutes, to have recourse to external aids derived from the surrounding circumstances and the history of the subject-matter dealt with, and to consider the enactment by the light derived from such source, and so to put ourselves as far as possible in the position of the legislature whose language we have to expound. If this rule were rejected and the language of the statute were considered without such assistance from extrinsic facts, it is manifest that the task or interpretation would degenerate into mere speculation and guess work.

So we have the authority of one of the judges of the Supreme Court to say that we have a right to look at all the surrounding circumstances, and to consider what light can be shed by them on the legislation that has been passed. In the debates before the imperial parliament, when Lord Carnarvon was introducing the British North America Act, he spoke very clearly as to the language of the enactment, and laid down that the British North America Act was the result of a treaty made between the various powers every clause of which was a compromise; and because every clause of that treaty was a compromise he refused to allow the House of Lords to amend any clause of it in any respect. Now then if every clause of that treaty was a compromise, perhaps it would not be out of place to inquire into the circumstances under which this particular clause 51, in which we are so deeply interested, came to be put in the statute. On reference to Pope's Confederation Documents, page 67, we find the debate on the clause giving the number of representatives that the various provinces should be given. We find Mr. Galt saying :

> We have supposed that the population of Lower Canada being tolerably equable in its character, would afford the best basis. But having respect to the rapid increase of Upper Canada, we think the lower provinces should not be reduced if they do not increase in the same ratio. Therefore, the lower provinces would have the same as they have now unless in the very improbable case of any one falling off five per cent or more,—that is a decrease relatively to the whole federation.

Which then began with four provinces. The Hon. Geo. Brown whose name is greatly revered by hon. gentlemen opposite, speaking on the same subject, says on page 67 :

> The practical result will be that while Lower Canada certainly will not be less and the lower provinces may increase in population, they cannot decrease in the number of representatives. It keeps the House within a reasonable limit. It is now to start with one in 17,000. It will afterwards vary.

Then on page 68 the debate goes on, and it is stated that the number of representatives then given was not accidental, but was given because one member for each county and one for each city would give exactly the number agreed upon. The delegates found that they could so divide up the representation of the Dominion that the figures agreed on in the British North America Act would afford what they considered a fair basis for the representation of each province, and it was evidently understood by the representatives at that time when they so provided that unless there was a falling off of one-twentieth in the population of a province there should be no decrease, that practically they were insured against any decrease. Now the provinces have gone into the Dominion on that basis, and the British North America Act being an imperial Act, I submit it is beyond question that the terms of the British North America Act, every clause of it being, as Lord Carnarvon said, a compromise, must stand precisely to-day as they were then, except insofar as those clauses have been modified by imperial legislation. We must not forget that no matter what legislation this parliament might profess to pass or attempt to pass in derogation of imperial legislation, we would be exceeding our powers and our legislation would be utterly void. Now, I would ask the Minister of Justice what legislation has ever passed the imperial parliament that in any way affects clause 51. Probably the answer will be : The other provinces came in under Orders in Council. True, they did come in under Orders in Council, and if the Minister of Justice will read the imperial Orders in Council under which Prince Edward Island, British Columbia and other provinces came in, he will find that in each case the Order in Council provided that in pursuance of the 146th section of the British North America Act they came in subject to the provisions of this Act, for in fact an Order in Council would have no power to vary the British North America Act, it would be as invalid as an Act of this House, except for clause 146 which provided that on an address from a province, with a similar address and on similar terms, from this House, the Queen in Council might approve of their addresses and allow that province to come in on the terms agreed upon, but in every case subject to the provisions of that Act. So that when British Columbia or Prince Edward Island came into the union, they came in subject to the provisions of the British North America Act. The imperial Order in Council has no power to vary that, and whatever its provisions were, they had to accept them.

Now the Minister of Justice seemed to think that if there were four partners, and two or three others came in, they must come in on equal terms. Surely no wilder statement of law than that could be imagined. One can understand four gentlemen owning a business each holding a one-quar-

ter interest; and they decide to take in, we will say, their head clerk. There is nothing to prevent them giving each one his share of one-eighth, or one-sixteenth or one-thirty second, or any interest they like, to that clerk. It is wholly a matter of contract between them, and even if that clerk had ten times the brains of the original four, and contributed ten times as much to the success of the business as the original partners, when he came to claim his share of the profits, he would have to abide by the terms on which he came in. If the Minister of Justice will look at the terms on which these provinces came into the union he will find that there was a provision that they should have the benefit of certain terms from the old provinces, they were given a benefit here and there, but there is not a single word to show that the old provinces lost the rights they had already acquired by imperial legislation. It would be easy for any one to infer that the provinces should have equal rights, but they did not get equal rights, as is shown by the exceptional representation given to British Columbia. Therefore we find that the provinces have come in with different rights between themselves. Now, if they have come in with different rights between themselves, why should it be argued that they would necessarily come in with equal rights as against the old partners ? I venture to submit that the true view of the British North America Act is that laid down by Sir John A. Macdonald in his state paper of 1870, when he said that the purview of the British North America Act was evidently confined to the original four provinces. That Act was framed by the ablest statesmen of Canada. They were building wisely and well, and they knew the country was liable to have an unlimited expansion; they knew it was impossible to foresee the possibilities of this country, and therefore, in providing for the present, as far as possible they provided for the future in general but not in details. They provided that other provinces might come in, but the details they left to be arranged while the original partners of the British North America Act secured imperial legislation, a charter which they hold to-day. I will not say anything further on this point than to claim that in view of the circumstances under which this clause was inserted in the British North America Act, in view of the guarantee of the charter that the provinces have under the British North America Act, in view of the fact that not one word is to be found in any Order of Council or in any address on which an Order in Council is issued, leading to the conclusion that the original provinces were divested of any powers they had, whereas on the contrary they have been given new powers, certain specified powers, it seems to me that the case is not free from doubt, and this is as far as it is necessary to go for the purposes of my argument. But if the question be not free from doubt, admitting that the right hon. gentleman wishes to do what is fair, is it the part of a practical man of business to obtain an opinion from an inferior court when he could obtain one from a superior court ? Is it wise to obtain an opinion that has no intrinsic value beyond the value that may be given to it from the personal standing of the judges when, if the case be referred to the Privy Council, we shall then have an authoritative decision which will be beyond question. Therefore I hope that the right hon. leader of the government, considering that this is only the third session of this parliament, that the parliament is still in its infancy, that there is ample time to secure the decision of the Privy Council and pass this legislation long before this parliament comes to its natural end, will not cause the money of this country to be expended and the time of hon. members perhaps, to be wasted in fruitlessly discussing legislation which the decision of the Privy Council, a few months later on, may show to be utterly abortive.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker, of course my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) is not unaware of the fact that there is no provision for any reference to the Privy Council and that the only provision which we have in our statutes is that which provides for a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there not a provision for an appeal from the Supreme Court ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We are not dealing with appeals ; we are dealing with references. I assume that when hon. gentlemen argue legal questions, they mean what they say. As I understand it, the obligation is imposed upon the government after each decennial census to provide for the redistribution of the representation of the different provinces of the Dominion. That is an obligation which is imposed on parliament. There is no discretion that can be exercised by the government in respect to that redistribution. The charter under which we live, under which we are governed, the British North America Act, provides for the manner in which that redistribution is to be made, and section 51 of the British North America Act operates automatically without reference to the government in any manner or form. Now, in respect to the apportionment of representation in each province, there parliament is supreme. When you have determined that in respect to the province of Quebec sixty-five members are to be allotted, or rather when the British North America Act has decided that sixty-five members are to be allotted to the province of Quebec, then, within the limits of the province, parliament is absolutely supreme. Parliament can determine how these members are to be allotted, to which portion of the province they

are to be allotted, or generally in any manner that parliament chooses. The principle upon which we proceed in this Bill in respect to the redistribution of the constituencies in the provinces, a principle which was laid down by the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as I understood him when he presented this Bill, is that we should maintain county boundaries, and that after having settled the principle that in so far as it is possible county boundaries should be maintained the subdivision of any county is a matter that parliament should deal with and that subdivision is to be made by a committee of the House, as stated by him when he introduced the Bill. In respect to the principle that was laid down by the right hon. the leader of the government that we would adhere to municipal or county boundaries, I would like to say to the House that that principle was laid down by the late Sir John Macdonald in 1871 at the time of the first redistribution, and that it was acquiesced in by the then leaders of the opposition, Hon. Mr. Mackenzie and Hon. Mr. Blake, and was concurred in by Sir Charles Tupper, who also spoke upon that question. Therefore, the question of adhering to county boundaries may be considered as a question that was determined by the leaders of both political parties in 1871. It is true that for purposes to which it is not necessary to refer now that principle was departed from in 1882, but it was not departed from by the Liberal party, and in so far as we are concerned our position to-day is the position we occupied in 1871, that we should maintain county boundaries. Having stated that much, I now proceed to submit to the House the method of reasoning adopted by me in support of the proposed redistribution of seats. This matter is to be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada; it will be argued there, and in so far as I am concerned I will be content to state now the position I take without adding any argument in support of it. It seems to me the time to argue this abstract legal question will be when we come to submit the matter to the Supreme Court, because it would be to some extent forestalling the judgment of the Supreme Court if we were to argue it here to-day. I will be content at present to leave it to the House to appreciate how far my conclusions flow from the position I lay down. My hon. friend who spoke last said the fathers of confederation provided for the then present. So far as I am concerned, as I read the Confederation Act, the intention was to provide for the then present and to provide for the future, and it is because I maintain that the British North America Act provided for the future that I have reached the conclusion to which I will have occasion to refer by and by. Am I right when I say that the British North America Act provided for the future, and that when the British North America Act was passed it was then in contemplation that we should have a Canada as we have it to-day? Let me read the preamble. The preamble of the British North America Act says:

> And whereas, it is expedient that provision be made for the eventual admission into the union of other parts of British North America.

There we find that at the time the British North America Act was passed provision was made for the condition of things we have to-day. But, we have more than that. We find that section 146 enacts:

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the union, and on addresses from the Houses of the parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land——

That is the province of Manitoba.

> —and the North-western territory, or either of them, into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed.

That is to say, that provision is made under this section for the admission of those provinces that existed at that time and also for the admission of the North-west Territories and Rupert's Land on conditions to be expressed in the addresses. I will have occasion in a few moments to refer to the conditions upon which these provinces were admitted. Take for instance the case of Manitoba—

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are other words which will have to be taken into consideration in connection with this section.

> Subject to the provisions of this Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (reading):

> On such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act; and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

The first province that came in was the province of Manitoba. In 1870 an Order in Council was passed in respect to Rupert's Land, in which I find the following:

> It is hereby ordered and declared by Her Majesty, by and with the advice of the Privy Council, in pursuance and exercise of the powers vested in Her Majesty by the said Acts of parliament, that from and after the fifteenth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, the said North-western territory shall be admitted into and become part of the Dominion of Canada upon the terms and conditions set forth in the first hereinbefore recited address, and that the parliament of Canada shall from the day aforesaid have full power and authority to legislate for the future welfare and good government of the said territory. And it is further ordered that, without prejudice to any obligations arising from the

aforesaid approved reports, Rupert's Land shall from and after the said date be admitted into and become part of the Dominion of Canada upon the following terms and conditions, being the terms and conditions still remaining to be performed of those embodied in the said second address of the parliament of Canada.

Rupert's Land came in under the name of Manitoba, and when it came in certain doubts were expressed in respect to the power of the Dominion of Canada to carve out—I use the expression again which I used in the opinion which I gave—to carve out of Rupert's Land the province of Manitoba. Certain doubts were expressed by the late Sir John Macdonald and other members of his government, and as a result the Order in Council, to which my hon. friend referred, was passed. Then, what happened? We find that we have what is known as the Doubt Removing Act; that is to say, the British North America Amendment Act of 1871, in which it is provided that:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order, and good government of such province, and for its representation in the said parliament.

The Dominion parliament shall have the right to pass such laws as it deems proper for the representation in parliament of the provinces of Canada. Then, we have, in addition to that, section 5:

The following Acts passed by the said parliament of Canada, and entitled respectively: 'An Act for the temporary government of Rupert's Land and the North-western Territory when united with Canada,' and 'An Act to amend and continue the Act thirty-two and thirty-three Victoria, chapter three, and to establish and provide for the 'Government of the province of Manitoba' shall be and be deemed to have been valid and effectual for all purposes whatsoever from the date at which they respectively received the assent, in the Queen's name, of the Governor General of the said Dominion of Canada.

That is to say, the Act passed by the Dominion carving Manitoba out of Rupert's Land in 1870, is declared by this Imperial Act as having been properly passed, and the Act of 1870 is now to be construed as if it had been an Act of the imperial parliament. Acting on this theory, that this Act here confirms the first Act and made it imperial legislation, I ventured to make the statement that the Dominion of Canada did carve Manitoba out of Rupert's Land. My hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) cavils with that statement. I say that the Imperial Act of 1871 says that what we did in 1870 was good, and that it gave to the Act of 1870 absolutely the same effect as if it were done by the imperial parliament, and my hon. friend says it is an incorrrect statement in law to assert that Canada had carved out of Rupert's land the province of Manitoba. I am willing to accept his criticism.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the Minister of Justice permit me to ask a question now—if it would interrupt his argument I shall do so later.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I prefer it now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I merely ask for information. Under what statute is it that we get power to provide for the representation of the North-west Territories. Is it not under section four of the Act to which the hon. gentleman has just referred.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman not observe a marked difference between section four and section two. Section two dealing with provinces (therefore not applying to the territories) provides specially for representation in addition to providing for laws for the peace, order and good government; whereas section four provides for the making of laws for the peace, order and good government of the territories but not for representation.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot see the distinction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The distinction is that in one case there is express provision for representation and in the other there is not.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a provision to provide for representation, and that is what we have done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see it just in that way.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Manitoba Act of 1870, thirty-three Vic. Cap. three, section two, which is now, mark you, imperial legislation, provides:—

On from and after the said day on which the Order of the Queen in Council shall take effect as aforesaid, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or, by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to, or only to affect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba in the same way, and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

That is to say, in 1870, as a result of imperial legislation, it is provided that Manitoba comes into confederation, and is to be dealt with in so far as the British North America Act is concerned, as if it had been originally one of the provinces that came into the union in 1867. Not only is

that to be the case but section four goes on to say :

The said province shall be represented, in the first instance, in the House of Commons, by four members, and for that purpose, shall be divided by proclamation of the Governor General, into four electoral districts, each of which shall be represented by one member : provided that on the completion of the census in the year 1881, and of each decennial census afterwards, the representation of the said province shall be readjusted according to the provisions of the fifty-first section of the British North America Act, 1867.

That is to say, that we have this Act which provides for the admission of Manitoba into confederation; we have this Act making all the conditions and all the terms of the British North America Act applicable to Manitoba ; and we have moreover special provision made that there shall be a readjustment of the representation of Manitoba after each decennial census subsequent to the year 1871, and that with respect to that redistribution or readjustment, section fifty-one of the British North America Act shall be made applicable, section fifty-one being the section which applies to the other provinces.

Now, so far as Manitoba is concerned, after the Act was passed, what is the condition of affairs ? Is the Act of 1867 not to be read and construed by the light of the subsequent amendment of 1870, and are you not bound to give effect to all the terms and conditions of the British North America Act with respect to Manitoba; and are you not bound in so far as the redistribution of Manitoba is concerned by the terms of section fifty-one ? My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) says that you have got to be careful, and you have to watch scrupulously the effect of each word contained in the British North America Act; that the British North America Act is a treaty between the different provinces. I agree with that. It was so stated at the time the British North America Act was introduced by Lord Carnarvon in the House of Lords, and it has been since stated on two different cases by the Supreme Court of Canada. But what is the effect ? The British North America Act is a treaty as between the four provinces which were parties to it at its inception; but it is also a treaty with respect to the provinces which came in afterwards, and if the four provinces which were parties to the British North America Act originally, accept other partners in the concern, they are bound by the terms and conditions upon which the other partners come in. They were free to modify the treaty. A treaty could not be modified by outside parties, but by those who were parties to it, and these parties can agree to modify the terms as they choose. Therefore, when the four original provinces say to Manitoba : We agree to your coming into confederation, and you are to be governed by the same stipulations that apply to us, and with respect to your representation you are to be governed by section fifty-one of the British North America Act, what is the conclusion ? The conclusion is : After that Act was passed section fifty-one of the British North America Act must be read in the light of the amending Act, and so is thereafter to read instead of 'four provinces' 'five provinces;' and instead of 'Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia;' 'Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Manitoba.'

Now, we are free so far as Manitoba is concerned. And what do we find after that ? We then find British Columbia coming in. British Columbia comes in on an address from the Legislative Council of the province of British Columbia to the parliament of Canada. The parliament of Canada, the House of Commons and the Senate, also passed addresses. The addresses of the House of Commons and of the Senate are in terms identical with the address presented on behalf of the Legislative Council of British Columbia. These addresses from the House of Commons of Canada and from the Senate of Canada and from the Legislative Council of British Columbia are sent over to England. There an Order in Council is passed and the Order in Council takes in the terms of the addresses that were presented, and says in effect : That the province of British Columbia is admitted into confederation on the terms and stipulations provided in the addresses. Let us see what these addresses are. You find for instance with reference to British Columbia, that in the Order in Council of the 16th May, 1871, it is represented :—

And whereas by addresses from the Houses of the parliament of Canada and from the legislative council of British Columbia respectively, of which addresses copies are contained in the schedule to this order annexed, Her Majesty was prayed, by and with the advice of Her Most Honourable Privy Council, under the one hundred and forty-sixth section of the hereinbefore recited Act, to admit British Columbia into the Dominion of Canada, on the terms and conditions set forth in the said addresses.

What are the terms and conditions ?

British Columbia shall be entitled to be represented in the Senate by three members, and by six members in the House of Commons. The representation to be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867. . . . .

The provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall (except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to, and only affect one and not the whole of the provinces now comprising the Dominion and except so far as the same may be varied by this minute) be applicable to British Columbia, in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the other provinces of the Dominion, and as if the colony of British Columbia had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

There you have British Columbia coming in subject to all the terms and conditions of

the British North America Act, and with a special stipulation that with respect to the representation of British Columbia, that shall be governed by section fifty-one of the British North America Act.

Now, let us take the province of Prince Edward Island. The same formality was complied with there. You had your addresses from both Houses of parliament here, and you also had an address from the parliament of Prince Edward Island. What do we find in the addresses? We find the same terms as in the case of British Columbia.

That the population of Prince Edward Island having been increased by fifteen thousand and upwards since the year 1861, the island shall be represented in the House of Commons of Canada by six members; the representation to be readjusted, from time to time, under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867.

There is further provision:

That the provisions in the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment, may be held to be especially applicable to, and only to affect one and not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and, except so far as the same may be varied by these resolutions, be applicable to Prince Edward Island in the same way and to the same extent as they apply to the other provinces of the Dominion, and as if the colony of Prince Edward Island had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

Now, we have reached the last one of the provinces, and what is the position? You have the British North America Act in the preamble providing for the admission of these provinces into confederation; you have section 145 of the British North America Act which makes provision for the way in which they are to be brought in; you have got the arrangement which contains specifically the words; that they stipulate that their representation is to be readjusted under the British North America Act, and that they specially provide that they are to be dealt with in all respects as if they had been part and parcel of the original provinces when the Confederation Act was first passed. They say you shall deal with us absolutely on the same terms and subject to the same conditions as those in which we came in. What was the result of that? How was their representation to be readjusted? The British North America Act provides for readjustment by section fifty-one.

On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time, as the parliament of Canada, from time to time provides subject and according to the following rules.

Where are they? If my construction of the Act be not correct, if we are to be held to the words of the British North America Act, without any regard to subsequent legislation, there is provision made here for a readjustment of the representation of the four provinces and nothing else. If that Act has not been amended, you have simply four provinces, the representation of which you can readjust. What an absurd conclusion that would be. The only sensible logical view is that what you are called on to readjust is the representation of the provinces of Canada existing at the time such readjustment must be made. That is to say, hat the British North America Act, like every other Act, has always to be construed as if it were passed at the time you are seeking to put it into operation. It is consequently necessary, under section 51, to make to-day provision for the readjustment, not of the four provinces, as they stood when the Act passed, but of the seven provinces composing confederation to-day. This has never hitherto been questioned. In 1871 provision was made for readjustment in more than four provinces, also in 1881, and in 1891 a readjustment was made of the representation of all the seven provinces. Where did the parliament of Canada get authority to readjust the seven provinces in 1891, if not in section 51? Have all those eminent men, who took part in the legislation of those years, been entirely at fault? Is it possible that they were so blinded, so ignorant, so absolutely incapable as not to understand where they got their authority to pass the legislation they did?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is contended that if you take the four provinces, as they originally stood, there would be, under present circumstances, no decrease in the representation of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario. Does my hon. friend say that any change has been accomplished with regard to that?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not arguing that point now, but will come to it in a minute.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought that my hon. friend had come to that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am discussing section 51 and refer my hon. friend to subsection 4.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend says that it has been amended by these addresses and the Queen's proclamation. I am not criticising his argument, but wish merely to understand it. Would he be prepared to go this far? If in each of these cases, it had been provided that hereafter the representation of the province of Quebec should be 64 instead of 65, would the hon. gentleman say that the British North America Act had been amended by means of these addresses and proclamations? And if it could not be amended in this way, how could it be amended as he has suggested it has been?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I entertain absolutely no doubt whatever that if

addresses had been presented in the form suggested by my hon. friend and if an Order in Council, which has the effect of an imperial Act, had sanctioned these addresses and given the effect of law to them, it would follow that the British North America Act was amended. The imperial parliament can amend at any time any Act which it has passed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is a perfectly fair answer. Would not the words 'subject to the provisions of this Act' have a controlling influence in that regard ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not if, as my hon. friend said a moment ago, it was in the address stated specifically that the representation was reduced to 64.

Mr. FRASER. Would that be true also, without any reference at all to Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The British parliament can undoubtedly amend the Act at any time. As to whether they would or could constitutionally exercise the right is another question ; it is extremely doubtful. I am replying simply to an abstract legal question. If the parliament that has power to pass an Act continues to exist, it must necessarily have power to amend or repeal it. That is an elementary principle in constitutional law. And as the result of the subsequent action of the imperial parliament, section 51 was amended so as to make the first clause read 'seven' provinces instead of four. That, I submit respectfully, concludes the matter, because if the representation of the seven provinces is to be readjusted, it must be readjusted by the parliament of Canada. What is the parliament of Canada ? It is the parliament which has control over the seven provinces to be readjusted, and in which those provinces are represented ? Canada must of necessity mean the whole of the provinces as they exist at the time. What is the result ? The result is that, section 51 being applicable, you have, when you proceed to readjust your provices, to be governed by it. The province of Quebec shall have a fixed number of 65 members. That province is of course out of court, but it is the pivotal province. It is by the population of Quebec that the whole redistribution of the country is to be settled.

Subsection 2 of section 51 provides :

> There shall be assigned to each of the other provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number 65 bears to the number of the population of Quebec (so ascertained).

What is the result ? The unit of representation is 25,367 and a fraction, Ontario having a population of 1,648,898, the population of the Dominion being 2,182,947, the representation of Quebec being 65. The Act works automatically. It is a mere question of proportion—as 1,648,898, the population of Ontario, is to 2,182,947, so is 65 to x. The result is 86·05, and we find that readjusted, the represention would be in this House :

Ontario	86
Quebec	65
Nova Scotia	18
New Brunswick	13
Manitoba	10
British Columbia	7
Prince Edward Island	4

The question naturally arises, how do you justify the decrease in the representation of the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. I may say at once that with respect to Prince Edward Island, there is no necessity for any argument, because whatever view you take, whether or not you construe the term 'Canada' in subsection 4 of section 51 to include only the four original provinces or to mean Canada as it is to-day, the island is, in either case, out of court. But with respect to the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, if you construe the term 'Canada' to mean only the four original provinces, then their representation would not be reduced, but if you take it to cover all the provinces then their representation will be reduced to the figures I have given. The only question to be determined therefore is what is the meaning of the word 'Canada' in that subsection 4. I say it must of necessity mean Canada as it is at present and not merely the four original provinces. I shall not attempt to argue that question out now, because it seems to me that it would be to some extent unseemly that I should present here a legal argument which should be more properly submitted to the Supreme Court. I wish merely to state the position I take. But I should state to the House that this question is, of course, one that the House is free to discuss—I am not arguing that the House is not free; it is a matter of taste. But I say that this question is one to which I have given considerable thought. At the same time, as I had occasion to say once or twice before, I am not absolutely infallible ; and I thought it was proper for me to get the opinion of some outside counsel on the question, and I did do so. I thought I could not do better than get the opinion of so eminent an authority as Mr. Christopher Robinson, who entirely agrees with the views I take. He says :

> In my opinion, 'Canada' in section 51, subsection 4, means Canada as now constituted.

And he goes on to say :

> I do not agree with what I understand to be the contention of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick that for the purposes of readjustment it means only the four original provinces.

Now, that is the case as I want to put it; that is the case as I understand it; and that is the case as I am prepared to argue it in the Supreme Court. I hope the matter will

be disposed of there. I think it is a case that ought to be argued, not because I have any doubt whatever of the soundness of the view I take, but for the simple reason that, when you are taking from a province a political right, when you are depriving a province of a certain number of representatives, it is proper that every possible facility should be given to make it clear that, if they have rights that are being interfered with by parliament, those rights will be construed by a proper tribunal. We want to have a fair redistribution; we do not want to take from any province what it has. On the contrary, we are of those who believe that every constitutional right vested in a province is to be construed as sacred and is not to be lightly interfered with, is not to be interfered with unless it is absolutely certain that, under the operation of the Act, it is necessary that we should do so. For that reason, and not that I have any doubt, the matter is to be referred to the Supreme Court.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I do not propose to occupy the time of the House in following the legal arguments that have been advanced by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House or by the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick). But I do propose to adopt the words of Sir Henry Strong, quoted by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), in which he said we were entitled, in such a case as this, to refer to the history of the matter, to look at the circumstances of the time and see what was intended by those who, as delegates from the various provinces, sought to frame confederation. I may say a word or two as to the Minister of Justice, not for the purpose of following legal argument, but to show the House wherein our position differs from the argument he has advanced. The hon. minister says that it is the duty of parliament to redistribute after each census. I do not know that that is questioned. I take it that it is as the hon. minister says. But the hon. Minister of Justice will not dispute—I am sure he will admit—that where the readjustment of representation comes in question that readjustment must take place before you can redistribute; and it is a question of the law as to the readjustment of the numerical representation of the provinces that we are really now discussing, not the redistribution of the constituencies. Now, with regard to that, the Minister of Justice has referred to the Manitoba Act as if that was inconsistent with the position taken by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and by my hon. friend from East Hastings. I think that, perhaps, the Minister of Justice has overlooked the exception in the Manitoba Act which brings the Manitoba legislation into practically the same position with the introduction of provinces under Orders in Council. The second section, which has already been referred to says that :

> On and from such a day aforesaid——

—That is the day on which the Order in Council shall introduce Manitoba as a province—

> ——the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment may be held to be clearly applicable to or only to affect one or more but not the whole of the provinces.

Now, there is an exception preserving, according to our contention, the very provision we are talking about. The fifty-first section and the eighth section, according to our contention, provides for readjustment of the four provinces originally united, and these two provisions especially relate to one or more provinces and are therefore expressly excepted from the provisions of the Manitoba Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Were there other provinces at that time ?

Mr. BARKER. There were other provinces brought in. I am going to deal with that in a moment. That is another point rather in favour of our contention. The other provinces brought in by Orders in Council, after addresses sent to England by the provinces and the Dominion, come under clause 146 of the British North America Act, and that section of the Act expressly provides that when addresses are sent by the incoming provinces and by the Dominion stating the terms and conditions on which the incoming provinces propose to enter, they shall, upon the Order in Council being passed in Great Britain, become members of the union, subject to the provisions of the British North America Act—subject, that is, to the very same condition put into the Manitoba Act that the special provision relating to one or more provinces shall not be affected by what appears in the addresses. So that no matter what province you take that may have become part of the Dominion, whether under the Manitoba Act or under Orders in Council, you find that the addresses pursuant to section 146 in the one case and the Manitoba Act in the other, are expressly subject to the special provisions of the British North America Act, as to the relative representation of the original four provinces. In other words, the addresses are subject to the conditions of the British North America Act. Provinces may enter the Dominion on any terms and conditions that they and the Dominion may agree upon, no matter what they are ; but, whatever these terms and conditions may be they shall be all subject to the special provisions of the British North America Act as to any one or more provinces ; and, as we contend, no matter what their agreement may be as to representation or anything else, they are admitted according to the bargain they have made ; subject, however, to this : that that bargain or agreement shall not interfere with the special provision made in the original Act respecting

the readjustment of the four original provinces. That, Mr. Speaker, is our contention. Now, I do not propose to go on and take up the time of the House in arguing that question, because, as the Minister of Justice says, it is more properly a question for the court. But I wish to point out that the Minister of Justice has dealt with clause 8 and clause 51 as if these clauses read not the four provinces but each of the provinces of the Dominion. He treats the four provinces for this purpose as if at the time the words 'each of the provinces' were inserted. Now, I propose to show, by taking the resolutions of the conference which framed the Act, that the delegates deliberately avoided using the words 'each province,' that they, on occasion, used those words and then struck them out and substituted the words which appear in the Act to-day. For some reason which they well considered, no doubt, seeking to provide for the readjustment of the representation of the four original provinces—they did not want to use words which might leave any doubt. I would refer to the original resolutions prepared by the conference and presented in London, as found at page 101 of Pope's Confederation documents. Clause 20 of that document, with some change, became section 51 of the Act; and it reads thus:

> Immediately after the completion of the census of one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and immediately after every decennial census thereafter, the representation from each province in the House of Commons shall be readjusted on the basis of population, such readjustment to take effect upon the termination of the then existing parliament.

Then follow as separate sections the other provisions that now form the subsections of section 51. Now, we go on, and at page 126 we find what is called the rough draft of the Act that was to be submitted to the British House of Commons. We find in that rough draft the same words are followed, 'from each province,' instead of 'the four provinces,' as they now appear in the Act.

The clause is in these words:

> 18. The House of Commons shall be constituted upon the basis of representation by population, and shall consist of 181 members distributed as follows: To Upper Canada, 82; Lower Canada, 65; Nova Scotia, 19; and to New Brunswick, 15; and after the decennial census of 1871, and every decennial census thereafter, upon the determination, by dissolution or otherwise of the parliament then existing, the representation from each province shall be readjusted, and for that purpose Lower Canada shall always be assigned 65 members, and to each of the other provinces at such readjustment shall be assigned the number of members to which it will be entitled in the same ratio of representation as Lower Canada will have.

Then on page 147 we have what is called the first draft. It is marked 'Confidential, 23rd January, 1867. Draft of a Bill.' There we find the same clause in section 25.

> On the completion of the official census of the population of the united colony in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation 'of the four provinces' shall be readjusted by such authority and in such manner, and from such time, as any Act of the parliament of the united colony from time to time directs, according to the following rules:

There for the first time we find the words 'of the four provinces,' after twice using the words 'each province,' which would follow the construction the Minister of Justice is seeking to put upon the present Act. Now it is singular that in the third draft of the Bill they come back to the words 'from each province.' That clause is number 34, and evidently during the hammering away at this Bill and trying to meet all the difficulties that existed in confederating these provinces, they first in the resolutions, and then in the other draft of the Bill, use the words 'each province'; next, in what is called 'first draft,' they use the words 'four provinces'; then in another draft of the Bill they go back to the words 'from each province,' and finally in the last draft and in the Act itself use the significant words, 'of the four provinces.' I do not dispute for a moment that if they had adhered to 'each province,' both in the 8th clause and in the 51st clause, there would be a great deal in the argument of the Minister of Justice. But they deliberately abandoned it. In the final draft and in the Act which was passed they come back to the words that we are now discussing, 'the four provinces,' the four original provinces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the meaning of all these changes? These changes were being discussed by statesmen who were sent from Canada as the delegates of four provinces to arrange the terms of confederation. The delegates were settling these provisions with regard to existing difficulties between the provinces. They were negotiating the conditions of confederation. We all know the difficulties that existed at that time between Lower Canada and Upper Canada. There was the burning question of representation by population, and there were difficulties between the provinces down by the sea and ourselves. There was a divergence of interests. At the first meeting two years before, there were six provinces represented; Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island were represented and took part in the first discussion. Newfoundland dropped out, and then the five provinces attempted to settle the difficulties. The first difficulty arose because Prince Edward Island wanted more than its share of representation, and the other provinces would not agree. Prince Edward Island candidly admitted that they could not argue that they were entitled to six members, but they said: There is no use talking to us about coming into confederation if you insist upon our having only our proportion according to population; you must give us six or we

cannot come in. The four would not agree to it, and Prince Edward Island dropped out. Then the four got together at Westminster, and having discussed all the difficulties that existed between them, the statesmen who had lived all their lives amidst political difficulties, set to work, and the thing that seems to have received the most consideration from them was the wording of this very 51st clause. They started with the very words that would suit my hon friend, 'from each province'; they put them in twice or three times, then abandoned them. They were dealing with the troubles and divergent interests of four provinces, Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; those are the provinces they were dealing with in that 51st section; and it is rather singular that you find, when they use the words 'the four provinces,' they for the first time make the other provisions relating to readjustment of the numerical representation a mere subsection of 51. When they come to deal with this whole subject, confining the subject-matter to the four original provinces, they make the connected provisions subsections of 51 so that there might be no difficulty with the details, and that that word 'Canada,' that comes in subsection (4), should be understood as limited to the subject of the main part of the section, the four provinces. Now I refer for a moment to clause 8 of the Act. This is not the clause that I read from the resolutions, it is a clause that does not seem to have come in until they were framing the Act.

8. In the general census of the population of Canada which is hereby required to be taken in the year 1871 and in every tenth year thereafter, the respective populations of the four provinces shall be distinguished——

Why distinguished? Why did they want the respective populations of the four provinces to be distinguished when, as the Minister of Justice says, they were contemplating a Dominion consisting of many provinces? If they were looking to a general provision in that section, why did they not say 'of each province of the Dominion' or 'of each province'? But they deliberately use the words "four provinces', just as in 51 'each province,' was struck out and the particular words 'four provinces' substituted. Section 51 reads:

On the completion of the census in 1871 and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority and in such manner and at such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:—

The following rules are the five subsections that were in the old resolutions as independent sections.

Now allusion has been made to the words 'parliament of Canada.' Well, that phrase has a clear and distinct meaning. Clearly it implies here something more than a parliament of the four provinces, because there can be no parliament of Canada except the parliament of the whole Dominion. There can be no difficulty about the construction of that phrase.

Here I may refer to another matter. Whether the parliament of Canada has power itself to distribute or readjust as has been considered settled, because it has been argued that the parliament can itself do what, under this section, it was empowered to authorize others to do. But I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that if the construction that we are now putting forward is to have effect, it may be necessary to reconsider whether that view of its authority is correct. It might be that if the minister's view that section 51 applies to the whole Dominion, was correct, the parliament of Canada might possibly be argued to have power to do what it could authorize somebody else to do. But a different construction might be reasonable and proper if the parliament of Canada is only to authorize somebody to adjust the representation of these particular four provinces. It does not at all follow that the parliament of Canada would be a proper body to adjust the representation of a particular province. I should doubt very much whether, if we took the view that I am now putting forward, parliament has authority at all to distribute, or whether it is not bound to depute that authority to somebody else, as the section reasonably seems to have intended.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend will admit we have been all wrong since 1871.

Mr. BARKER. Possibly, but the hon. gentleman must not forget that this is the first time since 1871 that this question has arisen.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKER. There has been no time, as I understand it, when such a readjustment of the population was necessary as would raise this contention. This is the first time that it has ever come before parliament, so that nothing turns upon the statement that the hon. gentleman makes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I understand my hon. friend to say that we have no power to do ourselves that which we have authority to confer upon another to do, that we have no power to readjust ourselves, but that we might authorize some one else to do it.

Mr. BARKER. I think a great deal might be said in favour of the view taken on that point in the past provided parliament was dealing with the readjustment of the whole of Canada, but when it is dealing with only a section of Canada I think there may be a grave doubt as to whether other authority has been given to it than to depute some-

body else to do that particular work. I think the question is worthy of consideration, but it is not up at the present time. The important section is subsection 4, of section 51, in which the word 'population of Canada' occurs :

> On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one twentieth part or upwards.

The contention of the hon. gentleman, I know, is very plausible. I think there is very grave doubt as to whether it is correct, and nobody can positively say at the present time that the other contention is absolutely wrong. But we find in the 4th and 5th sections of the British North America Act what the word 'Canada' means where there is no expression to the contrary and no implication to the contrary, and we have the word 'Canada' here without any expression to the contrary, and I contend that the only implication of the meaning of 'Canada' here is the four provinces, because it is used in the subsection of the main section, which refers only to the original four provinces called 'Canada.' I would like to point out that the consideration we are urging is a reasonable one. The four provinces had peculiar reasons for maintaining a certain ratio of representation as between themselves. The men who were settling the terms of confederation were not able within human foresight to see what might be necessary for other provinces. They had had before them the case of Prince Edward Island, and they were unable to agree upon the terms upon which that province should come in. Were they likely to settle for one hundred years to come upon what terms the balance of the provinces would come in ? Surely it was a reasonable thing for them to agree upon terms and conditions as to representation, readjustment, and otherwise, of the four provinces, the circumstances of which they were fully aware of and to leave the terms and conditions upon which the other provinces should come in to be settled under section 146 at the time when these provinces might wish to come in. They could, under section 146, make any terms they pleased. It was competent for the Dominion, when a new province came in, to agree that the incoming province should have a fixed representation, not merely for ten years, but for twenty years or fifty years. It was competent for them to agree that they should have a representation which would increase and not decrease, to agree to any terms they saw fit, subject always to one condition expressed in section 146, that its admission should be 'subject to the provisions' of the British North America Act. Among these were special provisions that were made between the four provinces in relation to each other and which therefore cannot be affected by any terms that the incoming provinces obtain under the addresses or Orders in Council. The matter strikes me as a reasonable one. A number of delegates met to try and settle the differences between the four provinces existing and which they represented. They had in view the admission of other provinces and territories. They knew that we had a vast territory in which at that time, I believe, there were only 12,000 inhabitants. How could they foresee the terms upon which it would be reasonable for provinces as yet unborn to come in ? Would it have been sensible for men in their position to attempt to do more than they did, which was to settle the terms and conditions between the existing provinces that were confederating and to leave the incoming provinces in the future to make whatever conditions they saw fit to make at the time and which the Dominion should see fit to grant to them? That is our contention, and it seems to be a perfectly reasonable one. It seems to me to be what any business men would agree upon who sat down to meet the difficulties that presented themselves when these provinces attempted to confederate. There is another feature, and I would like to point it out, because it shows further why it was reasonable that the word 'Canada' in the 4th subsection should not include the population outside of the four provinces. Suppose that in 1901, before this census was taken, that there had been a proposition for Newfoundland to be brought in, what would have been the effect of it ? Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia would immediately begin to calculate what the probable populations were, and what effect the incoming provinces would have upon the proportion of representation, and if Ontario, for example, saw that the addition of the proposed new province to the aggregate population of the Dominion might have the effect of placing her outside the one-twentieth limit and subject her to a loss of six members, the natural consequence would be that Ontario would say : We will vote against Newfoundland coming in. That will be the result of the contention of the hon. Minister of Justice as to subsection 4. But if the calculation is confined simply to the aggregate population of the four provinces which constituted Canada as defined in the Act, no trouble can arise. What had the population of British Columbia, what had the population of Manitoba or the North-west Territories to do with the question of the readjustment of the representation of the four provinces? Those populations were factors quite outside the subject matter. The four provinces endeavouring to readjust, as between themselves, their relative representation would naturally want to know what

was the population of each province and what was the aggregate of the four provinces. That gave them all they wanted to know, and if you interpret the word 'Canada' to mean more than it is defined to mean by sections 3, 4, and 5 of the British North America Act you make it impossible to foresee what the future relative representation of the four provinces may be. In the next twenty-five years we may have a million people in the far west. No man can see what effect that will have upon the representation, and the fact that one-twentieth was put as the margin of stability shows that the framers of confederation were not considering so wide a field. They were confining themselves to the four old provinces whose population was fairly well settled, and the whole of the provisions show that they were framing these words in reference to it. If you take section 51 you will see that it clearly refers in explicit terms to the four provinces, not to the provinces of the Dominion, but explicitly to the four provinces. When we take subsection 4 of that very section we can have no doubt that the word 'Canada' means the four provinces there referred to. Why should you go beyond it? It seems to me a clear and reasonable reading of the words in the main section to use the word 'Canada' as defined by the Act itself. If you go outside of these four provinces, you introduce a disturbing element. What had these people, dealing with the readjustment of their own representation, to do with the people that might come into Manitoba or British Columbia? How did that concern the question between themselves? If Ontario and Quebec were jealous of each other, were nervous about the effect of the future upon their relative representation, what had they to do with the number of people that might come into British Columbia, the North-west Territories or the Yukon? These were elements quite outside of the calculation. The definition of the word 'Canada' by the Act is consistent and reasonable with what they were driving at; that is keeping their relative positions, in so far as they could be provided for by Act of parliament. I repeat what other hon. gentlemen have said, that nobody would, especially in the face of the opinion which the hon. Minister of Justice has read, say that there was no doubt upon this question.

There certainly is such a doubt that it would be extremely unsafe to go on and provide for a parliament upon a new basis of representation, perhaps elect a parliament, and leave the question in such a condition that hereafter—when Acts have been passed and corporations created and all sorts of interests dealt with—that we might find that under an appeal of private parties to the Privy Council, that, the highest court, decided that all our procedure was irregular? Where does the need for haste arise? This Act cannot have force until the end of this parliament. This parliament has two or three years to run yet. What is the difficulty about getting the opinion of the highest court in the empire to definitely determine this question so that we shall know where we are. We are asked now to discuss this Bill before we get the opinion of the Supreme Court as if there was some urgency that we must deal with it at this moment or not at all. It seems to me that we are putting the cart before the horse. It would be far better for us to first find what the law is. I presume the Minister of Justice would not refer the question to the Supreme Court unless he thought there might be some doubt about it. After we know the law, let us pass an Act in accordance with our authority. But to go on discussing this Bill, before we know what the decision of the court will be, seems to me to be farcical.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I desire, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words on this very important measure, and to give the reasons why I feel constrained to oppose the second reading of this Bill. It must be conceded that if this Bill is read a second time, then every principle contained in it is endorsed by this House. If it were not that I have other reasons, I might well content myself with the reasons given by the Minister of Justice this afternoon as a justification for opposing the second reading of this Bill under the existing circumstances. The Minister of Justice told us to-day as clearly as he could state it in language, that the measure is not ripe for second reading, for he declared that there may be some doubt concerning the rights of the parties as declared by this Bill. In view of that statement made by the chief legal adviser of the government, I was somewhat surprised that the right hon. the Prime Minister did not withdraw his motion, and acting upon the advice of his Minister of Justice postpone the second reading of the measure until the rights of the parties were defined by the courts. We are in this position now. We have a very serious constitutional question brought before us. This parliament is asked to legislate in regard to a serious interference with what has been up to this moment the right of four provinces to a certain representation in this House. We are asked by this Bill to say, without any more ado about it, that a change in the representation of these provinces shall be made to their detriment and made at once, and we are asked to declare that, in face of the declaration of the Minister of Justice on the floor of the House: That it is a question which should be decided by the

highest court in the land before it is concluded by this parliament as to whether that principle is right or wrong. As has been said by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) : This is putting the cart before the horse. But that is not the worst of it. While the Minister of Justice says that he does not think we ought go far in discussing what the decision of the Supreme Court may be ; we are at the same time told by him that we should go ahead and by giving this Bill a second reading anticipate the decision of the Supreme Court in favour of the Minister's contention. It seems to me that if that were done the Supreme Court would be in a proper position to say to us : Parliament has already decided on the principle of the Bill and why appear idly before us now and ask us whether you did right or wrong. But Mr. Speaker apart from that I have a stronger opinion on this question than even the Minister of Justice has. It is not to be wondered at that two lawyers should not agree ; it is perhaps customary that lawyers, when they are engaged on the opposite side of a case, should not agree ; it is also probable that a Conservative lawyer may not agree with the Minister of Justice in a so called Liberal government. However I do agree with the Minister of Justice that there is not much doubt about this question, but I disagree with him as to where this doubt is. I have given considerable attention to this Bill and I have gone into the Acts and into the history of this matter, and I have been obliged to come to the conclusion that this Bill provides for a wrong principle, and that a reduction in the representation in this parliament of the provinces of Ontario and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia is not warranted by the law as it stands today. I therefore believe that this Bill ought not be read a second time upon its merits, and I believe that, apart altogether from the doubt which the Minister of Justice has said he is going to get the Supreme Court to decide upon, I shall have to ask the indulgence of the House if I again call attention to the provisions of the British North America Act. The first part of the Act to which I shall refer is the one headed 'Union' and bearing the figures II in Roman numerals, being a subdivision of the Act. The heading 'Union' applies from section 3 to section 8 both sections inclusive. Now this heading 'Union' and this subdivision of the Act under that heading, is of considerable importance. The first part provides :

> On and after a day therein appointed, not being more than six months after the passing of this Act, the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall form and be one Dominion under the name of Canada ; and on and after that day those three provinces shall form and be one Dominion under that name accordingly.

It goes on to say :

> The subsequent provisions of this Act shall, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, commence and have effect on and after the union, that is to say, on and after the day appointed for the union taking effect in the Queen's proclamation ; and in the same provisions, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, the name Canada shall be taken to mean Canada as constituted under this Act.

It seems to me with all due deference to the Minister of Justice, that under this British North America Act there is for the purposes of this Act no other constitution of Canada than the province of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—the two provinces Ontario and Quebec being known as Canada at that date. It seems to me to be begging very hard for some argument to say that these positive and distinct words 'Canada as constituted under this Act' can mean anything else than what is stated in subsection 3, which says that Canada consists of the four provinces.

We have to ask ourselves what is the next step to take in determining whether this term Canada is to apply to the whole of Canada or to the four provinces for arriving at the number of members for each province. There is one thing which strikes me very forcibly, and which has not yet been referred to. Why does this Act at all say what shall constitute Canada ? What would constitute Canada if this section were not in the Act ? Why, it would simply be, as the hon. Minister of Justice says, whatever Canada may be at the time. But the difference between the Minister of Justice and myself is that I contend that when these words were put in the Act, they were inserted for some purpose. The effect would be altogether different had they been omitted. No lawyer of any experience will say that the putting in of these words was a mere surplusage or meant nothing. If they do not mean what we say they do, they would not be in this Act at all, and then Canada would mean exactly what the hon. Minister of Justice says it does. Canada might mean four provinces or five or six or seven, according to the changing circumstances. But what I submit is that the very fact that these words are put in show a special attention to give a special meaning to the word 'Canada.' It shows that the parliament which passed this Act did not intend that the term 'Canada' should bear the ordinary meaning, but that it should apply for the purpose of readjustment to the four original provinces. Has that been changed or repealed by any proper authority ? There are other provisions in this Act which show that the term Canada is only intended to cover the four original provinces. Take for instance section thirty-seven :

> The House of Commons shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, consist of 181 members, of whom 82 shall be elected for Ontario, 65 for Quebec, 19 for Nova Scotia and 15 for New Brunswick.

And section forty provides :

Until the parliament of Canada otherwise provides, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall, for the purposes of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts as follows.

The Act does not say that until parliament otherwise provides, the number shall be so and so, but only that the electoral districts shall be so and so. Special power is given to provide for the rearranging of those districts, but no power is given to interfere with the number that shall be elected from each province. Section fifty-one provides that :

On the completion of each decennial census the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority in such manner and in such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules.

No language could be stronger. And one of these rules, subsection four, is :

On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of a province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upward.

It is conceded on both sides that if that be applied to Canada, as originally constituted, three of these provinces are entitled to a different representation than is provided for in this Bill. According to section fifty-two :—

The number of members of the House of Commons may be from time to time increased by the parliament of Canada, provided the proportionate representation of the provinces prescribed by this Act is not thereby disturbed.

Thus there is provision for increasing the number of the members. But if a reduction were contemplated, why did not the Act provide that the number should be 'increased or reduced.' There is not a word about any reduction, so that we find on all hands corroboration of the contention put forward by this side of the House, that subsection four of section fifty-one applies only to the four original provinces, and not a word to warrant a different construction being put upon the Act than is to be found in the wording of the Act itself. What has happened since that Act has passed ? Has anything been done by the imperial parliament to disturb the effect of the British North America Act as it applies to those four provinces ? It is contended that addresses have been presented and Orders in Council passed in some cases, and Acts of parliament in others, bringing new partners into the concern. But there was not a word in any of these to show that subsection four of section fifty-one has been amended. Yet if these addresses and Orders in Council were to have the effect claimed for them, subsection four of section fifty-one would have to be amended, and there is no way of amending it except by saying so in the usual and ordinary way. And if the imperial parliament do not see fit to amend section four or to say anything more than that an agreement is made as regards new provinces coming in, how can these addresses and Orders in Council be construed to mean that the original arrangement between the original provinces was to be disturbed in the least ?

The last part of section 146 must be borne in mind in order to keep us right in this matter. It says :

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of the parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies, or provinces, or any of them, into the union, and on address from the Houses of the parliament of Canada to admit either of them, into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case, as are in the addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act.

Again 'subject to the provisions of this Act ?' The Act says you can make a bargain with these new provinces and let them in on such terms as you may provide, but always subject to the provisions of this Act, and the provision standing out before everybody is that you shall not reduce the representation of these four provinces except it falls under the condition regarding the one-twentieth part, provided in subsection 4 before quoted.

The hon. Minister of Justice argued that chapter twenty-eight of thirty-four and five Victoria was a doubt removing Act. That is probably not an inapt expression. But what doubt did it remove? It did not remove any doubt upon the question we are debating. I did not pretend to say, for instance, that this subsection 4 would no longer apply. It removed a doubt as to the particular matter being dealt with in the Act. The very fact that it had removed that doubt showed that there was a doubt even then with the authorities in Great Britain as to whether the parliament of Canada had power to do that which compared to what we are being asked to-day to do was a very small matter. I do not think that Act does anything but indirectly strengthen the case made here for the non-reduction of the number to be elected from the three provinces of Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The last section of what the minister calls the doubt-removing Act, says :

Except as provided by the third section of this Act, it shall not be competent for the parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the last mentioned Act of the said parliament inso-

far as it relates to the province of Manitoba, or any other Act hereafter established in new provinces in the said Dominion.

Will it be contended that when this says : You shall not, except as provided in the Act and in respect of the small matter with which it deals, interfere with any rights heretofore existing in regard to the province of Manitoba or the new provinces, it impliedly allows you to make ducks and drakes of the legislation bringing into confederation the four provinces of the Dominion of Canada as it at first existed ? It could not, even by the utmost stretch of imagination, be made to accomplish such a result. The parliament of Canada has never asked the imperial parliament to repeal or amend section 4, therefore, we are not in a position to say whether they would or would not repeal it if we asked them. But we know that nothing else that they have been asked to do in regard to the other provinces have they ever done except upon the address of the legislature of the province affected.

I understood the Minister of Justice to say, in answer to a question by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) that, under the Order in Council that had been passed it would be competent for the representation of the province of Quebec to be reduced to any number. If that is so, if he can, by an Act of parliament approved by Order in Council by the imperial government, reduce the representation in the province of Quebec, why cannot he do the same thing under the statute which gives power for the entry into confederation of the territory known at that time as Prince Rupert's Land ? The only difference is in the heading, and that cannot affect the case—let it be called Prince Rupert's Land or Quebec, the effect is the same. There is another thing which, I say with all due deference, the Minister of Justice forgot when giving the opinion which was spoken of in the House this afternoon. He forgot the well-known rule of law with regard to the repeal of statutes. Every lawyer who has studied the matter knows, when the question rises whether a subsequent statute repeals a former one you must 'lean against repugnancy'—you must assume that there is no repeal, unless it is expressly so stated or unless there is no construction which can be found consistent with the belief that there has been no repeal. Let me quote, for the benefit of he Minister of Justice and also for the benefit of the laymen as well as the lawyers of the House, the words of Sir Peter Benson Maxwell, who is acknowledged to be one of the greatest authorities on the construction of statutes. In his latest work, this great writer says—I quote from page 134 :

To impute repugnancy is to impute ignorance or carlessness of expression or confusion of thought ; and not only therefore is repeal by implication not favoured, but any construction involving it is to be rejected in favour of any other which the language will rationally bear.

Mr. LANCASTER.

And he gives several decided cases as authority for this view. At page 136, he says :

When the latter enactment is worded in affirmative terms only without any negative it does not take away the earlier law. The governing principle in all these cases is to construe the Act if possible as reconcilable, and capable of co-existence.

Now, with the indulgence of the House let us apply this principle to the case before us. Here we have an Act showing how the calculation of representation is to be made as between these four provinces. The Minister of Justice says that this is by implication repealed. He does not contend that there has been an express repeal, nor does the right hon. mover (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) of the second reading of the Bill. But, because certain Orders in Council, which have the effect of statutes as provided for in the Act, have, or are said to have a certain effect, therefore, you must, by implication read into section 4 'seven' instead of 'four,' and apply it to seven provinces instead of four, or you are not giving the smooth and easy construction required for the purposes of this Bill. But the authority I have quoted makes it clear that if we can find a construction of the two which is consistent with the non-repeal of the earlier statute, we must accept that interpretation. That is why we say that the Act must have the meaning that we give it. We preserve intact the provision with regard to the one-twentieth, and we give full force and effect to the Orders in Council which the minister refers to. The fact is, there was a business going on with these four provinces as partners. The other provinces wanted to come in, and were asked to come in. An arrangement mutually satisfactory was made for them to enter the partnership. It is contended, therefore, that there should not be the same construction of the bargain among the four as between themselves that there would have been if the others had not entered. The better interpretation of the law is that the new provinces should be held to the bargain that they made, leaving the other bargain intact, and so there was no repeal.

Now, with regard to what the Minister of Justice has said as to reducing the representation of the province of Quebec. When the hon. gentleman was speaking I thought : Oh ! shades of provincial rights, where are you. When we hear a minister in the Liberal government contending that the province of Quebec could have its representation reduced by a mere Act of this parliament, and this with the statutes before him showing that the British parliament has refused to make any changes affecting a province without an address from the legislature of that province—

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) does not mean the House to take him seriously when he attributes such a statement to me.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am replying to what I think the result of the hon. gentleman's argument.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not understand that.

Mr. LANCASTER. The argument of the Minister of Justice, as I understand it, was that this could be done. I may point out that these new provinces were not allowed by the imperial government to come into confederation except on address from the legislature of the province as well as of the Dominion. But the logical result of the Minister of Justice's argument is that you could interfere with the existing arrangement of the four provinces without an address from the legislature of those four provinces or consulting them in any way. I think the conclusion that we must come to with regard to the whole matter is that, interpreting the British North America Act as we must interpret it, it is not only doubtful, but I am constrained to say that it is clear to me that you have no right to interfere with the arrangement under section 4, you must apply that proportion of one-twentieth to the four provinces. That being so, then, on the merits, this Bill should not be read a second time, but the order should be discharged, the existing arrangement should be left undisturbed and, applying properly this proportion of one-twentieth to the four original provinces, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, none of them should be reduced in the number of representatives they send to this House.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) I desire, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words, in reply to some remarks fallen from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) who has just taken his seat. Clearly, my hon. friend has not caught the exact meaning of the statement made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick). I think the question as to whether the representation of the province of Quebec could be reduced by an Act of this parliament has never seriously been raised by any member of this House.

I agree with the hon. gentleman that the Liberal party has always championed provincial rights. I wish also to express my entire accord in his remarks, when he said that the provinces having entered into partnership, the British North America Act is a treaty which ought to be fairly carried out by all those who were parties to it.

The province of Quebec agreed that she should have a fixed representation of sixty-five members, provided that the representation of the other provinces should be reduced in the event of their population becoming proportionally less considerable than the population of Quebec. In 1872, as also in 1882 and in 1892, the province of Quebec has cheerfully concurred in the enforcement of the compact it had been a party to in 1867. It is most regrettable that the hon. gentlemen opposite should seek to put a different construction on that Act, now that it becomes incumbent upon parliament to reduce the representation of a sister province. As the hon. Minister of Justice explained this afternoon, the soundness of the view taken by the government cannot be questioned. Section 4, upon which hon. gentlemen opposite have dwelt at length with such evident relish, is not so obscure as they pretend. The last part of that section provides :

> And in the same provisions, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, the name Canada shall be taken to mean Canada as constituted under this Act.

Now, I appeal to any hon. gentleman who has read the British North America Act whether, in any part of this Act, the word 'Canada' does not cover all the provinces that may join confederation ? But let us look at the preamble of the Act, which is as follows :

> Whereas the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom.

Clearly, sir, in this peamble of the Act, Canada means only the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec which were then known, in virtue of the Union Act, under the name of the province of Canada. Prior to confederation, the term Canada applied only to Ontario and Quebec. But under section 4, the word Canada has a much wider meaning as shown by the concluding words of that section :

> Unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, the name Canada shall be taken to mean Canada as constituted under this Act.

That is to say, the union formed under the new constitution. When the word Canada does not cover that union, it means Canada such as is understood in the preamble of the Act.

Then, in section four, it says :

> The subsequent provisions of this Act shall, unless it is otherwise expressed or implied, commence and have effect on and after the union, that is to say, on and after the day appointed for the union taking effect . . . . . .

Section 146 enacts that the provinces, which have later on joined confederation, may be admitted into the union, subject to the provisions of this Act. Now, from the very moment those provinces were let in, it was under section 4 that they came in. True, there was a special treaty entered into between those provinces, but apart altogether from such treaty, supposing, for instance, that the entry of Manitoba only had been provided for, section 4 says that that province may be admitted into confederation subject to the provisions of the British North America Act; and therefore it came in under

section 4. Sections 4 and 146 should be construed as forming a whole.

Now, with the indulgence of the House, I shall urge but one objection to the arguments advanced by the opposition. They pretend that a contract or partnership has been entered into, but the province of Quebec was also one of the contracting parties. It should be borne in mind that the province of Quebec agreed to having a fixed representation of sixty-five members, but it is but fair that it should be given a compensation, and that the other provinces should have their representation reduced. It is a policy of give and take. That was a well understood principle from the very outset, as shown by subsection 2 of section 51 which says :

> There shall be assigned to each of the other provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number 65 bears to the number of the population of Quebec—(so ascertained).

So, if there was anything in the minds of the fathers of confederation it was that representation was to be based on population. Such was the principle adopted at the time. Quebec was to have sixty-five members and the other provinces were to be given a proportionate number. Such was the system adhered to by the framers of confederation.

The hon. member of Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has also referred to the interpretation of treaties. But he should not forget that treaties must be interpreted as against the stipulating party. Now, it is agreed that as the province of New Brunswick has not the required population, it cannot rightly claim more members than the number which the government contemplate allotting to the province. Were the matter open to doubt the province should not be given, the benefit of the doubt ; but, on the contrary, the treaty should be construed conformably to common law, that is to say, in favour of the main clause of the contract, instead of the exception.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). It is with a good deal of diffidence that I approach the discussion of this question. The right hon. gentleman stated in introducing this Bill that it was his intention to bring in a measure which would be submitted to both parties in this House to agree upon. He stated that he was following English precedent, and especially the doctrine laid down by him and his followers when they were in opposition, when they declared that if they had an opportunity of introducing a Redistribution Bill it would be drawn on those lines and would be perfectly fair, a Bill which ought to be acceptable to all parties in the House. The Bill introduced by the right hon. gentleman and his statement in introducing it led me to believe that the Bill would be submitted to a committee, a majority of which would have an opportunity of framing and reporting the Bill to the House. The principle adopted in England has been set forth by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. He has shown that the English Bill was the result of a conference, which consisted on behalf of the opposition of Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote. They met time and again in the Privy Council. The question that arose was as to the number of members which should be assigned to England, the number to Scotland and the number to Ireland. They also had to decide the principle as to whether a suburban population should be attached to a rural population, and they decided the principle that a suburban population should be attached to the cities and an urban population should remain with the counties. The conference decided upon all the leading principles of the Bill, they fixed the unit of representation for England, for Scotland and for Ireland, the unit for the counties and the unit for the cities ; all the leading principles of the Bill were agreed upon by the conference, and then it was referred to the committee for the purpose of delimiting the various ridings. As my hon. friend the leader of the opposition stated, that committee consisted of gentlemen from different sections of the country. They had as asistants officers of the Royal Engineers, and they made a delimitation to which no objection could possibly be taken. If I understand the right hon. gentleman, he intends that a conference, composed of members whom he may select and whom the opposition may select, should settle the principles which should be adopted in the delimitation of the different constituencies. That is perfectly fair, we were perfectly willing to accept that proposition. Viewing the conference as representing the principles laid down by the opposition in 1892, as interpreted by the Hon. Mr. Davies, by the Hon. Mr. Mills and by Mr. Dalton McCarthy, it was to be a conference designed to come to a mutual agreement, the same as the English conference in 1884, which settled the principles upon which the delimitation was to take place. The right hon. gentleman in introducing this Bill is fixing the number of representatives for the different provinces. I suppose he does not intend on the second reading to include that principle. As I understood him, the question as to whether we are to have a reduced representation in Ontario is to be left with the Supreme Court to decide.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Ontario and the maritime provinces.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood that the question as to whether Ontario, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island were to be affected in their present representation was to be left to the Supreme Court to decide ; that is, the interpretation of clause 51 and the correlative clauses was to be left to the Supreme Court. If that is the case,

he cannot expect us to approve of the principle of the Bill, and to say that Ontario should have a certain number of representatives, and the same with the other provinces except Quebec. He cannot expect us to vote for the second reading of the Bill affirming the principles which the Minister of Justice says are the governing principles in the Redistribution Act, on which we take issue, and which we understand from the right hon. gentleman are the questions that are to be submitted to the court. But if these clauses fixing the number of members are eliminated from the Bill, I do not see that we can have any objection on this side of the House to a second reading, providing that the Bill does not become law until the Supreme Court has decided whether Ontario, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island must submit to a decreased representation.

The British North America Act is the charter and constitution of this Dominion. We have no power to decide whether any Act of ours infringes upon it. The parties who are the custodians of that Act are the imperial authorities and their representative here, the Governor General. He has exercised that authority already on the Oaths Bill. When any question arises as to whether the legislation of this parliament is ultra vires of the British North America Act, I consider that it is the duty of the Governor General to consult the law officers of the Crown in England. For these reasons, I feel a double security. I feel a security in the promise which the right hon. gentleman has made to us that the question will be submitted to the Supreme Court; I also feel a security in the fact that the imperial authorities and the Governor General of Canada are the custodians of the British North America Act, who are to decide as to whether any legislation of ours is outside the corners of that Act.

Now let me refer to the question which is particularly before the House as to whether there is the right to deprive Ontario or New Brunswick of the number of members which they at present send as representatives to this House. I do so with a good deal of diffidence. I am of the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice that when the British North America Act was passed it contemplated the present and it contemplated the future, but I will ask the hon. Minister of Justice what is the meaning of clause 8 in that British North America Act in which it states that the four provinces of Canada shall have a separate census taken and then I shall deal with clause 51 of the Act. My contention is that clause 51 of the British North America Act has no application to any of the provinces which might be in future added to the Dominion, that its application is solely and only to the four provinces and that if an Act of parliament is passed by the imperial authorities on addresses from this House and addresses from the different provinces asking that the provisions of the Act shall apply to the different provinces coming into confederation clause 51 would not apply at all. I doubt very much if the Supreme Court, or any lawyer throughout the country, would give the opinion that unless clause 51 is especially mentioned it would apply in connection with the redistribution after any decennial census to any province or territory added to the Dominion of Canada. Let us read the wording of the Act. Clause 51 says:

> On the completion of the census in the year one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such manner, and from such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides.

What is the meaning of 'Canada' in that Act? I will admit the correctness of the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice that it is Canada as constituted at the time of the passage of the Act. There is no doubt whatever about it that the parliament of Canada could not mean the members of this House representing the four provinces of the Dominion, but that it must apply to the whole 'Dominion of Canada.' Then, we have this governing clause:

> On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one twentieth part or upwards.

The hon. Minister of Justice says that 'Canada' within the meaning of that clause refers to Canada whatever it is at the time the readjustment is made and to back up his opinion he reads the opinion of Mr. Christopher Robinson, of Toronto. On that point I would remind the hon. Minister of Justice of the delicacy that he had in arguing the question when he said that he did not like to discuss the question in full because he did not like to lead the Supreme Court upon the question. But, he has no delicacy in reading the opinion of Mr. Christopher Robinson in support of his contention and it never struck him that he might possibly lead the Supreme Court into forming an opinion in reference to the matter.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On that point the whole argument of the hon. Minister of Justice is that 'Canada' comprises the Dominion as at present existing between the Atlantic and the Pacific. Unfortunately for his argument he admitted that the North-west Territories did not come within the meaning of the word 'Canada.' Why does not 'Canada' comprise the North-west Territories? The application of this clause was intended to the four provinces of Canada

and 'Canada' under the meaning of the clause could not mean anything else than the four provinces at that time. The parliament of Canada may redistribute the representation of the four provinces and if my argument is correct unless clause 51 of the British North America Act is specifically mentioned as applicable to the provinces or territories coming in it would have no application at all. The application is solely and only to the four provinces mentioned and the strongest support of my contention is the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice that the North-west Territories did not form part of Canada as at present constituted. The hon. gentleman risks his reputation; he says that he has no doubt as to the opinion of the Supreme Court in the matter. He fortifies his position with the opinion of Mr. Christopher Robinson. I, a layman, perhaps, should not speak particularly of the interpretation of an Act of parliament or statute, but I am clearly of a different way of thinking. I understand the meaning of the English language, I understand the meaning of the surroundings of the British North America Act. This was a bargain between the four provinces entering into confederation and the representation either increased or decreased, was to be governed by a proportion between them. The hon. Minister of Justice says that on addresses from this House and on addresses from the provinces or territories coming into confederation, the governing power in England, the King, can, by Order in Council, within the four corners of the British North America Act, or if nothing is contradictory or against the tenor of the British North America Act, admit these provinces into the Dominion. That is true, and it becomes as solemn as an Act of parliament can be but when he was faced by the question of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax): Supposing there was a bargain with Newfoundland for the purpose of securing her admission to the confederation by which Newfoundland would have an abnormal representation could he make it a part of the bargain that the representation of Ontario and of Quebec and of New Brunswick should be decreased ?—the hon. Minister of Justice said 'yes.' It becomes, he said, in fact, an imperial Act of parliament and if upon an address from us an imperial Order in Council is passed and receives the sanction of the King we can reduce even the representation of Quebec three or four members. I contend there is no such power vested in the imperial authorities.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman gives a power to the imperial parliament which would never be submitted if the imperial parliament had that power. He says that as a matter of law the British North America Act could be altered from time to time by the imperial parliament. It may be so but when a constitution is once given to a country the imperial parliament will not interfere. I doubt very much if they have the power of doing it unless when a rebellion, or a revolution or a reconquest of the country occurs. I heard that doctrine laid down long ago by as able a lawyer as the hon. Minister of Justice, the Hon. Ed. Blake in this House and he held that once a constitution is given to a country there is no power, even under the imperial authority, to diminish or lessen that constitution without the consent of the country to which the authority is given.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And the power to limit such a constitution is only exercised in the most extreme cases such as for instance in the case of a revolution. I am glad to say, although possibly the reports in the newspapers may have been wrong, that when there was a question in the old country in regard to doing away with the constitution of Cape Colony all the representatives at the colonial conference protested against anything of the kind being done for the reason that they did not know when it would perhaps occur to themselves. The principle I lay down is that although the power may be there I doubt very much if it can be exercised except under extraordinary circumstances, that once they grant a constitution to a country they have no power to revoke it without cause. I contend that the clause in regard to representation has no effect upon or no application to any province or territory which is admitted into Canada unless it is specially asked for. The imperial authorities on an address from this House, admitted Rupert's Land into the Dominion. They passed an imperial Act of parliament giving it representation in the Dominion parliament. Does the Minister of Justice contend that they could pass an Act of parliament limiting the representation of Canada under the British North America Act, or increasing the representation of Rupert's Land, without the consent of Canada. If he admits that principle, then if ever we think that Quebec has too much influence in the Dominion, all we have to do is to pass an address to the imperial authorities asking for an Act of parliament to reduce the representation of Quebec. The Minister of Justice seems to have set aside the legal opinions in his department altogether. In support of my view in reference to clause 51 having no application to provinces or territories afterwards admitted into the Dominion I wish to read a couple of clauses from an Order in Council passed by Sir John Macdonald and on which the Imperial Act of 1871 was passed. It says :

The general purview of the British North America Act of 1867 seems to be confined to the three provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick originally forming the Domin-

ion. In the constitution of the Senate, the Dominion was divided into three divisions, each division having equal representation in that body. In like manner the clauses of this Act relating to the constitution of the House of Commons give a certain proportional representation to the provinces originally constituting the Dominion, and make no reference to the increase in numbers or any addition to the territorial domain. There is in the Act no provision whatever for the representation in the House of Commons of Rupert's Land or the North-west Territories or British Columbia.

The Minister of Justice argues that because we pass an address to the imperial authorities, with respect to a new body coming into the Dominion, be it a province or be it a territory; the conditions of the address being approved by His Majesty the King, it becomes part of the British North America Act, and so they may reduce the representation set forth in the agreement between the original four provinces. Do I understand the Minister of Justice rightly in that?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not quite understand my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart). Of course he realizes that there is a difference between the case of a territory which has no representative institutions, and the case of a province. In the case of a territory the Dominion parliament has jurisdiction to bring the territory in. With respect to a province having representative institutions, it is entirely different. In that case there must be an address from the province that seeks entrance into the Dominion and there must be an address from the Dominion parliament. Both these addresses from the province coming in and from the Dominion parliament must go to the imperial authorities, and there by Order in Council sanctioning the address the province is allowed in upon the terms fixed in the address. The address of course must be in the same terms from the province and from the Dominion. In these terms the imperial order is passed, and has the effect of imperial legislation. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) was good enough to give us his opinion a moment ago with respect to imperial legislation, and perhaps he will allow me to read from Jenkins, who is something of an authority on this point:

> The legislative supremacy of parliament over the whole of the British domain is complete and undoubted in law.

And there is no lawyer in parliament who would say to the contrary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is no doubt at all as to the technical power of the imperial parliament; there is no doubt as to the technical power of the King of Great Britain and Ireland to disallow a Bill, but the Minister of Justice knows that constitutional writers distinguish between the technical power and the constitutional right. Therefore, it is said that although the King of Great Britain has the technical power to disallow Acts of parliament he has not the constitutional right; and his doing so after the lapse of 200 years might provoke a revolution in a great emergency. Therefore, while the imperial parliament might exercise its power to make a tariff for us to-morrow, because it has the technical power to do so, that is a different thing altogether from the constitutional right; and it was on the question of constitutional right that my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) was addressing himself. While I am on my feet, I might with the indulgence of the House mention to the Minister of Justice a consideration which has been addressed from this side and which he has perhaps not fully appreciated. He has said that it would be quite possible, by means of addresses passed by the provinces and by this parliament upon the admission of these provinces, to so far alter the effect of the British North America Act as to reduce the representation of the province of Quebec which is definitely fixed and stated in that Act. Now, I submit to the Minister of Justice that that would lead to a very extraordinary condition of affairs, if his argument is pursued to its logical conclusion, and for this reason: So far as Rupert's Land is concerned there is to be no address from Rupert's Land because Rupert's Land possesses no representative institutions. Rupert's Land was to be admitted on an address from no other body than from the House of parliament of Canada. The statute says:

> And on address from the Houses of parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North-west Territory.

Then the British North America Act of 1886 was passed giving power to this parliament to deal with the representation of Rupert's Land; and the point to which I invite the attention of the minister is this—he says that by means of this address, coupled with the Queen's proclamation you can cut down the representation of the province of Quebec. I do not agree with the Minister of Justice at present; I may change my mind upon further consideration; but if his argument is correct, does it not lead to this inevitable conclusion: You have so far as Rupert's Land is concerned the address of the Houses of the parliament of Canada plus the Imperial Act of 1886 giving power to deal with the representation of that territory. Therefore, the address of the Houses of the parliament of Canada, which made no provision for representation of the Territories and Rupert's Land, plus the Imperial Act of 1886, should place this parliament in the same position as that which the Minister of Justice has already indicated. In other words, it seems to me it would logically follow from his argument that this parliament, under the imperial statute of 1886 in providing from time to time for

the representation of the North-west Territories, could deal with the representation of Ontario or Quebec or the maritime provinces. It seems to be that that would logically result from the argument of the Minister of Justice with which, however, I do not agree. I say this, because the addresses with respect to Rupert's Land, plus the Imperial Act of 1886, are exactly equivalent to the address from the Dominion and from the province of Prince Edward Island for example, plus the Queen's proclamation. I would think that possibly the argument which the Minister of Justice made in that regard may lead to a very awkward result if carried as far as I suggest.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think that we can debate the question quite fully at the present time. We will have occasion to debate it before the Supreme Court, and I will have to discuss it in the House of Commons again, but I do not wish to be misrepresented on any statement of law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I certainly have no desire to misrepresent the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What I said was that the legislative supremacy of parliament was undoubted. That is what I said, and when my hon. friends come to look up 'Hansard' they will see I guarded myself by saying that it was extremely doubtful if any attempt to legislate in that direction would be made. The right to legislate is undoubted. That is the statement I made, and that is the statement I repeat, and that is the statement that no lawyer will venture to doubt.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know whether I am a lawyer or not, but I would venture to doubt it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. My argument was from the constitutional point of view, that the imperial authorities had no right at all to interfere with our constitution. The Minister of Justice said they had, and the application of his argument was that when the addresses and Order in Council received the sanction of the Queen, they became part of the British North America Act or the imperial law and affected our position to that extent. I pointed out that addresses from the different provinces coming into the Dominion and the addresses from the Dominion to the imperial authorities, if approved by the Sovereign, might alter the representation of the four provinces under the bargain which we make with a new province coming into the union. I state here, and it cannot be contradicted, that if it were not for the admission of the North-west Territories and Manitoba into this Dominion, the number of representatives in this parliament from the province of Ontario would not be diminished at all. Therefore our representation is affected by the bargain which we make with the different provinces entering into the Dominion. I say that there was no such intention in the British North America Act. That Act bears no such meaning. Section 51 applies solely to the four provinces which originally constituted confederation and it is solely to the readjustment of the representation of these provinces to which that section applies. Then what can be the meaning of the term 'Canada' so far as this clause 51 is concerned? As regards the readjustment of the representation of these four original provinces, the term can be held to cover but them alone. Notwithstanding the argument of the hon. Minister of Justice and the opinion of the eminent lawyer, Mr. Christopher Robinson, of Toronto, I am still convinced, following the opinion of my old leader, the late Sir John Macdonald, that this clause 51 in the British North America Act has no reference at all to the future new provinces of Canada, and that unless it is specially provided in the Acts authorizing the admission of new provinces into the Dominion, that this section 51 shall apply to them, it must be held to be restricted to the four original provinces.

The right hon. gentleman the First Minister in introducing his Bill the other day, said, in reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), who drew his attention to a telegram from the hon. Minister of Railways to the legislature of New Brunswick, that he intended to press the Bill, that he had no doubt as to the law on the question, and that he was only following the principles laid down in 1882 and 1892. But there was no such principle at issue in 1882 or in 1892 as we are contending for now. The question then was not raised. It did not enter as an issue at all. It could not have any application at all, and the right hon. gentleman cannot take any authority from anything that was done in 1882 or in 1892, inasmuch as the one-twentieth provision in subsection four of section fifty-one did not affect the position of any of the provinces at that time.

I have looked very carefully into the provisions of the British North America Act. I was at first impressed by the opinion of the Minister of Justice that subsection four of section fifty-one referred to Canada as it is constituted at present, but looking at all the surroundings of the Act and having regard especially for the opinion cited by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) of Sir Henry Strong on the subject, I am convinced that section fifty-one was not at all intended to apply to the provinces or territories to be subsequently admitted. The principles which are laid down by Sir Henry Strong, I think, apply particularly to that clause :—

In construing this enactment, the British North America Act, we are not only entitled but bound to apply that well established rule which requires us, in passing upon the descrip-

tive terms or definitions contained in a statute, to have recourse to the external aid derived from the surrounding circumstances and the history of the subject.

The history of the subject and the surrounding circumstances. Mr. Speaker—that opinion of Sir John Macdonald and his memo. to council upon the subject—point clearly to the conclusion that section fifty-one of the British North America Act was intended to apply only to the four provinces which originally constituted confederation. It is true that by special arrangement with the new provinces entering confederation and forming now part of the Dominion, section fifty-one is made specially to apply to them, but in every address, enactment and Act of parliament governing their admission, it is specially provided that the rule laid down in section fifty-one shall apply to their representation, except in the case of British Columbia, one of the conditions of whose entrance into the Dominion was that in no event was its representation to be reduced. But what I protest against most of all is that by an address of this House, or of this House and any of the provinces combined, to the imperial authority, power should be given to the British parliament to reduce the representation granted by the solemn compact, under which they formed confederation, to the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (East Prince, P. E. I.) The hon. Minister of Justice has said that viewing Prince Edward Island from the contentions put forward this afternoon regarding Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario, she was out of court. But, Mr. Speaker, we contend that Prince Edward Island's case is a special one and a much stronger and entirely different case from that put forward by the other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, we object to the principles of this Bill insofar as it does not remedy the wrong done to the province of Prince Edward Island in violating the special compact under which she entered the union and taking away, contrary to the special terms, the status of representation of six members given at that time and treating her as coming in under the general terms of representation as applies to provinces entering under the British North America Act of 1867.

At the time of redistribution of 1891 a false interpretation was put upon the clause re our representation, and we object against that being recognized in this Bill and still further wronging her in again reducing her representation in giving her four instead of the original six with which she entered and perpetuating an erroneous and unjust principle which will eventually take away the entire political entity of a province that before confederation enjoyed to the full the principles of a self-governed colony.

The objection to the principles of representation by population as regards Prince Edward Island, except as I shall hereafter point out, is general throughout the Island and maritime provinces by parties of both political leanings.

At the opening of the provincial legislature on March 19, 1903, the Lieutenant Governor referred to this matter of representation as follows :—

> The claims of this province that its representation under British North America Act, in the Dominion House of Commons should not be reduced below the number of members conceded to it at the time of our entry into confederation, have been pressed upon the federal government by my premier and representatives of my administration, and I feel confident that the province will be given an opportunity to establish its rights in this respect.

And the mover of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne spoke strongly on this matter. His opening remarks were:—

> We now come to the question of representation, this is to-day a most important question. In the very near future the Dominion parliament will be called on to discuss a redistribution Bill, and the House would be derelict in its duty if it should allow the central government to perpetrate another such error as inflicted on this province in 1891 without the strongest protests.
>
> A false interpretation was put upon our terms of union by the Dominion government, the words : 'the representation to be re-adjusted from time to time, under the provisions of the British North America Act 1867' were torn from their context and made to do duty as law. Mr. Speaker, these words do not apply, and never have applied to this province by right—it was an iniquity and we should deny it and defy it.
>
> What, Sir, are the principles laid down in the various Acts of confederation ; is there one essential principle or are there two distinct standards of representation, let us see. In 1864 a basis of confederation was adopted by the Quebec conference, in which the principle of representation was laid down, that principle was accepted after a time by the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but it was not accepted by us. We stood out for another standard and after a long fight we succeeded in securing a representation of six members for 95,000 of a population; this, Sir, is quite another rule, and it is a rule or principle that has been acknowledged, accepted and applied to other provinces before and since that time, notably to Manitoba and British Columbia. One of the greatest obstacles to the scheme of confederation with this Island was the insistence of the Canadian statesmen that representation by population should be part of the terms, while our people were quite as isistent on having not less than six members regardless of population.

In the first place, I do not believe that the principle of representation by population is found within the four corners of the confederation document. And, so far as regards the reduction of the representation of Prince Edward Island, this was not intended if Prince Edward Island maintained the population with which she entered confederation—95,857. And I think this clause

giving her representation of six members and the interpreting clause fully carry out this idea. To follow the unit of representation as in Quebec with 65 members would render the whole scheme with regard to Prince Edward Island absurd. Because, if Quebec were as thickly populated as Prince Edward Island, we should have 65-152 of a unit of representation, because Quebec is 152 times as large as Prince Edward Island. We would not have half the population to make up one unit of representation, and so we should be deprived of representation altogether. It is absurd to suppose that such a thing could have been intended when Prince Edward Island entered confederation. Then, there are the reports of the Quebec Conference and the speeches in the local legislature repudiating representation by population; and, finally, we have a telegram, just before the close of the conference, admitting Prince Edward Island to the union and confirming a representation of six members as its representatives had been asking for. It was five years after the formation of the union of the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, that Prince Edward Island joined the union, having remained out up to that time for causes to which I shall refer later. Prince Edward Island came in under section 146 of the British North America Act, which provides the terms under which Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and other provinces might enter—that is, on addresses by the province and the Dominion, and the passing of an imperial Order in Council which would have the effect of law.

The clause of the British North America Act reads as follows :

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them into the union, and on address from the Houses of Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North Western Territory, or either of them, into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act ; and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

The Order in Council admitting Prince Edward Island was passed on the 26th of June, 1873, declaring that Prince Edward Island be admitted and become part of the Dominion of Canada upon the terms and conditions set forth in the addresses. The clauses in these addresses of the different Houses to the Sovereign regarding representation is as follows :

That the population of Prince Edward Island having been increased by 15,000 or upwards since the year 1861, the island shall be represented in the House of Commons by six members ; the representation to be readjusted from time to time under the provision of the British North America Act, 1867.

This plea is made on the belief that, under this clause Prince Edward Island is justly entitled to retain the six members with which it came into the union, and given under this clause, and that the reduction in 1892, and the further contemplated reduction now, are contrary to the direct terms under which the island came into the union. I think this will be very clearly seen upon an intelligent interpretation of the Act, and from the manifest intention of the parties negotiating the terms, which intention, to my mind, should weigh greatly with this House, particularly when it comes to unjust interference with such paramount rights as the representation of a province in the House of Commons in Canada which will create and I know is creating, a great deal of dissatisfaction among the people of Prince Edward Island.

Now, to go back to the Quebec conference of 1864, where the different representatives of different provinces met to discuss the terms of confederation we find that the insurmountable difficulty in the way of Prince Edward Island entering the union was the matter of representation. The position which our delegates took at that convention was firm and decided. They realized what that union might mean in the matter of representation to a small province and one very thickly populated in proportion to the rest of the Dominion, as Prince Edward Island was at that time. They insisted that the system of representation by population should not be applied to so small a province with no territory to enlarge her borders, no mines, and cut off from the mainland by a barrier of ice which would interfere with the development of manufacturing industries on the island. They insisted on six members as a status before Prince Edward Island should enter the union. They further contended that Prince Edward Island, having three counties should have two members for each county. These counties had been established for many years, and each had its own institutions and should have equal representation in the House, two members for each. In proof of what I am saying I shall take the liberty of reading from Joseph Pope's Confederation Documents, extracts from the speeches of our representatives to the Quebec conference. At page 68 of the documents, I find the following :

Mr. HAVILAND. Prince Edward Island would rather be out of confederation than consent to this motion. We should have no status. Only 5 members out of 194 would give the island no position.

Mr. TILLEY. That is rather a singular ground of objection, for they have objected to the basis of representation by population. Now

it was fully understood at Charlottetown that those who came to the conference expected representation by population. Some difficulty might have arisen on those points, but not on this.

Mr. PALMER. Representation by population is not applicable when a certain number of provinces are throwing their resources into one confederation and giving up their own self-government and individuality. When a colony surrenders that right she should have something commensurate in the confederation. The debt of Prince Edward Island is nothing. Our taxation is vastly below that of other provinces. Our trade and revenue are rapidly increasing. Why give up so great a certainty for an uncertain benefit where we have only a feeble voice ? Looking first at the larger provinces, Canada has secured for herself a greater number of representatives than she had before. . . . Not even two or three more members could induce me to give my consent to the scheme. I never understood that any proposition at Charlottetown was to be binding by representation by population. It was there made by those from Canada and I do not think it necessary to remark on it as it was a mere suggestion then thrown out by Canada for consideration.

Mr. WHELAN. I do not think, however, I could say that I was satisfied with the representation of five in the federal House of Commons. We are in an isolated condition. Our resources are large and our people would not be content to give up their present benefits for their representation of five members. It may be said that the confederation will go on without Prince Edward Island and that we shall be eventually forced in. Better, however, that, than that we should willingly go into the confederation with that representation.

COLONEL GRAY. I am instructed by my co-delegates to say that the provision of five members is unsatisfactory. Prince Edward Island is divided longitudinally into three counties, each returning ten members. But they are always opposed to change of representation. We cannot divide the three counties into five members.

Mr. COLES. Mr. Galt had proposed six members for Prince Edward Island. I approved that rather than Mr. Brown's motion, because it allows us to give to our three counties two members each.

Mr. POPE. I agree in all that has been said by Colonel Gray and Mr. Coles. But the circumstances of Prince Edward Island are such that I hope the conference will agree to give us such a number as we can divide amongst our three constituencies. Nature as well as the original settlement of the island has made three counties and would give rise to much difficulties and if we had to adjust five members to the three counties. I cannot ask it as a matter of right but one of expediency and one without which it is impossible for us to carry the measure in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HAVILAND. I fully agree with Mr. Pope. It would be an insuperable difficulty with us if we had not six members.

Now, will any hon. member of this House deny that the plain intent of these delegates was that the island should be represented by six members as a condition precedent to entering the union ? And is it not perfectly apparent that their intention was to safeguard the interests of the province by a representation in the House of Commons that would not fall below six members so long as we retained the status of 95,000 population ? The asking for two for each county was not intended as a temporary arrangement until the next census, but that they should always be represented by two. The arguments used then have greater force at this time as regards giving us a respectable status in the House. A small province with a stationary population in a large and growing confederacy, our voting power becomes less; and I contend that the principles for which our people fought so long, standing out from 1864 to 1873, should not be so easily filched from us to-day. These terms of union were discussed in the local legislature in several sessions following. To show the members of this House that the delegates at the conference had the full approval of the local legislature, I shall again take the opportunity of quoting from some of the discussions. I apologize to the House for taking up its time, but this is a matter of paramount importance to Prince Edward Island, and I think it necessary that the intention of the parties to confederation should be well known in order that the government may be guided thereby before they finally adopt such a principle as that laid down in the Bill. Speaking on a resolution introduced by the Colonial Secretary in favour of the Quebec terms, and which was overwhelmingly lost on division, the Hon. J. C. Pope said :

It is proper to notice some of the objectionable features of the report. Without admitting the principle of representation according to population under all circumstances to be sound, it is, in the opinion of this House, particularly objectionable as applied to this island in connection with Canada, taking into consideration that the number of our inhabitants is, and must continue comparatively small, owing to the fact that we have no Crown lands, mines, minerals or other resources sufficient to induce immigrants to settle here, and that we never can expect to become to any extent a manufacturing people, in consequence of our navigation being closed for nearly half the year, and all trade and communication with other countries stopped. Under this principle, the city of Montreal alone would at the present time, have a representation greater than the whole province of Prince Edward Island, and under the provisions of the convention which regulate the mode of readjusting the relative representation of the various provinces at each decennial census, looking at the rapid increase of the population of Upper and Lower Canada heretofore—particularly the former—and the certainty of a still greater increase therein in the future, over that of the population of this island, it follows as a certain and inevitable consequence, if a federation of the provinces were consummated upon the basis of the said convention, that the number of our representatives would, in the course of a comparatively short number of years, be diminished to a still smaller number than that allotted at the outset to us.

It seems to me that it is a perfectly plain statement from the leader of the government and shows that the concession of six members was a condition precedent, and could only have been six in perpetuity, for Mr. Pope fully realized that at the next census our representation according to population would be reduced, as has been actually the case. Mr. Pope further said :

Among these objections I may mention the principle of representation by population.

Speaking of Quebec he says :

Its statistics warrant the belief that in a few years the population will be so increased by the influx of the tide of immigration that the island would lose in the halls of legislation even the small voice which she might raise at her entrance into the union.

The Hon. Mr. Howland, speaking on the same subject, said :

In the seventeenth paragraph of the report we are told, 'The basis of representation in the House of Commons shall be population, as determined by the official census every ten years; and the number of members at first shall be 194. Of this number Upper Canada is to have 82, and Lower Canada 65—in all for Canada 147. The remainder of the 194 is distributed as follows : Nova Scotia, 19; New Brunswick, 15; Newfoundland, 8; Prince Edward Island, 5—in all for the lower provinces, 47. By this arrangement it will be seen that Canada will have 100 representatives in the House of Commons more than the aggregate of all the other colonies. Representation by population might be very well for Canada herself, but in a general union of the colonies it would operate injuriously for the maritime provinces, as they could not expect to protect their interests when they would have to contend with 100 of a clear majority over their own representation. This principle would give the city of Montreal with its 101,000 inhabitants one representative more than this island. Quite different is the representation of Great Britain, for while London has about the same population as Scotland, that city has only 16 members in the House of Commons, while Scotland has 53. But it may be argued that as our population increases our representation will increase. This is very doubtful. Indeed under the operation of the twentieth and twenty-first clauses of the report it seems probable that we might lose our representation altogether. Lower Canada is always to have 65 members, and the representation of the other colonies is to be arranged every ten years so as to give each the same ratio to population as she will then possess. Now, should the population of Lower Canada increase more rapidly than that of this island, which is almost certain to be the case, our representation would decrease, and we would be left perhaps without a member at all. To show at least that it is much more likely that our representation will decrease than increase, I will read the Hon. George Brown's opinions on the subject, as given in the Toronto 'Globe.' In treating of the probable effect of these two clauses of the report to which I have been alluding, on the representation of the maritime provinces, that journal says :

'The fact is best shown by illustration. Prince Edward Island with a population say of 85,000 is, it is said, to have five representatives at starting. Suppose she increase at the rate of twenty per cent each ten years, at the end of twenty years her population will be 126,000. But at the same rate of progress the population of Lower Canada would be 1,596,000. Divided by 65, this would give one representative to every 24,550 of her people ; so that the island would not be able to claim an increase of membership.

Mr. Duncan, speaking on the same question, said :

The five representatives allotted to us in the lower House would not give this colony much influence there ; but as our population will not increase so rapidly as that of Canada, there is a prospect, through the operation of one clause in the report, that our five representatives would dwindle down to three. Taking all those points into consideration, therefore, it is clear to me that we have nothing to gain but much to lose by adopting the Quebec scheme.

Those speeches were made in 1865. In 1866 the debate upon these resolutions was resumed. Speaking on a resolution introduced by the leader of the government, the Hon. J. C. Pope, against confederation on the terms submitted, Mr. Duncan said

Nothing could be more unjust to Prince Edward Island than representation on the basis of population, as laid down by that scheme, according to which the Canadas would have 100 representatives in the House of Commons, more than the aggregate of all the colonies, the number assigned to us being only 5. Representation on this basis might do very well for Canada ; but as respects Prince Edward Island, it would be nothing but mere mockery.

The Hon. Mr. Longworth said :

Another objection which I had to the union was that according to the scheme laid down in the report, representation in the House of Commons is to be based upon population. Representation on that basis is as objectionable as applied to those other two provinces, does not render less so to Prince Edward Island. Upper Canada is a growing country and her population will rapidly increase ; and as that increases, so, according to the Quebec scheme of representation, her representation in the federal House of Commons would increase, whilst that of Prince Edward Island would decrease. And, in fact, if the increase in the population of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick does not, in the future, grow more rapidly than it has in the past, they will also, if the plan be strictly carried out, be losers instead of gainers as respects legislative representation. Thus, as respects representation on the basis of population, the scheme appeared to me to be unjust to us, and I was therefore prepared to go against it ; and the result of our deliberations upon it in this House was its rejection by a large majority. I, for one, am not changed. I entertain the same objections to the scheme which I entertained then, and I am therefore glad to presume that the resolutions just submitted by the hon. the leader of the government harmonize with the views on that question of a majority on both sides.

The Hon. J. C. Pope said :

Representation by population is not fair as regards this country. Where there are large towns there are not so many different interests as there are in a country like this. Therefore, I do not believe in it as a principle. It is not favourably looked upon by reformers of the

present day. Even Earl Russell does not believe in representation by population. As was said here last year, by that rule London would have more representatives than Scotland. If I had acted as a delegate when the delegates from Canada were here, and when they laid it down that they would not entertain the question at all, unless representation by population were acceded to, I would have stopped there and said, no, I will not agree to it, and I blame the leader of the opposition and those other delegates who agreed to it ; they should not have done so, for it is one of the strongest objections to that scheme.

The Hon. Mr. Coles said :

The hon. the leader of the government said that the delegates should not have consented to the principle of representation by population. They did not consent to it ; for, after the Canadian delegates came here and stated their case, the first delegation ceased, and another was appointed. Therefore it was for the government to consider the matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that these speeches in the House of Representatives of Prince Edward Island show very clearly that the principle of representation by population was not accepted by the legislature of that island. She contended that special terms should be conceded to her, that she should enter with six members, and as a matter of fact, I have pointed out that Prince Edward Island remained out of confederation until 1873, and then only consented to come into the union when this final point of six members was conceded, notwithstanding anything in the British North America Act as to representation by population. When the final arrangements were being completed, in reply to an inquiry from Governor Robinson, Mr. Haviland, one of our delegates wired in reply. 'Six members conceded.' The clause again reads :

That the population of Prince Edward Island having been increased by 15,000 or upwards since the year 1861, the island should be represented in the House of Commons of Canada by six members.

Now, let us look at the facts, taking the first part of the clause. This would give us an alleged population of 95,857. On the basis of population at that time, under the general terms, got by dividing sixty-five into the population of Quebec, we get the unit 18,330, and by dividing this into the population of Prince Edward Island we get five and a fraction, 4,207. Thus, on the basis of population, we were only entitled to five members. But there is no sense or reason in the clause for giving us six unless six as a status. For any other construction would be ridiculous, after stopping out ten years, and knowing that the next census would deprive us of one, if the representation was to be by population under the general terms.

Our contention simply was this : We have a population of 95,857, and we want six members regardless of any unit of representation for other provinces. I consider, Mr. Speaker, that this ground is perfectly tenable, that we were given six members on a status of entering union with 95,857 population and that we were to have six in perpetuity. I repeat again that the reasons advanced then are more potent today in the history of events, and what a representation by population under the general terms would mean as regards Prince Edward Island, as I shall illustrate to the House later. Now as to the balance of the clause :

The representation to be readjusted from time to time under the provisions of the British North America Act.

This, in my opinion, can only refer to an increase of population in the event of our population increasing more rapidly than Quebec, and from the foregoing no other construction seems applicable, or in the case of a reduction of our population below the population we had on entering the union. This construction is also strengthened by the cases of British Columbia and Manitoba, both coming in after confederation and upon special terms. British Columbia came in in 1879, having a population of 10,586, which would give her under the general terms one member, yet she was given six. The clause reads as follows :

British Columbia is entitled to be represented by six members, the representation to be increased under the provisions of the British North America Act.

In 1881 she was entitled by population to two, yet she retained six ; in 1891 her population would entitle her to four, yet she kept six. The rights under the Prince Edward Island clause are certainly the same as the British Columbia clause, except that the language in the latter is possibly clearer. British Columbia has a right to enforce her special terms, and in fact it was never seriously questioned, and in the event of her population not having increased as it has, could any hon. member of this House question her right to retain six members ?

I can turn to the 'debates' of 1892, when we had the right hon. leader of the government speaking of this matter of the representation of British Columbia. He says :

But, at the same time, I am myself taken by surprise at the objection raised, for it has always been understood that British Columbia was entitled to six members.

Again he says :

We have always understood that British Columbia was entitled to six members until such time that she was entitled to a larger number, but that she should not be represented by a less number than six. For my part I would be sorry to come to any conclusion which would deprive British Columbia of that which the people suppose themselves to be their right.

I consider that Prince Edward Island is in exactly the same position as British Columbia ; the language of the clauses are practically the same. In the one case it says 'readjusted' and in the other case

'increased,' but, as to the intention of the framers of these clauses and of the contracting parties at the time of the union, it cannot be successfully contradicted that the meaning and purpose was the same. There was the status under which these provinces should come in, there was a special provision under which small provinces should enter the union, and both of these provinces came in under this special provision. Mr. Davies, of Prince Edward Island, speaking at that time, said :

I beg to assure my hon. friend that so far as the individual members coming from British Columbia are concerned, we entertain nothing but kindly feelings towards them personally. I am in thorough accord with my leader that this is a matter of good faith. I think it would be a breach of faith on the part of parliament to alter those terms if they could do it, but the point before the House is a purely legal question.

Sir John Thompson contended at that time that there was no need of an appeal to the Privy Council. I think the present right hon. leader of the government (Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suggested at that time that as it was a legal point and that it should be handed over to the Privy Council or to some other authority to give effect to the intent of the contracting parties. Sir John Thompson considered that even that was not necessary, that the plain intent of the Act was sufficiently expressed that British Columbia should have her six representatives until such time as the number might be increased by an inflow of population. I consider that Prince Edward Island is in the same position as British Columbia was at that day, and I think her rights should be safeguarded by this government.

Manitoba came in under an imperial Act and upon special terms. Her population in 1879 was 10,586, and under general terms would entitle her to one member, yet she came in with four. In 1881 her population would give her three, yet she still kept four. The section referring to representation in her case reads as follows :

Provided that on the completion of the census of 1891, and of each decennial census after, the representation of the province shall be readjusted according to the provisions of section 51 of the British North America Act.

Why should Prince Edward Island be treated any differently from other provinces. Their special terms were manifested better than those of Prince Edward Island and yet they were not disturbed.

There is another section of the Prince Edward Island terms to which I wish to draw attention. It reads as follows :

That the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to and only to affect one and not the whole of the provinces now comprising the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by these resolutions, be applicable to Prince Edward Island in the same way and to the same extent as they apply to the other provinces of the Dominion, and as if the colony of Prince Edward Island had been one of the provinces united by the said Act.

The qualifying words, 'except so far as the same may be varied by these resolutions,' are important. Clearly the 51st section of the British North America Act, which provides for representation by population was so 'varied' when with a special reference to our population, it was declared that the island shall be represented by six members, such six members being in excess of what we would then be entitled to by our population.

Let us point out the position this province would be in taking the general terms of the British North America Act to apply. We will take the figures of the census of 1871 and compare the growth with the recent census of 1901, thirty years later, and for convenience let us make four groups to get the relative growth of the east, centre and west. For the purpose of this study we shall group the three maritime provinces together, take Quebec and Ontario each singly, forming the fourth and last group of Manitoba, British Columbia and the territories, organized and unorganized, that are outside the provincial boundaries. The comparison will show very unequal growth as we shall see. The western group, including Manitoba, British Columbia and the territories had in 1871 a population of 109,475. In 1901 the population of the group was 624,970, showing a gain of 515,495 in the thirty years, or 470 per cent. Ontario in 1871, had a population of 1,620,851, and in 1901 this had increased to 2,182,847, showing a gain of 562,096 or 34¼ per cent. Quebec, with 1,191,516 in 1871, and 1,684,898 in 1901, gained 457,382 in the thirty years, or 38¼ per cent. The maritime group of three provinces had a population of 767,415 thirty years ago, and 893,953, according to the last census, showing a gain of 126,538 or 16½ per cent.

Here then we have four different rates of growth, 16½ per cent in the maritime section, 38¼ per cent in Quebec, 34¼ per cent in Ontario and 470 per cent in the great west. This comparison covers not a year or a ten year period merely, but the period of a generation. It indicates conditions that may operate for a generation to come. The rapid growth of the great west was a thing to be expected. What was not expected was that neither Ontario nor the maritime provinces have kept place with Quebec. And what is especially disappointing is that the increase in the population of the maritime provinces in the thirty years has been less than one third of the increase that has taken place in Quebec, the pivot province on which our representation in parliament turns.

To see whither we are drifting let us project these ratios of increase forward thirty

years into the future, and note the results. We add 38¼ per cent—the past rate of increase—to the present population of Quebec and we find that province may have in thirty years from now 2,279,601 people. We add 16½ per cent to the present population of the maritime provinces and we find they may then have 1,041,455 people. Assuming that Quebec has a population of 2,279,601 in the year 1931 the unit of representation in the Commons will be found, if we divide that number by 65—the number of members permanently allotted to Quebec—to be 35,070. Dividing the unit of population into the prospective population of the maritime provinces in 1931—that is 1,040,455—and we find the maritime provinces would then be entitled to but 30 members at the most instead of the 43 we had when Prince Edward Island entered the union. And where will Prince Edward Island be in the matter of representation after 1931, if our ratio of increase should be no better in the thirty years to come than it has been in the thirty years past? This is a simple matter of calculation. Our increase has been less than 10 per cent in the thirty years since 1871. Add a full 10 per cent of gain in the thirty years forward and in 1931 we may count at most on a population of 113,585. Divide this by the unit of representation as it will then be, that is by 35,170 and it will be seen that we shall then be entitled to but three members—that is, if the terms of the British North America Act are applied to us as is at present proposed by those in authority at Ottawa. Half our representation as it was in 1873 would thus be swept away. It may be seen in the fact that just as soon as the province of Quebec becomes as densely populated as Prince Edward Island, we would not be entitled to any representation at all, which would be an absurdity, for the 22nd clause of the report of the Quebec conference declares that 'no fractional part of the unit of representation shall be considered, unless when exceeding one-half the number entitling to a member.' Quebec being 152 times our area, and the number of representatives limited to 65, we must need be more than twice as thickly populated as that province in order to have even one member. But Prince Edward Island has not during the last decade nor is it likely to increase to the same extent as in the thirty years past. We came in with a population of 47 to the square mile and now have 51. Where will the representation of Prince Edward Island be when Quebec population is even 40 to the square mile. Our province will be politically obliterated. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are well defined reasons why our representation should be the same as when we entered confederation.

1. The very wording of the terms and the qualifying clause that the British North America Act shall apply 'except were altered by these resolutions.'

2. To take any other interpretation would render us in time entitled to no representation which would be an absurd and invalid contract.

3. There are the demands of our delegates at the Quebec conference, the speeches on the Quebec terms in our local legislature, and the telegram announcing the granting of six members, the admission of a status of representation for a small self-governed province and varying the general terms—and the admission of British Columbia and Manitoba on the same principles and the stronger wording of British Columbia clause, is a good proof of our claim.

If the government should persist in holding that the representation of our province shall be reduced it will put in a very false position the men who made the confederation bargain, and who may be accused of not safe-guarding the interests of the people of Prince Edward Island whom they represented. All these things make a strong case why this government should not take from a small province the rights and privileges to which it is justly entitled. Speaking of the province of British Columbia in 1892 the right hon. the leader of the House said: That the intention of the parties should be considered, and British Columbia was in no different position than Prince Edward Island is to-day. If the right hon. gentleman is still of that opinion I would ask him that the intention of the contracting parties be given effect to and that our province should be given its six representatives in this parliament. I ask the right hon. gentleman to see that the rights of our small province down by the sea are not lightly cast aside.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The representatives of the province of Ontario in this House are confronted with the serious question as to whether the representation of their province in the Dominion House of Commons shall in future be reduced by six members. I regret that the government of the province of Ontario seems to have taken no steps to insure proper representation in this parliament for that province, as the governments of the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have done.

Mr. COCHRANE. They are busy looking after Gamey.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume they are, but they have exhibited a careless indifference in this matter sadly in contrast with the energy of the governments of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, who are endeavouring to secure justice for their provinces in this respect. And not only is the provincial government of Ontario negligent in its duty, but we see here ministers of the Crown from Ontario and Ontario members supporting the government sublimely indifferent, and making no effort to safeguard the rights of their province. Ontario has been

growing during the last few years; we are told by the local government that New Ontario is increasing in wealth and population, and in view of this, is it to be said that the premier province of the Dominion shall lose six of its representatives. Where are the Ontario ministers and where are the Ontario members supporting the government ? Why do they not protest ? Why is it left to New Brunswick and to Nova Scotia to secure that the question as to provincial rights should be submitted to the Supreme Court ?

The PRIME MINISTER. And Ontario also.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the first time I ever heard that Ontario has taken any part in this matter.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. All the provinces in the Dominion have.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the first time we have ever heard it mentioned here that the province of Ontario has taken any such action as that taken by New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to have her rights defined under subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act. With this question pending before the Supreme Court it does seem to me that it is not the part of wisdom for the government to force this Bill through the House. This parliament has yet a long lease of life if it expires by eflux of time, and there is plenty of time left to us yet to legislate on the matter. In view of the dissatisfaction created in the provinces whose representation it is proposed to reduce, it does seem to me that it is of the highest importance that the question should be first settled as to the constitutionality of reducing the representation of the provinces. From the point of view of a layman it would seem that very serious question may arise. Suppose we should illegally reduce the representation of any of the provinces, and suppose the legality of one of our enactments is brought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and it should be decided that we were not a properly constituted parliament, what would be the condition of affairs then ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would have no bearing on any legislation.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that the same question has arisen in the United States, and it seems to have a very important bearing on legislation there. I take it that if an analogous condition of affairs arose here some very troublesome question might result. In view of this it occurs to me that it would be a wise thing to delay this measure until such time as the government has obtained the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada and of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as well, if that be possible. Did I correctly understand the Minister of Justice to say there was no provision whereby this question could be carried from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not say that. There must be a reference to the Supreme Court and then the judgment of the Supreme Court is final unless there is a special application made to grant leave to appeal from the Supreme Court to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that the contention was that they could not appeal except a suit at law was actually brought, and that we were only applying to the Supreme Court for its advice. There is then all the stronger reason why we should ask delay. It seems to me that as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is the highest court of the empire, we should if possible submit the case to it before going any further. That, I think, would satisfy the provinces which are going to be deprived of part of their representation, and would satisfy the other provinces as well. We would then be sure of our ground and we would be going a long way towards destroying that feeling which is growing up to-day against the contention that the province of Ontario should have its representation reduced in this House by six members. Holding these views, and in view of the facts that there is no urgency, inasmuch as we are not near the end of the present parliament, I am disposed to move for delay. I therefore beg to move in amendment :

That the Bill be not now read the second time but that the second reading thereof be deferred until after a judicial determination has been had with respect to the numbers of members to which the respective provinces are entitled under the census of 1901.

I do not think that any harm can result from the delay as we are not near the end of the present parliament, unless the government see fit to recommend to His Excellency the Governor General to dissolve the House much earlier than we anticipate.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have to say to my hon. friend that the government cannot accept this amendment, and I think that, on reflection, he will agree with me it is not advisable we should. I would call his attention to the fact that we are bound by law to pass a Redistribution Bill immediately following the taking of the census. Parliament can be dissolved under our system at any time. Circumstances may arise at any moment which may make it advisable for His Excellency the Governor General to grant a dissolution, and the law makes it imperative that there should be a redistribution immediately, after the census, because, in the event of a general election, that general election must take place according to the representation to which every province is entitled. Let me cite section 51 of the British North America Act once more, merely in order to illustrate the point I now make, that we are imperatively called

on to pass a new Redistribution Bill. Section 51 provides:

On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted.

It does not say 'may,' but 'shall.'

Mr. SPROULE. The census is not completed yet.

The PRIME MINISTER. The number of our population has been ascertained, so that all the information required for the purposes of redistribution is before us. If there were a very serious doubt as to whether or not the proposition advanced to-day is one which can be seriously entertained, I think it would be well perhaps to stay our hands. We have agreed to refer the question to the Supreme Court, not because we have any doubt, but simply in deference to the views held by some people in the different provinces, and in order to have their minds set at rest. But we think it is better to proceed at once with the Bill and have the committee, which the House will appoint, get to work at once. We propose to have the decision of the Supreme Court at a very early day. Should that decision be adverse to our pretention, we might fairly consider the proposition to stay our hands, but in the meantime I see no reason why the committee should not go ahead with the measure while the Supreme Court is considering the point we have submitted to it. If we find our views affirmed, I see no reason why the Bill should not become law. But if the Supreme Court should hold the view advanced by some hon. gentlemen opposite, then its decision would be a matter for consideration at the proper time. I submit that all the arguments advanced this afternoon against the proposed measure do not lead to the conclusion sought to be derived from them. It is admitted on all sides that when confederation was organized, it was not intended to be restricted to the four provinces originally constituting it, but it was intended that other provinces should be allowed to come in later. It was contemplated that other provinces should be carved out in the west and also that other provinces might come in from the east. It was contemplated that Prince Edward Island should come in, and British Columbia and Manitoba, as they have done, and also that we would be prepared to admit Newfoundland, and that in the course of time other territories would be admitted as provinces into the full citizenship of the Canadian confederation. No one will contend that when this view was in the minds of those who framed confederation, of which we are all proud, it could have been intended that the law which was then enacted was to apply only to the four original provinces and not to all the provinces which were to come in later and form the Canadian family. It would not be reasonable to suppose that a certain law was framed to apply only to the original constituent members of the confederation and another law was to apply to those provinces which might come in later. At present we have not four but seven provinces, next year we will have eight, and in a few years we shall have more, and the proposition, I believe, will be accepted by everybody, even by the hon. members for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), Hamilton (Mr. Barker), and Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), that the same law should apply to all these provinces, and that there should not be one law for four of them and another law for the rest. If there was anything in the minds of the framers of the constitution, it was that representation was to be based on population. That principle certainly was in the minds of the people at that time. It had been the subject of a long and very ardent controversy in two of the provinces. The province of Upper Canada had been insisting for a long time that there should be representation by population. The province of Quebec did not object but insisted that there should not be representation by population unless there were substantial guarantees in favour of the minority in the confederation. Representation by population was therefore certainly strong in the minds of the fathers of confederation, and in expecting that other provinces would come in later, it was certainly understood that when they did enter the same rule of representation and the same readjustment at every census should apply to them. But what do we hear to-day? We hear hon. members argue that we should have one rule for the four original provinces and another rule for the others. We are told that while it has been enacted that the province of Quebec should be the pivot around which the representation of all the other provinces should revolve, still this enactment is not to apply to the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPROULE. That the saving clause should apply to them.

The PRIME MINISTER. I shall show that there is no saving clause. My hon. friend does not dispute that Quebec is to be the pivotal province. What is the population of the province to-day? It is little less than two million souls. My hon. friend does not dispute that the unit of representation in province of Quebec is 25,367. Now, the contention which we hold on this side of the House is that this 25,367 is to be the unit for all the provinces, not for the province of Quebec alone, but for the province of Ontario, the province of Nova Scotia, the province of British Columbia and the others. And, if that rule is to be applied and 25,367 souls is to be the unit of representation for the province of Quebec, does my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) contend that

the same rule should not apply to the province of Ontario ? Would he contend that there should be for that province a different unit of representation ? If the unit for the province of Ontario is to be the same as the province of Quebec then the province of Ontario is not entitled to ninety-two members, but only to eighty-six members. Will my hon. friend, considering this aspect of the case deliberately say that the same unit of representation is not to prevail in the one case as in the other ?

Mr. SPROULE. But it does not apply to all the provinces.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, it will apply to all.

Mr. SPROULE. Prince Edward Island is an exception.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all; the same rule will apply to Prince Edward Island, and under the application of the rule, Prince Edward Island must lose one member. But what is the view expressed by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) ? It is that the unit of population for Ontario should not be the same as for Quebec, but that the province of Ontario should be entitled to ninety-two representatives, that while it will require 25,367 to send one member to this House from Quebec, it will require only 23,777 to send one from the province of Ontario. Was that ever contemplated at confederation ? Will any one contend that that is a fair rule to apply ? The compact at confederation stipulated that there should be a way open for other provinces to come in. The province of Manitoba comes in. The population of that province has increased according to the last census, so that it gains three members. British Columbia will gain one. The province of Quebec will remain the same. This is the only basis upon which the operation could be carried on. Does any one suppose that the provinces of the west increasing their representation and the provinces of the east not decreasing proportionately to their population, the province of Quebec, which is the pivotal province would submit to such a state of things ? I do not pretend that the province of Quebec would not submit to it if it were the law—it would undoubtedly. But if representation is to be based on population it must be that there is a balance swinging upwards and downwards—this province will lose, not having kept pace with the province of Quebec, and the other will gain having gone on more rapidly than Quebec. Therefore, it cannot be stated that the position we take is unreasonable. That is the reason why we thought it would not be advisable, under present circumstances, to wait until we have a judicial interpretation of the law on this question. We proceed on this occasion as has been done on former occasions, and the argument in court is to allow no room for misunderstanding. In deference to the provinces that lose, we have agreed to follow them into court and argue the matter there. I would like to say a word in answer to my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) whom I regret not to see in his place. That hon. gentleman has appealed to me. But the government is not a free agent in this matter, we have not a will of our own. It is not through caprice or whim or any other motive of that kind that we introduce this Bill; it is in deference to the imperative mandate of the law. But if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) believes that the province that he represents should be kept in the position, as to representation, that it now has, I can only say to him that we have told the representatives of the province that we are ready to follow them into court—not that we have any doubt on the subject, but because they have doubt, and as good comrades and fellow citizens we should be glad to have the matter authoritatively adjudicated. On the 6th March I received a letter from the premier of Prince Edward Island, which I will read :—

Charlottetown, P.E.I.,
March 6, 1903.

Dear Sir,—When the delegation from our province, consisting of Mr. D. A. MacKinnon, M.P., Hon. Benjamin Rogers, Hon. Mr. Whear and myself waited upon your government in Ottawa a short time ago, with regard to the question of the representation of this province being maintained as it was at the time of confederation, namely, six members, the matter, as you know was discussed by myself and Messrs. Whear, Rogers and MacKinnon, and your honourable board seemed to take a contrary view to the one which I and my colleagues held ; that is, that at the time of confederation there was a contract expressed or implied, that this province should never have a less representation than six, as long, at any rate, as the population did not decrease below 95,000, which was the population we had when we entered confederation, and, upon which population we were granted six representatives.

The reasons given at the time for granting those six representatives were not on the ground of the population or the question of the unit of population, but, on account, as was expressed in the correspondence, of the peculiar situation of the island, and it being divided into three counties, rendered it almost impossible or very inconvenient to divide the province into districts for less than six. Upon this and other grounds, we contended and still contend that we were and are entitled to six representatives. However, as I have stated, your honourable board took a contrary view to the one taken by us on this point.

The delegation then requested your board, if you were fully convinced that we were not entitled to six representatives, to permit the province of Prince Edward Island, under the provisions of the statute to state a case to the Supreme Court, if they thought proper, setting out all the correspondence and such other matters as might be deemed advisable for the decision of the Supreme Court, as to whether or

not, under the terms of union, Prince Edward Island was and is entitled to six members ; and if you recollect, which I have no doubt you do, your answer to me was that you had no objection to a case being stated and I thought your attorney-general, Mr. Fitzpatrick, concurred in the matter and raised no objection.

Now, our legislature meets on the 19th of this month, and I would like to be in a position to have some written statement from you or your government bearing out these facts, and that you are willing that this province, if it thinks proper, should state a case to the Supreme Court. I do not think that you can have any objection to giving this assurance in writing, that your government is willing that this province shall take this course, if it deems advisable.

This application by our government to have a case stated to the Supreme Court will of course be understood by your government to be without prejudice to any right that we may have to any other course which may now be open to us to insist upon this right.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) ARTHUR PETERS.

The Honourable
Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa.

To this I replied :—

Privy Council, Canada,
Ottawa, March 10, 1903.

My dear Peters,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 6th instant. At the interview to which you refer I stated, with the concurrence of my colleagues then present, that we would have no objection to a case being submitted to the Supreme Court upon the question which you brought to our attention.

I am sorry to have to inform you that the consideration, which we have since given to the arguments which you presented to us, has not changed our opinion in any way, as to the merits of the representations which you made to us. But we are still of the same mind as to your desire of having the matter referred to the Supreme Court, and whenever you take the initial steps in that direction, we will he happy to facilitate the proceedings.

At the same time, I have again to confirm what I stated at our interview, that our Bill of redistribution has to be proceeded with without any delay.

Believe me,
Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) WILFRID LAURIER.

The Hon. A. Peters,
Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the right hon. gentleman kindly give us the objection raised by the province of Ontario if he has the correspondence ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it will be raised by the Supreme Court, if it is raised at all. But I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that I believe that the province of Ontario, now represented by the Liberal government there, will not agree—I shall be surprised if it does agree—to have the province of Ontario entitled to representation on the basis of a unit of population of 23,000 when Quebec is represented on the basis of a unit of 25,000. Ontario, which has been the champion of representation by population, will insist upon that principle even when the principle works to its own disadvantage.

Mr. SPROULE. Ontario raises no objection.

The PRIME MINISTER. I believe it has agreed to follow the other provinces into court; but it has not taken the initial step, for it has, perhaps, the most proper ideas on the subject of representation by population of any of the provinces. But, I suppose, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) would insist upon this demand even to the detriment of the other provinces of the Dominion. He is of those who, opposed representation by population before, and he is true to his record. But I appeal to every Liberal member and also to many Conservative members, that the unit of representation should be the same for all provinces whether they lose or gain; and this is the principle upon which we proceed at the present time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On behalf of the Liberal government in Nova Scotia, I must resent the imputation which is cast upon it by the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and I do the same on behalf of the Liberal government of New Brunswick—for I believe it calls itself Liberal at the present time. I resent on behalf of my own province the invidious comparison the right hon. gentleman has made between the Liberal government of that province and the Liberal government of the province of Ontario. The right hon. gentleman seems to have very peculiar ideas about this legislation. He says the unit of population in Nova Scotia, or Ontario, as the case may be, would be smaller if you applied section 4. Well, is not the statute before us ? Does the right hon. gentleman deny that the statute would have that operation if no other provinces had come in, and would not what he claims to be an evil have existed in that case by the very terms of the statute ? Assuming that no other province had joined Canada up to the present time, and assuming that the four provinces had increased as they have during the past ten years, then the very thing which the right hon. gentleman says is a scandal would have happened under the terms of the statute. Well, is it wrong to ask that the constitution should be observed ? In the case I have suggested, surely it should not be attributed as blame to those provinces that they have asked that the constitution should be observed. There is no necessity for heat on the part of my right hon. friend, when these provinces are asking for the opinion of the court as to whether this provision still remains intact in the constitution, although other provinces have come in. That is all they are asking, and is any blame

to be cast upon them, is any insinuation to be made against them, for simply wanting to have the court determine whether or not that which admittedly was constitutional before the other provinces came in, is still constitutional notwithstanding that these other provinces have been added? Why then should my right hon. friend seek to raise with regard to this question the matters which he has seen fit to bring to the attention of the House to-night? I am sure there is no harm in adhering to the constitution. My right hon. friend has always been a great admirer of the constitution. Then if we desire to adhere to the constitution, surely there is no harm in asking the courts to have that question determined. That is all that any one has asked up to the present time, so far as I am aware.

My right hon. friend points to the unit of population. Well, the unit of Prince Edward Island, British Columbia and Manitoba, when those provinces came in, was not at all the same unit as prevailed in the other provinces. The right hon. gentleman knows that as well as I do, every member of the House knows it. Under this very Bill the unit of population in the North-west Territories is not the same. I am not finding any fault with the Bill in that regard, because I do not think that too great a representation is being given to the North-west Territories. But still the unit of population there is smaller than it is in the other provinces. The unit of population for the North-west Territories under the last census would be less than 16,000, whereas in the other provinces it is between 25,000 and 20,000.

Now what is to be gained by going on while this matter is sub judice? It is practically sub judice at the present time, because the Minister of Justice is taking steps, as I understand, to have ths matter referred to the Supreme Court, under a provision in the Supreme Court Act. Suppose that we go on in the meantime and delimit the constituencies in the provinces where changes have to be made, the work of our committee will be all for naught in case the decision should be against the view which has been expressed by the Minister of Justice. I have every possible respect for the opinion of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, as I said before; but although he is strong on this point, he very candidly admits to the House that he is not infallible. None of us claim to be infallible, and it may happen that he is mistaken. I have not a very pronounced opinion myself, I have not a pronounced opinion against that of the Minister of Justice; but I can see that a strong argument can be made on the other side. I can also see that the argument of the Minister of Justice leads to some extraordinary conclusions. For example, he based his argument almost entirely upon the opinion that under the provisions of section 146, the addition of other provinces to Canada had resulted in amending the provisions of section 51. He was willing to make the admission that in section 51 the word Canada originally meant only the four provinces, as the right hon. gentleman himself has stated. Well, suppose you had had in the addresses under which those different provinces were admitted, a provision that their representation should be such as the parliament of Canada might afterwards determine, it would logically follow from the argument of the Minister of Justice to-day that the parliament of Canada would have, by reason of the power so given in the addresses, the right to alter the representation of Ontario, and Quebec, and the maritime provinces. I submit to the Minister of Justice, that this would be the logical result. It seems to me, with all deference to the opinion of the Minister of Justice, that if the argument cannot be based upon a higher ground than that, there is good cause for referring this matter to the Supreme Court. As I said before, we might simply be wasting our time by going on now and dealing with this matter while the question is sub judice. Therefore, I think the right hon. gentleman who leads the government might well consent to the amendement of my hon. friend from Grey, and allow the second reading of this Bill to stand until the court shall have given a judicial determination with regard to this question, which has been discussed at such great length in the House to-day.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Sproule).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Ball,	Kaulbach,
Barker,	Kemp,
Bennett,	Lancaster
Blain,	Lavell,
Borden (Halifax),	Lefurgey,
Brock,	McGowan,
Bruce,	McIntosh,
Calvin,	Northrup,
Cargill,	Pringle,
Carscallen,	Reid (Grenville),
Clancy,	Richardson,
Clarke,	Roche (Marquette),
Cochrane,	Sherritt,
Earle,	Sproule,
Haggart,	Taylor,
Halliday,	Vrooman,
Henderson,	Wilson.—37.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Angers,	Lemieux,
Bazinet,	Logan,
Bernier,	Macdonald,
Bickerdike,	Mackie,
Bourassa,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Brown,	Macpherson,
Calvert,	McCarthy,
Campbell,	McCreary,
Carroll,	McEwen,

Champagne,	McLennan,
Christie,	Marcil (Bagot),
Copp,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Costigan,	Martineau,
Cowan,	Matheson,
Davis,	Mayrand,
Delisle,	Meigs,
Demers (Lévis),	Monet,
Demers (St. John),	Morrison,
Dugas,	Mulock (Sir William),
Erb,	Oliver,
Fielding,	Paterson,
Fitzpatrick,	Power,
Galliher,	Préfontaine,
Gauvreau,	Proulx,
Geoffrion,	Puttee,
Gibson,	Ross (Ontario),
Gould,	Rousseau,
Harty,	Schell,
Harwood,	Smith (Vancouver),
Heyd,	Stephens,
Holmes,	Sutherland (Essex),
Lang,	Tobin,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tucker,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Turcot,
Lavergne,	Turgeon,
Law,	Wright.—72.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Thompson (Haldimand),	Ingram,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Parmelee,	Hale,
Borden (Sir F. W.),	Rosamond,
Fraser,	Bell,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Blair,	Hughes (Victoria),
McColl,	Ward,
Beith,	Avery,
Douglas,	Boyd,
Ethier,	Culbert,
Farquharson,	Broder,
Fisher,	Ganong,
Fortier,	Gourley,
Gallery,	Hackett,
German,	Kendry,
Grant,	Kidd,
Hughes (P.E.I.),	LaRivière,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Morin,
Kendall,	Maclaren (Perth),
Lewis,	Léonard,
MacKinnon,	Maclean,
McCool,	Robinson (Northumberland),
McGugan,	Clare,
McIsaac,	Pope,
Ross (Victoria),	Osler,
Ross (Yukon),	Lennox,
Russell,	Smith (Wentworth),
Scott,	Robinson (Elgin),
Sifton,	Monk,
Stewart,	Birkett,
Sutherland (Hon. J.),	Roddick,
Talbot,	Thompson (Grey),
Tarte,	Seagram,
Tolmie,	Tolton,
Wade,	Wilmott,
Bureau,	Casgrain,

Amendment (Mr. Sproule) negatived; motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

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

That the said Bill be referred to a special committee composed of Messrs. Fitzpatrick, Sutherland (Oxford), Hyman, Davis, Borden (Halifax), Haggart and Monk, with instructions to prepare schedules to contain and describe the several electoral divisions entitled to return members to this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, for reasons which I have already stated and which I shall not repeat now, I think, if this proposed tribunal is to be of the nature of a conference, such as has been described, it should be composed of an equal number of members on each side of the House. My right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in introducing this Bill laid down the principle that it was to be a conference, as I understood it, although I think he also used the word 'committee'—a conference designed for the purpose of agreement. A committee such as is now suggested is simply an ordinary committee representing as far as may be the numerical strength of each side of the House, and therefore it cannot be in the nature of a conference but will be altogether in the nature of a committee to represent the views of the majority of the House. However, I do not want to take up the time of the House at this stage in repeating what I have already said this afternoon. I again renew the suggestion I made to my right hon. friend at that time that if it is really intended to be a conference it should be composed of an equal number of members on each side of the House.

There is one further suggestion I have to make in regard to the motion and that is that the committee shall be given power to examine witnesses on oath and to send for persons and papers. I have already mentioned that matter privately to my right hon. friend, and he thinks it is not necessary that that provision should be made now. I desire to reserve my right to make a motion to that effect if it should afterwards become necessary. I mention this, because, otherwise, it might be taken as an admission on my part that I considered the motion in its present form as absolutely sufficient for all contingencies which might hereafter arise.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 15, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Bank of Canada.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the London Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. McGugan—by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Royal Trust Company.—Mr. Casgrain—by Mr. Taylor.

Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment—by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 105) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of The Standard Car Truck Company.—Mr. Lavergne.

ALIEN LABOUR ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) to amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens, chapter 11, statutes of 1897. He said: Mr. Speaker, I think the English system of setting forth the provisions of a Bill on the first reading is a good one, and therefore I take this opportunity of saying a few words with regard to this measure. The Act, chapter 11 of 1897, provides that it is permitted to import skilled labour in or upon any new industry not established in Canada. The Bill I now submit proposes to eliminate these words 'in or upon any new industry not at present established in Canada,' and to permit the importation of skilled labour for established industries. The operation of the existing law has been found by parties engaged in manufacturing to work most disastrously to their interest; and I can see no reason why a new industry should be permitted to import skilled labour and an industry which is already established in Canada should not be permitted to do so, if such labour is not obtainable in Canada.

Now, the manufacturers, as I have said, find that the operation of this Act inflicts upon them a great hardship. The importance of rendering our manufacturing interests effective, the importance of affording to them every facility and all necessary means to lead to their successful prosecution, do not need to be enlarged upon. If we are to build up the maufacturing interests of Canada it is unwise in my opinion, to handicap those interests by a restriction of this kind, a restriction which may prevent them entirely from obtaining the skilled labour necessary in the prosecution of their business. If we propose to transfer American manufacturing interests to this country, as we are doing, and as we will do to a still greater extent if our tariff is changed in the direction of protection, it will be necessary in such cases to permit these American manufacturing interests to import skilled labour, and why we should impose this handicap under existing circumstances upon our manufacturing interests, I am at a loss to understand. Of course it should be our aim and object to develop the resources of Canada, to increase its wealth, to increase all lines of business in the country, and especially manufacturing business; and it strikes me as being a line of action that can scarcely be defended, if we wish to encourage immigration to this country, to increase its population, to develop its resources—it is a line of action, I say, that can scarcely be defended to apply this restriction, to deny the right of coming to this country to a particular class of immigrants who prove to be the most valuable. The Bill provides for eliminating that provision in the statutes of 1897, and provides that manufacturers and all established interests in Canada should have the right to import skilled labour if that labour is not obtainable here.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is to determine that matter?

Mr. CHARLTON. The statute lays down the conditions upon which that kind of labour should be admitted. It strikes me that our trades unions, in taking the step which has crystallized in this provision of the Act, are acting against their own interests, they are acting in a way and adopting a course that will prevent the development of industries in this country, and will indirectly operate injuriously upon there own interests in this regard. I know as a manufacturer myself, and through the experience of other manufacturers with whose operations I am acquainted, that this provision is a hardship that handicaps their operations, and in my opinion it does not work in the interests of the country. I see no reason why we should exclude from Canada a desirable, intelligent and skilful class of immigrants who wish to come here and settle, and engage in the development of our manufacturing industries. These, briefly, are the reasons that have led to the introduction of this Bill, which, I may say, will receive the support of the entire manufacturing interests of the Dominion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. BOYD—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

Is it the intention of the government to introduce during the present session a measure granting provincial autonomy to the North-west Territories? If not, why not?

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That matter is under consideration.

SENATORS FOR MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES

Mr. BOYD—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

Is it the intention of the government to increase the number of senators for Manitoba and the North-west Territories, in proportion to their increased representation in the House of Commons ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That matter is also under consideration.

THE TOBACCO COMBINE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Did the commissioner appointed to make an inquiry into the question of the tobacco monopoly or combine make a report to the government ?

2. When will the said report be laid upon the Table of the House ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll). The commissioner has made a report, which I now beg to lay on the Table of the House.

A CANADIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the new Canadian Chamber of Commerce, established in Paris, been authorized by, or else is it under the protection of the Canadian government ?

2. Is there any correspondence, regarding the establishment of that chamber, with the government ?

3. Has the government contributed anything to the establishment of that chamber ?

4. Does the government officially know of the organization of that chamber ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The new Canadian Chamber of Commerce alleged to have been established in Paris has not been authorized by the government, nor is it under the protection of the Canadian government. There is no correspondence regarding the establishment of such a chamber of commerce. The government has contributed nothing towards the establishment of such a chamber of commerce, and does not know anything officially of such an organization.

POSTMASTER AT LIME ROCK, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. BELL—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What salary is paid to the postmaster at Lime Rock, Pictou County, Nova Scotia ?

2. Has his salary been increased lately ?

3. If so, on what grounds ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). 1. $12. 2 and 3. No.

I.C.R.—TRACKMEN'S WAGES.

Mr. KENDALL—by Mr. Calvert—asked :

1. What increase of wages has been granted to the trackmen of the Intercolonial Railway since the last session of parliament ?

2. What other increases have been made to the Intercolonial Railway trackmen during the past six years ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). In July 1902, and since the last session of parliament, the track-foremen were increased from $1.65 to $1.75 a day, and the under-men from $1.20 to $1.30 a day. In January 1900, the track-foremen were increased from $1.60 to $1.65 a day, and the under-men from $1.15 to $1.20 a day. I may add that the increases last year took place since the last session of parliament.

NAVIGATION ON THE ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS.

Mr. BOYD—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the Minister of Public Works received the following communication from the Winnipeg Board of Trade :—

Winnipeg, 18th March, 1903.

The President and Council,
Winnipeg Board of Trade.

Your committee, appointed to report on the Assiniboine river as a navigable stream, beg to report as follows :—

1st. That all the bridges now existing on the Red and Assiniboine rivers, east of Portage la Prairie, have been constructed with swing spans.

2nd. That the population along the banks of the Assiniboine is becoming dense enough to provide traffic on the river.

3rd. That with the completion of the St. Andrews locks and dam, it is believed that an impetus will be given to river traffic.

4th. That the extra cost of providing for a swing span is inconsiderable.

5th. Therefore, the committee recommend that the board should use every means to have the Assiniboine and Red rivers retained and held as navigable streams ; and to that end, that representations be made to the Minister of Public Works.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

ANDREW STRANG,
Chairman.

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to provide for the improvements necessary to make the said Assiniboine river navigable ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes, on 7th April instant.

2. Matter will be given due consideration.

WHARF AT BLIND RIVER.

Mr. BIRKETT asked :

1. What are the names of the parties who tendered for the wharf at Blind river ?

2. What was the amount of each tender ?

3. What is the name of the party, or parties, to whom the contract was awarded ; and the amount of said contract ?

4. Were any changes made in the plans or specifications of the said work, after the tenders were advertised, or since the awarding of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland):

1. Messrs. Robert Grant; Moodie and McDermid; David Porter; Green and Mackinnon; David Conroy; W. H. Lewis; F. J. Sullivan; F. E. Fortin.

Robert Grant..	$ 9,310 73
Moodie & McDermid..	9,375 00
David Porter..	10,900 00
Green & Mackinnon..	10,995 00
David Conroy..	11,000 00
W. H. Lewis..	11,848 00
F. J. Sullivan..	12,300 00
F. E. Fortin..	14,975 00

3. (a) Robert Grant, (b) $9,310.73.
4. No.

OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. THOMAS MURRAY (Pontiac) moved for:

Copies of all engineers' reports, plans, specifications, estimates, and correspondence in reference to surveys made on French river and Lake Nipissing.

He said: With the consent of the House, I desire to add to my motion:

Also copies of all reports and surveys recently made on the Ottawa and Culbute rivers.

My object in bringing this motion before the House at the present time is to endeavour to get, if possible, some announcement from the government as to what they propose doing, and what their policy is in regard to this matter, also to get an expression of opinion from the representatives of the people of Canada in this House on this most important question. I need not remind the House of what has been said in that connection by representative men, the heads of the government of this country in years gone by. Take, for instance, the late Sir John A. Macdonald who, early in his political history, in referring to the construction of this particular canal, made this statement which is contained in the report of one of the engineers, Mr. Marcus Smith:

The Ottawa ship canal and the Pacific Railway must be constructed, and no voice would be raised against the great national work, which would open the western states and colonies to the seaboard.

He says that no one would raise his voice against that great project which is going to do more to build up Canada than any other project that has been proposed. We have also the statement of the hon. Alex. Mackenzie. He says:

I am perfectly satisfied that the Ottawa valley presents the greatest facilities of any route upon the continent for the transportation of the products of the North-west to the Atlantic ocean.

I think hon. members will bear me out when I say that this question has been brought before parliament time and time again. It was brought before parliament by Sir James Grant when he sat in the House of Commons representing the city of Ottawa, by the Hon. Peter White, who was then representing North Renfrew, by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) who I am pleased to see sits opposite. I believe he is as strong an advocate of the project to-day as he was then. It was also brought up by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), Mr. Poupore and others. There has been a great deal of talk about this project, but the time has arrived when some action should be taken. There have been engineers' reports one after the other. The first was prepared in 1858, when the late Mr. Walter Shanly prepared a report in reference to the construction of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal. His idea then was that a ten or twelve foot depth of water way would be sufficient, but, of course, later examination and the development of the trade of the country have shown that a twenty foot depth of water will be required. Mr. Shanly made a survey of the route and he reported most favourably. He said that the approximate cost for the depth of water which he proposed would be only about $24,000,000. Other engineers have reported upon the project, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Macleod and Mr. Marcus Smith. I think the latest survey of the whole route was made by Mr. Marcus Smith. He estimates the cost of the canal to be about $80,000,000. It may be contended that that would be a large sum for this country to undertake to expend, but when the great advantages to be derived from the project and when the great necessity of it are taken into consideration, it will be admitted that $80,000,000 is only a drop in the bucket. This natural waterway is considered to be more nearly an air line than any other stretch of water navigation in the known world.

The cost is not excessive when it is considered that this is the shortest route, the least expensive to construct, and that it will result in the development of our resources, of our great mineral deposits which we know this country possesses which are undeveloped, as no other project will. Before the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I am sorry to say, few people appreciated the resources of the country through which that railway passes. When first, as a young man, I went to the Ontario legislature, in 1869, as the representative of North Renfrew, I met many people from western Ontario who knew nothing at all about the northern part of the province or about the Ottawa valley. They said: What kind of a country is it? Who lives there? There are only a number of Indians, squaws and a few lumbermen in that country. That was the impression then, and I regret to say that there are many hon. members of this House to-day who do not know very much about the Ottawa valley. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was enraptured with the grandeur of that country when he made a personal inspection of it. I accompanied him to Arnprior and he said to me: We do not know what we possess.

We do not realize the grandeur of the Ottawa river, or the value of the water powers which we have all along that route. It is estimated that there are 750,000 horse power of water power on the route alone. Taking each water power at a minimum value of $10 per horse power, that means $7,500,000. Capitalize that at 3 per cent, and you have a value of $250,000,000. The construction of that great work would bring thousands of people into the country. It is considered that it will take five years to construct the canal and the result would be that instead of people coming in hundreds and thousands to the North-west Territories, the influx would be quadrupled. You will not be able to put up buildings sufficiently large to accommodate them. Our great North-west Territories are capable of sustaining fifty millions or sixty millions of people. I am not a young man, but I hope to live with all who are listening to me to see the day in the near future, if this canal is constructed, that instead of having a handful of people, comparatively speaking, we will have a population of eighty to one hundred millions that Canada is capable of sustaining; we will have an enormous influx of settlers. You are going to bring these people here by providing the country with such transportation facilities, as I am drawing the attention of the House to now. I am favourable to railways, I am favourable to this transcontinental railway, I am favourable to building railways in isolated provinces, and of giving to the North-west Territories the advantage of good transportation facilities. I noticed a short time ago that a deputation of farmers waited on the government to oppose the subsidizing of any more railways. I venture to say that these very farmers came from a section of the country where they have railway facilities. We should look at the question in a patriotic spirit, free from local or sectional consideration. Although I am an Ottawa valley man, I have only wakened up, having been attending to my business, to the necessity of this great undertaking. I had never studied the question until recently, but I have made a close examination of the engineers' reports and an inquiry into the whole question. I may say that we have a report from the Senate—the Senate that I do not take much stock in, but I will give them credit for one thing they have done. They went into that question thoroughly, and they had before them men of eminence to give their opinions in regard to it. Amongst others they had a gentleman by the name of Thompson, an eminent engineer from Duluth. This gentleman said all that could be said in favour of the project. I need not draw the attention of the House to what the Americans are doing now. They have only lately voted $100,000,000 for the improvement of canals in order to facilitate trade and increase the traffic which passes through these canals from Canada. Are we going to allow that diversion of our trade to continue? We must bestir ourselves if we are going to build up our country and keep our own trade. Mr. Thompson stated before the Senate that this waterway transportation would mean a cost per ton of one dollar as compared with $27 by rail. It will be readily seen what a great advantage will accrue to the people of Canada by the construction of this waterway. I do not want to dwell on the subject at any great length. I do not think it is necessary. I trust that hon. members of this House will take part in this discussion. All I wish to do is to draw the attention of the government and to draw the attention of the country to the necessity of carrying out this proposition.

I say, Sir, that this undertaking is within the means of the people; I say that it is an actual necessity for the country at large, and I say further that we cannot move too soon to initiate it, and when we once have commenced it to carry it on to completion. Surveys have been made by the government of Canada at considerable expense, and the present government has made a survey of the French river, the reports on which I have asked for as well as the approximate cost of the work. The French river work is all right enough so far as it goes, but what I advocate is that the whole scheme shall be carried out. I understand that the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) meant to have a survey of the French river with the object of ultimately carrying on the whole work, and he promised that he would report to parliament on the approximate cost. That was a businesslike way of handling this scheme. I give the Hon. Mr. Tarte the credit that he generally took a business proposition in hand in a businesslike way. I have every faith in the right hon. the Prime Minister and his present colleagues in the Cabinet that they will also grapple with the question. I had the pleasure of attending a deputation that waited on the government a short time ago from North Bay and Port Arthur and places in the vicinity, in favour of this project, and I am glad to be able to say that the answer given to that deputation by the government was satisfactory. I hope that the government has now arrived at the conclusion that there is a necessity for grappling with this important project in a businesslike way. The country has been put to considerable expense in getting engineers reports and surveys and things like that. That must mean something. They were surely not doing it for fun, and if it does mean anything then it is the bounden duty of the government to go on with that work immediately, provided of course that the reports will justify them in doing so, and I verily believe that these reports will furnish ample justification to the government. As a matter of fact there is practically no canalling to be done on the French river and not more than thirty miles on the whole

route, so that the work is easy enough from an engineering point of view. In face of the advantages which will accrue to the nation at large, is there an hon. member here who will object to the construction of this great national waterway ? I hope there is not. I hope that the unanimous opinion of this House will be that this work should be commenced and commenced at once. I say, Sir, that no scheme which we can devise, will tend so much to enrich the North-west and to develop its enterprise and increase its population. It will give Canada such a prestige as it never had before. The country demands the Georgian Bay canal from a military point of view, from a commercial point of view, from every point of view. This is a business proposition, and I bespeak the support of hon. members for the government in carrying it out. I might go into further details, but they have all been referred to before, and to do so would be taking up the time of the House unnecessarily. In conclusion, Sir, I repeat the hope that every member of this House will be in sympathy with the motion and that it will receive unanimous and hearty support.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The subject which has been brought before the House by my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Murray) is not exactly new to us. We have discussed it on more than one occasion in past years, and I do not know that there is anything to add to the declaration which has been made by the government on previous occasions. My hon. friend (Mr. Murray) is aware that a company has been chartered by this parliament to take power to construct what is called the canalization of the Ottawa river and the French river from Georgian Bay to the waters of the St. Lawrence. I think that I may say that it was never expected that this company would be able to perform such a gigantic task unassisted. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Murray) that the company which was last organized has on one or two occasions approached the government with a view of obtaining assistance to enable it to carry on the scheme which they have power from parliament to undertake, but the proposals which were made to the government were of such a nature that they could not be entertained. The assistance which they asked was of such a character that the government did not feel justified in asking parliament for the aid that was sought. When the papers are brought down my hon. friend (Mr. Murray) will see what was the character of the assistance which was required from the country at large, and I think he will agree with me that the proposal that was made to us was of such a character that the government was quite justified in taking the position which it did. For my part I think that the country would justify a moderate expenditure—a reasonable expenditure of money—with the view of providing another means of communication between the east and the west. The route of the Ottawa river is undoubtedly the natural channel of communication between the east and the west. It was the route followed by the old voyageurs in the early days of the colony. When the North-west produced nothing but furs it was the route followed by the fur traders to bring the products of the west to the eastern shores. That trade has now become a thing of the past; settlement has gone into the North-west; immense quantities of products are being sent from that fertile portion of Canada and they grow larger and larger as time develops. We are all aware that new methods of communication have been found, but nevertheless we know that undoubtedly one of the easiest and cheapest routes would probably be the canalizing of the Ottawa river. Whenever a company is prepared to approach the government asking for what I would call reasonable assistance, I think the government would be prepared to hear the application favourably and to ask parliament for that reasonable assistance. But if my hon. friend (Mr. Murray) expects that the government should assume such a gigantic work I am not prepared to say that that subject has yet received such consideration as to enable me to answer in the affirmative. I do not think that at this moment the country is prepared to expect that the government should ask parliament to undertake this work out of its own resources. I rather think that the opinion is that it had better be left in the hands of private enterprise. When the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was my colleague in the government, he had rather thrown out the idea that the government might very properly undertake the work of canalizing the French river from the waters of the Georgian Bay to the waters of Lake Nipissing. That is a project, which speaking for myself personally, rather commands my sympathy and my favourable consideration. I think there is a great deal to be said in favour of that project. I am not prepared to say that the government is ready to endorse it at this moment. The matter has not yet been considered by council, and I give only my own expression of opinion upon this subject, and I do so very guardedly, but it seems to me that there is a great deal to be said in favour of the view taken by my late colleague (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in favour of the government itself undertaking the full development of the French river from the waters of Georgian Bay to Lake Nipissing. If that were done it would be a means of having another port on the lakes, and it would undoubtedly contribute to solve the problem of the transportation of the products of the North-west to the seaboard. More than this I am not prepared to say at this moment. The government will have

great pleasure in bringing down all the papers asked for by my hon. friend (Mr. Murray).

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, I was just on the point of rising when the premier rose, and I presume that the government desire, now that this question is before the House, that the views of members should be expressed, where members hold views on the question. The statement made by the right hon. leader of the House, that a company had been chartered, and that the demands of that company on the government for aid have been of a character that the government could not accede to, leads me to believe, as I always have believed, that if the construction of the Georgian Bay canal is to be undertaken, it will hardly be done by a company. The state of New York, as we are aware, has just appropriated $101,000,000 for the enlargement of the Erie canal. This is done as a state work. It is done for the purpose of cheapening the cost of transportation and securing for the great seaport of New York the business of the west. The Panama canal was undertaken by a company, and that company failed, and that canal is now being constructed by the United States government. A work of the character of the Georgian Bay canal is one which I think we can scarcely anticipate will be constructed by a company; and it is better for us to face the question with the point in view whether there are reasons which would warrant the government in undertaking this work. We are confronted with transportation problems of vast magnitude. One shrinks almost appalled at the money needs of the near future for the opening up and development of the north-west, the settlement and production of which will increase rapidly; and if we are to keep pace with that settlement and production we must provide ample transportation facilities.

With regard to the construction of a canal to Lake Nipissing, I have never looked with favour on that project, unless it were to be taken up as a part of the general project of a Georgian Bay canal. I could not see the force of establishing a seaport on Lake Nipissing. It would benefit the Canadian Pacific Railway, of course; but as a project standing by itself, I could not see that it would be good for the country, while as a part of the general scheme of a Georgian Bay canal, it would of course be commendable.

We can scarcely comprehend the prospective transportation needs of the north-west. Our American friends are fully alive to the probable increase of business to be derived in the near future from that vast region; and the enlargement of the Erie canal simply means that the United States intend to compete for that trade, and to compete for it under conditions more favourable to success than exist at the present time. It is proposed to enlarge that canal to a depth of 12 feet, making it a barge canal. One of the most reliable experts on canal construction is Major Simons, who has charge of the construction works at Buffalo; and that gentleman, in an exhaustive report made a year or so ago, took the ground that a barge canal to the Hudson river, capable of passing vessels of 1,000 tons burden, would be more economical than a ship canal of 21 feet of water. He stated that a vessel capable of navigating the great lakes must, when entering the canal, reduce her speed to one-fifth of her speed on the lakes, while keeping her whole crew. By a carefully prepared tabulated statement he arrived at the conclusion that the barge canal would serve the purposes of transportation better and cheaper from the lakes to New York, while the handling of the grain by elevating it from vessels to barges was calculated to put it through to its destination in better condition.

In view of this position taken by Major Simons, and in view of the fact that after careful consideration for years the state of New York has adopted his views and will construct this barge canal, if the referendum on that subject results favourably, we must see the propriety of examining carefully into the reasons which have led to the adoption of this course. If we were to construct a barge canal of 12 or 14 feet of water from the waters of Lake Huron to the St. Lawrence river, the grain of the west would then be shipped to the mouth of the French river; from that point it would be put through by barges to Montreal or Quebec, and there elevated to elevators and transferred to ocean going vessels. If the reasons which have led to the determination to construct a barge canal in the state of New York are well founded, the same reasons will apply to the construction of a canal by the Ottawa valley. These are points that require careful consideration, for we are confronted by a problem of great magnitude and involving the interests of that vast country to the west, the very heart and seat of power of this Dominion. We want to approach this question, not in a party spirit at all, but from a business standpoint, and give to it the consideration which its importance requires. There is one consideration that has had much to do with the proposed enlargement to the Erie canal—the question of competitive rates and the regulation of rates. The Erie canal is to be constructed, not because the railways cannot transport the produce of the west, but for the purpose of regulating rates and preventing a combination for the purpose of taking from the producers exorbitant freights. The same reasons would apply to the construction of the Ottawa river canal, the source of whose business would be derived from the waters of the great lakes, from Duluth, from Chicago, from

Fort William, from the wheat fields of the north-west, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota and Wisconsin. There would be low vessel rates to the mouth of French river, and barge canal rates from that point to Montreal or Quebec. A low rate of freight would be held over the competing railways not as a menace, but as a condition of things that would compel them to give vastly lower rates than they would give if this competition did not exist. We want to divert that trade to our own ports of Montreal and Quebec. I have always believed that Quebec was the true competitive point to aim at in sending our grain to the seaboard.

For these reasons, I believe that this question should receive exhaustive consideration and discussion. The government naturally have no policy on this question. It is not a party question. The government are asking in the first place what the wishes of the country are, and in the second place what the interests of the country are, and the decision of the government will naturaly be determined by the answers to these questions. The day has not yet arrived for asking what the policy of the government is with regard to the Ottawa valley canal, but it is a good time to discuss the question. We want to accumulate the data on which we can, later on, found our decision with regard to this matter. My own belief is that we must make up our minds to confront very great expenditures; we must make up our minds to draw upon the future. We must enter into obligations which the future must discharge, obligations for the benefit of the future, for the benefit of the untold millions who will people the north-west, but who, without transportation facilities will not people the north-west with the rapidity that will characterize the filling up of that country if those facilities are provided. And these great expenditures, vast as they may seem, if made honestly and with due regard to economy, will bring an adequate, a rich reward. I rose to present these few remarks upon this question because I feel, and feel very deeply, that the government now in power desire to consult the interests of the people, desire to do that which the requirement of the future demand, yet, at the same time, naturally shrink from undertaking vast obligations, and wish to be satisfied first that the demands of the country require that these obligations shall be incurred and that the expenditures will be justified by the results.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). The position in regard to this matter is one which should be discussed and thoroughly understood before we go any further. It should be understood that we are not asking the government to appropriate a large sum of money for the construction of this canal. What we ask is that a proper survey shall be made of the whole route, that we may know with reasonable exactness what the work will cost before we undertake it. We believe this is one of the greatest routes on the continent for the transportation of the products of the North-west to the seaboard If that is the case, the country should have knowledge of that fact; and, if the cost will be too great for our means, we ought to know it in good time. The state of New York, one state alone, is preparing to spend $101,000,000 to improve the Erie canal. If they take the matter so seriously, surely we should do the same with regard to this great water route through our country. If we can shorten the route to the seaboard by 340 miles, as I believe we can, surely that is something that we should know and understand; but, if the cost of construction is to be too great, we ought to know that also. We contend that this is not properly a canal, it is merely the construction of a certain number of locks, the work of this character to be done covering a distance of fifteen miles. There are thirty miles altogether, but in reality fifteen miles is already constructed and in operation, and the construction of the other fifteen miles would shorten the distance from Chicago and Fort William to the seaboard by no less than 340 miles. That is a most important item. There are parties now in the North-west who are face to face with the serious problem of how they are to get their products to market. This canal will greatly increase the facilities for the transportation of those products. It should not be forgotten that the earlier the crop of wheat can be marketed, the more valuable it is. Every month, every week, and even every day that it is retained in the owner's warehouse makes it less valuable, for delay means more shrinkage and more loss in every way. What the people of the North-west want is to get out their crops as early as they can, in order that they may get the best return for it. We contend that if this canal were constructed, it would materially assist the Canadian Pacific Railway in getting out the crop. The great difficulty with the Canadian Pacific Railway is not that they have not a sufficient number of cars, but that they have not sufficient engine power to take the cars away. Last winter, train after train stood dead on the tracks in the North-west because the road had not the engines to move the cars. It is impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to construct the engines fast enough; nor can they purchase them in this country or in the United States. So, we wish to assist them to make the most out of the motive power in their possession. If the Canadian Pacific Railway were to double track their road between Fort William and Winnipeg—and we understand that they have already let the contract for that work—they would treble their capacity for taking out grain. See what an important thing that is. We do not wish them to use their engines to

bring that grain down to the seaboard but merely to take it to Fort William, where facilities would be provided for taking cheaply to the port of shipment. In that way, we can get vastly larger amounts of grain out of the North-west early in the season than we can get otherwise. Some tell us that the days of canals are past, that canals have done their work, and that to-day nothing but the railway is practically useful in the work of transportation. But the experience of the world goes to show that canals are most valuable in assisting railways to do their work. There is a certain class of traffic which, if the railways handle they must handle it at a very small rate of profit, or, sometimes, almost at a loss. I refer to the carriage of raw material, such as grain, stone, iron, coal and other things of that sort. Now, if this work were done by the canal the railway would be free to carry the freight that is most profitable. In all cases where canals have run alongside of railways they have been found to be of great assistance to the roads. In fact, railways which were run alongside canals that were not worked have been run without profit, but when the canals were put in shape and began to work, the railways have paid a dividend. The reason is that the canals carried the rougher class of freight on which the railways' profit was little or nothing and they made traffic by building up factories and bringing in people, and so giving the railways more of the better kind of traffic to do. So we say that if this canal were constructed, it would be of great assistance to the railways as well as to the country generally. It is not my intention to go into the subject at greater length, but what I wish is to urge upon the government to take this matter up and give us the desired information, so that we may know the cost of this work and may be able to calculate whether our means will justify us in undertaking it, or whether it is too great for us at present. With the information before us we shall know just what we have to do.

Hon. J. ISRAEL TARTE (St. Mary's, Montreal). Last year, when those who had received a charter at the hands of the late government, applied for its renewal, I made as strong objection as I could. But it was represented to us that there were vested rights, that these men had spent pretty large sums of money in making surveys and trying to organize a company to make the enterprise go. I reluctantly consented to the renewal of their charter. But my colleagues were all of the same mind, after having discussed the question thoroughly, that the French river should be excluded from the charter, and it was. A complete survey of the French river has been made by the department of Public Works. My hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Murray) forgot to mention that survey. The engineers of the Department of Public Works deserve a great deal of credit for the complete, intelligent and thorough survey they have made of the French river—in point of fact it is the only complete and thorough survey that has ever been made. That survey is available with its maps and charts. The report which will be laid on the Table of the House will show that for the small sum—I call it a small sum—of five millions of dollars, the French river can be improved and made a waterway twenty-one feet deep from its mouth to Lake Nipissing. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said a moment ago that the improvement of the French river should be undertaken only on condition that it would form part of the whole project. There must be a beginning to everything in this world. If we construct this first part it will be the first step towards the completion of the whole great project. There has never been any complete survey of the Ottawa river and nobody knows what will be the cost of that work. I have gone over the Ottawa river, but I am not in a position to say, or even guess, what will be the cost of that great work. It will cost a large amount of money.

Mr. CLARKE. How much ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I cannot say. I do not like to give figures on questions that neither I nor anybody else has studied thoroughly, but as far as we are able to know, the project—I speak of the canalization of the Ottawa river from Lake Nipissing down—would cost, judging by the information we have, in the neighbourhood of $80,000,000. That is a large amount of money. I do not say that this country has not the means to spend $80,000,000, but I doubt very much whether we are prepared to do so now. We have so many large enterprises to promote that it is necessary for us to pause when we have to face such a large expenditure. I altogether share the view expressed by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) a moment ago, when he said that the country should undertake itself works of that kind. You can always build railways, there is plenty of room on this Canadian soil to locate railways, but there are only one Ottawa and one French and one St. Lawrence river, and I earnestly urge my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister—who, I may say, has given a great deal of thought and consideration to the views I have often laid before him—not to commit himself to any plan by which the Ottawa river would be made a private enterprise. If that ever should be done, we will have practically no control over it. My hon. friend from North Norfolk has said that if the French river project only be carried out, it will benefit the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. friend perhaps has been a little unwise in saying that. It is no use prejudicing the public mind against Canadian enterprises. The people of this country have spent in the neighbourhood of one hundred

million dollars to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have built that railway ourselves. It has rendered us immense service. There are few works of waterways improvements that will not benefit the railways. Where would we be to-day if we had not the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway and their ports on the lakes? Midland is a great port to-day because the Grand Trunk Railway has its terminal there. Depot Harbour is a great port also because it is a terminal of the Canada Atlantic Railway. It would be the easiest thing in the world to build another railway paralleling the Canadian Pacific Railway to North Bay if necessary. We have plenty of area to do so. If the French river project were carried out, it would place Montreal in a better position than New York. From Buffalo to New York by rail are 445 miles; and from North Bay to Montreal the distance is only 360 miles. It would place the St. Lawrence in a better position to handle the western trade than the route via Buffalo and New York and other American ports. Let us open as many avenues of trade as we can within our means and we will not have too many. It is no use in my saying more to-day, but before I take my seat let me beg again the right hon. gentleman, who has all the responsibility of the government of this country to-day, not to alienate great national property for the benefit of promoters. We have been giving too much to promoters. Let us keep at least the control of our national properties—national properties that we cannot duplicate. We can build other railways, but let me say again we cannot have another Ottawa river. To give the Ottawa river to a private corporation would be just as bad as if we were to give up our canals. It is represented that our canals do not pay. For my part, I am surprised that they have done so well. We have not equipped them, we have done nothing at both ends of our canals. Let us equip our canals. We are doing that now, but doing it pretty slowly. When the St. Lawrence is equipped as it should be, when our canals are equipped; when we have harbour facilities as we should have at Quebec, Three Rivers, Montreal, Port Colborne, we will see what advantages we will then enjoy. Railways cannot carry the trade of the country in the summer in competition with waterways. It is very important indeed that such questions as this should be always discussed without party bias. As my hon. friend from North Norfolk says, this is not a party question, but an undertaking of national import.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). It is not my intention to go fully into the question at present before the House. Every member of this House, who has been here a couple of years, knows my views on the subject. I believe that the undertaking which is advocated by my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Murray) is one of the most important in the interests of Canada that ever was propounded before this House. I have not altered my views on the subject. If we are ever to become a great nation, if Montreal is to become the great port nature intended it to be, and if our country is to receive the development it deserves, it depends upon the people themselves; and one of the most important undertakings to achieve that desired result is the building of the canal advocated by my hon. friend from Pontiac. I never had any other view on the subject. The undertaking is one which must some time be done, in the interests not only of this country but of the whole population surrounding the great lakes to the west of us. There is no use talking, it is proved mathematically, it is beyond all doubt that carriage by water is cheaper than carriage by rail. There is no probability in the future that that will be overcome. We are placed then in a position where we undoubtedly have the advantage in the carrying of the immense products of the west to the east. These must eventually pass over our territory, and it depends entirely on our people themselves whether we shall secure all that trade in our generation or leave that to be done by future generations. I am not going to discuss the question fully to-day, because probably a better opportunity will come later. I intend to go fully again into the question when the government announce its policy with regard to the commission for the purpose of inquiring into the transportation question. I think perhaps that that will be the better time to discuss the subject now before us. But we have the important announcement from the right hon. gentleman who leads the government that several propositions have been made by a company for the purpose of building this undertaking from the Georgian Bay to the port of Montreal, and that they were unreasonable and that the papers will be brought down and will justify the action of the government. He is favourable to the scheme as propounded by the ex-Minister of Public Works, and says it is a necessity for the country to complete the canal from Georgian Bay to Lake Nipissing. That may be the commencement of a great undertaking, but it would not be, in my opinion—and I have read all the articles on the subject—worth the expenditure of a single cent if the undertaking were to be completed in the manner proposed by the hon. member for Norfolk. He stated that big vessels can be carried on a twelve-foot navigation cheaper than on a twenty-one-foot navigation. The navigation of the western lakes by American boats down to Buffalo is on a twenty-foot navigation. The proposition of the ex-Minister of Public Works is the correct one, namely, the continuation of a channel of that depth of water down to Montreal, or, if we are going to use Lake Nipissing as part of the scheme, to have a twenty-one-foot navigation as far as Lake Nipissing.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And there are only 61 feet to overcome.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is all the difference between the Georgian Bay and Lake Nipissing, a rise of 61 feet. I may remark that I think all through navigation in the future should be made a depth of twenty-one feet, the depth which is adopted as a standard by the Americans between Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, and down the St. Mary's river to Buffalo. What an absurdity it would be to load boats at Port Arthur, bring them down to the mouth of the French river, reload them into barges drawing twelve feet of water, and carry them up a few miles to and through Lake Nipissing, then unload them again on a railway and carry them to Montreal. The case needs only to be stated to show its absurdity. The reason that our navigation on the St. Lawrence has not been utilized, up to the present time, to the extent it should be, is simply the fact that all vessels loading on the great lakes of the west are built for a navigation different from that which we have adopted on the St. Lawrence river. If we are to divert that traffic from the west to the east through our own waters, we must have a navigation the same as theirs. Perhaps I am going too fully into the subject.

I may say that I was gratified with the statement of the Prime Minister. He sees the importance of constructing that work. He agrees with the ex-Minister of Public Works as to the importance of extending the navigation into Lake Nipissing. The reason he rejected the proposal of the company was on account of its unreasonableness ; but he is prepared to consider, and perhaps enter into, an arrangement with a company that offers a more reasonable proposition. I am not going to discuss the question which the ex-Minister of Public Works has raised as to whether it would be better in the interests of the country that the government should retain absolute control of the canals, or whether it would be better to enter into some favourable arrangement with a company for the purpose of building that work up to Lake Nipissing. That is a question which should be considered entirely upon its merits. Some of the most important canals, doing the largest business in the world, are owned by companies, and that fact does not interfere with the benefit of the nations who are users of those canals. Possibly the company's proposition was an unreasonable one ; possibly we should adopt the argument of the ex-Minister of Public Works, who says that we should not part with any of our franchises in the manner that it is proposed to give them to companies. But that is beside the great project itself. I believe a Georgian Bay canal will do more for the development of this section of the country than any other scheme that has been proposed. I am in favour of its extension to Montreal. I am cosmopolitan enough to favour the scheme that was propounded by the Hon. John Young, when he was a member of this House for Montreal, who advocated the extension of that canal, with a depth of twenty-one feet, to the city of New York. He was of the opinion that that scheme, besides benefiting New York, would benefit this country and benefit particularly the port of Montreal. My hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Murray) says he does not expect to live to see this undertaking completed ; for myself, I hope to live at least to see it commenced. I believe that the future of this country depends greatly on the development of the natural advantages which we possess for the carriage from the west to the east of the immense quantity of products which is bound from year to year to increase.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. member who has just taken his seat made one statement with which I cordially agree, that if that canal was built it would be of immense value to the locality through which it runs. I do not think any one will disagree with that statement. It might be of great value to the country as a whole as a great highway of commerce ; I should neither affirm that nor deny it. But the gigantic undertaking itself is what interests me, in view of the very imperfect knowledge we have of it. Why, we cannot even discuss it intelligently, because we are entirely without any knowledge as to what it would cost the country. We have had that scheme before this House for several years. I remember distinctly that when it was brought before this House for the first time it was contended that the canal could be built and equipped for less than nine million dollars. I believe at that time it was intended to make it with a navigation of eighteen feet. The cost afterwards crept up to $15,000,000. I believe the next time it was discussed in this House we were told that we could have completed an eighteen feet navigation for an expenditure of $15,000,000, provided the country would raise part of the money and that a company could be found to raise the balance, and who would engage to build the work. The estimated cost was afterwards raised to $25,000,000, and it was said that undoubtedly the scheme could be completed for $25,000,000. The next time it was debated in this House the cost still remained an unknown quantity, because we were told that it might be anywhere from $25,000,000 to $60,000,000, but there was no doubt whatever that it could be done for $60,000,000. Now, it must be apparent to this House, as it is to the country, that the parties who are dealing with this scheme know very little about it. They have given us no intelligible data upon which to estimate the cost of this canal, nor can we judge even approximately what it is likely to cost. The ex-Minister of Public Works says that we do not know much about it, that we have very

little definite information, but we do believe it would cost at least $80,000,000 to complete it. I have no doubt that next year the estimate will reach $100,000,000.

Now, I say that in view of this uncertainty, even if we were confronted by no other difficulties in regard to this undertaking, it behooves us to go slow, to move with great caution, until we get more correct data upon which to estimate the cost of that great undertaking. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works said in reference to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that he regretted the statement he had made that providing navigation between Georgian Bay and Lake Nipissing, or improving it, would benefit the Canadian Pacific Railway more than anybody else. The hon. ex-Minister said: I regret to see the disposition to create a prejudice against one of the great Canadian enterprises. It is not, in my judgment, with any desire to create a prejudice against that Canadian enterprise, but what I understood the hon. member for North Norfolk to intimate was that if the expenditure took place as contemplated last year it would be of more benefit to the Canadian Pacific Railway than it would be to the Canadian people. Therefore, he was justified in drawing attention to the matter. If the undertaking is engaged in under any consideration, it ought to be for one purpose principally and for one purpose alone, and that is for the purpose of making a great highway of commerce, a national highway of commerce, which would be valuable to the Dominion of Canada more than to any private enterprise in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, we have been informed, during the present session, that the government contemplate the appointment of a transportation commission to make inquiries, and to take into consideration the feasibility of different routes. I presume the object of the appointment of this commission is to get information as to the cost of these routes, the value of them when they are provided, the advantage they will be to the country as highways of commerce in and in view of that fact I say that we would be doing a very improper thing if we were to make any move towards committing the country to an undertaking of this nature before that commission had time to make ample inquiry and report to this House. If the merits of this route are as great as its advocates claim, that commission will undoubtedly find it out and so report to this House, and when we take up that project, if we ever do, it will be done more intelligently and with better information than the House is possessed of to-day. We have practically no information in regard to the cost of the undertaking. It seems that it is the merest guess work. Are we prepared to justify the Canadian parliament in commencing an undertaking that will cost anywhere from $60,000,000 to $150,000,000 or $200,000,000 ?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. MURRAY. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? Has he ever read the report of the Senate on the question ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, I have.

Mr. MURRAY. The information is given there.

Mr. SPROULE. I must frankly confess that I think the information given there is based on very imperfect data. It seems to me that it is the merest guess work in the world and as evidence that it is guess work, I may say, that when intelligent engineers have gone over the ground years afterwards, they have declared that the work will cost upwards of three times as much as that report shows it will cost. Is that not evidence that the information contained in that report is not based on reliable data, and is not such as we would be justified in accepting as even approximately indicating the cost. As year after year new men look into the enterprise, they report that a larger and a larger expenditure will be required to complete the work than previous engineers have estimated it at. That in itself is sufficient to show that the data is quite unreliable. I agree with the ex-Minister of Public Works in one thing in toto, and that is that if the enterprise is ever gone on with, it should be as a public work belonging to Canada and not be put into the hands of any private corporation. I think it is a great mistake to lock up our highways of commerce, or to leave them in the hands of private corporations that can tax the trade of the country, that can handicap the trade of the country on one route as compared with another, or that can place a tax upon commerce, thereby interfering with the freedom of commerce as a private corporation would undoubtedly do provided they were allowed to build that canal, because they will place a tax upon the commerce so as to get a return upon their money afterwards.

Another question which has interested me a good deal and in regard to which I cannot agree with the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works, and it is in regard to the great benefit that would accrue if we have the navigation between Georgian Bay and Lake Nipissing made good. Why, when we get to the port of Lake Nipissing, the nearest port to Montreal, we are no nearer to Montreal than we are at Midland or Parry Sound. What great advantage would it be to have the navigation made complete between Georgian Bay and Lake Nipissing if we reach no closer to Montreal at the end of the route than we are already by two or three very good routes of navigation so far as the Georgian Bay goes ? The navigation to Midland Harbour and to Parry Harbour, because the difference between Midland Harbour and Montreal and Parry Harbour and Montreal and the port of Lake Nipissing and Montreal are practically the same. We were told here last year that it would cost about $5,000,000 to make good

the navigation between the Georgian Bay and the port of Lake Nipissing, yet, if that expenditure were made we would be no nearer Montreal than by the present lake navigation, either by way of Midland or of Parry Harbour. That being the case, it does seem to me that we are not justified in undertaking that heavy expenditure for making a route by way of Lake Nipissing that will be no better when it is finished than routes we have at the present time.

There is another thing that I have often thought and I think it should not be lost sight of, and it is that the history of the past has taught us a very important lesson that no matter how cheaply transportation is carried on by water, the railway companies nearly always manage to compete with it during the season of navigation. We have evidence of that in the trade between Buffalo and New York. They have a canal which affords some nine feet of navigation, but the railways carry grain over the same distance for about the same cost and they compete with the canal there. It does not necessarily follow that because railways will carry products the same distance for the same cost during the season of navigation we should not incur expense to build canals, because there is another very important element which comes in and that is that canals are a guarantee of low transportation as long as we have them and they hold the railways in check. If the canals do nothing more than this we should have these highways of commerce. Now, I am not arguing against the feasibility of this route as a great highway of commerce, provided we have twenty-one or twenty-two feet of navigation. I agree with the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that if we ever have that route we must at least have twenty-one feet of navigation. I do not agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that navigation can be carried on as successfully with a canal where there is only fourteen or fifteen feet of water as with a canal where there is twenty-one feet of water.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is the hon. gentleman quite sure that we can have twenty-one feet of water from Lake Nipissing right down ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not questioning that because I do not know anything about it, but what I say is that if it is to be a very great commercial waterway, for the whole of the Dominion of Canada, the best results can only be obtained by making it at least twenty-one feet, because the whole trend of the times is to have vessels of larger and larger capacity every year. The other day a vessel came to Midland laden with 350,000 bushels of grain, and day after day vessels come to Meaford, Collingwood, Midland, Parry Harbour and Georgian Bay ports carrying 250,000 bushels, whereas a few years ago 20,000 bushels was considered a large cargo. When such large vessels get to a fifteen-foot navigation they would simply have to tranship and the cost of transhipping once would equal the cost of transporting a thousand miles by water. This shows the importance of having twenty-one-foot navigation if the results that will accrue to Canada generally are to be at all commensurate with the expenditure. Let me say in conclusion that we should make haste slowly. I do not underestimate the value of waterways, but I do say that in face of the imperfect information we have ; in the absence of any definite information as to what this scheme would cost ; in view further of the fact that we have a commission appointed now to inquire into these things, the scheme should be left in abeyance for the present. We should get all the information possible for this House and then let parliament exercise its judgment as to whether or not it would be in the interest of the country for us to undertake this gigantic scheme.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). Whenever this great project has been under discussion in this parliament the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) never misses an opportunity to tender advice and to impress upon us that we should go slowly. He generally supports that advice with the statement that we know nothing about the subject, and that he himself in particular knows nothing about it. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) wishes to enlighten himself on this subject ; if he wishes to know something about it, I would advise him to look up the very valuable information published by the company which at one time contemplated the construction of this work.

Mr. SPROULE. The ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) told the House a few minutes ago that we knew little or nothing about this scheme, and I based my statement on his remarks. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who has considered the matter carefully, has to admit that he knows nothing about it I do not need to apologize.

Mr. BELCOURT. I take the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) that he personally knew nothing of the subject. I know he must be open to conviction, and I suppose that he wishes enlightenment, and therefore I invite him to read the pamphlet which was published by the company to which I have referred.

Mr. SPROULE. I have read every word of it.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has so soon forgotten it.

Mr. SPROULE. You may tender that advice to the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte).

Mr. BELCOURT. I am afraid I will have to assume that the hon. member (Mr.

Sproule) has made up his mind against the project, or otherwise he would not be so prone to tell us how little we know about it, and how much less he knows about it. I would ask him to read the report of Mr. Wisner, who is one of the most prominent engineers on this continent, who has travelled from the Georgian Bay to Montreal, who has examined the surveys which have been made and who has given his emphatic opinion that the improvement of the river Ottawa on the lines suggested is not only feasible, but that it is also to be a great commercial success. It has been my pleasure on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, for years past, both in this parliament and elsewhere to urge as strongly as I could in my humble way the canalization of the Ottawa river from the Georgian Bay to Montreal. I do not propose at this hour, when other business is so pressing, to go over the whole ground at length, but it is my duty to emphasize one or two points. First of all, I wish to say that the improvement of the Ottawa river is a work which does not, as some people imagine, interest only a few constituencies which border upon the Ottawa river. It must be apparent to every member of this House as it is to the commercial community of Canada that the construction of the Georgian Bay canal is of the vastest importance to every portion of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELCOURT. It may be that it does not directly benefit the riding of East Grey, and for that reason the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) may be opposed to it; but there is no doubt in the world that it will be of vast advantage to Canada as a whole. The tremendous immigration to western Canada; the enormous development of our wheat fields, as well also as the development of coal mining and the steel industry in the east, all point to the construction of this route as a public necessity in order that the products of the east may be brought to the consumers in the west, and that the products of the west may be carried to the seaboard. For my part, I believe that the construction of the whole of the canal from Georgian Bay to Montreal is a necessity. So far as I am concerned, I do not believe that it should stop at the deepening of the French river. I believe that the deepening of the French river alone would not be for the benefit of Canada as a whole, although it would undoubtedly bring the grain to North Bay, so that the Canadian Pacific Railway would unquestionably derive the greatest benefit from that work. If the Ottawa river is going to be improved, as I am sure it will be, it must be improved all the way from the Georgian Bay to Montreal. It has become manifest to all who have studied the question of water transportation as against railway transportation, that the former is undoubtedly the cheapest means of transport. On that score I shall read to the House an extract from the report of M. de Freycinet, President of the French Senate, who in a report recently sent to the Senate said :

It is conceded that waterways and railways are destined not to supplant, but to supplement each other. Between the two there is a natural division of traffic. To the railroads goes the least burdensome traffic, which demands regularity and quick transit ; to the waterways gravitate the heavy freights of small value which can only be transported where freights are low. Waterways, by increasing traffic, are rather the auxiliaries than the competitors of railroads. In procuring for manufacture cheap transportation for coal and raw materials, they create freights whose subsequent transportation gives profit to the railroads.

This seems to me to sum up the question in a very practical and lucid way, and shows that the construction of the Ottawa ship canal will not in any way antagonize or interfere with the railways of Canada. On the contrary, I think that the improvement of the navigation of the Ottawa river will actually benefit the railways of Canada.

One reason which to my mind has made the deepening of the Ottawa river a greater necessity than ever, is the recent decision of the state of New York to construct the Erie barge canal at a cost of $101,000,000. In connection with that project, I would like to cite to the House what is thought of the Georgian Bay canal by no less an authority than the 'Engineering News,' which published last month a very exhaustive article, from which I will quote one or two passages. It says :

We presented last week a comparison of the New York barge canal and the federal deep waterway as economic transportation routes to the seaboard ; and showed, we believe, the great superiority of the larger project. We now have to suggest to the legislators of New York and to the New York commercial organizations which are pushing the barge canal scheme, that they inform themselves as to the waterway which Canada has on foot.

It will be noticed that this American publication is far removed from the ignorance which has been admitted by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), because it gives the particulars of the surveys, the cost of construction, the manner of construction, and so on, of the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal. It goes on :

We do not refer now to the 14-foot navigation via the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence, although that is by no means to be ignored. What we desire to point out is that if New York should decide to spend $80,000,000 on a barge canal, it might be rendered obsolete long before its completion by the construction of a Canadian deep waterway to the sea big enough for any of the vessels now navigating the lakes.

We respectfully submit to the New York barge canal promoters the question how their barge canal could hope to compete with such a route. Indeed, we may make the question a broader one, and ask how any route to the seaboard which requires transhipment could

possibly compete with a route which takes freight on board a lake steamer at upper lake ports, and delivers it at tidewater without breaking bulk.

Again it says :

From an engineering point of view, disregarding for the moment political boundaries, there can be no doubt that the Ottawa route is by far the best for a deep waterway from the upper lakes to the sea. So far as export traffic from the north-west to Europe is concerned, it offers by far the shortest possible route, and practically its only drawback is the dangers of navigation of the St. Lawrence gulf.

Here is an American paper admitting that the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal is, to use its own language, by far the shortest possible route and consequently the best route to the seaboard. In view of the fact that the people on the other side of the line are realizing the importance of informing themselves on the question of our deep waterways, and that they are very much concerned over the prospect of our building this great route, and are going to spend $101,000,000 to build a barge canal for the purpose of competing for the traffic of the west, it is not plain that we should not, in the words of an hon. gentleman, go slow on this question. I am not contending that the government should this session go ahead and provide money for this work; but I say that if a company comes prepared to give the government a sufficient guarantee of its ability, financial and otherwise, to construct this canal, the government should give their fullest consideration to the proposal, unless they think that public opinion would warrant them in undertaking the work themselves. I am not concerned whether it is done by the government or by a company. My preference would be to have it done by the government, because I think it would tend greatly to check railway competition and exorbitant railway rates. In the meantime, I think the government should at the earliest possible moment fully inform themselves on this great project, and not allow valuable time to go by, while our competitors on the other side are doing all they can to take the traffic from us. The construction of the Erie barge canal means keener competition than ever for our transportation route. It means that another strong effort is going to be made to divert the traffic from the St. Lawrence via Montreal to New York via Buffalo. I believe this subject must be taken up seriously without delay, and given the very best consideration its importance deserves.

Mr. THOMAS MACKIE (North Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, in regard to this Georgian Bay canal, I do not call it a canal, but a great stretch of lakes with narrows between them. These narrows are very short in places, and it should not cost very much to make them navigable. This work will give us a great waterway all the way from Montreal to the Georgian Bay. I know probably as much about this route as any other member of the House. I have driven timber from North Bay into the Georgian Bay, and down by the great lakes and the St. Lawrence to Quebec, and I have taken timber from four miles east of North Bay down the Ottawa and St. Lawrence to Quebec, without any difficulty. If the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had gone over this route, he would know better what he is talking about. I notice that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is always ready to oppose anything required for eastern Ontario, but is always ready to support any proposition in the interest of western Ontario. I am sure that any one who knows the Ottawa river route will come to the conclusion that there is a great waterway there. It will cost money to open it up, of course; but it costs money to open up any route. I do not believe, however, that it will be necessary to construct more than twenty miles of canal to provide a twenty-one-foot channel all the way from the Georgian Bay to the St. Lawrence river. I hope the government will look into the matter. I am opposed to the canal ending at North Bay; I would like to see it go through. I do not care whether the work is done by the government or by a private company so long as it goes through.

It is the cheapest and quickest route by which grain can be brought from the North-west. We cannot get railways into the North-west for a number of years, but we could get by this route to North Bay in one year, and our railways would be able to carry all the grain from the North-west. I hope that the government will look into the matter, and I am sure they cannot fail to come to the conclusion that they will have to build without delay at least the first portion to North Bay. Although I am opposed to the work being done piece-meal, I would rather see it come in that way than not attempted at all, and then in a few years we will have this route completed to Montreal at a cost which, I believe, will be far less than many people imagine. There have been some very complete surveys of the Ottawa river made in the old days and the estimated cost did not figure up to anything then like what is estimated now. I trust that the hon. members of this House will not oppose the project but give it their support, and I am satisfied it will be a success in the long run.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of lease made between the superintendent general of Indian Affairs and S. G. Holbrook and Adam S. Benn for the south half of lot number twelve, concession two, township of Tuscarora, county of Brant, also of lease made by said superintendent general to one Gibson for south half of lot number five, in said township, for better identification both said half lots belonging to or for the benefit of Indian

locatee, Robert S. Sawyer ; also of lease or agreement for or in reference to one of said half lots made (previous to said leases to Holbrook and Benn and Gibson) by said superintendent general, or the late Indian agent, Captain Hugh Stewart, to or with one R. Brant ; also of all indorsements made on the said leases, or any of them ; also of all other agreements or writings made by or between said superintendent general, or Indian agent Daniel J. Lynch, and said Holbrook and Benn in reference to the said lease to them ; also of all receipts or acknowledgments made to the department having charge of Indian Affairs, or the said Lynch, of or for rent or other payments made by the said Holbrook and Benn, or either of them, under or in connection with the said lease to them, or having reference to or in connection with the lands mentioned therein; also of all letters or correspondence between the said department or Indian agent, the late Captain Hugh Stewart and Daniel J. Lynch, and the said Holbrook and Benn, Gibson and Brant, or either or any of them, or from or to either or any of them to the other of them, in reference to or in connection with any or either of the matters or things above mentioned, or in reference to or in connection with a certain order for ten dollars, dated the third of April, nineteen hundred and one, made by said Sawyer on Hugh Stewart, late Indian agent, in favour of said Holbrook ; also copies of all letters or correspondence between said department and said Indian agent, Daniel J. Lynch, or by or from either and each to the other, in connection with or in reference to any or either of the said matters or things ; also statement in detail, showing all moneys received by the said department from said Indian agent, Daniel J. Lynch, for or on account of any of the said matters and things aforesaid, with dates, items and amounts, and for which, and what ; and also to or for what, and for and by whom, such money was paid out or applied ; also of any petitions, or writings in the nature of petitions, in reference to Indian agent Daniel J. Lynch, and the names of those signing the same ; also of all other documents, papers and writings in connection with or in reference to all or any or either of the matters aforesaid.—Hon. Mr. Tisdale.

Copies of all corespondence and Orders in Council relating to or concerning the leases issued to Robert Anderson, J. J. Doyle, et al., Messrs. Bronson and Ray, C. A. Matson, et al., and Joseph W. Boyle, respectively, and to all other leases now in force, issued to other parties for hydraulic mining locations, in the Yukon territory.—Mr. Ross, Yukon.

Return of the contract entered into between the government and the Canadian Construction Company, for enlargement and improvement of the Farran's point canal, and the profiles, plans, drawings, and specifications in conection therewith ; all accounts and claims made by the said contractors, for extras or damages under or in connection with this contract ; and particularly claims Nos. 3b, 9 and 10, made by the contractors. Copy of the Order in Council of February 5th, 1900, authorizing the payment of $70,309.74 to the construction company. And a return of all papers, documents, letters, memoranda, Orders in Council, and rulings of the honourable the Treasury Board in reference to the items 8b, lock foundation on rock, $9,588.50; 9, extra unwatering of prism, $7,534.28, as referred to on pages A—24 to A—36, inclusive, of the Auditor General's report for the year ending 30th June.—Mr. Lennox.

Mr. MACKIE.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Hon. Mr. TARTE moved for :

Copy of the Order in Council appointing Sir William Van Horne, Mr. John Bertram, and Mr. Harold Kennedy, members of the commission on transportation ; and of other documents and papers, relating to the appointment of such a commission.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no Order in Council yet passed but there will be one in a few days, and it will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

GERMAN DISCRIMINATION AND THE BOND-HAY TREATY.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). At the beginning of the session, the right hon. the First Minister promised to lay on the Table all correspondence between this government and Germany and the imperial authorities regarding German discrimination, but so far that correspondence has not yet been brought down. I would also ask when the correspondence between Canada and the government of Great Britain with regard to the Bond-Hay treaty will be laid on the Table.

The PRIME MINISTER. The correspondence with Germany will be brought down to-morrow. With regard to the correspondence between Canada and Great Britain on the subject of the Bond-Hay treaty, we are at present communicating with the imperial authorities in order to have power to bring down certain despatches which form part of this correspondence, and the authority to do so has not yet come.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Bill (No. 39) to make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to animals and to amend the Criminal Code 1892 (Mr. Brock) read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon.

On Section 1.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Will my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) please explain the object he has in view in this Bill ?

Mr. BROCK. The Bill is a very short one, and has been drawn up to meet cases arising in the actual experience of those interested in these matters. The object, in the first place, is to provide that cars used for the transportation of cattle shall be provided with fodder, that they shall be properly clean and kept clean, and that where cattle are unloaded for the purpose of resting, watering or feeding, the car shall be cleaned out and reprovided with proper bedding. I may explain that in our cattle market in Toronto, cattle arrive from a distance in a most shocking state with dirt, having been put in a car where they

are shipped hundreds of miles away, brought down, changed at times to be watered or rested and returned to the same filthy car. This Bill provides that where they are unloaded for the purpose of resting, water or feed, that the car should be cleaned out—that is, wherever possible—exception being provided for cases where the dirt is frozen solid and the cars cannot be cleaned. It also provides that the cars must have proper feed and bedding.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) before him the statute he seeks to amend ?

Mr. BROCK. I have not it before me, but it is quoted in the Bill—subsection 5, section 514 of the Criminal Code. The most important provision of the Bill, probably, is that in the next subsection, which reads :

5a. No smaller animals shall be confined or carried in the same car, van or vessel with any larger animals of different species, unless a suitable and substantial partition, securely fastened to the car, van or vessel, is placed and maintained, and is sufficiently strong, to keep the smaller animals securely separate from the larger animals.

A year ago, I was sent for to go to the cattle market in Toronto to inspect a carload of animals that had been sent in from some distance. Lambs and sheep had been driven in under the larger cattle, and many of them arrived in Toronto in a most shocking state. The lambs and some of the sheep had been trampled and some were disembowelled. The railway company stated that they had no responsibility in the matter, the responsibility being with the shipper. It is difficult to get at the shippers as they may be at a great distance and hard to find. We thought, therefore, that we should have an Act of this kind by which we could get at the railway in case cattle should arrive in such a state. The last section of the Bill provides for right of entry and is as follows :

The right of entry provided for in section 515 of the said code may be exercised in or upon any car, van, truck, vehicle, cockpit, vessel, place or premises in which any police officer or constable has reasonable grounds for supposing that any breach of sections 512, 513 or 514, as hereby amended, is taking or has taken place.

That is the whole Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may explain that this is the very first moment that my attention has been called to this Bill and that I learn that it deals at all with the question of railways. That being the case, I am quite unable, at the moment, to give such consideration to the clauses of the Bill as would enable me to pass upon them with any satisfaction to myself or with any advantage to the committee. I think that the Bill is one that might very properly be referred in the ordinary way to the Select Standing Committee on Railways. It has a very important bearing on railways, and should be threshed out by that committee. I have no doubt at all that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) is proposing a very proper remedy for very serious grievances. I have no opinion at all against this Bill, and it is not with the view of offering the slightest opposition to it that I make the suggestion that this committee rise and the Bill be referred to the committee on Railways, where the matter can be better dealt with.

Mr. BROCK. I have no objection whatever to the suggestion of the hon. minister (Mr. Bair). But the hon gentleman and the House will see that this Bill applies not only to railways, but to farmers who bring cattle into market, as they often do, in large vans. It also has reference to the loading of cattle aboard vessels.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, it is not limited to railways, but it has an important bearing upon the operation of railways. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) move that the committee rise, so that the reference to the railway company may take place.

Mr. BROCK. I am quite willing to take that course, as I take it that it is the quickest way to reach the object I have in view, which is to have this Bill made a law as soon as possible.

Mr. MONK. This is a Bill to make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to animals and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. It can be only incidently—I think very incidently—that it would require the consideration of the Railway Committee. I understand that it may be necessary for the hon. minister to look into the Bill but there is something ominous in the reference of the Bill to the Railway Committee. I was about to suggest to my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) that the Bill might be allowed to stand for the consideration of the minister instead of being referred to the Railway Committee.

Mr. BROCK. I simply wanted to have the Bill made law, and if the best way is to allow it to stand for the present, I am willing to allow it to stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would suggest that my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) should move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. I do not know why my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) should speak as he does about the reference to the Railway Committee. I do not think that he has anything that would justify the suggestion that Bills referred to that committee receive anything but the fullest and fairest consideration.

Mr. MONK. I have found such a reference to be the death of a Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And why not ? What is the use

of having a committee, unless it has full power to express its judgment upon measures referred to it ?

Mr. MONK. I think mine is the experience of a great many members of this House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Monk). The reference to the committee is simply for the better guidance and management of our legislation. There is no such object in view as the hon. gentleman suggests. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. When a minister asks that such a course should be followed, we take it as equivalent to an assurance on the part of the government that the Bill shall not be delayed, but shall come back to the House in good time. Otherwise it would not be fair to the hon. mover of the Bill to take such a step. But assuming that the motion is equivalent to the assurance I speak of, I do not know of any better place for the consideration of these clauses with regard to the shipment of animals than the Railway Committee. That is the proper tribunal. But, if the minister does not agree that the Bill shall go there with the understanding I have mentioned, it might be equivalent to the death of the Bill. He will see that we have a chance. I think that is the best course to adopt.

Progress reported.

OTTAWA VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MONK moved the second reading of Bill (No. 59) respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.

Mr. C. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I object to this Bill being taken up in place of Bill (No. 36) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. Some nights ago when Bill (No. 36) came up, the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Ball) moved the second reading, and he was asked to allow it to stand. I object to Bill (No. 59) being read, because it is connected with Bill (No. 36). I have just allowed Bill (No. 36) to stand at the request of the member for Nicolet. I do not want Bill (No. 59) to go on now, because it forms part of Bill (No. 36). I want both Bills to stand, or else I wish to proceed with Bill (No. 36).

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Stand.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Ross (Ontario)—by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 68) to incorporate the Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Charlton—by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt—by Mr. Lemieux.

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Clare—by Mr. Lancaster.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson—by Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Brockville and North-western Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment—by Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company, Limited; and to change its name to the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—Mr. Guthrie—by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Dominion Gas Improvement Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited; and to change its name to the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—Mr. Bickerdike.

THE NEW CANADIAN COMPANY, LIMITED.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A mistake has been committed. Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the New Canadian Company, Limited, which stands in my name, has been passed over.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It has been called.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He can move it now.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved that Bill (No. 83) be read the second time.

Mr. MONK. When the hon. gentleman's Bill (No. 83) was called, it was I who asked that it stand, because I think it is connected with the two other Bills which have been ordered to stand.

The PRIME MINISTER. Stand.

Order allowed to stand.

SHIPPING FEDERATION OF CANADA.

Mr. BICKERDIKE moved the second reading of Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Shipping Federation of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. It will be well to have an explanation of this Bill. I see some intimations in the press that this is rather far reaching in its nature.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. There is nothing very far reaching about the Bill. The shipping firms of Montreal wish to incorporate themselves into an association similar to the bankers association, or the butchers association, or any other association for mutual protection. I do not think there is anything

outside of that in the Bill, but if there is, I will explain it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule). I know there is nothing in it other than an ordinary association of steamship companies just on the same principle as the bankers or any other association now exists.

Mr. SPROULE. From the press reports it would seem that it is a combine of the shipping people of Montreal, and if that is so, it might be a very far reaching and injurious Bill, and it still seems so from the limited explanation that the hon. gentleman has given as to the aim of the Bill.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If it were such a Bill I would not have introduced it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY—RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I desire to draw the attention of the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) to the return which was brought down to the House the other day as to the number of railway accidents which have occurred in the Dominion of Canada during the past six months, and the enormous attendant loss of life. The return brought down covers the period from the first of October last to the first of April, and during that period of six months no less than 142 accidents took place in which, or as a result of which, 179 human lives were lost. It is a matter profoundly to be regretted that even since the first of April there have been other railway accidents. Several have occurred since that time in which, or as a result of which, many human lives have been lost. There seems to have been an epidemic, if I may use the expression, of accidents during the past eight or nine months. From the information obtained from the government, it appears, Mr. Speaker, that there is no public official under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals, or of the Minister of Labour, whose duty it is to make inquiry at once into the cause which has led to these accidents, to make inquiry under oath to ascertain all the particulars antecedent and leading up to an accident, to ascertain any steps that might be taken to avoid a recurrence of a similar accident, to ascertain what was the condition of the road bed and rolling stock, to make inquiry as to the number of hours employees on these railways are on duty, to make inquiry as to the efficiency of the train crew, as to the sufficiency of the station help, as to the hours the station masters are supposed to be at work, and also to make inquiry as to the experience and efficiency of the telegraph operators. I think it must appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that in view of the number of accidents that have happened during the past six months in the conduct of our railways and in view of the fact that these railways are operated under a code of rules which have to be submitted to and approved by the government it is in the public interest that some official should be appointed at once by the government and given full power to make inquiries as to these accidents and to endeavour to ascertain their causes and put a stop to their recurrence in the future. We learned recently from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that there was no official whose duty it was to make such an inquiry. At present, all the information that the public obtain as to the cause of an accident, is gleaned from the finding of the coroner's jury, but I am sure I am within the sense of this House when I say that these juries do not obtain all the information that is necessary for the public to form a judgment as to the causes which have led to the accident. It seems to me that there is something wanting in the method adopted by coroners' juries to obtain this information. It seems to me that it is necessary in the public interest that an official should be appointed to make these inquiries, not only that a more searching investigation may be made into the causes of accidents, but also that the employees of the company who may be called to give evidence may have the protection which such an official could afford them in giving evidence before a jury or making a statement to him. I believe that in the United Kingdom there is some public official whose duty it is when a serious railway accident occurs involving a loss of human life to proceed at once to the scene of the accident, make a full and complete inquiry and report to the government. I am sure it is so self evident that it is desirable to have an inquiry of this kind instituted and a report made to the government that I only need to draw the attention of the right hon. First Minister and of his colleagues of the government to the situation which exists in Canada, to have them take definite action in this matter at the earliest possible moment. We have the Department of Railways and Canals and we have also a Department of Labour. It would surely be the function of an official of one or other of these departments to act in the manner suggested. I believe that the Department of Labour has an official whose duty it is to inquire into the number of hours, work performed, the wages paid, and so on, on works with which the government is identified. I think under these circumstances the powers of this officer might be enlarged, or some officer might be appointed from the Department of Railways and Canals to make an investigation such as I have suggested and to make a report. I saw it stated in one

of the English papers recently that during the year 1902, notwithstanding the many millions of passengers carried by railways in the United Kingdom, not one human life was lost. It is deplorable and regrettable that the public of Canada have had to read from day to day and month to month during the past six or eight months of accident succeeding accident with daily regularity and with attendant loss of life and property. I think if such an officer as I have suggested were appointed the result would probably be greater care upon the part of all concerned in the management and operation of railways. Railway companies have been given great privileges and great powers; they ought to be held responsible by the people for the way in which these privileges and powers are exercised, and it seems to me that if a rigid inquiry were made whenever an accident occurs in which human life is lost, and if those responsible were held strictly accountable for the loss of human life, much greater care would be exercised than at present in the operation of these roads, and the result would be that in future we would have fewer accidents and less loss of life. I ask the Prime Minister or the Minister of Railways and Canals, or the Postmaster General or whatever minister is to answer: What is the policy of the government with respect to this matter? Has the attention of the government been called to these frightful accidents which are growing constantly more frequent from one end of the country to the other? Is it the intention of the government to take some decisive action to have an inquiry on oath as to the cause of these accidents? Is it the intention of the government to hold the company responsible, or the employees responsible, if dereliction of duty is shown? I am sure, Sir, that the matter is of sufficient importance to justify me in drawing the attention of the House to it at the present time. I know that the people throughout the country are commencing to fear very much, are in fact becoming nervous because of the frequency of these accidents.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I have no complaint to make at all that my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) has brought the subject up this afternoon. He was good enough to drop me a note a few moments ago telling me that he would call attention to it when the House would go into Supply.

Mr. CLARKE. I did not expect the House to go into Supply for some hours yet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand. Had I had a little more time it would have enabled me to bring down some information which might have a bearing upon the subject, but perhaps a subsequent opportunity may offer. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is no doubt impressed, as others have been, with the extreme gravity of this subject. It is startling to think that so many lives have been lost in railway accidents within the short period of six months, and unless we had the actual figures one would have scarcely thought it possible. Immediately these facts were brought to my notice I submitted the subject for the consideration of my colleagues, and we have been considering it since at every spare moment which has been available to us. We are considering very seriously what is the best course for us to take. It has not escaped our attention, and I can assure my hon. friend that we are not indifferent in the matter. But it is a much easier thing to say that action should be taken than to determine upon the nature of the details of such action. In my own department there was an accident recently which it was possible for me to deal with without getting formal authorization from the Governor in Council, and I confess that I have not yet been able to find an individual possessing the precise qualifications that would be necessary to enable him to conduct such an inquiry in an efficient manner. You need a man who has practical experience in the operation of railways, who is familiar at least with the regulations in a general way, and who knows from having worked on railroads in what manner these accidents are likely to occur, so that he can press his investigation in the most effective way. Up to this time I have not been able to select a person who I think possesses the necessary qualifications for that purpose. The Railway Act contains ample power to authorize the Governor in Council to appoint an officer and to endow him with any powers which may be necessary for the purpose of conducting a thorough inquiry; authorizing the summoning of witnesses, the compelling of them giving testimony, the production of books, papers and documents, and all evidence that may throw light upon the question. I think the present legislation is ample in that respect. However, I would point out that that law has been on the statute-book for a very long number of years, ever since confederation, and it has never been acted upon so far as I am aware of. It may be that in a special case a person has been appointed to hold a particular individual inquiry, but there has been no official named or charged with the duty of holding inquiries whenever accidents upon railways occur, entailing loss of life or of property. I apprehend that there have been very grave accidents in the past; as disastrous no doubt to life and property as any that have recently occurred, so that the subject must have been oftentimes under consideration, but for one reason or another no official has been appointed. I am not authorized definitely to say just what action the Governor in Council will take upon this subject, but the House and the country may rest assured that we will endeavour to reach a wise conclusion in the premises, and if it shall appear to

us that the appointment of an official for such a purpose would tend to produce good results, that course will be determined upon.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the practice in the old country ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is an official in the old country who has general authority to make on his own motion inquiry into any railway accidents and to report his conclusions to the Home Office or to the Board of Trade, or to some department of the imperial government. It may be that we would do well to have an official similarly equipped with power and appointed by the government of Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) has alluded to the remarkable freedom from loss of life on railways in the old country. It is a very striking fact, but it does not mean that loss of life has not taken place to a very considerable extent in connection with the operation of railways. It merely refers to the fact that the lives of passengers have not been lost. The accidents referred to in the return brought down the other day are not accidents to passengers alone. A very small proportion of them involved loss of life to passengers on railway trains. We know, unfortunately, that some very serious casualties have occurred whereby passengers have lost their lives, but the great majority of deaths and permanent injury on railways occur in the shunting yards to employees, and not when the trains are on the line in the ordinary course of travel. The men get a carelessness bred by familiarity with the habit of jumping on and off shunting engines. They are fully alive to the danger and hazard of what they are doing when they are committing an indiscretion, but before they know what they are about, they are run over by a train and life is lost. So that it is not possible to organize any regulation which will protect the men to a complete extent, or to a much greater extent than the present regulations, against the consequences of their own negligence and folly. We had an accident of a grave character on the Intercolonial Railway the other day, one of the gravest that has occurred for a long time. It is almost impossible to form a judgment as to why or how that accident came about. I have had the very fullest reports from the officers of the department on the spot. There is no question at all but that every provision which has been ordained for the purpose of ensuring safety to trains coming and going which are liable to meet one another, had been observed, so far as regulations could do it. The conductors and engine men on both trains received their orders where the crossing of these two trains took place —at Windsor Junction; and they both acknowledged receiving them. The train which is entirely to blame for the collision came to the point at Windsor Junction where it ought to have stopped. There was the semaphore signal forbidding that train going out; yet, notwithstanding that the engine driver swept through, and within two miles and a half of where he should have stopped his train, it collided with the other.

Mr. INGRAM. How long was that engineer on duty ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only three or four hours ; he had just come fresh to his train. That officer was one of the best and most experienced men we had ; he had been thirty-two or thirty-three years in the service without a mark against him. It appears that he did not lose his life, and he has made the statement that he must have lost his senses, which is the only explanation he can make. He knew he was to stop, and was apparently thoroughly alive to the duty of his stopping the train until he came near to the point where it was to stop, and then the mental machinery failed to work. Now, I do not think, if we had an investigation of the fullest and amplest character, it would give us any more evidence as to the facts ; but I thought it was desirable, and I concluded that if I could find some suitable person who would go there and have everybody who knew anything at all about the matter give his evidence, I would have the matter thoroughly looked into. I do not know that we can get any more light, but it will be a satisfaction to know that every effort has been made to trace out all the facts and to see whether there is any fact that we do not know. I can only say to my hon. friend that we realize the full gravity and importance of this subject. We shall not treat it with indifference, but will deal with it in such a manner as we deem conducive to the protection of life and property.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I am sure the members of the House will be gratified to know, from the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that the government have under consideration this very serious matter to which my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has referred. I was somewhat surprised a few days ago to learn that the government had not in their possession any statistics of the number of fatal accidents that occur on railroads, or the number of persons injured in railway accidents.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are providing for that in the new Bill.

Mr. KEMP. I was going to suggest that the matter might be covered in the new Bill. The Minister of Railways and Canals has announced that under the law as it exists a person can be appointed to make an inquiry into an accident. In the past the public has been ignorant except in the case of fatal accidents, as to the cause of railway accidents, or where the responsibility rested.

It seems to me that we have arrived at a time in this country when the government should obtain under the Railway Act all the powers that are necessary, if they do not at present possess them, to investigate railway accidents, and also to see that the railway companies carry out the rules and regulations which are submitted to the government for approval. I am informed that sometimes there is a laxity in carrying out these rules and regulations, through overwork, the great pressure of traffic, and that sort of thing. I think it is the duty of the government to inquire into all these matters. However, I am very pleased to learn that the government have this subject under consideration, and all I would urge is that they try to put some machinery into operation as soon as possible with the view of minimizing and diminishing railway accidents, and somewhat approaching the state of perfection that exists in Great Britain, where my hon. friend states that during the year ending March 31st, 1902, there was not a single fatal railway accident.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Among the passengers.

Mr. KEMP. The memorandum which is taken from the newspapers, does not say that, but I accept that as correct.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I do not think there is so much fault to be found with the rules of the companies. I do not think the trouble lies there, but it is due to the management of the railways doing their utmost to cut down their operating expenses. To this end they discharge old reliable men and put into their places younger and inexperienced men. The cause lies in that more than in anything else. When freight becomes congested it takes the trains longer to pass over the lines, and the men are kept longer on duty. As a result of being a long time on duty accidents occur due to that reason, the employees not being as alert as they would be if they worked only ordinary hours. I think the greatest curse of all is this system of cutting down expenses at the cost of efficiency. The loss of life, not only of employees but of the travelling public, is a result of the experimenting by railway companies to reduce the cost of operating their lines. I think that the government would take a step in the right direction if they would appoint some first-class man who, in case of accident, would have full power to fairly investigate. These investigations held by coroners' juries are not reliable and in many cases do not bring out the actual facts. As one having some railway experience, I am in a position to say that the despatchers in railway offices frequently send orders which they refuse to O. K. If they carried out the rules of the company, they would O. K. these orders, but they have refused and what has been the result? The result has been that when the operators at the stations were asked to produce the O. K. they could not because the despatchers had refused to give it to them. So that an operator, although he had been doing his duty, had no proof to bring, because the despatcher refused to give the O. K. order. I know myself of a serious accident which was visited on a man who was perfectly innocent.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Railways if he has taken any steps towards having an investigation generally into the frequency of these accidents during the past few months, and into the cause of the accident on the Intercolonial Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have said that nothing has been done in the way of appointing any official to pursue inquiries of this kind since the law has been on the statute-book, and that although I have power as minister, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, to have an investigation on my own motion without getting authority by Order in Council, into the accidents which occur on the Intercolonial Railway, none have yet been investigated except by officials in the ordinary way, but that I was quite resolved to have, if I could find a suitable person, an official appointed for that purpose in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I further stated that I would have an investigation into the recent accident.

Mr. MONK. What I asked the hon. gentleman was whether he had taken any steps of any kind to investigate into the cause of the frequency of these accidents during the few past months. We have had a discussion in which it has been urged that the accidents are nearly always due to the desire of railway companies to reduce the cost of operating their lines, and I wish to know if any steps had been taken at any time, of any kind, to investigate into this matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. G. BARKER (Hamilton). I am very glad to hear that the hon. Minister of Railways proposes to consider the question of making an inquiry through a proper official into the causes of accidents. This inquiry should not be made merely after an accident occurs but should be in the nature of a general and continuous inspection for the purpose of preventing accidents. I do not know, and I do not very much care to discuss whether the troubles we have had so frequently this year have been due to any one or more of the particular causes referred to in the House to-day. But whatever the cause, whenever a serious accident happens, you will find that there are two or three officials of one class or another implicated, each of whom has neglected some rule or order of the company, and that if any one of them had observed the rules

and regulations approved by the government, the neglect of another would not have caused the accident. Nearly always you will find a combination of two or three errors causing an accident and that if one of the men had done his duty, no trouble would have occurred. I think that indicates a very general neglect to carry out the rules adopted by companies and approved by the government. Those who know anything about the railway rules are convinced that if they were observed, an accident would be almost impossible except from some defect of machinery or appliance. In nearly every case there are two or three officials, one checking the other, and if any one of them did his duty there would be no accident. The difficulty is rather this, that a man working year after year without anything happening, becomes convinced that some particular rule is not essential to the safety of the train, and he neglects complying with it, and of course, when no accident occurs, nothing is ever heard of the neglect of the rule. That is due to the very natural reluctance of one employee to peach on his fellow employee. The officials of the railway companies probably never hear of the neglect until some lives are lost, or there is some destruction of property. Then an investigation takes place, and they learn that for months, and perhaps for years, some particular rule never has been observed. The inspector, of which the hon. member for West Toronto has spoken, should be a man in continuous employment, and not one sent out simply when the minister hears of some dreadful accident. He should be on duty as inspector from the beginning of the year to the end, travelling continually over the railways and seeing that the rules provided for the safety of the public are being observed. If a competent official of that kind were appointed I am satisfied that many of these accidents would be avoided, and we would have less need for investigating the cause of destruction of life and property.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to say a few words on the subject of wrecks and loss of life upon the railways, which was under discussion before the House rose for recess. These disasters seem to have been especially frequent since the last of December; the losses since that time have been quite remarkable. It is time steps should be taken to prevent the continuance of this great evil. We are sent here by the people to represent the people and to protect them, and this is an occasion that calls for action on our part. We have before us, in the person of the hon. Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) the man who should take the first step in this matter. Of course, unless that hon. gentleman moves, other managers and presidents of railways will say : So long as the government remains inactive, we will do the same. And in so saying they will be quite right. The Minister of Railways is the proper man and the only man to set this reform in motion. We were told in 1896 that this government would be a government of reform and a government of example. Let the government set the example and bring forth a proper measure of reform. What I wish to say is this—for I will speak but a few moments and would like to be well understood—in the first place the Minister of Railways must be aware of how his own men are worked on the government railways. I cannot speak so well about the government railways, but speaking of railways that I do know, I can tell the House that drivers—engineers, as some call them, but they call themselves 'drivers'—firemen, conductors and telegraph operators work too many hours at a stretch. Often, you see these men go on duty in the morning with instructions to remain on duty until they are told to quit. Sometimes they will be ten, twelve and even fifteen hours on duty. The result may be that a wreck takes place and there is a loss of life. And when the question is asked by the public how the accident occurred, they are told : It was on account of the operator. But there is somebody behind, and the operator is not always to blame. Those who give instructions to the operator are often to blame. When the men in responsible positions tell an operator or an engineer, or a conductor, to stay on duty until he is told to quit, they are the men who are to blame, and the only ones. The Minister of Railways, being at the head of the government in these matters, should make the first move, and provide that drivers, conductors, firemen and telegraph operators shall be allowed to work only so many hours out of the twenty-four. Understand me well—when I say they should be restricted to so many hours, I do not mean to say that you should go to the extreme. To say that one of these employees shall not work more than fourteen hours or sixteen hours would not do. Take a driver who runs an express at the rate of forty, forty-five or fifty miles an hour, and sometimes even at sixty miles an hour, at the risk of his life—such a man should not be on duty more than four hours at a time, say four out of sixteen or twenty. Working for such a length of time, these men will be fit, and it will be safe to entrust to them the lives of passengers. The same way with the conductors, and the same way with the telegraph operators. A telegraph operator, let us say, is ordered on at six o'clock in the morning; and at eight o'clock in the evening or nine or ten o'clock, his hours of duty not ended, he becomes tired and goes to sleep. A train may pass by which should be stop-

ped by the operator, but he, tired with overwork, is sound asleep, how can he stop the train? The result is that there is a wreck ahead and loss of life. The government may say that it will be too expensive to give these men short hours. But there are two ways of looking at it. Suppose that it should cost the government $20,000 a year extra to employ the additional staff necessary to give this class of employees such short hours. Why, in one wreck you will lose fifteen or twenty or sixty or even a hundred thousand dollars. But that is not all, nor is it the worst. It may be that five or six or even ten or fifteen lives are lost. Who will restore those lives? The people are dead and gone and that is the last of them for this world. The Minister of Railways, if he would but say the word could prevent all this; and to him the people look to take the first step. And if the hon. minister is kind enough to adopt the necessary measures, he shall have my support. It will be the duty of everybody to support him cordially. I was coming up on the Canada Atlantic Railway to-day. Some people asked: Why do not you go by the Canadian Pacific Railway, for there is a strike on this road? There is one example. A number of employees have stopped work, and we are even told that signals have been tampered with. Of course, it may be said that the government is not to blame. But all this goes to show the dangers that are involved and that should be overcome as far as possible. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) must travel a great deal by the railways. Should he lose his leg in a railway accident—would not that be a loss that could not be made good to him by $50,000? And should he happen to lose his life, of course, there is no money that would redeem that. Therefore, this House has a right to call upon the hon. minister to take steps before more disasters occur, to secure greater safety to those who operate or travel by the railways.

Mr. M. K. RICHARDSON (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, the subject which is before the House, and which was discussed for some little time before recess is of more than passing importance. It is one that has awakened keen and lively interest in the public mind. I am not at all in sympathy with the kind of propaganda which would unnecessarily excite the public mind against railway companies or unnecessarily embarrass those companies with legislative enactment. We know that the duties of railway managers are of a very onerous character. On one hand they have the lives of people committed to their care in very large numbers. On the other hand, they have the interest of the public who have invested their money in their railways, and the managers are naturally desirous of running their roads so that they may pay some decent dividend on the capital invested. It may be that there has been too great a tendency towards economy in the running of railways, which may be to some extent responsible for the large number of accidents that have occurred in this country during the past six months. This is a matter of national interest and of national importance. It is not merely a question of loss to the railway companies, or even a question of a loss of life, but it is a matter of national importance, because if the statistics in Canada should show that life is much more imperilled on railways here than in other countries, it would be detrimental to the settlement of this country, it would be detrimental to the investment of capital in this country, and in a number of ways it would hinder that progress which we have a right to expect and which we are all looking for.

As I said before, I am not in favour of legislative enactments that would unnecessarily embarrass the operation and management of railways, but I think we owe it to the public and to our constituents to bestir ourselves and to prove that we are alive to the public interest in view of the deplorable loss of life that has recently occurred in railway accidents. I understand that the railway companies have very strict rules for their employees, which are intended to safeguard the travelling public, but these rules are not always implicitly obeyed. For instance, I understand they have very strict rules with regard to the use of intoxicants while their men are upon duty. Now from what I can gather from remarks that I have heard, I believe that in many cases the men are worked over hours, whether from compulsion or whether from a desire to work longer hours in order to get more pay, I do not know. But certain it is that evidence has come out to show that men have been kept on duty fifteen or sixteen hours in the twenty-four. Now it is not in human nature to bear up under such a strain, nor ought the lives of the travelling public to be committed to men who work such long hours. From what I can gather they resort to stimulants in consequence, and from information had I believe that engine drivers and their assistants are in the habit of using intoxicants to stimulate them under weariness and exhaustion in performance of arduous duties for long periods. I was recently with a man who said that he had frequent opportunities of riding upon one of the engines belonging to a line of railway that I know very well. He had been himself in the employment of the company, and he stated that having the confidence of the engine drivers he frequently rode with them, and he knew for a fact that they were accustomed to take stimulants with them, and were frequently under the influence of those stimulants. More than that, we know that men who work very long hours and become wearied have been known to fall asleep on their engines, when they were travelling at the rate of forty or fifty miles an hour. We can form but a slight conception of the immense danger to the travelling

public which must ensue when they have entrusted their lives to men in this condition and under these circumstances.

I understand that this motion has for its object to bring this matter to the attention of the government so that some means may be taken to safeguard the travelling public and lessen the danger of railway accidents which have been so frequent recently. Compared with the record of European countries and compared with the record of Great Britain, our record for railway accidents, during the last six months especially, is of an unenviable character. I do not know how it compares, as to mileage and population, with the record in the neighbouring republic, where accidents have been considered more frequent than in any other part of the world. But I am sure we are acquiring an unenviable reputation in that respect. I hope that this discussion will lead to some appointment by the government which will reassure the people, and will at least show that the government appreciate the importance of this matter. The railway companies have been given large privileges in their charters, and we have a right to exercise supervision over their management by the appointment of some commission of inspection which will tend to lessen the frequency of accidents which have been so appalling during the last six months.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). I think it proper to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to one branch of this case which, I think, judging from the remarks he made this afternoon, he has failed fully to appreciate. I refer to a feature of the case that was clearly brought out by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) and also by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), that is, the question of prevention rather than the question of investigation after the difficulty has arisen. I understand from watching what has happened in the last six months, and from taking note of the accidents that happened before that time, that there is a necessity for taking preventive measures, or such means of supervision being adopted as will lead to a diminution of the danger of accidents in the future. That this can be done, I think will be admitted by any person who has given any attention to the matter. When these accidents occur we have had evidence from time to time that in many instances they result, not from the want of stringent regulations made by the railway companies, but from the failure of the company to put those rules vigorously into operation. In many cases accidents have undoubtedly resulted from the fact that the companies were endeavouring to carry on their operations with too small an expenditure of money, or were imposing upon their employees more duties or greater responsibilities than they could possibly discharge. Now this afternoon the member for Hamilton, I think, referred to the fact that the railway companies, while they make regulations and obtain the proper sanction of those regulations, still in many instances have failed to carry them out. I know an instance that occurred between the town of Barrie and the city of Toronto not many months ago, where the regulation as to the passage of trains at a certain point had been deliberately ignored for, I think I am safe in saying, a year, if not to the direct knowledge of the head officials of the company, at all events to the knowledge of many of their prominent officials. While no trouble arose, they virtually winked at the infringement of their own rules. But, unfortunately, not long ago an accident occurred, and what then happened? All the officials that could be charged with responsibility were immediately dismissed. The company would not take as an excuse that the company itself had long been aware that the rule was being broken. The answer was: You are bound to obey the rules, and when an accident occurs you must stand the consequence. This is only one instance of many which point to the fact which the Minister of Railways and Canals entirely ignored in the remarks he made this afternoon. What the public needs is the appointment of some official of the government whose duty it would be to see that proper regulations are made and enforced to insure the safety of the travelling public, to make himself familiar with the actual working of the various railways, and to see that these regulations are efficiently carried out. What the hon. minister says in regard to the fact that there is a statute in force which enables us to appoint some one to investigate the causes of accidents after the accidents have occurred indicates a very ineffective remedy, but if an active official of the government is charged with the duty of seeing from time to time that certain necessary rules are being carried out on the various railways, then, there is no doubt at all that great good will result and the number of accidents will be greatly diminished. This, I hope, will be sufficient to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to this important matter and to enable him to act and to act now. I cannot but feel that it is a very regrettable circumstance that whilst everybody in this country has been shocked by the number of accidents that have occurred, whilst every public man, every intelligent man, has had full knowledge for months and more than months of the absolute necessity of some action being taken by the government to lessen the number of fatal accidents that are occurring, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has not been in a position to-day to tell the House that he has adopted some effective measure already to advance the remedy and prevent the recurrence of these disastrous accidents.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair to go into Supply, I would like to draw the attention of the House to what I consider a very reasonable grievance. We have now been sitting for a month and I think I am right—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has spoken on the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MONK. No, I only asked a question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Only a question ?

Mr. MONK. We have been sitting for a month and I think I am right in saying that with the exception of some very trifling legislation, there has been very little done beyond the passing of estimates and the furnishing of supplies. In this I think we have acted very generously; we have voted, if I mistake not, several million dollars and we have shown a disposition, at least every time I have been present in this House to go into Supply, and I think I may claim that we are doing it unduly at the present moment. I have no desire for my own part to retard in any way the work of Supply. I know that it involves considerable labour for the minister in charge of the department, and for my own part, in order to advance the work of the session, I want to assist the minister as much as possible when the estimates of his department come up to pass these estimates, because we have quite enough work without creating obstruction in the slightest degree. For my own part I disclaim any idea of creating obstruction, but what I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to hon. members of both sides of the House respectfully is that we are not proceeding in the regular way. We have grievances to redress and the voting of supplies ought to be preceded by the redress of grievances. Now, I will just enumerate to the House some of the important questions that are before us this session and which, according to my view, create the question of grievance. I will not speak of the tariff, Mr. Speaker, because we have the announcement of the budget speech for to-morrow; still, I do not suppose there is throughout the whole country a single person, however indifferent that person may be to the great political issues of the day, who, if asked, what is the question that is disturbing the public most at present, or which is creating an interest in politics, will not answer at once : It is the question of the tariff. Well, we have been over a month here and we have had no opportunity for the discussion of this most important question upon which there are so many different opinions throughout the Dominion. We have remedies to apply to the Election Act. Hon. members on this side, and hon. members on the other side of the House have introduced measures to remedy serious grievances in the electoral law. Why cannot we take up these grievances and remedy them before we continue voting money day after day as we are doing at present. At the very opening of the session we had the announcement of the Redistribution Bill. What is that but a grievance ? The right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said, when introducing his Bill, that it was intended by that Bill to remedy a grievance, but going outside altogether of the question of party in respect to that Bill, the taking of the census and the result of that census now before us creates a grievance and before proceeding any farther with Supply we should apply ourselves strictly and absolutely to remedy that grievance. That is what I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House, in respect to the Redistribution Bill.

We have had the announcement made to the public and I think it was confirmed in this House that we are going to have a transportation commission. That was foreshadowed in the speech from the Throne. What is the scope of that commission ? Is it designed by that commission to remedy the serious ills that are indicated in the speech from the Throne. What will the work of the commission be ? Is it going to take away from the government and the House the mission of defining and establishing a policy upon that great question, perhaps the most momentous one we have to decide during the present session ? What will be the cost of the commission ? Is it a machinery which will meet with the approval of the House ? Why cannot we, in accordance with our constitutional duty, keep Supply back until these grievances have been set right ? Why cannot these questions be discussed before we get to work to vote the money required for the next year ? We have the Railway Bill; we have a voluminous document set before us, the object of which is to remedy a grievance. We have divided opinions as to the nature of the remedy afforded for existing ills. We have to discuss the question of the railway commission whether, here, again, that commission will undertake the responsibility of curing the evils which have been time and again set before the House by hon. members from the far west, by hon. members from the province of Ontario and from the other eastern provinces. We may be divided upon this question; we may be divided irrespective of the question of politics, but what I submit to the House and the government is that if we proceed regularly and constitutionally we ought to take up a measure like that one and see it through before we are called upon to vote supplies. I believe there is to be a militia Bill ; we have had a foreshadowing of great reforms in our militia system which must entail

considerable public expenditure. Our representatives at the conference in London stated what would be done in this respect when they returned to Canada. Where is that militia Bill ? Are the increased expenditures for these reforms to be brought in at the end of the session, or are we going to have them before proceeding to the duty which we must accomplish en connaissance de cause, when we are called upon to vote supplies for the coming year. Again there is the question of the new transcontinental line which has been discussed throughout Canada for many months passed, and yet all that we have heard with regard to this most important subject is what the newspapers have published of statements made by ministers outside of this House. We have heard nothing in this House which would indicate to us what extra expenditure will be laid on the public by reason of this great transportation problem. Is it unfair that we in our role as critics of the government, should ask that before we be requested to vote supplies that we should know what the nature of that measure is going to be. Should the House go into Supply to-night we will be asked to vote money for the building of wharfs, and the construction of breakwaters, and are we not entitled before we go into this voting of supplies to know what is the policy of the government in respect to that transcontinental scheme which will call upon the people of this country to make very great additional sacrifices of money ? After all, under the modern understanding of the constitution, the government is nothing else than a committee of this House, and the government should make known to this House its policy on such an important matter as this. I was through a by-election just before this session opened, and one of the important questions discussed there was the reorganization of the departments of the government. The electorate of Maisonneuve were told that if the Department of Public Works had been taken from the province of Quebec where it had been for many years, it was with a good object. It was stated that in view of the great works which are to be executed on the lower St. Lawrence, it might be better that the Department of Public Works should remain vested in one who knew the immediate requirements of the navigation of the lower St. Lawrence, and we were told by the ministers there, as we have been told in the speech from the Throne that a Bill would be introduced which would place in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the control of the works on the St. Lawrence from Montreal to the sea. Where is that measure ? If it was a grievance during the election in Maisonneuve it is a grievance still. Is it right that we should be asked to vote money for public works before an attempt is made to remove that grievance as the government promised it would be made ? There is also a Bill, which has the character of a public Bill, to change the constitution of the Supreme Court. That Bill is in the hands of my hon. friend from St. Jean and Iberville (Mr. Demers). I venture to assert that the hon. gentleman is ready to proceed with that Bill which he claims is destined to remedy a grievance, but I venture also to assert that the hon. gentleman has been requested to leave that Bill in abeyance, just as he has been requested to leave in abeyance the Bill designed to remedy what we in my province consider a grievance, namely the existing state of the law as interpreted by the highest tribunal in the empire in regard to the protection of private property from fire caused by the operation of railways. All these and many other important matters involving questions of policy, questions of grievance, are put aside and this House is asked to go into the voting of supplies. Under these circumstances it is not only our right but it is our duty to call attention to this state of affairs. Unless we have some absolute assurance from the government as to the policy which is going to obtain in regard to these great questions, which are really the questions of the session, we will righteously incur the blame of the people of Canada for consenting to this unconstitutional method of conducting public business, and when we have voted supplies, then we will be left without any adequate remedy to insure the removal of public grievances. I protest against this manner of conducting public business. We have seven or eight important questions ; the only questions of the session that really interest the public, and the constitutional and proper method for us to pursue is first and foremost to apply ourselves to the solution of these questions and then take up the voting of supplies. I say this frankly to the government. I have no desire to obstruct business in any way ; it is not in accordance with my feelings to be compelled to have recourse to the system of discussing at length item after item. But it seems to me, Sir, that we are varying the good old rule of the British parliament that first and foremost we must proceed with the settlement of measures which are for the good of the people and for the settlement of which we are here, and that we should keep back the furnishing of the supplies until those measures are satisfactorily settled. Having said this, if the government call upon us to proceed with supply this evening, I am quite ready as I was when we were called on to go into supply several weeks ago to go on; but I felt that I would not be performing my duty if I did not call your attention, Sir, and the attention of the House to what I consider an important point.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir Wm. Mulock). Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have

the assurance of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that his observations are simply based on a deep conviction on his part as to what should be the procedure rather than upon any desire to delay the legitimate work of parliament; but he has to-night laid down a new practice, and one without a parallel either in the mother of parliaments or in the parliament of Canada. I have yet to learn that it has become a practice, either by rule or by practice itself, that parliament shall not proceed with the great work of the session in such order as may be most convenient for the government and parliament and most in the interests of the country. It has never yet been the rule that great public measures introduced by the government shall always be disposed of before the voting of supplies. My hon. friend has perhaps forgotten the advanced state of work when parliament met this session. I have had twenty years or more of experience in this House, and I think I am correct in saying—and every hon. member who has been in parliament during that time, will agree with the statement—that never before did a government meet parliament better prepared with its work than did the government at the present session. When the speech from the Throne was disposed of—and it was disposed of with gratifying business alacrity—the departmental reports were immediately laid on the Table, and we were prepared to render an account of our administration during the last fiscal year. A few days afterwards we laid before parliament some of the important legislative measures now engaging the attention of the country. On the Order paper I find, among government Bills and Orders. Bill No. 21 an Act to amend the law respecting railways. My hon friend would argue that we must dispose of that measure before we proceed with Supply. Is that his argument? That Bill was introduced on the 20th of March. It is of a very far-reaching character. No government ever introduced a measure of this kind into the parliament of Canada before; it affects great interests; it is a measure the country is greatly interested in. Does it not seem becoming that the details of that measure should be a reasonable time before the country before parliament proceeds to convert it into an Act of parliament? We do not possess all the wisdom of the country—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I include hon. gentlemen opposite in that observation. The aggregate wisdom of parliament itself does not perhaps represent all the wisdom of the country; and I hope that before that measure becomes law many of the citizens of Canada who are deeply studying it will offer valuable suggestions towards its betterment, if it is not perfect already. Is it not becoming that a measure of such importance, and one so novel in its character in this country at least, and which relates to the interests of every class in the Dominion should not be proceeded with with undue haste? My hon. friend complains that we are not proceeding to improve the harbour of Montreal or the river St. Lawrence. I find by the estimates that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is about to ask parliament to assent to a vote of $500,000 for the improvement of the St. Lawrence ship channel. This is not a new work, but one to which parliament has already committed itself. My hon. friend complains that we are not proceeding with the improvement of the St. Lawrence channel, and yet he will not let us get into committee in order that we may vote the money required for that purpose. He argues that this work must stand over and that we must not go into Committee of Supply until we dispose of these important Bills, including the Bill for the establishment of a railway commission. I ask this House is it the right procedure to stop the voting of supplies until we pass that Bill? Have we all the wisdom that the country possesses on that measure? Would we not be chargeable with proceeding with undue haste if now, at the conclusion of the first month of the session, and before the Bill has been before the public twenty days, we took it from the people and converted it into an Act of parliament to-night?

Mr. LENNOX. Practically the same Bill was introduced last session and has been before the country ever since.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then it will be all the better for the careful consideration it has had during that time. Then my hon. friend argues that we should proceed with the budget speech before we vote the supplies. The budget speech is fixed for to-morrow. Was a budget speech ever presented at an earlier date? I trust it will be an exceedingly gratifying one to hon. gentlemen, as I think it will be to the country; and inasmuch as that speech is to be delivered in a very few hours from now, what public good would be gained by deferring the public business to-night and idling the time of parliament? Hon. gentlemen will remember that this is not government day. This is a private members' day, and I think I am correct in saying that never before in twenty years has the Order Paper been as free of matters introduced by private members as it is at this moment. We were able, with the common consent of parliament, to take Thursday as a government day, simply because private members' work had been exhausted, and to-day, before six o'clock was reached, all the private members' work was exhausted, we had the option of adjourning or proceeding with government business. As a working government we deemed it our duty to do our work instead of adjourning at six

o'clock. My hon. friend complains that we should stop the voting of supplies until the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) proceeds with two measures, forgetting that these two measures were called for this afternoon and were not proceeded with. Consequently the Order paper was exhausted and we had the option of adjourning or taking up Supply. I think the country will admit that we are pursuing the right course when we proceed with the business of the country. My hon. friend complains that we are not going on with the Redistribution Bill, and he claims that till we do, Supply should not be voted. But the Redistribution Bill has been referred to a special committee. Does my hon. friend say that the whole proceedings of parliament should stand over, that nothing should be done, that Supply should not be voted until the committee on the Redistribution Bill have made their report? It is only necessary to mention my hon. friend's suggestion to show how absurd it is. My hon. friend is in a hurry to see a new transcontinental railway policy introduced. But how long did it take the former parliaments to formulate a policy for the transcontinental road we now have, the Canadian Pacific Railway? Was that policy introduced at as early a period in the session as the present? This scheme of a new transcontinental road is a large one. It would have far-reaching importance. It has been discussed in the public press, and many different opinions have been advanced. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) not long ago advocated the construction of such a road by the government, other hon. members favour giving aid to a private company to build it, and others protest against the adoption of any such policy at all. My hon. friends from St. Mary's division, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and Pontiac (Mr. Murray) argue that the most important feature of transportation which can engage the attention of the country is not a transcontinental railway, but a canal connecting the Georgian Bay waters with the Ottawa river. All these different views and considerations must be well weighed before the government can be called on to decide on a policy. Yet my hon. friend argues that all these measures must be disposed of before we go into Supply, and supposing the government should say that it was not in favour of any of these policies, then, according to my hon. friend's argument, no Supply should be voted and the King's business should be allowed to fall into confusion. Our practice hitherto has always been that Supply should take up the time at the disposal of the government for that purpose on every government day, and on private members' days the time not required for private business. We are economizing time by proceeding in this way. It has never been the practice in any parliament to do what my hon. friend suggests, and I think that before this parliament inaugurates a new policy and procedure, it should take a little more time to consider it than can be had in this off-hand way of giving advice just on a motion to go into Supply. My hon. friend was not here when we adjourned last night or he would know that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who was then leading the opposition, asked what business would be taken up to-day, and my right hon. colleague, the Prime Minister, announced that we would proceed with the Orders of the Day and if time were still left, we would take up the Public Works estimates. With regard to those estimates, let me point out that they do not involve any new public works, but are merely for the carrying on of public works, to which the country has already committed itself, and I am sure that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier will see that whatever force his contention would have if we were inviting the House to vote expenditures on entirely new works, it can have no application when we are simply asking the House to deal with public works to which parliament has long since given its sanction.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. minister apply that remark to the Quebec estimates?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am speaking of the Public Works estimates we are about to proceed with.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The pyrotechnical display which the hon. gentleman who is now leading the House has just given us, may have been interesting to the hon. gentlemen on that side, but it did not throw much new light on the situation. The hon. minister started out by saying that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier was introducing some new principles. What new principles? The principle he enunciated is as old as the British parliament, and that is the redress of grievances before Supply is granted. The hon. minister says that we have an important Bill before us, the Railway Commission Bill, a new measure, and that it has been before us for twenty-five days, but that measure, as he was reminded by an hon. member from this side, is only the Bill revamped which was before the House last year. It has been discussed by the press at different times throughout the year, but we have no substantial information from the government as to how that commission will be organized, what it will apply to when organized, what will be the scope of its powers, how it is likely to prove beneficial in redressing the grievances under which our people are labouring or in improving the transportation problem. These are questions on which the government has given practically no information. Is it improper that we should desire information as to the policy of the government on this important measure before we vote Supply? No doubt it would suit the government to have the Supply voted as early as possible, because once the Supply Bill is passed the

government can dispense with our services. But it is for the purpose of having public measures considered as they should be, that the supplies are held back until we know the details of the government's policy and the lines of action they propose to carry out. The government have not given us that information. True they have announced their measures, but they are all like the Redistribution Bill, practically in blank form. The House has as yet no information as to how redistribution will take place. We are told that it is to be regulated by a committee, and the right hon. the First Minister has said to us: 'When we appoint the committee we will hand in our schedule and you will do the same with yours.' And then, forsooth, we are likely to vote through ours whether you like it or dislike it. We are told that this is practically representation by population, but we are told in the next breath that county lines are to be observed. If you have one, you cannot have the other. That was clearly pointed out years ago by the late Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. He declared it was impossible to have representation by population if you observe the county lines. But you have the anomaly in this House that the government is going to observe county lines and yet is going to grant representation by population.

Mr. COWAN. Are you opposed to the observance of county lines?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying whether I am opposed to it or not. I am simply showing what the information the government has given us about it, and expressing our desire to know more. Then, there is another very important question mentioned by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in which the country is vitally interested and on which we have no information. I refer to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. There are two or three transcontinental lines before the government and the country to-day, yet we are in the dark as to the policy the government intend to adopt with regard to them. We desire information. we wish to know what the government's policy is so that we may be able to judge for ourselves whether it is right to grant them these supplies or not. But, after we have granted these supplies, they may turn to us and say: You may go home we have the supplies and do not care for your opinions on other matters. This is the reason why we wish to know their policy with regard to these great matters now under discussion, before we grant them these supplies. The Commission Bill I have already referred to. It is a very important one, but we know nothing yet as to what its scope is to be, what the powers of the commission will be, what railways the measure will apply to or how far it is likely to be useful to the railways or to the country. From the very first it seems to have been the aim of the government to get the supplies voted. The hon. member for North York (Hon. Sir William Mulock) upbraids my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) with being unwilling to vote the supplies necessary for the works in the great port of Montreal. Why, last session we voted supplies for this work up to the 30th of June next. The government have money enough to go on with, and there is plenty of time between now and the 30th of June to vote any supplies that may be needed for the ensuing fiscal year. So, no question arises as to whether it is right or wrong to prevent the government from getting the supplies at the present time. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) in my judgment was entirely right; the position he takes is in harmony with the well understood principles of constitutional government. He only asks that the government should place their policy before parliament and before the country so that the opposition may have an opportunity of criticising it, and the country an opportunity of understanding it, before supplies are voted to enable them to carry on the affairs of the country. That is the position that has always been taken by parliament, and we are only doing our duty to parliament and the country, when we demand to know what the government's policy is on these various lines, before we grant them the supplies they are asking for.

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

Public works—chargeable to income, harbours and rivers—Ontario—Bowmanville, to complete repairs to breakwater, $1,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this work on private property?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). I find that parliament has been expending money on this for a number of years. The property was originally vested in the municipality, I believe.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it in private hands now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe it is the property of private individuals.

Mr. CLARKE. It would be interesting to have the names of the owners of the property. Some of the hon. minister's supporters may be able to give us the information. It is extraordinary to vote public money to be spent on private property. The hon. minister ought to give us other information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I only investigated the matter to-day, and was somewhat surprised to find that parliament was spending a good deal of money from time to time on some of these harbours that are not vested in the Crown. I must say, that although I have been in the House for a long time, I was not aware that this was so generally the custom as I find it to

have been. I find that there has been a total expenditure of $29,000 on this work by the Dominion government covering a number of years. So, this is not extraordinary, I may say. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) has taken part, like other members of the House, in voting more or less to this work. There was a vote of $4,000 last session, and this is a vote of only $1,000 to complete the work.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that it was only to-day that the hon. minister became aware of the fact that this was private property. Would it not be as well to give the hon. minister an opportunity to further pursue his researches, and, for this purpose, to let this item stand for three or four days? He may be able, within that time, to get fuller information as to the owners of this property on which public money is being expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am willing to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) all the information at my command. I understand that this property is mainly in the name of a Mrs. Raines, a widow of Montreal.

Mr. CLARKE. Is Mrs. Raines the sole proprietoress ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Almost the sole proprietoress. There are other small shareholders.

Mr. CLARKE. Who are they ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A part of the stock is held by a widow lady in Bowmanville, a Mrs. Galbraith, and another of the proprietary is Mrs. McClellan.

Mr. CLARKE. Are we to understand that the sole proprietors are these two widow ladies ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Three. And there are other very small stockholders.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) says that he can give us all the information. Will he not tell us who are the others in addition to these three widows ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not pretend to have this information in the department. That which I have given, I have obtained from the member for the riding (Mr. Beith). This vote is only a small balance of $1,000 to complete the work.

Mr. CLARKE. A sort of a widow's mite.

Mr. SPROULE. It is very interesting and amusing, no doubt, to see the bachelor Minister of Public Works looking after the interests of the widows. Of course, he would be reluctant to interfere with them. But there is involved in this vote a principle, a principle we have fought against for many years. We fought against it in the case of a dock at Sault Ste. Marie, in the case of another dock at Port Arthur, and, I think, in the case of a dock at Bruce Mines, and others. That principle is the expenditure of public money upon private docks. Some of these docks we have had to buy from their owners at high prices, and in buying, we had not even the advantage of a reduction in the price to the extent of the money we had put into them. That is where the principle comes in, a principle which, in my judgment, is entirely wrong, namely, to put public money into private docks which we may afterwards be obliged to buy, and to pay a higher figure for than their actual value.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this harbour owned by the government, and is the hon. member for West Durham looking after it and constituting himself the guardian of the three widows, owners thereof ? How much money has been spent there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $9,210.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the government taking over the Oshawa harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How much money has been expended on it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not got that information at the moment.

Bronté, harbour improvements, $2,700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year there was an appropriation of $3,000, most of which has been expended. This appropriation will complete the work.

Mr. TAYLOR. When is this money to be expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Right away.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand it cannot be expended before the 30th of June.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As soon as it is available.

Mr. TAYLOR. I ask this question because the Postmaster General, a few minutes ago, stated that if we blocked the estimates we blocked the carrying on of the improvements. Last session we voted all the money that the government asked for up to the 30th of June, and we do not block any improvements in this country if we pass the estimates before the 30th of June. I understand that this money is not available until after the 30th of June of the present year, therefore the statement of the Postmaster General was altogether incorrect when he told my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that if we blocked supply in any way we blocked the improvements of Montreal harbour, because there was in the estimates of the Minister of Public Works a large amount for improvements in Montreal

harbour, and that money cannot be touched until after the 1st of July.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend misunderstood the Postmaster General. What he said was that the appropriation the House was being asked for was to continue works that parliament had already authorized. My hon. friend is perhaps technically right in saying that this money cannot be spent until after the Supply Bill has been assented to. But he will remember that it is one of the misfortunes of conducting public works that if time is lost, if we are compelled to wait before beginning them, they may cost considerably more. After this vote passes it is quite within the right of the department to go on with the work. After parliament has assented to these votes, although the Supply Bill may not have passed, where the works are under contract, we feel ourselves authorized to go on and spend the money.

Mr. COCHRANE. Was the $3,000 voted last year expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, $2,875 was expended up to the end of the year. The work was done by a government dredge.

Mr. HENDERSON. This work has been going on for several years. I would like to ask the minister if the $2,700 now asked is likely to complete the dredging and the construction of the wharf, or will a further sum be required another year ? I may say that the people there are anxious to have this work fully completed, and I hope the minister will be able to tell us that the appropriation now asked for will complete the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimate submitted by the chief engineer is that $1,500 will complete the repairs to the pier, that $1,200 more is required for dredging the harbour to a depth of eight feet. He estimates that this will complete the work for the present.

Mr. HENDERSON. So that no further sum will be required after the present year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not for the present work.

Mr. HENDERSON. Whilst this estimate is before us, there is another matter I would like to draw attention to. I regret that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in his place. It is to be regretted that whilst these estimates for public works are going through that that hon. gentleman should continually absent himself from the House, because there is so much connection between the two departments. I understand these wharfs are usually handed over to the Marine Department, that lighthouses are constructed by the Marine Department, so that there is a certain connection between the work done by the Public Works Department and that done by the Marine Department. Now, we have no person here to answer for the Marine Department. I drew the attention of the minister a year ago, I think, to the fact that the people were promised, in 1900, that a lighthouse would be constructed on this wharf. Such a construction would be very desirable. There is a considerable amount of fishing done on the lake extending some ten or fifteen miles from this port, and a lighthouse would be very desirable for the benefit of the fishermen. Sometimes in dark nights the men lose their way, and they have no signal to guide them to the port. If the department did nothing more than construct a lighthouse, it would be a great benefit. I was told last year, I think, that the government had no record of the promise that was made for the construction of a lighthouse. I can understand that. I think the promise was only made by the candidate who opposed me for the purpose of securing a few extra votes. I do not suppose he had the authority of the government, nor do I suppose that he has any intention of seeing that the promise is carried out. But the promise was made to these people, and I am one of those who believe that every election promise of that kind ought to be carried out. In the case of Bowmanville, a public building was promised in the last by-election, when it was announced in the papers, 'Vote for Mr. Beith and you will have a public building.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He denies that.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no necessity for denying it, it was published in the press at the time. The government did supplement the promise made to the electors at that time, when they were asked to vote for Mr. Beith and secure a public building ; and I think it is only fair that the government should supplement the promise made to the electors in the present case. The electors gave my opponent a good vote there, a great many more than he was entitled to. They have done their share of the contract, they have done their part, and now they want the job completed. I hope the Minister of Public Works will see that this work is given to them that they were promised. I say again, I regret that the Minister of Marine is not in his place. It is important that he should be here whilst these estimates are going through, so that we may get some statement from him about it, because, apart from all other considerations, whether it was intended to be done at the time or not, or whether it was merely to influence an election, I say there is a necessity for it, and it will be in the public interest to erect it. I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will be able to influence the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he has not the power within himself, to supplement that pledge, or at any rate to give the people there what they have been led to expect they would get.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In support of the position taken by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), and to show that the government in certain places are carrying out their ante-election pledges, made by some of their speakers—I regret very much that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) is not in his place—I will read from the West Durham newspaper, the 'Canadian Statesman,' of January 8th, 1902, previous to the election of the then candidate and the present hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Beith), to show that these gentlemen did make promises on that occasion and that they are now fulfilling them. On January 8th, 1902, the 'Canadian Statesman' said:

Conservatives in this town know that Robert Beith can get government favours for this town if any man can, and that Mr. Thornton would be unable to accomplish anything. We want a new post office and customs house, don't we? Other ridings have received new public buildings. We want our share of patronage but can only get it by sending a government supporter to ask for it. Return Mr. Beith to parliament and Bowmanville will get these necessary public buildings.

I am glad to see that the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) is carrying out the ante-election pledges of the Liberal party. In another instance this paper says:

For 18 years the Conservatives were in power at Ottawa. Millions of dollars were dispensed for public buildings and otherwise during that period, but not a dollar for West Durham till the Liberals got into power, then necessary grants were made to keep Newcastle and Bowmanville harbour piers from being washed into the lake. Millions of bushels of grain have been shipped from time to time from these harbours for West Durham farmers and will still be in years to come. Further assistance is needed. Bowmanville badly needs a new post office and custom house and Robert Beith can get these also. Vote for him and see what he will do.

I am delighted to see that the hon. Postmaster General is carrying out the bribe—I beg pardon—the pre-election pledge, as I had better put it, made to the electors of West Durham and Bowmanville. On December 25th, in the same paper, I find this:

There is also the matter of patronage and legislation in the interests of West Durham. Does any one suppose for one moment that Mr. Thornton could get any favours for us from this government? To imagine such a thing would be the height of absurdity. Few people know what Robert Beith has already done along these lines. At this very time the rubber factory is supplying goods to the government railways on orders secured through Mr. Beith's influence. Then we have got to have a new post office and custom house. There must no longer be any ifs or buts on this public necessity. This town needs a new post office and must have one very soon and Mr. Beith is the one man who can get it if any man can. We have waited patiently for better times, now we have the good times and Bowmanville wants a new building suited to the requirements of a post office and a custom house. We believe that if Robert Beith is elected we shall get it—in short order too. We are not urging this as a reason altogether for supporting Mr. Beith,——

Not altogether; of course they had some other things.

But if we want a public building, we are not as likely to get it if we send a man opposed to the government as if we sent one to support it.

I am delighted, when quoting these statements in support of the position taken by the hon. member for Halton, to see that the hon. Postmaster General and Minister of Labour is carrying out the pre-election bribe offered to the people of West Durham. The reason I have read these statements is that on an occasion, not very long since, the hon. member for West Durham positively denied that an appeal was made to the electors of West Durham along those lines. I have quoted from the Liberal paper statements made on the eve of the election there, and now the hon. gentlemen opposite are delivering the goods.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that I will be pleased to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the subject that he has mentioned. However, he will have an opportunity when the estimates of that department come before the Committee to urge the importance of having a light at that point. I think something should be done in the matter. It occurred to me when the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) was speaking that he must have been supporting the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Beith), because the statements he quoted reminded me very much of his own writing in his spicy paper the Lindsay 'Warder.' However, my hon. friend must know that it is only on the merits of the case that I have asked for this vote.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). As reference has been made to myself, I may say that I stand, I presume, the only man in Canada that never asked a man for a vote. I have never yet stooped to offer any public, personal, or private bribe to any elector. I would commend this to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General and to the hon. Minister of Public Works, but especially to the hon. Postmaster General when he goes up around the methylated spirits manufactory where he gets good rake offs, and I would suggest that we might have a committee or a commission at Ottawa as well as at Toronto.

Burk's Falls, Magnetawan river—wharf, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for building a wharf at Burk's Falls. There is an extension of the Grand Trunk Railway which renders available thirty or forty miles of navigation, and people bring

down a great deal of material to be transshipped at that point. The Committee knows this is a newly settled part of the country, needing assistance. I think the money is well expended. The pier is under contract, the price being $5,400.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that the total cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost will be about $6,000.

Burlington channel piers—works of renewal and repair under contract, $50,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract. The vote of $50,000 is required to make provision for completing the works, for the renewal and repairs under contract in connection with the reconstruction of the pier on the south side of Burlington channel. The total amount of the contract is $96,700.

Mr. BRUCE. May I ask the hon. minister if the work on the Burlington piers will be completed this summer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The expectation is that this work will be completed this summer. I have had representations made urging that it is necessary that this work should be completed, and instructions have been given to proceed with the work as quickly as possible. There has been some delay, but a great deal of material is on the ground and the work is proceeding very much more quickly than for some time past.

Mr. BRUCE. The work has been going on very slowly since the first appropriation was made, and if this appropriation is going to be expended on the same principle we are not likely to finish it within the next ten years. I notice that on an expenditure of $1,500 over $700 has been spent for advertising. I do not think we can build piers very quickly under these conditions.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report of the engineer just received says that the work is proceeding very much more expeditiously than it has been in the past.

Mr. BARKER. I think it is proper to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to an item that appears in the expenditure of last year in reference to the estimate now asked for—Burlington channel, repairs to piers. The present item is to cover repairs to piers, and in the Auditor General's Report of 1902, page V—263, we find $1,521.15 expended on repairs to piers of which $733.22 are for advertising. There seems to be too much advertising for the amount of work done there.

Depot Harbour—breakwater, $75,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was spent on that work last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must say that this work has not proceeded very rapidly. It was let at a season of the year when the class of timber which had to be ordered and cut in special sizes could not be obtained. However, I do not regret the delay because since looking into this work with the engineers, I believe we can make a change in the construction that will be much in the public interest and it is my intention to recommend that change. It will cost just about the same as the work under contract, but it will give greater accommodation to the public. The present contract is for a breakwater 1,700 feet long by twenty feet wide, and it is proposed to reduce the length of the breakwater to 500 feet, which will be sufficient to protect the present wharf but to make it very much wider so that two railway tracks can be laid down, and also afford a wharf for the accommodation of the general public. This is one of the very best harbours in the province. It is the only harbour I know of that requires very little work in the way of dredging after the piers are erected. A great deal of business is carried on there and it has been represented to me that a great deal of lumber is being brought down to this harbour to be shipped to different parts of Canada and also for export to the New England States especially. I believe that without increasing the amount of the estimate we can provide a great deal better accommodation for the public.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the amount of the contract for the present work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was let by contract for $195,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How much has already been spent?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $8,000 or $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it let to the lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I may say that my intention is to recommend the continuation of the present contract; it is doubling up the work instead of continuing it out as I have explained.

Mr. SPROULE. What explanation does the minister give as to the changes he proposes to make?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The present contract provides for a pier 1,700 feet long and twenty feet wide. I find that the pier can be shortened so as to give sufficient protection, and widened to eighty feet, on which we can put two tracks of railways. The water is deep and boats can unload on both sides of the wharf. When a boat arrives with lumber it is very desirable to have accommodation to land that lumber, because you cannot always land it from the boat into the railway car. We hope that the trade of that port will grow so that perhaps in the future the wharf and

pier may have to be extended, but at all events we are dealing with the present now.

Mr. INGRAM. Was not the contract let to Mr. Davis.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contractors are Davis, Haney and Millar.

Mr. INGRAM. Was the contract not let for $157,500 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract for the crib work is for $157,500, but there is $37,500 for rip-rap.

Mr. KEMP. What revenue will the government derive from this wharf which is going to cost $200,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is impossible to tell exactly what the direct revenue will be, but every one who has studied the development of that district will know that the indirect benefit to all Canada will be very great. Something like 15,000,000 bushels of wheat were shipped through Depot Harbour last year, and this will give increased facilities for shipping not only grain but lumber and other commodities as well.

Mr. SPROULE. How does the minister propose to adjust the account, because his contemplated changes will apparently alter the nature of the whole work. Who makes an estimate of what the difference in the cost will be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no change made at present but I thought it my duty to tell the House that I had those changes in contemplation. The estimates are made by the chief engineer of the department. It is not so difficult to get at the details after all, and before the work is proceeded with I shall submit to the House the plans proposed by the chief engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. The suspicious thing about it is this : That the departmental engineer gets out a plan for a certain work, recommends that as suitable for the locality, a contract is let for a large sum of money, $10,000 is spent and then the engineer changes the whole plan. It would indicate that the first plan was made on poor judgment and imperfect knowledge, or otherwise there would not be any necessity for changing it so very soon. The next question is how to make even an approximate estimate of the difference in the value of the work now as compared with the original contract. There is always an amount of suspicion attached to a transaction where a radical change is made in a work shortly after a contract is let, and an arrangement is made privately between the minister and the contractor as to what shall be paid for the work. The practice, I think, is very bad. It might be, if the minister invited tenders for the work he proposes to do now, that he would receive tenders for doing it at a very much lower figure than it is likely to cost. At any rate, the public have had no opportunity of tendering for this new work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is altogether mistaken. It is quite true, perhaps, the minister might have made this change without consulting parliament, but I am not in favour of doing business in that way. I thought it my duty in making the change, to submit the recommendation to parliament. Neither is it correct to say that the chief engineer exercised bad judgment under the existing conditions when he recommended this pier to be built as it is. I am the one responsible for looking into the work, advising the recommendation, and asking parliament to endorse my recommendation. If there was anything suspicious about it I would be very sorry to be accused of anything of the kind, and I certainly would not submit a proposition to make a change which I did not think warranted in the public interest and likely to receive the endorsement of the members of this House. My view of the matter at any rate is that a great deal more public benefit can be got for the expenditure by the changed plan. As to calculating the price, my hon. friend will know that for the same class of work there are so many cubic feet to be done under contract, and by the change there will be no advantage to the contractor and no disadvantage to the public.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says the work can be estimated, but in one instance you have two face walls, 1,700 feet long with 25 feet between them and in the other two face walls 500 feet long with 80 feet between them, and you must fill in between them. That kind of work can be done very much more cheaply where there is a wide space between the walls than where there is a narrow space.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will see that there are so many cubic feet of timber work, stone work, or earth work, as the case may be. We are not going to pay any more than will be paid for the same class of work under contract. However, I am not asking for any change, but I have taken the first opportunity to intimate to the House what I thought would be in the public interest. If, when I submit the proposition and the plans to the House, it does not receive the endorsement of the House, I will carry the work out as it is. But I feel so confident that it will receive the unanimous endorsement of the House that I propose to make the recommendation.

Mr. COCHRANE. Will this work when completed belong to the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this is a government work.

Mr. COCHRANE. Of course, I do not object to the expenditure of the money, but it appeared to me that a breakwater was quite a different thing from a wharf. I have always understood that a breakwater was built for the protection of a harbour. I think that is in the public interest; but I do not think it right that the government should build a wharf from which they will receive no revenue, simply for the benefit of some corporation. I think that is an important harbour, and that it is in the public interest that it should be improved; but I do not think it necessary to double up the breakwater and provide space for railway tracks for the benefit of some individual corporation to make money out of at the expense of the public. That is the way it strikes me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say to my hon. friend that the very opposite is the case, and I know that I shall have his endorsement. This is not for the benefit of any corporation. A breakwater is often used as a landing pier, and there is no reason why it should not be, and by making this change we shall get a very much needed wharf which will be of great advantage to the public. I am sure that when I bring down the plans the hon. gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says that when we see the plans we shall be perfectly satisfied; but the very few moments that we have to look at plans which are laid on the Table at the very time the item is voted, afford little opportunity to obtain any information, or to exercise a judgment on the matter in hand. I am not saying that this work is wrong; it may be all right; I am only objecting to the principle of making radical changes in an important work like this after the contract is let. I still contend that the party who does the work could do it very much cheaper by filling up a space of 80 feet wide than by filling up a space of 25 feet wide, because in the larger space we could use almost any kind of material. Then, letting a contract for a certain kind of work, and telling the House that is what is needed, and the House accepting that information as correct and voting the money on the strength of it, and the next year coming back and practically changing the whole plan, at least arouses a suspicion in our minds that the matter could not have been well considered in the first instance, or that there must be some special reason for making so radical a change, and we want to know what it is. Then, the other question comes up which we have often debated in this House, of changing large contracts on the recommendation of the engineer and putting it into the hands of the contractor and the government to manipulate the figures between themselves as to what shall be paid for the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring down the plan and lay it on the Table, so that my hon. friend will have an opportunity of examining it before I make any recommendation.

Mr. INGRAM. Did the government build Depot Harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been a lot of work done by the Canada Atlantic Railway at Depot Harbour in the way of wharfs and elevators for its own purposes, but this is for the shipping interests, and I do not know of any work the government has undertaken which is so much in the public interest as Depot Harbour.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that Mr. Booth has spent about $750,000 on this Depot Harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That would be on wharfs and elevators in connection with his own work, but not in connection with this.

Mr. INGRAM. If this is a breakwater protecting the harbour, what part of this harbour does the government own ? Does the government own it all or does the Canada Atlantic Railway or Mr. Booth own any part of this harbour which the government is now protecting ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is for the benefit of the harbour and for the advantages of shippers outside the railway and is under the complete control of the government.

Mr. INGRAM. Therefore the interests of Mr. Booth and those of the government will not conflict in any way ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister bring down the tenders received for that work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the work going on now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract is let, the timber has all been got out, and the change can be made at present without loss to the country. I will bring down the plan and submit the change I propose to the House, and if the House does not approve, no change will be made.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not desire to dispute the statement of the hon. minister, but would it not be a more business-like proposition to bring down the amended plan before asking us to pass the item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The House is already committed to the contract. It is a legal, binding contract, and the only question is whether the change I propose would commend itself to the good sense of the House. If not, we will go on with the work as originally contemplated.

Mr. CLARKE. It seems to me that this is rather an unusual proceeding, but I am going to accept the statement of the hon. minister, and he says we will get full information when the plan is brought down.

Georgian Bay, Point au Baril route—improvement of the Devil's Elbow channel between Parry Sound and Killarney, $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What improvements are you making there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a vote to provide for the improvement of the channel. It is being pressed by the navigators and is very necessary. It is for the removal of a shoal that is very dangerous to shipping.

Mr. SPROULE. That is by dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and blasting too.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you doing it with your own dredge or by contract and day's work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have no dredge there to do the work and will have to make arrangements for a dredge at the usual terms.

Mr. CLARKE. What are the terms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It depends altogether on the size of the dredge and its capacity for work—$8 to $12 per hour, if by the hour, and if by contract, so much per yard.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you pay per yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The average price would be about thirteen cents.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you do the blasting work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Under the supervision of our own engineer and not by contract. It is very difficult in a small work like this in a channel to make any specifications. It would take the appropriation to make them.

Goderich harbour works, $16,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for renewing the original portion of the old superstructure of the pier. The total cost of repairing is $16,000.

Mr. CLARKE. How is the work to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would be somewhat difficult for me to pledge myself without further information, as to whether this would be done more advantageously under the supervision of an engineer and by hiring labour, than by letting a contract. If specifications can be prepared, I prefer to let a contract, but if not we will have to hire our own labour and buy material.

Mr. KEMP. Does this constitute all that the people of Goderich demand from the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, demands have been made, not only from Goderich, but the whole of the district and from Toronto West, that a breakwater should be built at that port. I myself believe it is a matter of necessity, if we are to have the benefit we should have on Lake Huron. At present mostly all the shipping goes up the American side of the lake because we have not any harbour of refuge on the Canadian side. There are in addition splendid facilities already erected there in the shape of an elevator and other improvements at the harbour. I am very much impressed with the representation that a great deal of the grain of the west might be taken care of here if we had the proper facilities. However, the discussion of that matter will come up more properly when I ask the House to consider an appropriation for the purpose of improving Goderich harbour. I do not think it is a local work, but national in its nature, and the shipments to Canadian ports depend a great deal on our being able to take care of the grain which comes to these lake ports. Larger vessels could come to Goderich than to many of the other places. I am informed by the Grand Trunk that they would be prepared to take care of the grain and that perhaps from fifteen to twenty millions of bushels could be easily handled if there was a very moderate expenditure on the harbour.

Mr. KEMP. Goderich is not a harbour of refuge in any sense at the present time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For want of protection to the boats coming in, it is almost impossible, I am informed, to take a vessel into the harbour. I am informed by lake captains that if, following the experience of some of the ports on the American side, a pier were built out to break the rolling of the sea, a vessel might enter the harbour with some safety, and they could use it as well as they do the harbours on the other side of the line.

Mr. KEMP. Would the breakwater be an expensive undertaking ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think not. I intended to look into the matter more fully and have a further report from the engineers as to the character and cost of the work. I think that at least a test might be made at very moderate expense. Representations have been made to me that the cost of a breakwater such as would make this a first class harbour of refuge is in the neighbourhood of a couple of hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). I have many communications from that part of the country with regard to the harbour, and they say that for two hundred miles along the shore of Lake Huron there is not a safe harbour

for steamers to enter in case of storm. The grain men and millers all through that part of the country are very anxious to have the harbour put into proper shape. I may say also that I have a resolution passed by the Board of Trade of Stratford, and letters and telegrams from Mitchell, Seaforth, Goderich and all along that line; and I think the government should do something to put the harbour into proper shape. So far as I am concerned, I will do everything in my power to help them.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this $16,000 to be spent on the two jetties that run out there, or on some work in the bay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to be spent on the pier on the south side of the entrance channel.

Mr. CLARKE. Speaking about the contemplated expenditure for the purpose of a breakwater, I understand that the hon. gentleman does not consider that to be a work specially for the benefit of the harbour of Goderich, but one of national importance that must be undertaken by the government—to provide a harbour of refuge and put the harbour into such shape that large grain carriers can come in.

Mr. BENNETT. Who owns the dock inside ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is government property.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the elevator on the government pier ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say that I am not sufficiently familiar with the locality to be able to say whether the elevator is on that pier or not. I do not think it is.

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). With the permission of the Committee, I will read a brief extract from the letter of the mayor of Goderich :

> Buffalo handled 12,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain in 1902. Goderich has an elevator capacity of slightly over 20,000,000 bushels a season, but we handled only three millions and a-half bushels last year because our harbour cannot be entered in the fall after bad weather.

That gives an idea of the business that might be done.

Mr. KEMP. The mayor of Goderich, over his own signature stated that $730,328.70 had been spent on the Goderich harbour. Can the minister inform us in what way this was spent ? Was it in dredging, in breakwaters, or how ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount given by the department is $713,341.43, much the same as the amount stated by the mayor. This covers the expenditure from 1850. The money was spent in dredging, building wharfs, making repairs, &c.

Mr. INGRAM. There was a breakwater there at one time, has it gone to pieces ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the present pier was swept away, but it was rebuilt. It is not the protection we are speaking of—which, of course, has nothing to do with this vote, but the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) brought it to the attention of the Committee.

Mr. INGRAM. But what I am asking about is the breakwater which was once there—a very good work. There was a good deal of shipping in Goderich harbour at one time. It seems to me that the difficulty with regard to Goderich harbour and the Maitland river is that when the ice thaws in the spring and the water comes down, the sand is carried out between the piers and prevents vessels coming in. It seems to me if they had a cut and a breakwater such as they had before, it would put the harbour into such shape that shipping could come in as before.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any revenue from this dock ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot answer my hon. friend. As he knows, that is another department, and would come under another head.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that, according to the report :

> The timbers are in a very much decayed condition, in some instances it being difficult to find sufficient sound old timber to spike the new timber to, and these remarks will hold good with reference to the south pier as well. Some slight repairs should be made to both north and south piers as well as to the checkwater. . . . These repairs will be only temporary, as the timbers of both piers are so badly decayed their superstructure should be completely renewed within two or three years, or breeches will be washed through into the newly dredged channel.

Evidently, the works are not in very good condition. I noticed in the letter advocating this being made a harbour of refuge, which, I suppose every member got, it is stated that we have spent a very large amount of money already. Perhaps as much as three-quarters of a million in that harbour and that if we did not spend more the work would be of no use. But this would suggest either that the expenditure has not been wisely carried on or that the harbour is a very difficult one to make. And, if we make further heavy expenditure, we may find we are still without the harbour of refuge. As to making the harbour fit for grain carriers to come in, I think that should be done, but whether we should spend so much in making a harbour of refuge is another question. On the basis of the information we have, it seems a very doubtful question whether it would be well to do that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is hardly under consideration now. At

the same time, I may say, I am having further information collected with regard to the question. I have consulted some of the captains of the vessels in those waters, who, after all, are the practical men. They gave their experience with regard to similar works erected in places on the American shore. They know something of the advantages of breakwaters such as is proposed for Goderich. Of course, conditions vary in different places. It may be to some extent an experiment, but I think that, from the experience on the American shore we should be perfectly safe in making the improvement I speak of. It would not require a very extravagant expenditure to make the trial. As to what effect the breakwater would have in making this a harbour of refuge, I have asked the engineer to prepare a plan of the shortest breakwater that could be built there that would have the desired effect of allowing ships to enter the harbour. In that way—of course, I may be mistaken; it was an idea of my own—I think it possible that we might, for a very reasonable expenditure, learn what the effect of the larger one would be at that point.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you proposing to repair all these docks ? What interest have we, for instance, in the Grand Trunk dock ? I see that is very much out of repair, and is a menace to both life and navigation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no doubt the Grand Trunk Railway will repair their own dock. I may say that they joined a deputation in making representations to the minister in favour of an appropriation. But none of this vote is to be spent on the property of the Grand Trunk Railway, or on any other property. It is for the improvement of government piers.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not possible to have specifications prepared and tenders called for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not prepared to pledge myself, but I may say that I prefer to let this work by contract if the specifications can be prepared.

Mr. SPROULE. I can understand how the Grand Trunk Railway would desire to press upon the government the expenditure of a large sum of money ; but I think private docks should be kept up by private corporations.

Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements to $15,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Where does the hon. gentleman propose to spend the largest part of this item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that last year $15,000 were spent at Beaverton, Burk's Falls, Goderich, Huntsville, Hawkestone, Marksville, North Bay, Port Findlay, etc. For the current year small sums were expended at Bruce Mines, Kingston graving dock, Lancaster, North Bay, Presqu'ile, Summerston and Sydenham river, &c.; and generally a sum of $7,000 for different works throughout the province.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Is some of this money to be expended in repairing the dock at Presqu'ile ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, $144.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Does that property belong to the government or to a private corporation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the information. I was reading out the items that were spent.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I would like to know why the Minister of Public Works should expend money on that work. It does not belong to the government, it is owned by a private party. It seems strange that the government should spend money there on a work from which they receive no revenue whatever.

Mr. INGRAM. If the principle is to expend this money on private docks as well as on government docks, we want to know it. Some of us have private docks in our constituencies, and we might approach the hon. gentleman with the view of getting some money expended on them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At a previous sitting of the House I said that I was surprised to find that so much money had been spent in previous years on this class of works. I am rather surprised that the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) should have supported for so many years a government in voting money to be expended on private docks. I am not prepared to say at the present moment that there might not be a justification, in the public interest, in spending money on a wharf which, though not owned by the government, might be used by the public at a nominal charge. But generally speaking, I think it would be much better that properties on which public money is spent should be vested in the Crown. It is also true that through municipal assistance private companies have built works on the lake shore and at other points, and it seems that the government has been aiding them on the ground that they were of public utility.

Mr. INGRAM. My experience with the Conservative party has not been such as the hon. gentleman intimates. A number of years ago I asked for a small amount of money for Port Stanley harbour. It was owned by the London and Port Stanley Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway Company had it leased, and the government refused to spend any money on that harbour until it was transferred to the government, and after it was transferred to the government, then I was able to obtain a small amount for that harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What evidence has the hon. gentleman that that harbour was transferred to the government ?

Mr. INGRAM. I myself held the documents some years ago relating to the transfer. But my principal reason for rising was to remind the hon. gentleman that in my constituency there is a harbour which is contributing towards licenses. Their money is being paid into the hands of the government, and while the government is willing to receive money from the fishermen at that port, they are unwilling to expend any towards fixing up the harbour for the benefit of the fishermen. The fact that by a recent judicial decision the license fees from the fishermen are now handed over to the Ontario government should be no reason why these men should be deprived by this government of the enjoyment of a proper harbour.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is any part of this $15,000 to be expended in the harbour at Gananoque ? When the late Minister of Public Works visited that town I think he promised the deputation who waited on him that something would be done. While speaking on this point I would ask the hon. minister if he would kindly have an engineer from his department go up there and see the work that is going on now. The Rathbun Company are rebuilding a dock over 300 feet long. It was originally built with timber and filled with stone. They have taken the timber down below the water line and they are renewing the whole work with concrete. It will cost a very large sum of money but when they get the dock completed they will not have sufficient water outside to allow vessels of deep draft to approach laden with coal. I presume there are more arrivals, as you will notice by the report of the customs department, at Gananoque than at any other port on the Canadian side of the lake. I think the least the government can do is to make a fair appropriation for the necessary dredging before public docks. Not a dollar has ever been spent by the government on the dock at Gananoque; indeed, all the docks have been built by private parties, but unfortunately we have not a sufficient depth of water. I think it would be in the interest of the country generally if, in place of renewing docks and piers with timber as the government are doing, they should commence doing as all towns are doing, that is, putting down permanent sidewalks, doing away with the wood and putting in concrete. I think it would be well if the hon. minister would send one of his men to inspect the work that is now nearing completion at Gananoque.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter mentioned by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has been brought to my attention and it is under consideration to make provision for dredging at the point he has mentioned as well as at Kingston. We have to realize that the larger boats now in use make deeper dredging necessary. I have asked for an increase of $5,000 in that province for this general work of dredging. Considering the size of the province and the number of harbours that have to be dredged it is a very small amount and I think that after the estimate is made up we may have to ask for probably an increase of $5,000, because, I believe, a great deal of satisfactory work can be done by the government dredges if we had sufficient money to do a lot of work that we now let by contract. It costs so much to move these private dredges from place to place while if there is a bar filling up, such as the hon. member for South Leeds refers to at Gananoque, the government dredge can be sent without any extra expense being incurred because the employees are under pay, and good effective work can be done at these various harbours. I agree with the hon. gentleman as to the advantage of concrete over wooden work, especially now that we cannot get the class of timber that was formerly available. I have been pressing on the engineer's department my own personal view in regard to this matter and the superstructures of many of the new works we are undertaking, or rather the works that parliament is committed to and which were only commenced since I took office, are being made of concrete. With modern machinery and the improved method of making concrete you can build a concrete work of a considerable size for the same price as a first-class timber work and it will wear a great deal longer.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Rathbun's who are large lumber dealers claim that they can put in a concrete wharf cheaper than a timber one. The large steamers owned by the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company and plying between Toronto and Kingston refused to call at Gananoque because of the insufficient depth of water.

Mr. SPROULE. I am surprised to hear the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works that they had not money enough to keep the dredges going. I always thought the contention was that the government had not dredges enough to do the work. Parliament has never been niggardly in voting all the money required to keep the government dredges going. We have always heard the complaint that we could not use up the money by employing government dredges and that we had to hire private dredges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not had dredges at points where there has been considerable work to do. At some places the dredging has been in deeper water than the dredges we had in Canada are able to work. There are many such places not only in Ontario but especially in the lower provinces. I find that we have an-

other vote for general dredging out of which I propose to have this work done at different points, where it is required.

Mr. SPROULE. You do not intend to have dredging done to any great depth at Gananoque. I presume you could not dredge very deeply there because otherwise you would undermine the concrete wall, so that there could not be any very deep dredging there. I did not know there was on the Georgian Bay very much deep dredging required to be done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I was speaking generally.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to ask the hon. minister if he can give us any idea of the number of private wharfs upon which we are spending government money and the number of wharfs belonging to the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be very pleased to have a statement prepared.

Mr. SPROULE. And where they are ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, where they are located and the number. There is quite a number.

Mr. SPROULE. I know there is and I always thought the principle a bad one. I can understand that in the early history of the country where private enterprise would construct a dock that was valuable to the country it might be justified, but I never could understand the wisdom of spending large sums of money on building up private property, the revenue of which went entirely to the individual. There are examples of this at Sault Ste. Marie and Bruce Mines. I see you have a dock at Hawkestone in the county of Simcoe. The government can have no interest in that.

Mr. BENNETT. A boat called there last summer.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there one ? Well, that is a revelation. I was not aware that any but row boats called there. I hold that the principle is wrong. Where private individuals reap the rewards of our expenditure and the country receives practically no benefit from it beyond the convenience of shipping over the dock, it does seem to me that we are not justified in carrying this practice to the length we have done for many years. Two years ago, I understand, it was proposed to buy that Presqu' isle wharf. Now, I am told that that dock has not been in use for years and years and it is of no value to the public. The government made some kind of a preliminary contract to buy this dock which was of no use to the public, and the purchase of which would be beneficial to no one except the estate which owned the property.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister has stated that the practice has prevailed for a great many years of expending public money on private docks, and he asks for money tonight to continue that policy. He has promised the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) that he will bring down a statement showing the number of private properties on which public money has been expended. I would ask the minister what is his own opinion in respect to this policy ? Does he intend to continue to ask the House for votes of this kind in the future ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These small votes are in order to complete works already under way. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) that I am not in favour of the policy. So much is that the case that I asked the other night for a vote to purchase a wharf instead of spending money in improving private property, but hon. gentlemen opposite, acting within their right, thought that I should not be trusted to take over that property until they got further information. Generally speaking, I am not in favour of this policy, and I do not think I shall come down with a new vote asking for such an expenditure unless I am able to give special reasons that will commend themselves to parliament. I am pleased that the hon. gentleman made the suggestion that we should have a list of such works owned by private parties or corporations; so that we will see what reason, if any, there is for continuing the expenditure of public money on such works. I find that the owners put a very high estimate upon some of these works, and there is a conflict between the government and the private owners as to their value. Generally speaking, I am in favour of spending public money only on the property of the Crown.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Marine are absent, and I again am compelled to lodge a complaint against these ministers for their lack of attention to the public business. I want to submit a question to the Minister of Public Works which I presume could be better answered by the Minister of Customs, with reference to the transaction of public business on these private wharfs. What I desire to know is : How does the government protect the revenue of the country against the importation of goods through harbours and docks of this character, as I understand that there are no wharfingers or public officers in charge of them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the answer to that is simple. You ship subject to duty or in bond, and notice is sent to the customs officers, and if any parties are trying to smuggle they would be detected on a private wharf just as well as on a public wharf or anywhere else.

Mr. BLAIN. We voted at the last sitting $9,000 for the Blind river wharf. Was that property purchased by the Crown, and if so at what price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The property was purchased at $400, speaking from memory.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year the Minister of Public Works told us that the price fixed for the property was $250. How did it come to increase ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was probably the estimated cost, but the price was $400 about.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to make a brief statement in respect to some money that was proposed to be expended on Port Credit harbour in the county of Peel, and which harbour is owned by private individuals. Some years ago this matter was brought to the attention of the government and there was considerable correspondence with the council of the township in which that harbour is situated. The township council was told distinctly that the policy of the government was that they did not expend any public money upon harbours owned by private individuals. It seems surprising, in view of that statement, that at that time and up to the present large amounts of money are being expended by the government on harbours owned by private individuals. I direct the attention of the minister to the fact that Port Credit harbour is a very important harbour for that section of the country, and the expenditure of money there would be in the interest of the public generally. Last winter the cost of coal was a very important consideration to the farmers, and it would be in the interest of the people there if money were expended on these harbours upon that part of Lake Ontario, so that the people would have the opportunity of competing in coal by reason of the fact that coal laden vessels could come there. The pier of that harbour is in a very bad condition, and the harbour requires dredging.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is that harbour under municipal or private ownership ?

Mr. BLAIN. It is partly private and partly municipal ownership. I am surprised that the government should continue the policy of expending money on private harbours in face of the statement made to the township council to which I have referred. Perhaps I could get the minister to say that out of this vote of $15,000 which is to be expended on harbours partly owned by the government and partly by private individuals, that he would send his engineer up to look over Port Credit harbour, and to report to him if something could not be done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I said, I am personally opposed to spending money on private harbours. In this case, municipal ownership makes the work somewhat in the public interest, and I shall be pleased to grant the request of the hon. gentleman and have a report made upon it, and see how it stands.

Lake Temiscamingue—wharfs, $5,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a new wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for two wharfs for the accommodation of the people of that district. One will cost about $9,000 and the other about $1,500.

Midland harbour—dredging, $12,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is Midland harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend must know that Midland is going to be the Buffalo of Canada. It is one of the most important harbours of Ontario.

Mr. CLARKE. I notice that a vessel was aground there the other day. What is the depth of water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It varies from fifteen to twenty-one feet. It is the intention to make a channel a uniform depth of twenty-one feet.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the minister if the warehouses and the dock, for which the town paid $10,000, have been deeded to the government, have they been rented, who has rented the dock and who the warehouse, and what rental is paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These matters have not been attended to yet. We only got the deeds a short time ago, and this week is the first opportunity I have had of asking the chief engineer of the department and one of the principal officials to visit the harbour. As soon as I receive the report I shall be able to give information on this and other matters.

Mr. BENNETT. I may say that there is one large warehouse and two smaller ones, and also an excellent dock at which boats now land. All these being now the property of the Dominion, I think it would be in the public interest and in the interest of fair play that the department should ask for public tenders for the use of them, and that they should not be given to any person without competition. May I ask the minister if he promises that that will be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that will be attended to.

Mr. BENNETT. I may say that they have been rented, I understand, for $500 a year, which I think is a small rent.

Oakville—repairs to pier, &c., $6,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will this vote put this dock in a thorough state of repair ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report of the engineer shows details indicating that this will complete the work and put it in good shape.

these fears were unnecessary. The prosperity of that time has continued. Each succeeding year has shown an increasing record, and we find ourselves to-day with an outlook that is in every respect encouraging and satisfactory. I take up the affairs of the fiscal year ending the 30th of June last, the accounts of which have been before the House for some time. I am sure that hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I say that the exhibit made for that year in the public accounts is a very gratifying one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In some respects the results surpassed the conservative estimate which I ventured to submit to the House in the last budget speech. My estimate of the revenue was $56,800,000 and my estimate of the expenditure chargeable to income was $51,000,000, leaving a probable surplus of $5,800,000. So far as the expenditure was concerned the estimate proved to be a very close one, the actual expenditure being $50,759,391, but on the revenue side the last months of the year proved to be so very prosperous that our revenue exceeded the expectation by a very considerable sum. The revenue reached the sum of $58,050,790, being greater than my estimate by $1,250,790, and greater than the revenue of the previous year by $5,536,088. It too often happens that increase of revenue is accompanied by a corresponding increase in expenditure, but in this case it was not so. The expenditure, as I have shown, was very close to the estimate which I formed; it proved to be somewhat less. But while my estimate of the expenditure was a close one, the revenue as I have already pointed out exceeded my estimate by a considerable sum; the result being that instead of a surplus of $5,800,000 which I estimated, we closed the year with an actual surplus of $7,291,398. If I except the surplus of our own showing of two years earlier, this is the largest surplus that has ever been recorded in the public accounts of Canada. The increases of revenue will be found in nearly all departments. I have here a statement giving a comparison of the receipts in the various branches for the years 1901 and 1902. That statement is as follows:

DETAILS OF REVENUE—COMPARISON WITH 1900–1.

Service.	1901–2.	1900–1.	Increase.	Decrease.
	$	$	$	$
Customs	32,191,978	28,425,284	3,766,694	
Excise	11,197,133	10,318,266	878,867	
Post Office	3,918,415	3,441,504	476,910	
Railways	5,918,997	5,213,381	705,616	
Dominion Lands	1,227,976	1,517,319		289,342
Miscellaneous	3,596,288	3,598,945		2,656
	58,050,790	52,514,701	5,828,088	291,999
Net increase			5,536,088	

The chief increases of revenue over the previous year arose in customs, but there were also large increases in excise, post office, and railways. In this statement which I have read, the item of Dominion lands includes royalties from the Yukon gold fields, and the falling-off is due to the reduction that took place in the rate of royalty. The increase in customs can be ascribed to the general activity of trade in all departments. Increase of revenue is shown under nearly all heads of the customs business, and only in the case of a few articles was there a falling-off. In excise, too, the increase was general, as appears by the following statement, which gives the quantity of goods and the duties accruing thereon.

EXCISE.

Article.	QUANTITY.		DUTY.		Increase.
	1900-1.	1901-2.	1900-1.	1901-2.	
			$	$	$
Spirits Galls.	2,863,950	3,123,430	5,178,275	5,618,113	439,838
Malt Lbs.	64,723,616	71,440,519	970,855	1,071,608	100,753
Cigars No.	141,096,889	151,780,516	822,738	881,597	58,859
Cigarettes "	121,383,584	134,236,034	362,626	400,035	37,409
Tobacco and snuff Lbs.	11,330,345	11,569,632	2,308,460	2,433,355	124,895
Raw leaf, foreign "	9,848,803	10,704,961	1,026,265	1,137,279	111,014

y prosperous that our
expectation by a very
he revenue reached the
)eing greater than my
), and greater than the
)us year by $5,536,088.
hat increase of revenue
corresponding increase
this case it was not so,
have shown, was very
e which I formed; it
at less. But while my
enditure was a close
I have already pointed
nate by a considerable
that instead of a sur-
hich I estimated, we
an actual surplus of
pt the surplus of our
'ears earlier, this is the
as ever been recorded
s of Canada. The in-
ill be found in nearly
ave here a statement
of the receipts in the
the years 1901 an
t is as follows:

)—1.

Increase.	Decrease.
$	$
3,766,694	
878,867	
476,910	
705,616	
.....	289,342
.....	2,656
5,828,088	291,999
5,536,088	

de in all departments
s shown under near-
ms business, and only
articles was there a
too, the increase was
y the following state-
ie quantity of goods
ng thereon.

TY.	Increase.
1901-2.	
$	$
5,618,113	439,838
1,071,608	100,753
881,597	58,859
400,035	37,409
2,433,355	124,895
1,137,279	111,014

The increasing revenues and improved condition generally of the finances of the post office is worthy of special note. The following statement covering the expenditure usually given under the head of post office, and including all except civil government, is interesting:

POST OFFICE.

Year.	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Deficit.
	$	$	$
1896.....	2,964,014	3,665,011	700,997
1897.....	3,202,938	3,789,478	586,539
1898.....	3,527,809	3,575,411	47,602
1899.....	3,193,777	3,603,799	410,021
1900.....	3,205,535	3,758,014	552,479
1901.....	3,441,504	3,931,446	489,941
1902.....	3,918,415	4,023,636	105,221

The actual amount of surplus or deficit in the post office has been the subject of much discussion. There is, however, no room for any misunderstanding on the subject. The Postmaster General has made a statement, in which, for the purpose of comparison with the figures of former years, the service in the Yukon and Atlin districts is omitted, and leaving this out there was a small surplus on last year's operations. Considering that in previous years of comparison there was no charge at all for a service in the Yukon and Atlin, it is perfectly fair to make a comparative statement in this way. But if we put this aside and compare the expenditure of the Post Office Department of to-day with that of former years, we have before us the gratifying fact that while there was in 1896 a deficit of over $700,000, in the last fiscal year, 1901-1902, this deficit was reduced to $105,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deficit in 1896 was $781,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The figures I have here are $700,997, but I will look that up. However, the result is the same. In 1896, the last year under the former administration, the deficit in the post office account was upwards of $700,000. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has not only been able to carry on the service generally in a very efficient manner, but he has extended it, especially in the Yukon and the Atlin districts at a considerable cost, and he closes the year with a deficit of only $105,221. Even if this were the whole story of the post office, this statement would be a most gratifying one, of which the Postmaster General might well be proud. But the statement becomes immensely better when we consider the great reduction of taxation which has at the same time taken place in the Post Office Department. When we remember that under previous administrations the domestic rate of postage was three cents, and that under the present administration this has been reduced by one-third, and when we remember the great reductions that have taken place in the postage rates to Great Britain and the colonies, we must all feel that the financial results of the present post office administration have been remarkably satisfactory. It is a record of administration which the government and the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) particularly, may point to with satisfaction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that deficit reduced out of the revenue of the post office?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as I am aware, it was. I do not quite see the point of my hon. friend's question.

Mr. SPROULE. Simply this, if I may be allowed to explain. I understand that the old deficit of $700,000 was wiped out by an item put in the estimates for that purpose, but it was not revenue from the post office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not quite see the difference; the fact remains that at the close of the year 1896 there was a deficiency of some $700,000. Just how it was paid is of little consequence; and if under the circumstances which I have described, my hon. friend has reduced that to $105,000, I think that is a record which even my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) should receive with satisfaction.

In the Department of Railways, also, there is a large increase of receipts. We have been spending a great deal of money on the Intercolonial Railway, the returns for which we expect in some degree through increased receipts, but also to some extent, as in the case of the canals, not through direct dividends, but through service rendered in the general development of the business of the country. Nevertheless, it is gratifying to know that the volume of business on the railways has been greatly increased, as appears by the following statement of the revenue, expenditure, and surplus or deficit for a series of years:

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE—CONSOLIDATED FUND—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Year.	Revenue.	Expenditure	Expenditure greater or less than revenue by
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1890.....	2,928,080 92	3,481,472 97	+ 553,392 05
1895.....	2,940,717 95	2,950,300 91	+ 9,582 96
1900.....	4,552,071 86	4,431,404 69	— 120,667 02
1901.....	4,972,235 87	5,460,422 64	+ 488,186 77
1902.....	5,671,383 91	5,574,563 30	— 96,820 61

Thus, on the Intercolonial Railway proper for the last year there was a surplus of $96,820.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman include the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said the Intercolonial Railway proper. But the Railway Department has to deal also with the Prince Edward Island Railway, which is commonly associated with the Intercolonial, but is a different road, with a different gauge and operated under different conditions, and under a distinct account. The Windsor branch is also owned by the government, but is leased to the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company on conditions under which the government keeps up the track and receives a certain part of the earnings ; and that railway yielded a surplus for the year of $33,228. But against these two surpluses, on the Intercolonial and on the Windsor branch, there was a deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway of $72,150. So that taking the operations of these three railways together we find that there was a net surplus for the year of $57,898.

RAILWAYS—CONSOLIDATED FUND—COLLECTION OF REVENUE—INCLUDING INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY; PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY AND WINDSOR BRANCH.

Year.	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Surplus.	Deficit.
	$	$	$	$
1896....	3,140,678	3,254,442	....	113,764
1897....	3,066,784	3,195,959	.....	129,175
1 98. ..	3,313,847	3,508,648	.....	194,801
1899....	3,945,817	3,696,612	249,205	
1900....	4,774,162	4,665,228	108,934	
1901....	5,213,381	5,739,051	.. . ...	525,670
1902....	5,918,997	5,861,099	57,898	

So far I have been dealing with the expenditures of the year 1901-2 on consolidated account, that is, the expenditures chargeable to income. There were, of course, other expenditures, chargeable to capital and special account, which have to be considered. The following is a comparative statement of our expenditures for 1901 and 1902, covering not only expenditure on consolidated fund account, but also all the items of capital and special expenditure, thus showing our total outlay for the two years :

TOTAL EXPENDITURES 1901–2 COMPARED WITH 1900–1.

Service.	1900-1.	1901-2.	Increase.	Decrease.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Consolidated Fund.....	46,866,367 84	50,759,391 97	3,893,024 13	
Capital—				
Railways	3,914,010 50	5,102,838 99	1,188,828 49	
Canals	2,360,569 89	2,114,689 88	.....	245,880 01
Public Works.....	1,006,983 39	2,190,125 09	1,183,141 70	
Dominion Lands.....	269,060 90	370,837 97	101,777 07	
Militia	135,884 79	299,697 43	163,812 64	
Canadian Pacific Railway	8,978 87	448 70	.....	8,530 17
Total Capital	7,695,488 34	10,078,638 06	2,383,149 72	
Special—				
Railway Subsidies..	2,512,328 86	2,093,939 00	.....	418,389 86
South African Contingents and Halifax Garrison	908,681 42	247,741 45	....	660,939 97
*Bounties on Iron and Steel	.....	791,089 38	791,089 38	
Total Special.....	3,421,010 28	3,132,769 83	.....	288,240 45
Total Capital and Special.	11,116,498 62	13,211,407 89	2,094,909 27	
Total Expenditure of all kinds.... ...	57,982,866 46	63,970,799 86	5,987,933 40	

* Previously paid out of Customs receipts.

The expenditures on capital account for railways, canals, public works, Dominion lands, militia and Canadian Pacific Railway amounted in 1901 to $7,695,488.34, and in 1902 to $10,078,638.06. Special expenditures, such as railway subsidies, South African contingents and Halifax garrison, and bounties on iron and steel, show a total in 1901 of $3,421,010.28, and in 1902 of $3,132,769.83. Our total expenditure of all kinds in 1901 was $57,982,866.46, and in 1902, $63,970,799.86.

Coming now to the affairs of the fiscal year 1902-3, we find an even more satisfactory state of our finances. The revenue from the 1st of July to the 10th of April was $48,348,125.67, against for the corresponding period last year $43,169,658.04, showing an increase in the nine months of $5,178,467.63. I feel confident that the remainder of the year will show a further increase, and I anticipate that the revenue of the year will come very close to, if it does not reach $65,000,000. Our revenue last year was a little over $58,000,000, so that the House will see I am counting on an increase of revenue this year amounting in round numbers to seven million dollars. Our expenditure for the current year up to the 10th of April was $32,870,204.95, and for the corresponding period last year $31,946,181.16, showing an increase this year of $924,023.79. It will be observed that while during these nine months our revenue has increased over $5,000,000, our expenditure, chargeable to income, for the corresponding period has increased less than $1,000,000. I anticipate that this favourable condition will continue to the end of the year and that our expenditure chargeable to income for this year will be about $51,650,000, against a similar expenditure last year of $50,759,391.97, showing a probable increase of expenditure for the year chargeable to income of only $890,608.03, while at the same time I am counting on an increase of revenue of $7,000,000. Since I am estimating the revenue at $65,000,000 and our probable expenditure chargeable to income at $51,650,000, it follows that at the close of the year, as between our ordinary expenditure chargeable to income and our revenue, we shall have a magnificient surplus of $13,350,000—a surplus far and away above any previous surplus in the financial history of our Dominion.

Associated with a question of this character there is always of course the question of our public debt.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. 'Hear, hear' says my hon. friend opposite, and I am delighted to be able to assure him that upon that point also I have a statement to make as to which we need not fear any comparison. I have here a statement of the increases and decreases of the public debt, as they have occurred from time to time. Those increases and decreases in our net public debt are as follows:

NET DEBT—STATEMENT FOR SEVEN YEARS

	Increase.	Decrease.
1897	$ 3,041,163	
1898	2,417,802	
1899	2,317,047	
1900		$ 779,639
1901	2,986,196	
1902	3,349,085	
1903		5,650,000
	$14,111,296	$6,429,639
	6,429,639	
Net increase, 7 years	$ 7,681,657	
Average per year	1,097,379	
Average of 18 years, 1878-1896	6,563,075	

For the current year we do not anticipate any increase of the public debt. Last year we added $3,349,085 to our debt, which was considerably less than I expected. In the statement I presented a year ago, I anticipated a considerable increase of our public debt as we had large capital expenditures going on then, the outcome of which it was difficult to closely estimate. But happily the outlay on capital account proved less than my estimate and the revenue very much greater. The result was that we added to our public debt at the close of the year only the moderate sum of $3,349,085.93, which was considerably less than I expected. At the close of the present year, after providing for all our charges against income and our expenditures on capital account, which will be $10,000,000 or a little more, I anticipate that we shall not only add nothing to the public debt, but make a reduction of that debt to the amount of $5,650,000. If my expectation as to the favourable outcome of the present year be realized—and I think we may count with considerable safety on its being realized in the main—we shall find that in the course of seven years, we shall have increased the public debt by $7,681,657, being an average of a little over $1,000,000 per annum, or to be exact, $1,097,379 under the present administration. And against this, we have the fact that our predecessors increased our public debt during the eighteen years of their administration from 1878 to 1896 by $6,563,075 per year.

That, Sir, is a statement made to the close of the current year, when we shall have had seven years of financial administration by this government, showing that the average increase of the public debt during these seven years was but $1,097,379 per year. But making a statement for four years only, I find this result. That in the course of the last four years, including the present, we shall have increased our public debt $6,335,282.73 in the years 1900-01 and 1902 and shall have increased it by the amount

of $6,429,639.71 in 1900 and 1903. The figures are as follows:

NET DEBT—STATEMENT FOR FOUR YEARS.

	Increase.	Decrease.
1900		$ 779,639 71
1901	$2,986,196 80	
1902	3,349,085 93	
1903		5,650,000 00
	$6,335,282 73	$6,429,639 71

So that taking these four years, during which we have certainly made liberal appropriations for the public service, during which great public works have been carried on, and during which our hon. friends opposite have even charged us occasionally with extravagence, we shall have paid our expenditure on consolidated account, on capital account, on special account, and every other account, and will not have added one cent to the public debt of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not catch the hon. gentleman's figures for the estimated reduction of the public debt.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $5,650,000. Now with regard to reduction of public debt, it may be well to notice that it is very seldom the lot of a Finance Minister of Canada to be able to speak of a reduction of the public debt. Some hon. gentlemen, who may not have followed this matter closely, may be surprised to learn that prior to the advent of this government, only twice in the history of the Dominion of Canada was there a reduction of the public debt. Once in our time, prior to the present, have we had a reduction of the public debt, amounting to upwards of $700,000, and now, in the present year, we have this large reduction to which I have referred. While presenting these figures, let me frankly say that I do not think any Minister of Finance of this country should be expected to show often a reduction of the public debt. In a new country like Canada with a great many public works requiring to be assisted, with many demands on the treasury, it would not be surprising that each year we would not only be obliged to spend our ordinary revenue but to incur some debt in order to carry on our great public works.

That, Sir, has been the experience of Canada during the greater part of its history. Where we have had surpluses—and we have had many of them—almost invariably they have been absorbed by the expenditures on capital account. Only four times in the history of Canada have there been reductions in the public debt. That is to say, there have been only four years in which the Dominion was able to provide for all its expenditures and have a balance wherewith to reduce the debt. Twice in the time of our predecessors these reductions were made, and twice in our time. And, if there is anything in making the calculation, I may say that the reductions in the seven years of our administration, were nearly twice as great as the reductions made by our predecessors during the whole of their time. However, while I call attention to these reductions and regard them as a very gratifying feature of the financial statement, I do not hesitate to say that, as a rule, a Minister of Finance will not be able to show reductions of the public debt, and it will be no discredit to him if he is not able to do so.

I have prepared a statement of the public debt per capita, this, of course being the fairest way to make the comparison. It is not to be supposed that the public debt will remain at a standstill; but, as the country grows in population it is able to bear an increased amount of debt without increasing the weight of the burden upon the people. Beginning with the year 1891, we find that the debt per capita has been as follows:—

NET DEBT PER CAPITA.

Year.	Population.	Net Debt.	Per Capita.
1891	4,833,239	$237,809,030	49.20
1892	4,877,748	241,131,434	49.43
1893	4,923,818	241,681,039	49.08
1894	4,971,536	246,183,029	49.52
1895	5,021,005	253,074,927	50.40
1896	5,072,341	258,497,432	50.96
1897	5,127,220	261,538,596	51.01
1898	5,184,373	263,956,398	50.91
1899	5,243,950	266,273,446	50.78
1900	5,306,113	265,493,806	50.04
19[illegible]	5,371,051	268,480,003	49.98
19[illegible]	5,438,915	271,829,089	49.97
1903	5,509,000	266,179,089	48.31

The statement I have just given might be made even more favourable. In the estimates of population I have followed the method of calculation usually followed in the census office, by which they add a certain percentage from year to year during the interval between the times of census taking. But I have no doubt, taking into account the large increases in population during the current year, that a correct statement if one could be made, would show a much larger population for the present year than in the estimate I have made. It will be seen that I estimate the population for the present year at 5,509,000 and the net debt at $48.31 per head, as against $50.96 per head, the rate when this government came into office.

On the question of surpluses, which is always an interesting question, I have here a statement which gives the surplus or deficit for each year from the year 1897 up to the present time. It will be remembered that, while this government was in power during 1896-7 it had to carry on the financial affairs of the country under conditions which in the main, came to it by way of inheritance from its predecessors. It was not in a position to control the expenditures wholly; in fact the estimates for that year were prepared by my predecessor, and, coming into office when there was no time to revise them, we were glad to accept them, in the main,

and act upon them for that year. It will be seen that, for that year, there was a deficit, but that for every year since there has been a surplus :—

SURPLUSES—1897 TO 1903.

	Surplus.	Deficit.
1896-7		$519,981 44
1897-8	$1,722,712 33	
1898-9	4,837,749 00	
1899-1900	8,054,714 51	
1900-1	5,648,333 29	
1901-2	7,291,398 06	
1902-3 (estimated)	13,350,000 00	
Total for 7 years	$40,904,907 19	$519,981 44
	519,981 44	
Total net surplus for 7 years	$40,384,925 75	

Average, $5,769,275.10.
Average for 18 years, 1878-1896, $544,539.61.

The general condition of our country is so prosperous that, it is not necessary to quote any statistics for the purpose of showing that it is so. The figures I am about to give are not quoted for the purpose of proving prosperity which is apparent to all, but because the Budget Speech is a sort of financial library in which you can file a few documents of this character and which will be found useful and interesting for future reference. First, we have a statement of the deposits of the people in the chartered banks of the country. I give the figures for five year periods :—

DEPOSITS BY THE PEOPLE IN THE CHARTERED BANKS, JUNE 30.

Year.	
1868	$ 33,317,879
1870	54,074,460
1875	61,094,860
1880	76,244,065
1885	95,030,429
1890	128,631,455
1895	182,688,227
1900	277,256,716
1901	315,775,429
1902	344,949,901
Feb. 28, 1903	366,682,122

A statement of the discount of the chartered banks is a measure of the business of the country. These figures for five year periods are as follows :—

DISCOUNTS—CHARTERED BANKS, JUNE 30.

Year.	Discounts.
1868	$ 51,966,120
1870	67,107,167
1875	136,771,679
1880	111,956,858
1885	162,847,002
1890	195,987,402
1895	224,507,301
1900	316,634,620
1901	318,240,549
1902	348,690,611
Feb. 28, 1903	382,225,338

The total trade also is one of the means whereby we measure the prosperity of the country. I have here a statement of the total exports and imports :—

TOTAL TRADE.

Year.	
1868	$131,027,532
1870	148,387,829
1875	200,957,262
1880	174,401,205
1885	198,179,847
1890	218,607,390
1895	224,420,485
1900	381,517,236
1901	386,903,157
1902	423,910,441

These figures include total exports and total imports which in turn include coin and bullion.

My next statement is one showing the imports for consumption and the exports :—

STATEMENT OF MERCHANDISE IMPORTED (FOR HOME CONSUMPTION) AND EXPORTED.

Year.	Imports.	Exports.
1868	$ 67,090,159	$ 49,739,998
1870	66,902,074	62,608,814
1875	117,408,568	74,628,212
1880	69,900,542	83,336,197
1885	99,755,775	84,263,164
1890	111,682,573	91,387,295
1895	100,675,891	106,013,394
1900	172,506,878	177,776,044
1901	177,700,694	194,509,143
1902	196,480,190	209,970,864

These figures include merchandise only, (coin and bullion excluded). Equally satisfactory is a statement of our exports confined to home products.

TOTAL EXPORTS—HOME PRODUCE.

Year.	
1868	$ 45,543,177
1870	56,081,192
1875	67,490,893
1880	70,096,191
1885	76,183,518
1890	82,335,514
1895	99,528,351
1900	163,510,790
1901	177,431,386
1902	196,019,763

In connection with the statement of surpluses which I have read, I think, having reference to some criticism which occasionally appears in the press, that I should offer a further observation. It ought not to be necessary to make any explanation concerning these surpluses, but sometimes we see in the public press, and even in journals from which I would expect greater intelligence and greater fairness, the statement that the surpluses which the government have been able to set forth, are unreal, because they do not cover all classes of expenditures. Now, it ought to be well understood by hon. gentleman, and it will be understood by the older members of the House, that the distinction which is observed in our public accounts between capital expenditure and expenditure chargeable to income, is not a discovery which I have made.

It is not an invention of mine. It has existed in the public accounts from the beginning, it has properly existed; and I hope it will be clearly understood that in that respect there is no change. The public accounts in this respect are kept as they always have been kept. There is a proper distinction. Sometimes it may be difficult to draw the line, but as respects the greater part of our expenditures on capital account there is a properly drawn line between capital expenditures and expenditures chargeable to income. However that may be, we have simply carried on the same method of keeping accounts that our predecessors have followed.

An hon. MEMBER. Except the bounty on iron.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad my hon. friend has reminded me of that, but I would have spoken of it in any case. If you look at the statements which appeared under the head of capital and the statements to-day, you will find that the only new item of any considerable amount is that respecting the bounty on iron. Now, the former method of dealing with that bounty was one with which we need not fear a comparison. What was the former method of keeping accounts with regard to the bounties on iron? We had the moneys deducted from the customs revenues, they were classed as a refund of moneys. Considering that not a penny went into the treasury, it would be difficult to understand how they could be properly classed as a refund. There never was any money paid into the treasury in this connection; but year after year the payment of these bounties, for some reason that I have never been able to understand, was made out of the Customs Department and stated as a deduction from revenue. I think any business man on either side of the House will acknowledge with me that that was not a proper way of keeping the accounts. You do not find anything about the bounties on iron in the public accounts, as a rule. If you looked into the Auditor General's Report, you might discover that in his analysis of the work of the Customs Department account was taken of the fact that certain moneys were paid as a refund, or something of that kind, for bounties on iron. Well, so long as the sums paid for bounties were not very large, this perhaps was not a very serious matter, though, whether the sum was large or small, it was not a sound method of bookkeeping. But when it came to our knowledge that under this bounty arrangement we were likely to pay large sums of money running up perhaps to millions of dollars a year, then it became necessary that we should treat the matter properly and put it in some other place in the public accounts, and so we began to treat it in the same way as we treat a railway subsidy. Therefore we have charged these bounties on iron and steel to what is called a special expenditure, which is practically a capital account. I think that is justified. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that whether that is justified or not, does not affect my argument. As regards the total of the surpluses the bounty on iron and steel is a very small item, and if you strike out of the account the money which we have paid in the shape of bounties on iron and steel, and if you charge that to some other service and deduct it from our surplus, you will still have substantially the same record as that which I present to you, a record of a series of handsome surpluses to the credit of the Liberal government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are persons who sometimes wonder why, in a year, in which we say that finances are very prosperous, we are still borrowing money. There are people who cannot understand how that should be necessary. But even in private enterprises there are occasions when the most prosperous business requires loans to meet immediate obligations. So it is with the nation. There are times when the inflow of revenue into the treasury is greater than the outgo of expenditure, and then we accumulate a considerable balance. But there are other times when the revenue, though still flourishing in comparison with the revenue of corresponding periods, is insufficient to meet the demands. At such times temporary loans are resorted to for short periods, and in that way we have had some temporary loans during the past year. On the 1st of January last, we had outstanding treasury bills amounting to £1,250,000 sterling. These bills were renewed in London for a term of six months at 3⅞ per cent interest. That is a somewhat higher rate than in former times we had to pay. But as every business man is aware, the conditions of the money market for some time past have been very stringent, and having regard to these conditions, the rate was a fair one.

During the last month or two our revenue has increased so rapidly that we have found ourselves able to redeem some of these treasury bills in advance of their maturity. At the time we raised the money, of course we could not have foreseen the increased revenues that have come in. But we have been able to redeem some of the treasury bills already, so that we have reduced the amount of the treasury bills outstanding to £950,000. These will mature on the 1st of July, and our expectation is that we shall be able to pay off the balance of these on the 1st of July out of our accumulating revenue.

I come now to the question of loans which are maturing. If we had only to consider the question of current expenditure we would not require to go upon the London money market for some considerable period, except for occasional temporary loans in the way I have spoken of. We have to consider, however, not only the question of our

current expenditures but also the question of outstanding loans, issued many years ago, which will from this time forward begin to mature. I have a statement of those maturing soon, which I present to the House.

LOANS MATURING SOON.

Date of Maturity.	Rate of Interest.	Amount.	Sinking Fund.	Balance.
In London.	Per cent.	£	£	£
Oct. 1, 1903	5	500,000	None.	500,000
" 1, 1903	4	1,500,000	969,500	530,500
April 1, 1904	4	300,000	205,000	95,000
May 1, 1904	4	4,000,000	1,024,500	2,975,500
		6,300,000	2,199,000	4,101,000
In Canada.		$	$	$
Nov. 1, 1903	4	2,852,000	None.	2,852,000

As the House will see, one of these loans, which will mature on 1st November next, is a domestic loan, amounting to $2,852,000, which was issued in 1883 and bears interest at 4 per cent. My expectation is that we shall be able to refund this loan in Canada at a saving of one-half per cent interest. A few years ago we looked forward to more favourable terms than this. But for several years the condition of the money market has been one of considerable stringency, and the present indications are by no means favourable to cheap money at an early day. Under these circumstances I have thought it well to provide for this loan by issuing a domestic loan for a short period. The proposal is that the holders of this loan shall receive new stock, running only for ten years at 3½ per cent. I have no reason to doubt but that this will be regarded as a fair offer, and that the holders, as a rule, will be glad to renew the loan on these terms. If in any case they are not, I am satisfied that we can easily place the new stock in other quarters at the rate mentioned. I have spoken of a domestic loan which will mature in November in Canada. On the 1st of October we have two loans maturing in London, one a five per cent loan for £500,000 sterling against which there is no sinking fund, therefore, the whole amount of it will have to be provided for. The other is a four per cent loan of £1,500,000 against which we will have a sinking fund of about £1,000,000 leaving a balance of about £500,000 to be provided for. I feel hopeful that by the 1st of October we can, out of our revenues, provide for the five per cent loan of £500,000, and for such portion of the four per cent loan as may then be outstanding. But, if we should not be able to provide for the whole of it we can cover the balance by a small issue of treasury bills which will carry the transaction over into the next year, when we shall have to take into consideration other obligations arising, and at which time we hope for a more favourable state of the money market.

From this time forth, for some years, we shall receive considerable sums from a new source, money which we shall receive virtually as trustees, but which, will, for the time being, be available for our own purposes. I refer to sums which may be derived from the sale of lands by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The first mortgage upon these lands, given in 1881 to secure an issue of $25,000,000 of bonds, has been practically all paid off. The moneys hereafter realized from the sale of Canadian Pacific Railway lands become available for the payment of an issue of $15,000,000 of 3½ per cent fifty year bonds issued in 1888. The government guaranteed the interest on these bonds and the Minister of Finance became one of the trustees under the mortgage. It is provided that all moneys realized from the sale of these lands, after the payment of the first mortgage, shall be paid in to the Dominion government. The government allow 3½ per cent interest upon the money in accordance with an arrangement made by our predecessors, which is the rate which the company have to pay to the bondholders. So soon as the fund accumulated in this way is equal to the principal sum, the company shall be released from all liabilities. The government, with the money in hand to protect itself, will become liable to the bondholders for both principal and interest. We have not yet received any money under this mortgage, the transactions connected with the first mortgage having only recently been closed. But in view of the great demand for lands in the North-

west there is every probability that we shall receive a large sum from this source in the early future. It is difficult to make an estimate of the amount. Probably $2,000,000 per annum will not be an excessive estimate. As I have already pointed out, it is not a case in which the Dominion profits by the transaction. We shall have to repay ultimately to the bondholders all money which we shall so receive. But in the meantime the government will have the use of the money at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum and to the extent of sums coming into the treasury in this way we shall be relieved from the need of borrowing.

A very interesting feature in connection with the enormous development of business in Canada, and a feature which must have attracted the attention of some of my hon. friends opposite who are interested in large financial concerns, is that this great development of business has been carried on in the Dominion with a comparatively small increase of banking capital. When we look back we find that in 1895 the paid up capital of the chartered banks of Canada was $61,685,329, and we find that the increases from year to year have been as follows:

CHARTERED BANKS—PAID UP CAPITAL.

31st January,	1895	$61,685,329
"	1896	62,196,496
"	1897	61,756,813
"	1898	62,292,614
"	1899	63,284,043
"	1900	63,734,845
"	1901	66,436,767
"	1902	67,621,011
"	1903	72,856,125

It will be observed that for a long period there was practically little or no change in the volume of bank capital, but while that was the fact, trade and commerce continued to expand in a remarkable degree and the banks were able to handle all these transactions. The explanation, of course, is to be found in the fact that owing to the increased wealth of the people, the bank deposits have been greatly increased, and that in this way banks have been provided with ample funds for carrying on the increased business of the country. For a long time this worked out satisfactorily and there has been no difficulty in supplying the necessary amount of bank circulation to carry on business, but during the past year, owing to the great development in business, some of the banks began to be anxious as to whether or not they would be able to supply the necessary amount of bank circulation. The law provides that a bank is permitted to issue its own notes up to an amount equal to its paid up capital. Most of the banks have, in times past, found themselves with ample note circulation for their business. But during the past year, with the great increase in the trade of the country, there began to be a fear that the banks' resources in this respect might be insufficient. Several of the banks at all times had a safe margin to work on, but many of the others found their circulation running close up to the limit of their paid up capital. Several schemes have been suggested with a view to increasing the power of the banks to issue notes. We have not felt justified in encouraging any departure from the principle now recognized in the Bank Act, namely, that paid up capital shall be the only basis for the bank circulation, and although, at one stage, one or two of the bankers were inclined to take another view, I think there is a general agreement that this is the soundest and safest rule. A number of banks, realizing that they should have, not only a sufficient circulation for immediate requirements, but also a safe margin to meet the development of business, have taken steps to increase their capital, and, of course, with the increase of actual paid up capital there comes an increase of circulating power. In this way, it is fully expected that during the present year, even with the great development of trade which is going on, the banks will be in a position to provide amply for that part of the currency system of the Dominion which depends upon them.

While the banks of the country furnish a considerable portion of the notes for circulation, another portion of the requirements of the country is met by the issue of Dominion government notes. There has been no change in the law respecting the issue of these notes for quite a long period. Under the Act as it now stands the government are authorized to issue $20,000,000 of Dominion notes with a reserve of 25 per cent which reserve must take the form of either gold or debentures guaranteed by the imperial government, which are practically the same as gold. For all notes issued in excess of $20,000,000, the government hold dollar for dollar in gold. It will thus be seen that under this law the government are permitted to issue $15,000,000 of notes unsecured; that is to say $20,000,000 being allowed on the basis of 25 per cent reserve, the $5,000,000 of the issue was protected by a deposit of gold, and $15,000,000 were issued upon the general credit of the country. I think it will be generally admitted that if Canada at that time was justified in issuing $15,000,000 of notes on the general credit of the country, the great advance that has taken place in the revenue and wealth of the country will justify the issue of a larger sum to-day. I propose to ask parliament to amend the Currency Act by providing that instead of $20,000,000 to be issued, with a reserve of 25 per cent, the amount shall be raised to $30,000,000, the reserve still to be, of course, 25 per cent. For all issues over $30,000,000—and our circulation is already considerably above that figure—we shall continue to hold in gold dollar for dollar. The effect of the proposed change will be, that, whereas, under the present Act, there are $15,000,000 of notes unsecured and resting upon the general credit of the country, under the new proposal there may

Some other hon. MEMBERS. How does that suit you for a cheer ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The country is prosperous ; our manufacturing industries have, on the whole, enjoyed, and are enjoying, great prosperity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where there are exceptions to this rule, it must not be hastily assumed that these exceptions are due to tariff causes. There may be some cases in which that is debatable, but I think it will be found that in many cases where complaint is made, if that complaint is well founded, that the causes of difficulty are not to be found wholly in the tariff. Indeed Sir, the manufacturers themselves who have communicated with us, have rather based their claim for changes, not so much upon the present condition of affairs as upon the probability, as they think, that we shall soon have less prosperous times. I think, Sir, that most of the manufacturers to-day are suffering, not from want of orders, but for lack of sufficient hands and factory space to enable them to supply the demand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am far from saying that there are not exceptions to this, but I think it is not too much to say that subject to some possible exceptions, the general condition not only of the country at large, but of the manufacturing interests of Canada in the main, is highly prosperous. We know that all classes have prospered in Canada of late years, and it is an interesting fact that manufacturers have shared in the largest degree of that prosperity, for they have held their home markets to a large extent ; they have all or nearly all been busy, and their shipments to foreign markets have been constantly increasing. Therefore, even from a manufacturers point of view, we think the situation is not so bad. There may be a necessity at some early date to make further tariff changes than those which I now propose, but if so the extent to which these changes should be made and the character of the changes may be in a considerable degree dependent upon the attitude of certain other countries towards Canada ; certain countries as to which we are not to-day in a position to say exactly what they may be disposed to do now or in the early future. I suppose it will be generally admitted that while we are anxious to improve our trade relations with the world at large, there are two countries with which we naturally have or would like to have intimate trade relations. The one, it goes without saying, is our mother country ; the other is the neighbouring republic, because they are so near to us and so closely identified with us in many things that we must desire to have close and friendly relations with them.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Now with regard to the trade relations with the mother country. We decided several years ago to grant a preference to the mother country in the markets of Canada. There has been a desire among both parties, among all classes of the people of Canada, that that preference should be reciprocal. We do not differ in that. All will admit that if that could be brought about, it would be a desirable thing for Canada, and we hope for the mother country as well. But we have had different ideas as to the best means of accomplishing this. We have been criticised by hon. gentlemen opposite because we gave a preference to the mother country without demanding something in return. We have thought that our view was the better one. We thought that under the circumstances in which we were then placed that it would not only be useless but harmful to have pressed a demand upon the British government for a return of the preference.

In this, Sir, we were not speaking our own views alone. Members of this government had the opportunity to communicate with able, experienced and influential men in the imperial parliament, and the conclusion we reached, after such communication, was that the time was not favourable for pressing a claim of that character. At the same time we quite realized that these are days in which changes rapidly occur; and in the discussion of the question in this House, we have repeatedly said that it was quite within the bounds of possibility, and even probability, that at no distant day some change might be brought about in the attitude of the British government and the British people on that subject. Hon. gentlemen opposite have frequently endeavoured to assure themselves and others that the imperial authorities were ready and willing to give us a preference. We remember how it was stated that Mr. Chamberlain had practically offered us a preference, and that we had declined to have it. We remember how it was said that the Duke of Devonshire had also practically offered us a preference, and we had refused it. All these things, however, were mere fancies. Mr. Chamberlain made no such offer, and the Duke of Devonshire, when appealed to, flatly denied the views attributed to him. It was quite evident that we had nothing to expect in that way; but a change might come, and it did come sooner than we had reason to expect—not a change, however, which took the form of any preference to the colonies. In the midst of a great war, in a time of financial strain upon the imperial treasury, which still continues, the British government adopted the policy of a tax on breadstuffs. That change on the part of the imperial government produced a new situation of which we have not failed to take advantage. It was one thing to propose, as our opponents did in 1897, that the British government should tax the food of their people for our

benefit, in order to grant an exemption of Canadian goods from the taxation. It was too much to expect that the British taxpayer, in the then state of public opinion, would be willing to adopt the policy of preference. It was a very different thing, however, to propose to the British government, not that they should tax the food of their people for the sake of the colonies, but that they should take off taxation by granting a preference in favour of colonial products. We have not failed to press these views upon the imperial authorities from time to time, and in various ways. When the duties were imposed, representations were made, but without success. We resolved to carry the question into the colonial conference to be held in London in connection with the coronation; and at that conference this subject occupied a great deal of attention. It will be remembered that in a speech by Mr. Chamberlain at the beginning of the conference, he expressed the opinion that the preference granted by us, while of value as a mark of the good-will of Canada, and much to be appreciated as a matter of sentiment, was nevertheless not of much material value; and he added that if the question of granting a preference in the mother country could be entertained at all, it would have to be by the granting of some further substantial preference on the part of Canada. While we regretted that Mr. Chamberlain took that view, we felt that we should not on that account fail to press our views on the other side. This statement of Mr. Chamberlain is very interesting, however, as an evidence of his attitude on the question. For a long time it was commonly represented by our opponents in this country that Mr. Chamberlain had been making speeches avowing his readiness to grant a preference, and similar claims had been made with respect to the Duke of Devonshire. But what do we find? We find that not only was Mr. Chamberlain never disposed to grant us any preference, but he has now said that before he could consider the question of a mutual preference to be within the realm of practical policy, we in Canada would be obliged to consider whether we would not give a further preference to British goods. It is therefore perfectly clear that the impression which some hon. gentlemen opposite have had for years regarding Mr. Chamberlain's attitude on this question is an entire delusion. Perhaps in some respects it is to be regretted that the full proceedings of the conference were not made public. However, there were good reasons for the course that was pursued. It was understood from the beginning that the proceedings were to be confidential, and some of the gentlemen present, relying on that, discussed matters with the freedom of confidential negotiations. To have published all the speeches after that understanding would of course have been a breach of faith. In a conference of that character there are always arising not only national but international questions, and it would not be proper for matters of that kind to be made public unless it were so understood from the beginning. There is no room, however, for any misunderstanding as to what happened on the question of preferential trade, or as to the position taken by the Canadian government. Not only was the subject discussed again and again in the conference, but we had frequent opportunities of discussing it with the British ministers individually, and particularly with Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Gerald Balfour, the president of the Board of Trade. We contended, as appears in the blue-book containing the proceedings of the conference, that the preference was not only of sentimental value but also of great material value to the British trader and manufacturer. While we contended that the preference already granted was of more value to Great Britain than the British officials had been disposed to admit, we told them that if the imperial government were prepared to adopt the preferential policy and give our products exemption from the duties now imposed or hereafter to be imposed on foreign goods, we would be prepared to grant some further preference, subject to certain conditions which were clearly laid down. We frankly stated that we could not undertake to give that further preference in a manner which would operate to the disadvantage of our own industries. As between the British manufacturer and the Canadian manufacturer, we thought we had gone as far in the way of reduction of duties as we could. But we pointed out that Canada consumed a large quantity of goods imported from foreign countries; and in return for the preference which we sought for Canada, we were prepared to so rearrange our tariff as to give Great Britain a further preference, not over the Canadian manufacturer, but over the foreign competitor.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The views of the Canadian government on that question are referred to in the memorandum submitted to the conference by Mr. Gerald Balfour, president of the British Board of Trade, which appears on page 35 of the conference report, and reads as follows:

PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Memorandum by Mr. Gerald Balfour, President British Board of Trade.

As a result of the communications which have taken place, it is understood that the representatives of the colonies hereinafter mentioned are prepared to recommend to their respective parliaments preferential treatment of British goods on the following lines:—

CANADA.

The existing preference of 33⅓ per cent, and on additional preference on lists of selected articles—

(a) by further reducing the duties in favour of the United Kingdom;

(b) by raising the duties against foreign imports ;
(c) by imposing duties on certain foreign imports now on the free list.

The rest of the memo. refers to Australia, New Zealand and the Cape, and I need not detain the House by reading it.

Now, the result of the whole discussion, so far as the record shows, is a resolution found on page thirty-six :—

The general resolution that was finally adopted as covering the principle underlying the several proposals comprised in Mr. Balfour's memorandum, was as follows :—

1. That this conference recognizes that the principle of preferential trade between the United Kingdom and His Majesty's dominions beyond the seas would stimulate and facilitate mutual commercial intercourse, and would by promoting the development of the resources and industries of the several parts, strengthen the empire.

2. That this conference recognizes that, in the present circumstances of the colonies, it is not practicable to adopt a general system of free trade as between the mother country and the British dominions beyond the seas.

3. That with a view, however, to promoting the increase of trade within the empire, it is desirable that those colonies which have not already adopted such a policy should, as far as their circumstances permit, give substantial preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the United Kingdom.

4. That the Prime Ministers of the colonies respectfully urge on His Majesty's government the expediency of granting in the United Kingdom preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the colonies, either by exemption from or reduction of duties now or hereafter imposed.

5. That the Prime Ministers present at the conference undertake to submit to their respective governments at the earliest opportunity the principle of the resolution, and to request them to take such measures as may be necessary to give effect to it.

It will be observed that Mr. Balfour's memo. speaks of an increased preference to be granted to Great Britain by Canada, but does not make any reference to any preference to be granted by Great Britain to Canada. That, however, means nothing, because the reciprocal character of the arrangement was well understood and so expressed in the other documents. The conclusion of the whole discussion was that this additional preference which we were debating was only to be granted to the mother country for and in consideration of the preference we had asked for the products of Canada in the markets of Great Britain. That is made abundantly clear in the memo. of the Canadian ministers, which is filed on the subject. That memo. is a little lengthy, yet I must ask the House to bear with me while I read it, because although it was published some months ago, its nature may be forgotten. As it is a statement not only of our views, but of the views which were expressed by Mr. Chamberlain on behalf of the British government, and was published with his authority, I think we shall do well to give its terms our consideration :—

MEMORANDUM OF CANADIAN MINISTERS AT COLONIAL CONFERENCE.

This subject has frequently engaged the attention of the conference. At an early stage Mr. Chamberlain suggested that the question could most conveniently be considered by the representatives of each colony placing themselves in communication with the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Gerald Balfour, and the officials of that department. Accordingly the Canadian ministers had several protracted interviews with these gentlemen, and discussed the whole subject very fully. Opportunity was also taken to present the Canadian view to Mr. Chamberlain. Now that the conference is drawing to a close, it is desirable that the course of the discussion, and the conclusions reached by the Canadian ministers, should be outlined and placed on record.

From the beginning of the proceedings the Canadian ministers have claimed that in consideration of the substantial preference given by Canada for some years to the products of the mother country, Canadian food products should be exempted in the United Kingdom from the duties recently imposed. Representations to this effect previously made through the High Commissioner for Canada were supplemented by the ministers, both in writing and in the personal interviews with the imperial ministers.

Mr. Chamberlain, on behalf of the imperial government, was unable to agree to the proposals of the Canadian ministers. He represented that the imperial government, while highly appreciating the good feeling manifested by Canada in the granting of preferential treatment, did not think the material results to the trade of the United Kingdom were as great as the Canadian ministers claimed. He further said that the change desired by Canada would be an important departure from the established fiscal policy of the Kingdom, and that if the proposals could be entertained at all, as to which he was not prepared to commit himself, it would be necessary for Canada to offer some material tariff concessions beyond those which she had already voluntarily given.

The Canadian ministers, therefore, submitted a memorandum on the subject of the advantages already received by Great Britain from the Canadian preferential tariff, with a view to showing that these were of much value, and entitled to weight in the consideration of the whole subject.

While urging that the benefits of the preference were such as to entitle Canada to the desired exemption from the duties on food products in the United Kingdom, the Canadian ministers stated that within certain limitations they were prepared to consider the request of Mr. Chamberlain for further concessions in return for the desired preference in the markets of the United Kingdom. While it was not deemed necessary to enter into questions as to the wisdom or unwisdom of the policy adopted by all governments in Canada, of raising the revenues chiefly from customs duties, the Canadian ministers pointed out that under that policy large industries had grown up which had to be considered in connection with proposed tariff changes. Large reduction of duties had been made in recent years, especially on Brit-

ish imports. It was feared that in some lines of importance further reductions might create a disturbance of trade which would not be conducive to the welfare of the country. But the Canadian ministers pointed out that the Canadian tariff was by no means prohibitive, that large quantities of goods were imported, and that a great proportion of these came from foreign countries. In any lines in which it appeared that the goods would be manufactured in Great Britain it might be possible to so readjust some duties as to give an additional advantage to the British manufacturer, and thus turn over to him a volume of trade which at present is held by the manufacturers of foreign countries.

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

Meanwhile the Canadian ministers determined to present to the conference a resolution affirming the principle of preferential trade, and the desirability of its adoption by the colonies generally, and also expressing the opinion of the Prime Ministers of the colonies that His Majesty's government should reciprocate by granting preferential terms to the products of the colonies, in the markets of the mother country. The Canadian ministers desired to have it understood that they took this course with the strong hope and expectation that the principle of preferential trade would be more widely accepted by the colonies, and that the mother country would at an early day apply the same principle by exempting the products of the colonies from customs duties. If, after using every effort to bring about such a readjustment of the fiscal policy of the empire, the Canadian government should find that the principle of preferential trade is not acceptable to the colonies generally, or the mother country, then Canada should be free to take such action as might be deemed necessary in the presence of such conditions.

London, August 11, 1302.

Surprise has been expressed in some quarters—I have heard it expressed, I think, in this House—that the colonial conference did not produce some more definite result. I think that that is the result of some misapprehension. The colonial conference was not a legislative body; it was not what could be called an executive body; it was at the best merely an advisory body. All it could do was to consider the various subjects brought before it, and to express the conclusions which might be reached by the gentlemen comprising it, leaving to all the governments concerned the duty of taking up the matter later on if it should be deemed necessary. That is exactly the position in which this matter of preferential trade stands to-day. The end is not yet. We are not prepared to say at this moment what may be the answer of the British government with regard to the view we have placed before it.

We are aware, Sir, that Mr. Chamberlain, the able Colonial Secretary, whose interest and support we would naturally desire and hope to obtain, has been for some months absent in South Africa, where he has rendered very valuable service to the empire. While we are glad that he was there to render that service in the pacification of South Africa, his absence has, perhaps, to some extent, been a loss to us, inasmuch as, had he been in London during these six months, we might have had his valuable help in the consideration of this matter. The budget speech of the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ritchie, has not yet been delivered. We are so close to it, that it may be too much to expect that this subject would be dealt with in it. But, however that may be, this much at least may be said—that, as we were invited by Mr. Chamberlain to express our views on this subject, as he took an interest in the matter, and as there are others in the imperial parliament who take an interest in it, some of whom are prepared to express themselves more freely than Mr. Chamberlain himself was prepared to do, the least that the British authorities can expect is that we shall allow a reasonable time to elapse before anything further is done. But if, after further consideration, they come to the conclusion that our request is not a reasonable one, if, owing to their adherence to certain views they cannot grant us the preference, we shall be free to take our own course. Whether, in such a case it would be wise, in the interests of Canada, to modify or change the preferential tariff, would be a question to be considered. But, putting aside other considerations, if the British government and people do not show any appreciation of the value of the preference, then, so far as the British government and people are concerned, they cannot complain if we see fit to modify or change that preferential tariff. Of course, Sir, there would still remain the more important consideration, how far, if at all, that tariff could be changed with due regard to the interest of the masses of the Canadian people.

Next to Great Britain, the country with which, in the past, we have been accustomed to say we desire to deal, is the United States. I suppose it is not too much to say that, for some years, our friends across the border have not been too well disposed towards the admission of Canadian products into their markets. While from one point of view, we have been disposed to regret their attitude, there are other considerations which would dispose us to modify very much any expressions of dissatisfaction. When the people of Canada discovered, after frequent efforts, and after ample time given for consideration, that there was a strong hostility on the part of the United States authorities to granting liberal trade arrangements, they ceased to grumble about the matter but, like sensible people, made up

their minds to seek for markets elsewhere. And they sought and found them. I think that the proposition that these peoples, living side by side, should enjoy a greater freedom of reciprocal trade, is as sound to-day as it ever was. But it is the simple truth to say that we no longer feel the need of reciprocity as keenly as we once did. There will be no disposition, I am sure, on our part to clamour for reciprocity with the United States. But there can be no doubt that while, in the past, the tendency of the Americans generally have been adverse to reciprocity, there have always been in the United States a number of very able and thoughtful men who have been well disposed toward better trade relations. I think that that class of people is now increasing and that there is a manifest growth of public opinion in favour of better trade relations between the United States and Canada. That growth of opinion in favour of reciprocity has been manifested in several ways, one of them being an approach on the part of an authorized representative of the United States government to the government of Canada, that the Joint High Commission, which met several years ago, first at Quebec and afterwards at Washington, shall be again convened. The fact that such an approach has been made is well known, of course, for it has been announced in the public press. I thought that, perhaps, the House would desire to know exactly how the matter stands, and so I asked the Prime Minister to give me the correspondence which, if the House does not object to receiving it in this manner, I will read. The first letter from Senator Fairbanks to the Prime Minister is as follows :

United States Senate,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1903.

My dear Sir Wilfrid,—The matter between the boundary between Alaska and Canada having been transferred to a special tribunal by our respective governments, I presume that no obstacle remains to the reassembling of the Joint High Commission. I write, therefore, to inquire when it will be agreeable to you to have it reconvene. Any date after the middle of next month will suit the convenience of the commissioners of the United States.

The progress we had made in the consideration of the subjects of the protocol at the date of our adjournment gives warrant for the hope that we can determine many if not all of them.

I have the honour to be,
My dear Sir Wilfrid,
Very sincerely yours,
(Sgd.) CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa.

To this the Prime Minister replied :

Ottawa, 17th February, 1903.

My dear Senator,—I duly appreciate your thoughtfulness, and I hasten to give you my reply. It is a great satisfaction that, at last, the Alaska boundary is in a fair way to be honourably settled. This makes the course clear for the settlement of the other questions with which the High Commissioner had been entrusted. I am sorry to say that, as far as we are concerned on this side of the line, it would not be possible to reassemble the commission before the end of next summer. The session of congress will close on the 4th of March, but our own session will not commence before the 12th of the same month, and it is expected to last at least four months, and as three members of the commission on the Canadian side are also members of our parliament, it is a fatal objection to the early summoning of it.

Moreover, I think it would be unadvisable to have the commission to meet officially, unless we are pretty sure in advance of being able to come to some conclusion on some important points. If you will permit me a suggestion ; as soon as our parliament has been prorogued, I will take an opportunity of asking you for a private interview, where we could survey the ground again and fix a date for the commission to meet again.

Believe me, my dear Senator,
Yours very sincerely,
(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

The Hon. Senator Fairbanks,
Washington, D.C.

The next communication from Senator Fairbanks was as follows :

Washington, D.C., March 4, 1903.

My dear Sir Wilfrid,—I observe that the next session of your parliament is near at hand and that it will not be prorogued early enough to enable us to reconvene the Joint High Commission before the close of the summer.

It is quite well enough that we should arrange for a private interview, after your parliament is prorogued, and, as you suggest, so that we may consider the work before us and agree upon a date for reassembling.

The Senate is called to meet in extra session to-morrow. When it adjourns I shall return to Indianapolis, to remain indefinitely.

I have the honour to remain,
My dear Sir Wilfrid,
Very respectfully yours,
(Sgd.) CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa.

As the correspondence indicates, we are not in a position to form any decided opinion as to what may be the outcome of the proposed negotiations. The letter of the Prime Minister to Mr. Fairbanks points out that it is hardly worth while to summon the High Commission if we are to meet with the same difficulties as before; and I am sure I am right in interpreting the Prime Minister's letter to mean that, unless a preliminary discussion gives us some reasonable hope that the outcome of another meeting will be fairly satisfactory, there will be no desire on the part of this government to have the High Commission resume its sittings. But, Sir, while we should assume a dignified and proper attitude, while we could not again approach our American friends with a request for reciprocity, yet, if they are disposed, in the light of recent events, to take a more liberal view of the trade relations between the two countries, and manifest a desire to have the High Com-

mission reconvene for the purpose of trying, in good faith, to bring about a better state of affairs in this respect, it is due to them as well as to our own self-respect that we should meet them in a fair and generous spirit, and join in any reasonable effort to bring about such readjustment of the relations between Canada and the United States as will be honourable to both countries and advantageous to the interests of the people. While not too confident as to the results which may flow, either from our application to the imperial government with regard to preferential trade, or from the possible negotiations with the United States in respect to reciprocity, I think it is not too much to say that in both these matters there is enough to require us to stay our hands and to see what will be done as respects these two important matters before we enter upon any extensive change in our tariff.

Throughout this whole tariff question we have endeavoured to avoid extremes. The policy of the government on the tariff has been a policy of moderation and stability. There are extreme views held on questions of this character. There are extreme protectionist views, there are those who seem to insist that we should make things at home, and who do not always stop to consider what the cost will be. Sometimes, if you endeavour to ascertain from the gentlemen who advocate these views what are the duties which they wish us to impose in order that we may make these things at home, we discover that they are not very frank; sometimes they are only willing to give us their views on that matter in confidence, and not always then. I think, Sir, I may say that while there is a widespread, a universal sympathy for home industries, while every man in this Dominion ought to be proud of our home industries and desirous of giving a preference to our home manufactured goods, still there is in all these matters a question of cost; and when the manufacturers come to us, as they sometimes do, and desire to have duties which will go up as high as 50 per cent, 60 per cent, and even 70 per cent, on the cost of the goods, then I say there will be many in this country to question whether or not we can afford to carry protection as far as that. There are extremes of that kind to be avoided. Then there are extremes on the other side. There are people who, relying upon the sound principles of free trade, sound enough in their proper place, are disposed to carry them to a point which takes no account of the conditions. They seem to adopt a theory, and they say: You must carry out that theory regardless of what may be done elsewhere: Fix your own tariff policy, and never mind what is done elsewhere. Well, Sir, I am sure we cannot go as far as that. Commercial questions are every day occupying more attention in the field of public affairs. There is great rivalry among the nations; nay, there is commercial war, and in a contest of that character it is not enough to have a good old theory; you must understand the methods whereby your opponent plays the game, so that you may be able, if necessary, to modify your views.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN. You are coming to it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am delighted to have my views endorsed by my hon. friends opposite. It is not only necessary that we should take account of the way our opponent plays the game, but once in a while it may even be necessary, in exceptional circumstances, to meet him with his own tactics. If that doctrine meets with the approval of my hon. friends opposite I am not disposed to complain. In a country of such vast extent as ours, a country of great territory, it is inevitable that there shall be wide differences of opinion on questions of this character. There will be conflicts of opinion, and there will be conflicts of interests. There will be the extreme view on the one side, and the extreme view on the other. We hold that it is the duty of the government not to yield to these extreme views on either side, but to endeavour to reconcile these views, in the hope that we may bring about a common action which the whole country can accept—a compromise, if you care to call it such. We appeal to the people of the different sections, each one to yield up something in order that we may reach a ground upon which all can act in harmony.

Our manufacturing friends have expressed a desire that the tariff should be kept out of politics. Sir, how are you going to keep the tariff out of politics if some of our manufacturing friends insist upon duties so high that they are sure to antagonize great masses of the people? Especially should we consider these things when we observe what is happening in our great west. The seed that has been sown in the last few years is bearing fruit. When we see immigrants flowing into that country from all parts of the world, we cannot fail to observe the signs of the times. The power of control is passing from the east to the west. Great as is the prosperity of eastern and central Canada, greater still is the prosperity of the vast region lying west of Lake Superior. Ontario and the maritime provinces are losing members, the west is gaining members. That great population in the west is going to be a greater power in the future than it is at present. These western people, producing articles that depend for their value on the open markets of the world, would chafe under a system of high protective duties, and would unquestionably organize against it. Is it not better to meet these people in a spirit of compromise, and ask them to join us in a moderate tariff, rather than, by the adoption of a high

tariff policy, array them against the manufacturing interests of the east? I say it would be in the interests of the manufacturers themselves to take account of these things. The best way you can help the manufacturers of Canada is to fill up the prairie regions of Manitoba and the Northwest with a prosperous and contented people, who will be consumers of the manufactured goods of the east. But if, through the adoption of an extreme policy of protection which they would regard as burdensome to themselves, you were to undertake to impose rates of duties so excessive as to challenge the hostility of these people, then I say there will be an antagonism between the east and the west, and the result will be unfavourable to the upbuilding of Canada. Let us rather hold out the hand of encouragement to these people who come in and open up new homes in that land, let us adopt a policy under which the expenses of living will not be excessive, under which, in fact, living shall be as cheap as possible. As I have said, there have been extreme views on both sides, and we have tried to avoid them. We have endeavoured to give the country a tariff of stability, a tariff which, in so far as a tariff has any relation to prosperity, has been an important factor in the development of Canada the last few years. The efforts we have made to compromise conflicting interests, the willingness we have manifested to meet opposing interests and endeavour to reconcile them, affords the best guarantee that, in any future changes which may have to be made, the question will be approached in the same spirit and, let us hope, with the same happy results.

I suppose, Sir, that next to Great Britain and the United States, the countries in which we naturally feel the most interest, both in trade matters and in other respects, are France and Germany. With regard to France, we have a treaty existing for a number of years which covers, unfortunately, only a small list of articles, and which is not quite satisfactory to us in its terms; we think it is perhaps a little one-sided. However, if it has not been very successful in the development of business, that treaty has done something, and we hope it will prepare the way for better things. During the past year, when several ministers of the Crown were in Europe, we availed ourselves of the opportunity of going into this question of trade with France, and with the approval of His Majesty's government, we entered into negotiations with the French government at the Foreign Office in Paris. I am glad to be able to say, though I am sure it is not necessary to say it, that the French authorities met us with every possible courtesy and consideration, and manifested a very warm desire to extend their trade relations with Canada. Unfortunately the time would not permit us to follow up the negotiations to a conclusion; but I feel very hopeful, from the encouragement that we then received, that at no distant date we shall be able to extend very considerably the scope of our present commercial treaty with France.

I come now to Germany. Prior to July 31, 1898, we had a treaty with Germany, or to be more exact, we were participating in a treaty between Great Britain and Germany under which we, as well as the mother country, received the benefit of what is called the favoured nation treatment. That was the condition of affairs for many years. But that treaty, while satisfactory as far as favoured nation treatment was concerned, contained one clause that was very obnoxious to the people, not only of Canada but of the colonies generally. That treaty contained a clause that the duties imposed upon goods coming from Germany should not be higher, not only in Canada but throughout the empire, should not be higher in any case than the duties imposed on goods coming from Great Britain. Favoured nation treatment deals with the giving to one nation of as favourable treatment as you give to any other nation. This treaty went beyond that. It required that we should give Germany not only favoured nation treatment but the same treatment we were giving the mother country. This clause in the old treaty was a very objectionable one and was frequently the subject of comment and protest on the part of the colonies. But, all our protests were unavailing. However, in 1897 Canada rather forced the issue by asserting in her tariff of that year her right to grant a preference to the goods of the mother country over the goods of any foreign nation. That right was questioned and after a legal argument that right was denied. It was held that we were bound by the terms of the treaty, that we must give to the products of Germany the same tretatment that we gave to the products of the mother country, and it followed that if we gave it to Germany then the so called favoured nation treaties with other countries came in and we had to give it to the other countries as well; so that practically the preference to the mother country was for the moment cancelled. But, while the imperial government felt bound to take that view, they immediately realized that that was a condition of affairs that should not continue and they gave notice that after the 31st of July, 1898, the treaty would cease and determine, and it did. Then, a new question arose. Shortly before the expiry of the treaty negotiations were opened by the imperial government for a new treaty. It was explained that the German government were not prepared to make a permanent treaty with any country at that time, but that they were making provisional treaties to tide over a few years, and they made a provisional treaty with Great Britain whereby Great Britain was to continue

to have the benefits of favoured nation treatment, but they specifically excluded Canada from the benefits of that treaty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Great Britain and the colonies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, they extended it to Great Britain and the colonies generally but they particularly excluded Canada. So soon as that became known we entered a protest against it. Communications passed between our government and the High Commissioner in London. The treaty did not expire until the end of the month of July, 1898, and on the 11th of July, 1898, shortly before the treaty actually expired, Lord Strathcona addressed a letter to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies. We shall lay on the Table of the House all the correspondence on the subject, but for the purpose of my speech I will read one or two letters which will put the House in possession of the essential facts.

RELATIONS WITH GERMANY—LORD STRATHCONA'S LETTER.

17 Victoria Street,
London, 11th July, 1898.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge Mr. Cox's letter of the 5th instant with a copy of the note from the German ambassador to the Marquess of Salisbury, communicating the decision of the Bundesrath on the question of provisional commercial relations between the German empire and Great Britain and the colonies, on the expiry of the present treaty.

The Dominion government, I am advised, have observed with much regret that Canada is to be excluded from the grant of the most favoured nation treatment which is to be extended by Germany after the 31st instant to imports from the United Kingdom, the British colonies and the foreign possessions of the empire.

It is true that the Dominion is granting to the United Kingdom and to certain British possessions a preferential tariff after the 31st instant, but that is a matter of purely domestic policy as distinct from foreign policy. And in this connection I may state that Canada proposes to extend to Germany the same privileges that are accorded to all other foreign powers. It will be gratifying to the Dominion government if it is possible to continue this policy so far as Germany is concerned. And all that Canada asks in return is the same treatment that is being extended to Germany. No suggestion has ever been put forward that the exports from the Dominion should be placed in Germany on the same footing as goods exchanged between the different states that form the German empire.

There is one other point I may mention. It is that though in the French, Spanish and Portuguese colonies preferential rates of duty are conceded to imports from the metropolitan countries, I believe I am correct in stating that imports into Germany from these colonies are not refused most favoured nation treatment.

I have been requested by the government of Canada to ask Her Majesty's government to represent the matter to the German government, and with all respect, I venture to express the hope that the German government will find it possible to reconsider its decision and thus prevent a disturbance of the commercial relations between Germany and Canada which must otherwise result to the disadvantage of both countries.

I am Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) STRATHCONA.

The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies,
Colonial Office.
Downing Street, S.W.

We have been criticised in this House for not having adopted retaliatory legislation towards Germany. I admit that there was very much in the circumstances to tempt parliament to take such a course. However, the view which we took was that in matters of an international character we should not adopt any hasty or ill advised legislation, but that we should endeavour by patient representations to impress our views on the German government, in the hope that a better understanding would be brought about, and so, from the beginning, as shown by Lord Strathcona's letters under instructions from the government, we made these representations. Unfortunately, all our efforts in this direction have proved unsuccessful. Representations were made through the diplomatic channels of the British government, but without sucess. In the fall of the year 1901, and particularly in November, we concluded that as the usual form of diplomatic negotiations through the imperial authorities had not proved successful, we would avail ourselves of opportunities to discuss the subject with the gentleman who holds the very honourable position of Imperial German Consul in Montreal, Mr. Bopp. He was good enough to meet us in a friendly spirit and gave us the use of his official channel of communication to express our views. Of course, representing the German government, in our conversations with him, he was by no means ready to accept our views, but we thought that we should press the matter upon the German government through him, as well as through the more official channels of the colonial office. Thereupon, in the month of November, 1901, after a conference held by the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) and myself with Mr. Bopp we prepared the following memorandum :—

RELATIONS WITH GERMANY—MR. FIELDING'S MEMORANDUM FOR THE GERMAN CONSUL AT MONTREAL.

The undersigned Minister of Finance, having in conjunction with the Right Honourable the Prime Minister and the Honourable the Minister of Customs, had an interview at Ottawa with Herr Franz Bopp, His Imperial German Majesty's Consul at Montreal, on the subject of the trade relations between the German empire and the Dominion of Canada, submits for the consideration of council the following observations thereon.

Prior to 31st July, 1898, Canada, as a portion of the British empire, received the most favour-

able tariff treatment in Germany, under the terms of the treaty which had long existed between that country and Great Britain. On the date named, that treaty, having been denounced by the British government, ceased to have effect. Provisional agreements have since been entered into from time to time between Great Britain and Germany. Canada, however, has been excluded from the benefit of such agreements. The products of Canada are no longer admitted into Germany on the favoured terms known in the German tariff as 'conventional duties,' but are specially excluded therefrom and made subject to the higher duties of the general tariff. The reason assigned by the German government for this discrimination against Canada is the enactment by the Dominion of legislation granting preferential tariff rates to the products of Great Britain. The undersigned desires to point out that the policy of the Canadian government was not designed to give any foreign nation more favoured treatment than was to be allowed to Germany. The Canadian policy has been confined to a readjustment of the commercial relations of the Dominion with the British empire of which it is a part, a domestic affair which could hardly be open to reasonable objection by any foreign government. It would, therefore, seem that the action of Canada afforded no just ground for complaint by Germany. The undersigned is of opinion that there has been some misconception of the Canadian policy in this respect, and hopes that upon further consideration the German government will see that Canada, in taking the step referred to, did not forfeit her claim to the advantages accorded by Germany to the most favoured nations.

Apart, however, from the purpose of the Canadian policy in question, the undersigned invites attention to the fact that the trade between the two countries, which was largely in favour of Germany under the treaty, has continued to be equally favourable since the treaty ceased to exist. Canada was and still is a large purchaser of German goods, while Germany was and still is but a small purchaser of the products of Canada. The following statistics will clearly show how largely the balance of trade is in favour of Germany :

IMPORTS FROM GERMANY INTO CANADA FOR HOME CONSUMPTION FOR THE FISCAL YEARS ENDING JUNE 30.

1896	$5,931,459
1897	6,493,368
1898	5,584,014
1899	7,393,456
1900	8,383,498
1901	7,021,405

These imports it is believed have been substantially all of German origin.

TOTAL EXPORTS OF CANADA TO GERMANY DURING THE FISCAL YEARS ENDING JUNE 30.

1896	$ 757,531
1897	1,045,432
1898	1,837,448
1899	2,219,569
1900	1,715,903
1901	2,141,552

A portion of these exports was not Canadian but merely passed through Canada in transit. The following statement shows more accurately to what extent Germany is a buyer of Canadian goods :—

EXPORTS OF THE PRODUCTS OF CANADA TO GERMANY DURING THE FISCAL YEARS ENDING JUNE 30.

1896	$ 606,919
1897	764,589
1898	1,419,096
1899	1,310,373
1900	1,128,163
1901	1,374,616

In view of this evidence that the trade between the two countries continues to be very largely in favour of Germany, the purchases from that country being more than five times greater than Germany's purchases from Canada, the undersigned thinks that the German government may be fairly asked to give the products of the Dominion the most favoured treatment in the German markets.

The fact that Canada, while so largely a purchaser of the goods of Germany, is treated unfavourably by the tariff laws of that country, is regarded by many in the Dominion as evidence of unfriendliness and has led to demands for retaliatory tariff legislation. The Canadian government have not yielded to such demands, deeming it better to place the facts before the German government in the hope that the present discrimination against the products of Canada may be removed.

The Canadian government would at a convenient moment be prepared to consider the general question of trade relations between Germany and the Dominion. The undersigned understands, however, that it is not the policy of the German government at present to make any commercial treaties extending beyond the year 1903, it being desired that at that time all commercial arrangements with foreign nations shall be subject to revision. It would therefore be inexpedient for the Canadian government to enter into negotiations at this moment with a view to a general treaty with Germany. Negotiations of that character necessarily occupy considerable time and it is probable that before any arrangement satisfactory to both countries could be reached the period for which the German government are disposed to agree would almost have expired.

The undersigned therefore submits that, reserving for further consideration the question of a treaty to take effect after the year 1903, it is desirable that a friendly temporary arrangement be made with Germany. In view of the figures already presented, showing how largely the balance of trade is in favour of Germany, it would not be unreasonable to ask the German government to take that important fact into consideration and extend to Canada the tariff advantages from which the Dominion is at present excluded.

The only matters in which the products of Germany are at any disadvantage in the Canadian markets as compared with the products of other foreign countries are those which arise out of the arrangements made between France and Canada by the commercial treaty of 1894. The advantages of that treaty were extended to Germany and were only withdrawn after the adoption by the German government of the adverse policy which is the subject of this memorandum. In the event of Germany agreeing to allow favoured nation treatment to the products of Canada the benefits which are granted to France under the treaty of 1894, should, of course, be extended to Germany, thus placing German goods in every respect on equal terms with the goods of other foreign countries.

The making of a formal treaty would require the appointment of plenipotentiaries by His Majesty the Emperor of Germany and His Majesty the King of Great Britain on behalf of Canada. But while recognizing this fact, the undersigned is of opinion that a friendly exchange of views between members of the Canadian government and Herr Bopp, representing the government of Germany, may be very useful in bringing about a better understanding, and therefore it is recommended that a copy of this memorandum be furnished confidentially to Herr Bopp. If Herr Bopp should be able to intimate at an early date that the suggestions herein made are received with favour steps could then be taken to have the matter dealt with more formally through the proper treaty-making channels.

(Sd.) W. S. FIELDING,
Minister of Finance.

Department of Finance,
Ottawa, November 18, 1901.

The figures in this memorandum are brought down to the end of the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1901. The figures for the following year sustain the position taken as to the large balance of trade favourable to Germany. In that year, 1902, our imports from Germany for home consumption were $10,823,169, while our exports to Germany of the produce of Canada were only $1,298,654. Sir, I regret to have to say that unfortunately all these efforts to bring about a better understanding with Germany have failed. We have patiently, as it will be acknowledged, for the long period of five years endeavoured to bring about such an understanding—a longer period than some hon. gentlemen opposite were willing to wait, for they criticised us, and perhaps with reason, because we did not make some hostile movement in previous years. However, Sir, we do not think that we can afford to let the matter stand in its present position any longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. After these five years of careful, patient negotiation, we think it is our duty to place all the facts before the parliament of Canada and to take such steps as will assert the right of the people of Canada to make arrangements, either as respects their trade or any other matters, with the mother country or any part of the British empire, without admitting the right of any foreign nation to interfere in the matter in any shape or form.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Our German friends have given us some idea of how we may deal with a matter of that sort. We have not any legislation in our tariff at present which would enable us to deal with such an exceptional condition. Our German friends have shown us, however, how the thing may be done if we care to follow them. I have in my hands an extract from the new German tariff. This is the tariff law which was recently passed but which I think is not in operation at the present time. It is to be brought into operation by order later on. But it is the latest German tariff law. It says:

Dutiable goods proceeding from states that treat German ships or products less favourably than those of other nations may without prejudice to the tariff duties, be burdened with a surtax ranging up to 100 per cent of the tariff duty imposed on such goods, or even with a surtax equivalent to the total value of the goods themselves. Goods free of duty in virtue of the tariff may under the same conditions be taxed with a duty not exceeding 50 per cent ad valorem.

Germany would hardly be able to complain if we should copy that clause into our tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. Put it there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But still with that policy of moderation which has always to be observed——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We may learn a useful lesson from foreign countries without going too far in the matter. We do not propose to interfere, as the German tariff proposes to do, with free imports. In their proposal and the power they take in their tariff, they can impose a duty on free goods; goods which would otherwise be free but which in this particular case would be dutiable. We do not propose to do that. But we do propose that as respects the dutiable goods we shall insert in our tariff a clause to the effect that when any foreign country treats the imports from Canada on less favourable terms than the imports from other countries; then in such a case there may be imposed on the goods of such foreign country, a surtax over and above the duties expressed in schedule A of our tariff, which is commonly known as the general tariff, such surtax to be one-third of the duty so expressed in schedule A of the general tariff. This clause the House will observe is general in its terms and may be applied at any time to any foreign country which treats Canadian products unfavourably. But we propose to apply it immediately to the case of Germany and it will take effect as respects all German goods in all the customs-houses of Canada to-morrow morning——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE—Subject, however, to this reasonable qualification that it shall not apply to any goods which have been actually purchased by any corporation, firm or person in Canada prior to this moment for immediate transportation to Canada. With that qualification, at every custom-house in Canada to-morrow the surtax will be imposed on German goods. One

effect of this I suppose will naturally be to diminish our imports from Germany and to lead our importers to send their orders to countries which are more disposed to buy from us, and I suppose one effect will be to give a further encouragement to the trade with the British West Indies. If that should happen that also would be of some advantage.

There are two or three other tariff matters to which I wish to invite the attention of the House. While we have desired to meddle as little as possible with the tariff schedules, there are a few items which stand in peculiar circumstances. For the past year the manufacture of rails has been carried on to some extent in connection with the great enterprises at Sault Ste Marie. The government, recognizing that industry as one deserving of encouragement, gave the company a large order for rails, which it was only able in part to fill. We have not been unwilling to view with favour a proposal to extend to this manufacture the same degree of tariff encouragement which is enjoyed by most of our industries. But we have hesitated to do that in this case, because we were not satisfied that the mill at Sault Ste. Marie was in a position to supply either the quantity or the quality of rails required by the Canadian railways. It has seemed to us that the imposition of a duty under such conditions would not serve its purpose. We have decided that while we should not be justified in imposing a duty now, we may reasonably ask the House to agree to a duty, to take effect when there are rail mills, either at Sault Ste. Marie or elsewhere, in a position to turn out rails of proper quality and in reasonable quantity. We, therefore, ask that power be given to the Governor in Council to impose by Order in Council a duty of $7 per ton on steel rails, provided, however, that such order shall not be passed until the government are satisfied that there are rail mills in Canada making the best quality of rails, and in a sufficient quantity to meet the reasonable demands of the market. This duty, when imposed, will, of course, be subject to the British preference as usual.

Another industry on whose behalf urgent representations have been made to us, is the lead industry of British Columbia. We find, however, that the duties which the people interested in that industry desired to see imposed would necessitate a readjustment of other duties, involving considerable increases which we are not prepared to entertain. Therefore, so far as tariff changes are concerned, we find ourselves unable to agree to the proposals. Nevertheless, we appreciate the importance of the lead industry and realize the desirability of encouraging it, and we are willing to consider whether the situation may be met by some readjustment of the law respecting bounties on lead. Further than this we are unable to go at present.

Another industry which occupies a peculiar position is that of binder twine. In 1897 we placed binder twine on the free list. It was said by many people that that was the death blow of the binder twine industry. Strange to say, however, there are more binder twine factories in Canada to-day without a duty, than there were with a duty—another instance showing that theories and facts do not always come together.

Mr. MACLEAN. We have seen a lot of those theories to-day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am looking at my hon. friend. I see the whole World when I look at him.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is not a bad looking world either.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, the world looks very pleasant. With a good government and a good tariff, it is not such a bad world. With respect to the binder twine industry, up to a certain point it seemed to flourish on a free trade basis ; but a peculiar position has arisen owing to the legislation of the American government with respect to the Philippine Islands. That government has imposed an export duty of three-eighths of a cent per pound on manilla exported to all countries, with the proviso that where the manilla goes to the United States and is used in manufactures, the manufacturer shall be allowed a rebate equalling the amount of the export duty. This practically amounts to a bounty to the American manufacturer to the extent of that duty. In the case of the binder twine manufacturer in Canada, this works a particular hardship. While he has no advantage whatever in our tariff, his American competitor, besides being aided by this bounty, has free access to our market. This is a condition of affairs which we admit calls for some action ; and though we are not dealing with it in the tariff resolutions, the government will introduce, before the session closes, some legislation whereby the binder twine manufacturers of Canada will be compensated for the disadvantage under which they suffer as respects the export duty on manilla imposed by the American government.

There is an item in the tariff which imposes a duty upon foreign-built ships when entered for registration in Canada. We found that some persons evaded the provisions of that law by taking foreign-built ships to Newfoundland, registering them as British ships, and then bringing them as such into Canada. To prevent this evasion, we provided by legislation last session for the imposition of a license fee upon all foreign-built ships engaging in our coasting trade. That Bill did not at once become law, but was reserved for the consideration of the imperial government. It has since been confirmed by His Majesty's government, and is now in force. We did not repeal the duty on ships last session, so that as the

matter stands at present we have both the duty and the license fee, which, of course, was not the intention of parliament. We therefore propose to repeal the tariff item which imposes the duty, and leave the matter to be regulated by the license fee.

We have for some time past granted exemption of duty on machinery imported for the manufacture of beet-root sugar. That exemption expired on the 1st of April. We propose to renew it for another year up to the 1st of July, 1904.

With a view of encouraging alluvial gold mining in the Yukon district, we propose to ask the House to place on the free list until the 30th of June, 1904, machinery and appliances of a kind not made in Canada for exclusive use in alluvial gold mining.

I think I have now stated all the changes to be made in the tariff.

Mr. MACLEAN. Woollens.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one other change which is not included in my resolutions, but which will come later. There is a provision in the Customs Act that we may admit free of duty certain articles for the use of manufacturers. I suppose the principle should hold that the greater includes the less; and if we could take the duty off altogether, it would seem to be a sensible inference that we could take off part of it. However, the Act is not so interpreted. If we want to give the manufacturer absolute freedom of duty, we can do it; but if we think that this is too much and want to give him something less it is held that under the present Act we have not power to do it. There are some curious things in connection with the administration of our tariff laws. There are cases in which it is found that the raw materials which have to be imported from a foreign country are charged a higher duty than the manufactured article made from such materials which comes in from Great Britain under the preferential tariff. With the view of meeting such a case, we propose to amend the Customs Act so that we shall not only have the power in such a case to abolish the duty, but to reduce it.

There is another matter, perhaps somewhat outside the line of the budget, but nevertheless of much importance, as to which I desire to make a short statement.

The Dominion has spent a vast sum of money in the construction of canals and in the improvement of our waterway from the great lakes to the ocean, by way of the St. Lawrence river. Some years ago, these canals had but little depth of water. It was deemed wise to enlarge and deepen them, at a very heavy cost to the Canadian treasury. The canal system is now about complete, and we are looking to it, as well as to our railways, to carry the great volume of traffic which must pass between the western and eastern portions of Canada. Those who are most closely associated with the operation of the waterways are naturally anxious that every possible obstacle may be removed and every reasonable encouragement given for the transportation of our products through these channels to Montreal and other ocean ports. A large deputation of gentlemen interested in the traffic recently waited upon the government and urged that, with a view to giving greater encouragement to the business, canal tolls should be abolished, and the inland waters made as free to ships as the ocean is. The government have given the subject very careful consideration. There is room for some doubt whether the tolls that are charged are large enough to be a serious obstacle to the traffic.

But while these doubts exist, we do not feel that they are such as should prevent us giving the proposal a trial. The revenue involved, though considerable, is not large enough to prove a disturbing factor in these days of prosperous Canadian finances; and we would gladly yield up this item of our receipts if we could feel assured that it would have the great effect anticipated by the gentlemen who comprised the deputation. We desire to reserve our right as to future action, which may depend upon the results of the experiment which we intend to make. Subject to that reservation, I now announce that the government have determined for a period of two years to suspend the charges for tolls and make the entire canal system of Canada absolutely free to all.

This, as I have said, we will try as an experiment. We hope it may be justified, and we reserve our right as to what may be done at the end of the two years. We think that a trial of that kind will be all that those more particularly interested in this matter can ask us to do, and we do it with the desire that our great waterways shall carry the traffic which nature has destined they should carry.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that every member of this House and every good citizen of Canada will rejoice over the happy conditions which enable me to make such a gratifying statement of the affairs of the Dominion. We have every reason to view the progress of our country in the past with pleasure. We have even more reason for looking forward with hope and confidence to the great future that is before those whose privilege it is to dwell on this northern half of the American continent. We may differ in many respects, but not in our gratification that prosperity in a large degree has visited our country. Never in any previous period in our history was the future so full of promise. Never before in her history did our country loom so largely in the eyes of the world. We have ourselves long been aware of the magnificent resources of our vast territories, but our efforts to make these resources known and appreciated abroad have some-

times been less successful than could have been wished. But whatever may be said of the past in that respect, we have nothing to complain of now. In the mother country, on the continent of Europe, and even in the republic to the south of us, the story of Canada's advancement, Canada's wealth of resources, and Canada's splendid future is engaging the attention of the people, and many thousands of immigrants of the best class are crowding the steamships and the railway trains in their haste to reach the new country. We have every reason to welcome these people. We are glad to know that they are casting in their lot with us. Let us, to whom, as members of parliament, is given the high privilege of directing the affairs of this Dominion, fail not in anything that is within our power to give assurance to our new citizens that the land to which they have come is one that will reward intelligent and faithful labour with the blessings of peace, happiness and prosperity. I beg to give notice of the following resolutions :

That it is expedient to further amend 'The Customs Tariff, 1897,' to the following effect :—

That the following sections be added to the said Act :—

The Governor in Council may by Order in Council direct that a duty of seven dollars per ton shall be imposed in Schedule A on all iron and steel railway bars, or rails in any form for railways, imported into Canada ; and from and after the publication of such Order in the 'Canada Gazette' such duties shall be levied, collected and paid on all such rails ; and thereafter item 238 in Schedule A and item 585 in Schedule B shall be repealed.

Provided, however, that such Order shall not be passed until the Governor in Council is satisfied that steel rails of the best quality, suitable for the use of Canadian railways, are being manufactured in Canada, from steel made in Canada, in sufficient quantity to meet the ordinary requirements of the market.

Articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of any foreign country which treats imports from Canada less favourably than those from other countries may be subject to a surtax over and above the duties of Schedule A, such surtax in every case to be one-third of the duty as fixed by such Schedule A.

Such surtax shall apply to any article, the chief value of which was produced in such foreign country, although it may have been improved or advanced in value by the labour of another country, notwithstanding the provisions of the British preferential tariff and regulations thereunder.

Any question arising as to any foreign country or goods coming under the operation of this section shall be decided by the Minister of Customs, whose decision shall be final.

The Minister of Customs, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may make regulations for carrying out the purposes of this section.

Such surtax shall not apply to any goods actually purchased on or before the 16th day of April, 1903, by any corporation, firm or person in Canada, for immediate transportation to Canada.

That the period of exemption from duty of machinery of every kind and structural iron and steel for use in the construction and equipment of factories for the manufacture of sugar from beet root be extended to the 30th day of June, 1904.

That item 409 in Schedule A, respecting duty on ships and other vessels built in foreign countries and applying for Canadian register, be repealed.

That machinery and appliances of a kind not made in Canada for exclusive use in alluvial gold mining be added to the free list until June 30, 1904.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) moved the adjournment of the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. I can have no objection to the request of my hon. friend, but have to tell him that if we do not proceed with this debate at present, he will have a little difficulty to settle with his neighbour (Mr. Sproule) because that hon. gentleman objected yesterday that we had nothing to go on with but the estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On occasions of this kind it is usual to adjourn the debate, and my chief reason for not wanting to go on to-day is that I am suffering from severe hoarseness and am afraid that I shall not be able to make myself heard by the House. I may also state to my hon. friend that we extended a similar courtesy to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, as we are always glad to do, by waiting a half hour in our seats for the House to open.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was worth waiting for.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There may be two opinions about that. The hon. gentleman is quite sure of it, other hon. gentlemen may not share in his opinion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I apologize to my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Public works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—Ontario—Port Elgin, dredging and repairs to landing pier, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). This is to complete these works. The dredging will give a depth of fourteen feet at low water.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the Minister of Public Works please furnish the statement

which he promised to give us showing the docks owned by private individuals on which we are spending public money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not been able to have that statement prepared yet. There is a good deal of labour connected with it. There is no list in this form in the department, and all the items have to be gone over and the facts looked up. I hope to lay the statement on the Table to-morrow.

Port Hope—repairs to pier and dredging, $7,500.

Mr. SPROULE. It was stated that the amount appropriated last year would complete this work, but I see we are now asked this large sum in addition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the renewal of the superstructure of the east pier, for a length of one hundred feet by thirty-four feet and six feet high. I imagine that when they came to do the work, they found the pier in much worse condition than had been anticipated. It is an old pier.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a private dock or a government dock ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A government dock.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the work being done by day labour or by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By day labour.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Rivière aux Puces—repairs to pilework, $1,800.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has had this money for two years. How is it that no work was done last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have received a petition lately showing that this is a very necessary work. It is to renew 200 feet of piling work on the west side and 130 feet on the east side. The total estimate is $1,800, so that this will complete the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Essex county.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, only piling.

River Ottawa—improvement of narrows at Petewawa, above Pembroke, $4,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this part of the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose it is.

Mr. LENNOX. This appears to be a revote. When was the appropriation first made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some work seems to have been undertaken there some years ago. There is a rocky shoal which obstructs the steamboat channel through the narrows above Pembroke, and this money is to be expended in making a channel 100 feet wide, with a depth of eight feet at low water. I have not the information at hand to show when the appropriation was first made. But this is a very necessary work, as this shoal is an obstruction to navigation.

Mr. LENNOX. Has there been a considerable amount of money spent up to the present time on this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Three thousand dollars.

Mr. LENNOX. Why was not this money spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not able to give my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) that information. The information furnished to the department is that about 4,000 feet of this rocky shoal has to be removed.

Mr. LENNOX. How long has it been under contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say.

Mr. LENNOX. I consider that the principle of these revotes is a very bad one. It is not right to apply for an appropriation in advance, before there is any definite scheme proposed, or any contemplation of an immediate expenditure. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that appropriations of this kind are, in some instances and by some governments, held dangling before the eyes of the electors for the purpose of influencing votes. I think I may say that in some cases that has been done by the present government. I protest against the principle as a bad one.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There might be such instances, but this is not one of them. It does not affect any constituency or any vote.

Mr. LENNOX. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there are some.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There may be. But this is for the purpose of removing a rocky shoal in the Ottawa river, for the benefit of boats that ply north of Pembroke.

Mr. LENNOX. When I say that appropriations are frequently put in the estimates for the purpose of influencing votes, I do not mean to say that the present one may be wholly improper. No doubt it is intended to kill two birds with one stone. It may

be intended both to serve a public purpose and to influence votes at the same time. This may be also for a proper purpose, or it may not be; but generally there is an ulterior purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. Why was the money voted last year not expended? It could not have been for the want of dredging.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have given all the information at my disposal with regard to this item, and if any further information is required, I will ask that the item stand until further information is brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. We had better let it stand. We voted the money last year and none of it was expended. If the work was required at all, and we furnished the money, the government should have expended it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think this item had better stand until we find out in what position the work is.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the work to be done by day labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is let by contract. My impression at present is, speaking from memory, that this contract was let at the time the Hon. Mr. White represented that constituency. Let the item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

River St. Lawrence—dredging steamboat channel through shoal at foot of Wolfe Island, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The information I have from the chief engineer is that $3,000 will complete a channel 300 feet wide and 16 feet deep. It will complete the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that being done by government dredge?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By a hired dredge. Randolph & McDonald are the contractors.

Rondeau harbour—improvements to piers and dredging at entrance, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for protecting the west side of the west pier for 1,000 feet in length, also the east pier around its northern end for a distance of 100 feet. The estimated expenditure is $2,100. Nineteen thousand cubic yards of dredging require to be done to make a channel through the bar 1,000 feet long and 19 feet in depth. The chief engineer reports that this amount will be required. There has been already an expenditure of $6,308.35.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be done with the $10,000?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We ask for a revote of $6,000.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not marked here a revote; it is a fresh vote in addition to the $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The $10,000 will be all spent before the end of the year.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this work done by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By the government dredge 'Ontario.' The piling is done by day labour.

Southampton—improvement of harbour, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been a good deal of money spent at Southampton. This revote of $10,000 is to be applied to extending the present landing pier in a northern direction for 560 feet, leaving an opening between it and the land for a breakwater of 210 feet, dredging the area thus inclosed to a depth of 17½ feet at low water. The depth is 13 feet. Work does not seem to have been carried on there last year. Ten thousand dollars was voted and I do not know why the work did not go on last year.

Mr. SPROULE. How much money altogether has been spent in the Southampton harbour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since confederation $47,000 have been spent, and previous to that period, about $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say with reference to this work, that I have always noticed, whenever there is an election up there, that it is considered very important that there should be some work done at that harbour. The local member, who lives there, is always a very active canvasser, and he assures the people of the importance of sending to Ottawa a supporter of the government in order that money may be spent on that important work. There is nearly always money in the estimates or money on the tapis somewhere or other. If it is necessary to make an expenditure there it should be done. We have had this hanging on year after year. There is no election just now but if there should be one next year it will be a very valuable item to have in the estimates, because it will be made use of—not that I am suggesting that an improper use of it will be made by the department in the way of spending the money—but it will be made use of in the way of influencing the people as to the man they should send down to parliament, because it is desirable to have money spent in this place. Has the government any reasonable expectation of spending the money this year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As far as I am concerned I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that if the money is not spent this year and if there is not a sufficient excuse to satisfy every hon.

member of this House I will not ask the House to revote it. For the want of this pier this harbour has been filling up all the time and boats drawing thirteen or fourteen feet of water cannot get in. It is reported by the chief engineer that if this work is done there will not be the danger of filling up that there has been in the past.

Mr. SPROULE. Why was the money not spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot answer that.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard it said that even if this pier were placed there the harbour will always fill up. I do not know if that is correct or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer is satisfied that this will prevent it.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you propose to do this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to be done by contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What dredges have you in the Georgian Bay between Parry Harbour and Wiarton, or Southampton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Speaking from memory I think there are three or four firms that have dredges there. There is the firm of Porter & Bowman.

Mr. SPROULE. But these are not government dredges ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, they are not government dredges. We have no government dredges up there just now.

Mr. LENNOX. Before that item passes I would like to say that I quite appreciate the fact that the hon. Minister of Public Works is somewhat handicapped by not having been very long in the position he is now in, but all the same I think there must be some means of getting a sufficient amount of information to reasonably satisfy this committee. I do not think it will be any excuse to our constituents to go back and tell them that we have not got the information that we should get merely by reason of the fact that there has been a change of portfolios. I am not casting any reflection upon the hon. minister, but speaking in the interest of my own constituents and speaking upon the lines from which the people of the country will judge us, I do say with every confidence, although I have not had a long parliamentary experience, that we of the opposition are bound to get more information than we have been getting before we proceed with these estimates. What position are we in ? The hon. minister tells us candidly night after night virtually that he does not understand the position of these matters that come up for us to pass upon. We ought to have the information. It is true there has been a change of portfolio, but the staff is the same. There is a chief engineer, and if I understand it all correctly, that chief engineer knows a great deal as to the details of the office and as to what is transpiring from time to time. In reference to the matter that is now before us the chief engineer, or some one in the department, surely can tell why it is that it has been delayed. This is of the same class of items as I was speaking of a few moments ago. The hon. minister comes to us and tells us that there was a vote last year that was supposed to be for the immediate requirements of the country then, that the money has not been expended and if there is nothing done I submit to the good sense of the committee on both sides, that it is not sufficient to tell us that it is not known to the department why the money was not expended. The money must be expended because it must not be appropriated unless it is required in the interests of the country. It must be expended or the hon. minister must be prepared to give us some reasonable ground why it has not been expended or to present some exceptional circumstance that has arisen which could not have been foreseen and which has prevented this expenditure. I speak of this item but I could speak of many of the same class and I submit that we of the opposition, who are supposed to be on the alert, who are supposed to watch the expenditure of the administration—and it requires a good deal of watching—are bound, whatever courtesy we wish to extend, to require fuller information than we have been afforded in reference to this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to be excused because I have not been long in the department from furnishing all proper and necessary information. I wish that to be clearly understood. It may be possible that a question may be unexpectedly asked in regard to any work that even the officers of the department could not answer without referring to the papers and books. No minister would be expected to know every possible detail, but as to the general information in reference to this and other votes I think it is unfair to say that I have not furnished the information with the greatest possible detail and if I have not been supplied with all the details by the department I have been willing either to furnish any further information afterwards or to allow the item to stand, as I did in the case of the previous one when I was not satisfied myself that the fullest information had been given. One who has been only a few weeks in the department cannot be as familiar with all these works as a minister who has had them before him on a great many occasions, but

at the same time, no matter how long a minister may have been in the department, he could not be familiar with every detail without reference to the papers and books. I do not think there have been any questions in reference to this item which have not been fully answered excepting the one as to why the money was not spent last year. The officials of the department have too much to do to go on with all the works they have under their care. In some cases it has been explained that they could not procure the necessary appliances, especially in the case of dredges, to go on with the work. In other cases the reason for delay is that at certain seasons of the year they cannot get people to enter into contracts and they cannot get timber out. I have no desire that any hon. member of the opposition should allow an item to pass without receiving an answer to every reasonable question put to me because it is the duty of the department to furnish all the information. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) has any questions to ask in connection with the item, other than the one he has referred to, I will be pleased to answer it. I think it is fair to say that I have given the fullest possible information why this vote is asked, what is intended to be done with the money and what object is to be gained by building this pier and continuing the dredging at that point.

Mr. SPROULE. There is good cause for complaint because I notice, looking back over the estimates, that this money was voted in 1901-2 and was not spent, and that it was voted in 1902-3 and not spent. Now, we are voting money for 1903-4 and up to the present there has been no expenditure. There seems to be something wrong there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since I took office a complaint has been made by the municipal council of the district, but it would appear that the department was not able to cope with all the work it had on hand. This work is undertaken on the report of the engineer that it is urgently necessary, and I pledge myself that it will be proceeded with as quickly as possible.

Sturgeon Falls—wharf, $4,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This wharf is under contract, the contract price being $2,800 and the contractor is Robert Grant, of Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the Grant that is figuring in the Stratton case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think this Mr. Grant is a contractor and an honest man.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the town provided the site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The right of way was purchased by the municipality and transferred to the Crown free.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the value of the land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know what they paid for it.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this on the river or on the lake ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is on Sturgeon river and quite a business is done there.

Mr. LENNOX. Does this wharf serve a local purpose only; is there any navigation up and down the river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It must be largely for local shipping. The information furnished me is that twelve or thirteen steamboats use this wharf, the largest having a draft of eight feet and Sturgeon river is navigable for vessels of that size a distance of four miles to Lake Nipissing.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the ordinary line of business which Mr. Grant is engaged in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not a personal acquaintance with Mr. Grant, but perhaps the hon. member for Toronto knows him. I understand he is a contractor of considerable experience.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought he was a lawyer.

Mr. LENNOX. All the better if he were.

Mr. CLARKE. There is a gentleman Robert Grant, a contractor in Toronto. There used to be a gentleman of that name having contracts with the city. I do not know much about him.

Mr. SPROULE. When we have painters and newspaper men and lawyers turning up as government contractors it looks rather suspicious. They often farm out the business and have a rake off. I thought perhaps that might be so in this case. Was there more than one tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think there were seven. There is a good deal of competition in these small works. Mr. Grant was the lowest tenderer. I am informed this vote will complete the work.

Thornbury—repairs to harbour works, $1,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you doing any dredging here? I understand that some dredging is required, but if you have to repair the pier out of this vote as well, there will not be much left for dredging.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The department did some dredging there last year.

Mr. SPROULE. I am informed that some dredging is required there yet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I expect there will be and if so I will have to get another vote.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say with regard to this vote and the vote for Meaford that a much larger expenditure is necessary than you have provided for in the estimates. Do you intend to ask a further sum in the supplementary estimates ? I know that you can expend money to good advantage there and the people would not be displeased if there was a much larger expenditure than you apparently contemplated.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The mayor and the municipal council of Meaford have made strong representations to me by petiton and the chief engineer is now up there examining the place. I will be governed by his report as to what further work shall be done there this year.

Toronto harbour—works at eastern entrance, $14,000.

Mr. KEMP. The Postmaster General is probably much interested in this work, and if it is agreeable to the minister I would ask that this vote be deferred until Sir William Mulock is in the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work has no connection with the matters to which the Toronto deputation made reference recently. I had a communication from the council this week pointing out that this work is very pressing.

Mr. KEMP. Will there be another item for Toronto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope so.

Mr. KEMP. Then we could discuss that question on that other item. If that is understood I will not object.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the matter can be discussed on any item for public works. I am furnished with the following information with regard to this particular work. This is for the construction of two groynes to protect the island shore at an estimated cost of some $3,000; rebuilding and stone ballasting breakwater, $3,500; repairs to superstructure of eastern channel piers, $4,000. My hon. friend will notice that these are small works which if neglected would cost a great deal more a few months from now.

Mr. KEMP. Is this work being done by contract or by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All by contract.

Mr. KEMP. I notice by the Auditor General's Report for 1901-2, at page V—273, that one of the foremen on this work is Frank J. Sullivan. Is this the Sullivan who is under suspicion at the present time in connection with the Stratton-Gamey investigation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no information as to that, but I shall be pleased to make inquiries and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. KEMP. The entry is : 'Frank J. Sullivan, foreman, and nine men, one half day, putting government derrick scow in water, $15.' I am informed it is the same man who was in the employ of the government and recently resigned.

Trenton dredging—Trent river, $5,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the minister where this dredging is to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote for the purpose of removing small stones and gravel and providing a channel of sufficient depth. The reason of the delay was that the department could not secure a dredge to go on with the work.

Mr. COCHRANE. How is it that the public works of this country are so delayed for the want of dredges ? There was a time in the history of Ontario not long ago when there were plenty of dredges. Is it because there are some parties the government do not want to employ to do the dredging ? I know that it used to be said that shoemakers got contracts for dredging, and then hired somebody to do the work and made a rake-off. I never knew that there were not dredges enough to do the work, yet we have thousands of dollars voted and not expended because we are told there are not enough dredges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say as a matter of fact there are no dredges procurable, though at some points there may be too many. We have a dredge almost completed which will, I hope, early this season be placed on this section to complete this work.

Wendover wharf, $1,000.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister is asking for $1,000 this year, and last year we voted $3,000. I would ask him if the contract has been let, and how the work is being done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, this was done by day's labour under the superintendence of one of the engineers of the department.

Mr. LENNOX. How much was spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Three thousand and eighty dollars has been spent in the current year.

Mr. LENNOX. I find at page V—273 and 274 of the Auditor General's Report that there was expended on the Wendover wharf

last year $6,502.22. Was this the beginning of the expenditure, or was there an expenditure before that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was the first work done.

Mr. LENNOX. Where is Wendover ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the Ottawa river.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister know anything about the population of the place, or whose riding it is in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This wharf affords landing and shipping facilities to the residents of Wendover and the farmers of the vicinity. The nearest communication by rail is nine miles.

Mr. BARKER. I desire to call attention to this subject because it raises a question that was very much discussed last year. The minister last year obtained an appropriation of $3,000, and expended more than double the money authorized by parliament. We were assured that that would not occur again. The subject was discussed in the Public Accounts Committee, and the Auditor General said that he had brought the attention of the government to it, and that it would not occur again. I think parliament is entitled to more consideration from the departments than that. A department brings in an estimate to cover the cost of a particular work, a vote is taken for it, and then, utterly regardless of the amount authorized by parliament, the department spends more than double the amount authorized, and then comes back in the following year and asks for more money. I do not think that is treating parliament in the way in which it is entitled to be treated.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the hon. gentleman has overlooked the fact that the first vote for this work was taken in 1901-2. The vote for 1902-3 was $3,000. That amount has been spent, and now, to complete the work, $1,000 is required. I do not see anything irregular in the expenditure. I am not aware what estimate was given by the minister at first. There may have been an under estimate, but it is not a very serious one, because according to the report of the engineer this $1,000 will complete the work.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman may not think it is a serious difference when the expenditure is more than 100 per cent above what was authorized, but I do consider it a serious difference. Three thousand dollars was all the minister was authorized to spend at Wendover. He spent $6,500 there, and now he is asking for another $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is mistaken as to this vote. He must be referring to the vote of 1901-2.

Mr. BARKER. I am reading from the hon. gentleman's estimates. He wants a thousand dollars for this year. He states in the other columns that the amount authorized last year was three thousand dollars.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. That is for the expenditure last year. Yet according to the Auditor General's Report, he expended $6,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend has made a slight error. The fiscal year ends the 30th of June next.

Mr. BARKER. I am aware of that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Auditor General's Report refers to the appropriation expended in the year 1901-2. The $3,000 was voted for the year 1902-3. I have not at my hand just now what the amount voted for 1901-2 was.

Mr. BARKER. The Auditor General's Report is for the expenditure of the year ending 30th June, 1902.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was for the appropriation voted for 1901-2. It does not refer to this $3,000 at all.

Mr. COCHRANE. We have for the year 1902-3 the sum of $3,000. If the hon. minister is correct quite a sum will be spent on this work. Where is the village of Wendover and why should such an amount be spent upon a wharf which can only accommodate local traffic. I know of no stretch on the Ottawa so important that we should have that amount spent upon it from year to year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend must see that during the session of 1901-2, parliament must have voted at least $7,000 to begin this work. In the session of 1902-3 parliament voted $3,000 more, making $10,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. Has that been spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and I am asking for $1,000 to complete the work.

Mr. COCHRANE. How was that $3,000 spent—by contract or by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By day labour.

Mr. COCHRANE. How many foremen had you there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Only one. It was done under the superintendence of the resident engineer.

Mr. LENNOX. As I have already pointed out, there was an expenditure for the year 1901-2, as recorded in the Auditor General's Report, of $6,500. The hon. minister ex-

plained that that would not touch the $3,000 appropriation which we voted last year; but looking at the estimates for the year 1901-2, there does not appear to be any appropriation at all for Wendover in those estimates. Will the hon. minister tell us that it is in the supplementary estimates, because otherwise there would not appear to be any appropriation at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There must have been a vote at least of $6,500 or the department could not have spent the money in 1901-2, and the Auditor General would not have sanctioned the expenditure.

Mr. BARKER. Last year we found over and over again that money was expended away beyond the estimate without the authority of parliament at all.

Mr. LENNOX. What the hon. gentleman says is begging the question. He says that as we do not find the item in the general estimates and we do not find an expenditure of $6,500, it must follow that the vote was in the supplementary estimate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. I said that there must have been an appropriation or the department could not have spent the money, and the Auditor General would not have passed upon the expenditure.

Mr. LENNOX. We ought to know whether there was a vote for this expenditure or not, especially in view of the fact, to which my hon. friend from Hamilton has drawn attention, that time and again we have found expenditures which have exceded the appropriation.

Mr. BARKER. I have here the supplementary and the general estimates for 1901-2 and this place does not appear in either.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend will look at the Supply Bill on page 41 he will find a vote of $6,500.

Mr. BARKER. Is that in the estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in the statutes on page 41. I think that I am perfectly right in saying the Auditor General would not account for an expenditure of $6,500 unless the money had been spent and gone through the regular channels.

Mr. BARKER. Perhaps the hon. minister is not aware of what has been done in some of the departments. I can only tell him an actual fact, that last year the Public Accounts Committee investigated a case where $8,000 had been granted to parliament for a particular work and more than double that sum had been expended, and the Auditor General said he would see that it would not occur again. We are justified in seeing that such unauthorized expenditures are not still going on.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that this item is in three different parts—ice-breakers, storehouse and waiting room. How is it divided? What proportion will be spent on ice-breakers ? What is the size of the waiting room, and what will it cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The ice-breakers are for the protection of the wharf. The waiting room is a small part of the warehouse partitioned off for the accommodation of the people waiting for the boats.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to have from the Minister of Public Works an expression of opinion as to the policy of such items as this. Leaving aside, for the moment, the question to which I have directed attention more than once in this committee the undesirability of building local wharfs all over the country. I would like to know if it is the policy of the administration to build not only wharfs but warehouses, and not only warehouses, but waiting rooms for all the hamlets and at the mouths of all the small streams in the country. I understand from the hon. minister that this place is nine miles from a railway station. That may be a reason why the public of that neighbourhood require a wharf and a store house and a waiting room. But there is a great distinction between ascertaining that that is necessary for the accommodation of the people of the locality and coming to the conclusion that it is the duty of the government of the Dominion, at the expense of the whole of Canada, to supply that local accommodation. If this is the policy of this government, I protest against such a system of spending the public money of the Dominion. It may be a perfectly legitimate expenditure of money for some authority, but it is an unjustifiable expenditure, I submit, of the money of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not customary to build warehouses on these wharfs, I believe. Will the minister please explain the necessity for it in this case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe that on most of the wharfs the government puts up a warehouse or some kind of shelter for goods. As to the waiting room, it is merely a part of the warehouse partitioned off.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that the warehouses were usually built by the locality. On the Georgian Bay at Thornbury, for instance, while the dock was built by the government, the warehouse was built by the municipality. I think the same is true of Meaford.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no rule in the matter. In many cases private individuals have their warehouses alongside the docks, but in small

places like this the government builds, in connection with the dock a small, cheap frame warehouse.

Mr. SPROULE. There ought to be some rule that would apply equally to all places. Otherwise, you do too much for one place and not enough for another.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is there a village where this wharf is ? Is there a post office there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a small village. I have not a memorandum of the population. The wharf is quite a little distance from the village.

Mr. INGRAM. When this item was first introduced, what was this work supposed to cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot answer that, as the estimate is not before me. The estimate of what it would cost should have been given three years ago when this vote was first taken.

Mr. INGRAM. I have examined the records, and I find no account of them.

Mr. COCHRANE. I confess I cannot see why the Dominion should furnish not only a wharf, but a warehouse and a waiting room at a point where the population is so small that, if we may trust the Postmaster General's Report, there is not even a post office there. It appears to me that there must be something behind this vote that is not honest. I feel convinced of that. I do not think the Minister of Public Works himself feels easy in his conscience in making this expenditure.

Mr. KEMP. Who is in charge of this storehouse and waiting room ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Department of Marine and Fisheries always appoint a wharfinger to take charge of these public wharfs.

Mr. KEMP. Who owns this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The government.

Mr. KEMP. How can we find out who is appointed to take charge, for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) is not here ?

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Public Works, I must say, is usually pretty candid in telling us what he intends to do in future in regard to these matters. Already during the discussion of these estimates I think he has upon more than one occasion indicated that there will be a substantial improvement in the conduct of the department in the future, that better methods will be adopted. I was in hopes that he would tell us that, whether the larger improvement I have been urging, the total abandonment of this system of local improvements at the expenses of the exchequer, was to be adopted or not, at all events, we might look for such an improvement as would prevent, in the future, expenditures for waiting rooms. If the minister will tell us that, it would be some assurance that matters would be improved. Now, assuming that it was proposed to put up that little building at the expense of the township in which it is situated, to accommodate people within a range of seven, or eight, or nine miles, could it be contended that it was a proper expenditure of the money of the township or of the money of the county ? I think that could not be contended, much less, then, could it be contended that it is proper to expend the money of the Dominion of Canada for the same purpose. I say it should be observed as a principle that we should not have any longer this system of expending public money. The hon. member for Grey spoke of it as an injustice ; I say it is more than an injustice, I say that this money cannot be expended at Wendover for the purpose of building a warehouse and be an honest expenditure of the money of this country. I contend that when the work is so local in its character as not to justify the expenditure of money by the municipality, it is manifest that an expenditure of money by the Dominion for the same purpose is much less justifiable.

Mr. KEMP. This is certainly a surprise to me. I was aware that a great number of new wharfs were being erected in various towns and small villages throughout the country; but I never knew before that either this or any former administration erected storehouses and waiting rooms for the benefit of private individuals. According to the information before us, this storehouse and waiting room have been erected, and we cannot find out now who is in charge of the property. Property of that kind left without some one being in charge, will soon become useless. It seems to me we should have more information in regard to this particular case. I do not think the minister is prepared to say that he has any precedent for this kind of thing. Certainly, I do not know of a single instance where this or any other administration has expended public money in erecting storehouses and waiting rooms of this character.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are dozens and dozens of precedents for this expenditure, ever since confederation. It is usual to erect warehouses for the accommodation of the produce of people at these wharfs.

Mr. KEMP. Who is responsible for the safe keeping of these places, generally ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I explained, when a wharf is built by the Public Works Department it is transferred to the care of the Marine Department, who appoints the wharfinger. But

that cannot affect the expenditure in any way. If my hon. friend wishes to know the name of the wharfinger, he can get it when the Marine estimates are under consideration.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the minister inform us who is the gentleman that asked for this work to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This House authorized an expenditure on this work three years ago, and all the information should have been furnished then. A year ago we had a vote of $3,000, and I am now asking, on the advice of the engineer, for $1,000 for the purpose of building this work. If it were a new work, that I was asking for, of course the responsibility that would devolve upon me of giving the information would be very different from what it is now. Parliament has committed itself to this work, and the money has been spent, with the exception of a small amount.

Mr. CLARKE. Did the engineer recommend this work in the first place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely parliament did not allow the item to pass three years ago without this information.

Mr. INGRAM. Questions were asked when this vote was brought down, but no information was given. That is the trouble we have had right along. When there is any reference to the past record we cannot find any information in it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have said on previous occasions that I disapproved of parliament being asked for a vote without full information of the probable cost. I am no more accountable for this than the hon. gentleman, and perhaps not so much. I agree that the officers of the department should furnish the minister and he should furnish parliament with an estimate of the total cost of any work before it is undertaken. Any over estimate or under estimate would have to be accounted for to the satisfaction of parliament. In this case, if that was omitted, I suppose we are all responsible.

Mr. INGRAM. I draw attention to the fact that we have no record of what the work has cost or any other information about it. The hon. gentleman himself is not in a position to give us the information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman for the first time, probably, has got the information. I have given him now full information as to the cost.

Mr. INGRAM. The estimated cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the actual cost, what has been spent and what it will take to complete. The hon. gentleman has not been paying attention to the discussion.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister forgets that when this item was brought in at first there was nothing to show what the original estimate was. That is what we are asking the hon. gentleman for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was none.

Mr. INGRAM. No original estimate for this work ? That is a bad give-away for the department.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there no report from an engineer or some official recommending it, showing a public necessity for this work? The minister might give us that information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Michaud, one of the engineers, did make a report in 1901, estimating the cost of this work at $7,000.

Mr. CLARKE. That information, apparently, was not given to the committee at first.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Apparently not.

Mr. CLARKE. On what ground was the work recommended ? Was there any clamour for it among the people living down there, any public demand for the construction of this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be pleased to look over the files of the department for the past three years and see what applications were made and if there were any petitions from the people there, or other papers, in connection with this work. With the permission of the committee we might go back to the item of $4,000 for the improvement of the Narrows at Petewawa above Pembroke. I have the information now that the work costs about $7,000. The work has been done and the money was to be paid under the contract on the completion of the work. The reason it was not paid was that there was a dispute between the contractor, Mr. W. J. Poupore and the department as to the completion of the work. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked me why that item was revoted. There is a dispute between the contractor and the department as to whether the work has been completed according to the contract or not. That accounts for revoting the money.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you come to a settlement yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not yet.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. minister if the work of dredging along the River St. Lawrence, at Wolfe

Island, and other places is to be done by day's work or by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That work was done by contract. The dredge which did the work was the property of Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. REID (Grenville). At what rate was it engaged ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At $8 an hour.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does that include tugs and scows ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is that a fair charge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is supposed to be a fair charge. It has been the charge for several years in the department. I do not know whether we will be able to continue that. Applications have been made for increased wages and the cost of everything has been increased. That has been the price for a great many years for a dredge of the minimum capacity of 600 cubic yards.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose there is a fair wage officer to look after all these things ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is for a small sized dredge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report of the department shows that that is a dredge of the capacity of 600 yards a day.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What rate do you pay for a large sized dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From $10 to $12 per hour and as high as $15.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is that the highest price that the department has paid for a dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as the memory of the deputy minister goes he thinks that $15 is the highest.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is that for a large sized dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And that includes scows, tugs and all complete ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That includes all the apparatus.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the contract price for that work at the narrows at Petewawa ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $7,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there any more money expended on it than the contract price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nothing has been paid by the department yet.

Mr. SPROULE. Will that finish the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a dispute between the contractor and the department as to this work. The contractor claims that it cost him a great deal more to do the work.

Mr. SPROULE. How did he do it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By blasting and dredging.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there a signed contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is that work completed now ? I do not think it is.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a question in dispute between the contractor and the department as to whether it is completed or not.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The work is not completed. I was there last year. There is no use saying it is. The work is not completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) had been present he would have known that was what I explained.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to know if it is completed or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not according to the contention of the department.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There are not two ways of interpreting that contract. The work is not completed. The contractor had made a contract with the late government for a certain sum of money. He has been going on very slowly indeed. I was there last year and I say it again the work is not completed. But of course I may say immediately that the work cannot be completed for the sum for which it was agreed to do it. It is out of the question. The work is worth, I believe, about twice as much as the price of the contract. These are the facts of the case. The work is not done. There is only part of it done.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. minister what it costs per day to run one of his dredges. What does it cost to run one of the large sized dredges like 'J. I. Tarte' for instance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is an important matter not connected with this work and when the vote for dredg-

ing is up I would rather bring down the figures and furnish all the information. Roughly, I should say about $200 per day.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In an off-hand statement of that kind I suppose you include tugs, scows, dredges, coal and wages ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think they have any scows with that dredge.

Mr. REID (Grenville). You must have scows to take away what you dredge ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Take one of your large dredges in connection with which you use scows—do you include scows, tugs, coal and everything connected with it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would not be nearly as much for one of the smaller dredges.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But take one of your chief dipper dredges with which you use scows and tugs—roughly, what would it cost per day to handle a dredge of that kind ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not like to speak from memory.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The officer of the department knows roughly.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps from $100 to $125 per day.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That would include everything ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Returning to that Pembroke dredging item the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) gives the committee some light by making the statement that it will cost double the amount of the contract. Will the hon. minister tell the committee if it is the intention of the government to go on and complete the work, if they make a settlement with the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should not be bound by what I say here, because the matter was only brought to my attention a few days ago. The contract was made by the previous government with Mr. Poupore according to the specifications. The officers of the department claim that this work has not been completed under the specifications under which he took that contract. It will cost no doubt a great deal more money to complete this work according to specifications. He has furnished accounts to the department already for some $14,000. If the shoal is so removed as to furnish at low water a sufficient depth for boats to navigate there, I am inclined to think it would be better to make a settlement with Mr. Poupore than to go on spending money on this work. One of the engineers of the department has recently reported to the effect that there is eight feet of water at the shoal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Which engineer made that report ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Fraser.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When did he make the survey ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Within the last two or three weeks.

Mr. SPROULE. We have no information as to what kind of a contract this was. Was it a contract to give a certain depth of water; was it to take out so many cubic yards, or was it to remove the shoal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The late governmet made a contract with Mr. Poupore to do this work.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of a contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I understand it, he undertook to remove this shoal for $7,000. There has been a dispute ever since between Mr. Poupore and the department as to whether the work has been done according to contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What were the specifications ? It might take $100,000 to remove a shoal and it might only take $5,000. Surely the contract must have been let in some intelligent way.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a plan furnished by the engineer, and the contractor undertook to do the work for $7,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) can move for the papers and get all the information. It was so much money for so much work to give us so many feet of water. The truth of the matter is that the contractor sent in a tender which was far too low, and the contract has been dragging along for eight or ten years. That is the whole thing in two words. The price he tendered at was twice too low, and he cannot complete the work for the money. There is about eight feet of water now, and it is considered by certain parties that that is enough, but nevertheless the contract has not been carried out. It would take $15,000 instead of $7,000. The question came before me, and I had nothing else to do than to tell the contractor to carry out his contract, and when the work was completed I would pay him. The work was not completed when I left office and I did not pay him.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, that gives us some additional information, but surely before the department let the contract it had an engineer's estimate, and it would not let a work at less than half the actual cost. There was something wrong about the de-

partment or the engineer, or they would not get into a tangle like that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The contractor claims that when he did tender he did not receive from the department all the information he should have had. He thinks there was a mistake made, but at all events he has acted in good faith.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says that if I want the information I can move for the papers. It is the duty of the minister who is asking us to vote money to provide us with all necessary information which would satisfy us whether it is wise or not to vote the money, and it is not our business to go around the departments looking for information. This item should stand until we get this information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What information does the hon. gentleman want ?

Mr. SPROULE. I want to know what kind of a contract was made with Mr. Poupore. I have not been able to ascertain yet what kind of a contract it was.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thought I had given all that information, but probably it would be better to strike the item out. This is a disputed account between the department and Mr. Poupore. It arose under the late government, and when the matter came before me some time ago I was inclined to think that it would be better to come to some conclusion on it. Mr. Poupore claims he has done the work as he understood it, but the engineer reports differently to the department, and the ex-minister says he went on the engineer's report and he would not pay Mr. Poupore. My suggestion under these circumstances is to strike the item out, and I will bring down all the papers in connection with it, and if that is satisfactory to the House we can put another item in the estimates. If there is sufficient water for the boats that navigate the river there we might probably pay Mr. Poupore what the officials think would be fair for the work he has done. I do not suppose that any member of this House wants a contractor to do work for nothing. I think that will be the better way. I move that this item be struck out, and I will bring down a vote in the supplementary estimates for the settlement of this matter, and will then give full particulars to the Committee.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not see why the item should be struck out, because there is certainly more money now due for work done than the amount in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree with my hon. friend, but I think this is the better way to deal with the matter. It is an old claim, the work has been done, but the engineers think not according to the contract.

Motion agreed to, and item struck out.

Mr. SPROULE.

Manitoba—harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a general vote for extraordinary repairs.

Mr. SPROULE. One of our members who wished to be here when these items on Manitoba went through is away, and if it would not be interfering with the order of work too much, I would suggest that the hon. minister take some other items and leave one for discussion.

Mr. McCREARY. Leave the particular item the hon. gentleman refers to, and pass the balance of the estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is the better one. It is a small vote, and we will pass all the items except one, on which any item can be discussed.

Gull harbour, St. George's bay—extension of wharf, $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote to pay for the extension of this wharf 50 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this work done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, by day labour.

Hnausa—wharf extension, $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete this work.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that being done by day labour as well ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. This is a wharf of considerable size. It was originally built by contract, but these repairs are being done by day labour.

Lake Dauphin—lowering of, $5,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this work done by dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no provision made for a dredge there yet. The intention of the department is either to build or acquire a small dredge to go on with this necessary work.

Mr. SPROULE. How much land do you expect to reclaim by lowering the waters of that lake ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report of the engineer does not give the quantity of land. It is estimated that the total cost of the work will be $9,000. We have not yet been able to procure a dredge, and the engineer is now building a small one for this work.

Mr. McCREARY. The water overflows the land for a distance of six or seven miles from the lake shore. On this account many settlers had to leave there some years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that if this lake were dredged, a large acreage of land which is now practically useless, would be reclaimed and made available for agricultural purposes. I have no doubt the money is needed and it is desirable to do the work, but I think the department ought to provide some way of doing it. We do not want this money to be voted from year to year for a quarter of a century without the work being done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information from the engineer is that he is going to do the work this season.

Lake Manitoba—additional outlet via Fairford river, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to be applied to the removal of boulders from the bed of the river in order to regulate the flow from lake Manitoba.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you do any work last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there has been no work done there, owing to the very high water during the summer of 1902 and the want of a suitable dredging plant. The engineer reports that for $3,000 we could build a dredge.

Lake Francis outlet, Manitoba—construction of piers and dredging, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Orders have been given to go on with this work and make provisions for a permanent outlet for Lake Francis on the eastern shore of Lake Manitoba. We expect to do that work between now and the 30th of June.

Mr. BARKER. Has the hon. minister obtained any statement from the engineer that this money will complete the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have a report from Mr. Miall, the engineer for the department, that $8,500 will do this work.

Mr. BARKER. Complete it fully ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the report of the engineer. Of course in large works covering such an area, the minister must depend on the report of his engineer. That is the only information that in most cases the minister and parliament can have to depend upon.

Mr. BARKER. No doubt the minister must be guided by his engineers and nobody will find fault with a trifling discrepancy between the engineer's estimate and the cost of the work when finally completed. But we find frequently the department entering on a large work without the slightest idea of where it is going to land them. Thousands of dollars are spent beyond the original estimate when, if parliament knew at the beginning what expenditure was involved, parliament would never have authorized the undertaking. The minister should always be able to show that he has his engineer's written report, stating what the whole work will cost from beginning to end. Whether that report be thoroughly reliable or not is another question, but he ought to have it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree with my hon. friend, and my policy is to submit these reports on all occasions before a work is begun.

Selkirk, Manitoba—extension of wharf, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the 300 feet addition to Selkirk wharf. The work was begun in 1902-3, and will cost about $6,000 altogether

Wharf at Lake Winnipeg at Gimli—to complete repairs, $1,250.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete. The total cost is $4,946. It is being done by day's work.

White Mud river—dredging at mouth of, $3,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you a dredge there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and the work is going on this season.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the full cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total expenditure so far is $29,578, and the report of the engineer is that $3,500 are necessary to continue the work this year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where is White Mud river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Macdonald county.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this place navigable ? And how many vessels approach that wharf ?

Mr. McCREARY. There are many vessels plying on Lake Manitoba, and they have great difficulty in finding shelter. By dredging this river, vessels will be able to find a harbour some three miles up from the lake. The Northern Pacific put on a steamer at the foot of the lake, when they completed their road, and both steamer and wharf were entirely washed away.

North-west Territories—harbours, rivers and bridges, including approaches—general repairs and improvements, $5,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Surely the minister is going to ask for the appropriation of more money than this for the territories ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is only for extraordinary cases of repairs and so on. There will be separate votes for other works.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This has nothing to do with the territorial vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is a general vote.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Though it does not relate to the item immediately under discussion, I would like to take advantage of the opportunity to draw attention to a statement that appears in the Montreal 'Star' to-night, to the effect that a great many of the colonists going out to the Rev. Mr. Barr's settlement will suffer great hardship in travelling the road from Saskatoon to their settlement. As a matter of fact, the road referred to is better than most of the streets in Ottawa, better than most of roads in England. These settlers will suffer no hardship so far as the roads are concerned over which they must travel to their colony. I think it very unfortunate that erroneous statements such as this to which I refer should appear in the press. Settlers who came into Ontario in the old days suffered greater hardships in two miles of road than these Barr colonists will have to undergo in their whole journey.

British Columbia—Anderson and Kennedy lakes—clearing outlets, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the removal of boulders and other obstructions at the outlets of these lakes.

Mr. CLARKE. How is this work to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By day labour.

Columbia river, above Revelstoke—removal of obstructions to navigation, $6,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to be applied in continuing the work of removing dangerous points of rocks, reefs and boulders from the bed of the river over a distance of fifty miles between Revelstoke and Death's Rapids.

Mr. CLARKE. How is the work to be done, by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to be done under the supervision of the resident engineer for British Columbia.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is he ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Keefer.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to draw attention to correspondence which was printed in the 'News Advertiser' on the 30th of November, 1902, respecting the treatment meted out to Mr. D. Sinclair, who had been in charge of some work in British Columbia under the Public Works Department.

Mr. GALLIHER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) allow me to say that that was not in connection with the works now under discussion. That will come up under an item later on.

Mr. CLARKE. I asked the minister how the work under discussion was to be done, and he informed me it would be under the supervision of the resident engineer, Mr. Keefer. I was going to read for the information of the hon. minister and the committee a letter alleged to have been written by the resident engineer to a gentleman named Sinclair.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection, but if Mr. Sinclair was doing work in connection with another vote, perhaps it might be more properly discussed under that vote.

Mr. GALLIHER. That was on the Salmon river, which will come up later. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) will take it up when we reach that item.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is the item for work on the Salmon river ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I find that there is no special vote for the Salmon river.

Mr. CLARKE. I shall be delighted to defer to the wishes of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) if he will tell me under what item I shall bring this matter up.

Mr. GALLIHER. Right here, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) wishes it.

Mr. CLARKE. That will be quite satisfactory to me. I bring this forward because I wish to know under what system the public works in British Columbia are being carried on. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the statements in the article I refer to, but it is only right that I should let the hon. minister and the representative of the district have an opportunity of saying whether these statements are correct or not. This is what is represented to have appeared in the 'News Advertiser' on the 30th of November, 1902 :

KAMLOOPS.

Abuse of a Bad System.

Kamloops, Nov. 27.—Mr. D. Sinclair, who has been in charge of the Dominion improvement work at Salmon Arm, has been dismissed because, as correspondence shows—not having received any such instructions from his chief, Dominion Resident Engineer Keefer—he did not discharge some of the good workers he had employed and substitute for them nominees of a man named McGuire, who acts as secretary of the Liberal Association at Salmon Arm. The letter of dismissal ran thus :

New Westminster, B.C.,
October 3, 1902.

Sir,—I regret that, at the request of Mr. W. A. Galliher, M.P., I have to request that you hand over the charge of the work of improvement of Salmon river to Mr. G. McLeod. I do not know what the trouble is, but my instructions from Ottawa are to defer to the wishes of the local member in the appointment of men on the government work in their respective districts, and in the purchase of supplies. As far as I am aware, your work of last year was

well done, so it is not on the score of incompetence that you are superseded.

Yours faithfully,

G. A. KEEFER,
Resident Engineer.

Mr. D. Sinclair, Salmon Arm, B.C.

I would like to ask the minister whether instructions were issued from the department to Mr. Keefer respecting the discharge and employment of men under the department in British Columbia, whether the statement I have quoted is a truthful one and whether instructions were issued to discharge this gentleman who, as Mr. Keefer himself alleges, had done his work faithfully and in a competent manner and to employ only men nominated by the member for the district? Is it the policy of the government and is it the intention of the minister that work in British Columbia or any other province shall be done in this way? I think we should have a statement from the hon. minister on this subject.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This matter has never been brought to my attention. The deputy minister tells me that he knows nothing about it.

Mr. CLARKE. We might have the correspondence brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it would be better. I have not seen the article that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has quoted, nor do I know anything about it.

Mr. CLARKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) who represents the district might explain the matter.

Mr. GALLIHER. As the representative of that district, I know the facts. Also, I am responsible, if any one is responsible, for having Mr. Sinclair discontinued as foreman of that work. The circumstances are these: There was an appropriation in 1901 of $2,500 for clearing out this river. I recommended Mr. Sinclair as foreman for 1901, and he acted as foreman in clearing out that river in 1901. In 1902 there was a further appropriation of $2,500 for clearing that river, and a foreman was appointed for that year. The resident engineer, Mr. Keefer, asked Sinclair to go to work without consulting me—I don't blame him, because I suppose, as there was no kick about Mr. Sinclair's work for the preceding year, he probably thought it would be all right to continue him for the second year. But Mr. Sinclair had no appointment from the government or anybody else for the second year. That letter was written by Mr. Keefer to him. Now, along that river there are a number of settlers, men who are trying to hew out for themselves a home in that valley along the river. It was my desire that the benefit of any moneys expended on that river should be given to these settlers rather than to men whose occupation was loafing around town. I was informed that Mr. Sinclair was taking charge of that work for the second year, that is for 1902, and that he was not carrying out my wishes in that respect. I telegraphed to Mr. Sinclair asking him to follow my instructions, as it was my desire that the settlers who were there as bona fide settlers should receive the benefit of that money, and I drew no distinction between friends and enemies in that respect. Mr. Sinclair treated my telegram very cavalierly, saying he was not taking instructions from Mr. Galliher. The result was that in two days he was not taking instructions from anybody, somebody else was attending to that work.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. I ask any hon. gentleman on that side to say if he would have acted differently.

Mr. BARKER. I would think it was an impertinence to act in that way.

Mr. GALLIHER. Well, your ideas and mine differ. Those are the circumstances of the case, the circumstances under which that man was dismissed, because he was not rightly there for the year 1902. He had taken over that work, he was assuming to act there as foreman without having received an appointment from the department. His appointment was not a continuing appointment while that river required clearing, his appointment was only for the year 1901.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman when the work commenced in 1902?

Mr. GALLIHER. Some time in the fall.

Mr. CLARKE. The letter is dated 2nd of October, I think.

Mr. GALLIHER. Some time in the fall. I know I went up on the work myself in November, while it was continuing.

Mr. BARKER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell us whom he employed instead of this man, and what he paid him.

Mr. GALLIHER. Instead of this man I recommended that a Mr. McLeod be apointed, and his pay was exactly that of Mr. Sinclair's.

Mr. CLARKE. I would draw the attention of the committee to the fact that we were told by the minister that the work in British Columbia was done under the directions or instructions of the resident engineer, Mr. Keefer. Now I have presented to the House his letter to Mr. Sinclair. Of course, I am bound to accept the statement of the hon. member from Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) but there seems to be discrepancy between the statement of the minister and that made by the hon. gentleman. I was aware of the fact that Mr. Keefer has no authority, unless instructions are received from the department or from the representative of the district, to employ the

men. He makes the statement that Mr. Sinclair's work was satisfactorily done in 1901.

Mr. GALLIHER. No dispute about that.

Mr. CLARKE. And that he was dismissed because instructions had been received from the local member to dismiss him. Is that practice going to prevail in the future in British Columbia or elsewhere ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has always been the practice, when the chief engineer is asking for the appointment of a foreman, to take the recommendation of the member for the riding. I do not think there is anything wrong in that.

Mr. INGRAM. Did he take his instructions direct from the hon. member ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly not. The hon. member explained that he did not recommend this man, and did not consider that the chief engineer had any right to appoint him.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But the hon. member ordered his dismissal, and he was dismissed within two days.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the hon. member will pardon me—I made a distinction when I said that for 1902 he was not appointed foreman by the department. Therefore he was not dismissed as a matter of fact.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member made the statement that Mr. Sinclair was on duty, and he recommended Mr. Sinclair as the man in charge.

Mr. GALLIHER. I did not.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He wrote to Mr. Sinclair giving him instructions what he was to do as concerns the engaging of the men, and Mr. Sinclair replied that he was not taking orders from him, and that within two days he was not taking orders from anybody. Therefore, I would understand that he issued instructions that this man must be dismissed, and that the department acted accordingly.

Mr. GALLIHER. When I received word that Mr. Sinclair was not carrying out my wishes in the matter with regard to the employment of settlers on this work, I then took objection to his being foreman for the year 1902. Mr. Sinclair was not appointed foreman by the department for the year 1902 ; and although, as I say, the resident engineer, presuming perhaps that he was right in doing so, presuming that because his work had been satisfactory in the year before, it would be all right to continue him for 1902, asked him to go to work. Yet I did not consider that as an appointment, it was not an appointment by the department.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. member overlooks the statement made by the minister a few minutes ago. When asked how this work was done in British Columbia, he said it was done under the instructions of the resident engineer, who had control of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Under his supervision.

Mr. GALLIHER. A very different thing. The work is done under the supervision of the engineer, that is, the engineer has the right to say how, where and when that work should be done. That is what I understand by the supervision of the engineer. I do not think it is the engineer's duty to appoint the foreman, or to hire the men, either.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I consider this man was an officer of the department and was appointed by the department, since they paid him. Now this man was foreman during 1901, at least, he was paid regularly and monthly by the department. Then he must have been appointed by the department.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is true for 1901.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then he must have been recognized by the hon. member as the officer in charge.

Mr. GALLIHER. For that year and no other.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The point I am getting at is this : I would like to know from the hon. member the day he was dismissed. The hon. member says the department dismissed him on his telegram, he was dismissed within forty-eight hours.

Mr. GALLIHER. I did not say forty-eight hours.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member said within two days.

Mr. GALLIHER. I should have said a few days.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think the minister should tell us how this man was dismissed, because this is a very important matter as regards appointments elsewhere. Here is a man doing his duty, the hon. member admits that he did his work satisfactorily and honestly during 1901 ; and simply because he was not carrying out his instructions, but was carrying out the instructions of the department, he is dismissed promptly by a telegram or a letter from the hon. member. Now the minister should tell us what word he received from the hon. member and why he dismissed this man.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was not minister when this happened and I have no information from the department regarding it, but if I had been minister and an hon. member from any riding had made the same complaint——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You mean a Liberal member ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, a Liberal member, if my hon. friend

(Mr. Hughes, Victoria) prefers it—that a foreman was acting in the same way as this man was doing in employing unworthy and improper men instead of good men I certainly think he would have been asked to give an explanation. In reference to these matters, as far as I am concerned, we always ask for a report from the engineer as to the facts. But on such a request as this I think any hon. gentleman in this Committee will admit that it is worthy of investigation and if the statements are found to be correct, this man ought to be dismissed.

Mr. CLARKE. Probably it is not reasonable to expect from the present hon. Minister of Public Works an explanation respecting these matters. I think the letter which I read to-night was dated before the hon. minister assumed control of the department of Public Works, but we are fortunate in having in the House his predecessor in office and if that hon. gentleman would not be revealing any departmental secrets we would like to know from him if he issued any instructions respecting the dismissal of men in British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. So many things have passed through my brain since that time that I cannot really remember the details of that story. All I remember is that I heard that name 'Sinclair' before. There was something that was not agreeable to my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher). The facts I believe are these: Sinclair was appointed in 1901 on the recommendation of my hon. friend. Assuming that he was still persona grata, the resident engineer, Mr. Keefer employed him to continue the work he had been employed upon. Some friction took place. I speak from memory. I asked Mr. Keefer what was the matter and the next thing I heard was that Mr. Keefer had dispensed with the services of Mr. Sinclair, no doubt at the request of my hon. friend here, as he said. The appointment of foremen gives the minister a lot of trouble and I am very glad to have got rid of that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think it is due to the Committee that the hon. member (Mr. Galliher), who claims to have been instrumental in dismissing this officer, should give us the reasons why he was not satisfied with his conduct. Who were the men that Sinclair was employing and who were the men the hon. member wished to have him employ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If I remember aright, I left the whole matter in the hands of the resident engineer which is the only safe way to do. British Columbia is very far away and unless the minister gives the resident engineer as much of his confidence as is possible, trouble will certainly come. If I had any friendly advice to offer the hon. Minister of Public Works I would urge him to strengthen the hands of the resident engineers as much as he is able to do. Otherwise, improper parties will be forced upon him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, politics are politics, as my hon. friends know. Members of parliament are exposed to a great deal of pressure and to save them from that pressure the best thing to do is to instruct the resident engineers to employ only safe and honourable men. I have always endeavoured to do so and Mr. Keefer has carried out my orders with great care in the past.

Mr. KEMP. He is a very competent officer.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He is a good officer. He was recommended to me by hon. members on both sides of the House.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to ask the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and also the present hon. Minister of Public Works what the custom is in relation to the treatment of these engineers. For instance, if the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) wished to dispense with the services of Mr. Sinclair was it not his bounden duty to communicate with the Minister of Public Works and then let the minister issue his instructions to the resident engineer. I understand from a statement made by the hon. member himself that he simply took the bull by the horns and compelled Mr. Keefer to dismiss this man.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, not by any means.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works is responsible for this dismissal it is not much wonder that the right hon. Prime Minister asked for his resignation.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would not like to discuss that question again now; We will see later on. As to the Sinclair business it did not take place as my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) believes it did. There was a complaint made to me——

Mr. CLARKE. When was that complaint made—recently?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, there was a complaint made before he was dismissed. There was a complaint that something was going wrong, that Sinclair did not act agreeably to my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) in the appointment of men. I simply referred the matter to Mr. Keefer giving him to a very large extent carte blanche, and the next thing I heard was that Mr. Keefer had dispensed with the services of Sinclair and appointed another man in his place.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Keefer seems to have placed the responsibility of the dismissal upon the shoulders of the ex-Minister of

Public Works. He had no option apparently if the letter I read is correct. I have no doubt it is as Mr. Keefer has just received such a high certificate of character from the former head of the department. Mr. Keefer, in his letter, states that he received instructions from Ottawa that he was to take his instructions from the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo. Did the hon. ex-minister give those instructions to Mr. Keefer ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. As I remember the facts, speaking of Sinclair alone, I simply referred the complaint of my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) to Mr. Keefer and the next thing I heard was that the services of Sinclair had been dispensed with. I would be very glad indeed to have the whole of the correspondence brought down but I think it will confirm the facts as I state them now. In other words there was an agreement between my hon. friend and Mr. Keefer as to dispensing with the services of Sinclair. I do not believe that I gave an order to dismiss Sinclair. I simply referred the whole thing to Mr. Keefer.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have asked for an explanation from the hon. member for the riding as to what persons Sinclair was employing that were objectionable, why they were objectionable and what ones were sought to be employed and why they were sought to be employed.

Mr. GALLIHER. I have already stated that on that river that is being cleared there were a number of new settlers who had gone in who had taken up homesteads and who were hewing out homes for themselves along that river. I thought, as I believe any fair-minded man in this House would think, that where money was expended the benefit of that money should go to those settlers along the river rather than to men in towns who have no landed interest there and who have no homesteads there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What town ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The town of Salmon Arm.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the population of that place ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I could not tell the hon. gentleman. He has travelled through there, I have no doubt. It is a very small town in the west around which you cannot find a few hangers on.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A town of four houses ?

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friends need not be so much exercised over this because Sinclair is no friend of theirs. I thought they might be under the impression that some friend of theirs was being very hardly dealt with.

Mr. CLARKE.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, it is injustice to a poor Liberal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. member (Mr. Galliher) recommended him ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I recommended him myself in 1901. The whole crux of the case is right here; that man was not a foreman for 1902.

Mr. CLARKE. The ex-minister suggests that in order to refresh his memory the whole correspondence should be brought down.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not mean that, but if the hon. gentleman wants the correspondence I suppose there is no objection to it, but the item should be carried all the same.

Some resolutions reported.

CORRESPONDENCE ON THE GERMAN TARIFF.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. By command of His Excellency I lay on the Table correspondence in relation to the German tariff.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to make a remark as to certain correspondence that was read to-day by the Finance Minister, and some of which was three or four years old. It seems extraordinary that this correspondence was not brought down to the House before to-day. I think it was asked for several times, and yet the first we heard of it was when the Minister of Finance read it to-day. I do not think that is treating this House with the courtesy to which it is entitled.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no recollection of the correspondence having been asked for. If any motion were made and passed for an Order of the House for that correspondence, it certainly would have been brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. A motion was not made, but a request was made across the floor of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It does not always follow as a rule that it is wise to bring down correspondence on matters of that sort. However, I have no recollection of any motion having been passed or of any request even having been made. I expected to be able to lay this correspondence on the Table at 6 o'clock, but I may say that I have sent a copy of it to the leader of the opposition.

Mr. KEMP. In 1901 I asked for this correspondence, and last year the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) moved for it in the House and there was quite a debate upon it, but it was refused by the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is another matter. If a motion was made and refused, of course it was refused for good reasons. It is not always wise to bring down correspondence, especially in matters of an international character; but I think considering all the circumstances, that it is open to debate whether any good purpose would have been served by bringing down the correspondence. The time was spent in an effort to come to an understanding with the German government, but I am not sure that it would have been promoted by bringing down the papers and broadening the scope of the discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. But this correspondence is four years old.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is plenty of correspondence over four years old that has never been brought down.

Mr. MORIN. And never will.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And never will, as my hon. friend says, for a good and sufficient reason, that the public interest would not be advanced by bringing it down.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that reason could be advanced in this case. The correspondence was read to-day, and there is no justifiable reason why it should not have been placed before the House. It all stopped years ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is mistaken in saying that it stopped years ago. He will see from the papers which I have laid on the Table that it extended down to a very recent date. It began years ago, but did not stop years ago.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 17, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. J. A. C. MADORE (Hochelaga). (Translation). I present the third report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House during the present session, which is as follows :—

Your committee recommend that the sum of $250, being the equivalent of a gratuity of two months' salary, usually allowed to widows of officials under the Civil Service Act, shall be paid to the widow of the late N. H. Beaulieu, who, during his life-time, was a member of the staff of translators of the Official Report of the Debates.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 111) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver—by Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 112) to incorporate the Canada Industrials Corporation (Limited).—Mr. McCarthy—by Mr. Thompson (Haldimand).

Bill (No. 113) to incorporate the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. McCool—by Mr. Erb.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fielding :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I must in the first place congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) on the very excellent speech from his standpoint which he delivered yesterday. That the hon. gentleman always makes the best of the situation we will all acknowledge, and while yesterday he had even a larger number than usual of very sharp corners to turn, he on the whole accomplished it as well as could be expected. And, whenever he did upset he gathered himself up quickly again and he went on in as smiling a way as ever. Now, while the speech was received by the House in a very appreciative and attentive manner, I was astonished to see what a singularly soporific effect so good a speech had on some of his colleagues. I noticed that there was not the attention given to it by some of the members of the cabinet which we might have reasonably expected. In fact, I do not think that I have ever before witnessed in this House a budget speech of interest delivered while four of the Finance Minister's colleagues were sound asleep; and one of them enjoyed it so much that he woke up at six o'clock to protest against the debate being adjourned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Finance Minister congratulates the country upon its prosperity. We, on this side of the House, shall not be behind hand in

congratulating the country upon the prosperous conditions at present existing, and in that respect we offer a somewhat different spectacle to that which was presented in days past, by the Liberals when in opposition, some of whom were good enough to offer not only to this country but to the mother country a style of literature which was found very useful indeed by American immigration agents.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Finance did not quite so strenuously as on some past occasions argue that our prosperity is due to the government, he treats of that phase in very moderate terms indeed. In fact, the terms of his speech in that regard are in very strong contrast to a recent deliverance of the Minister of Marine (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) in Montreal in which he remarked that the prosperity of Canada was entirely due to the Fielding tariff. Coming from a gentleman of the position of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that was hardly a worthy statement —it partakes more of the character of a patent medicine advertisement than of the utterance which we might hope to hear from a gentleman occupying the high position of head of one of the departments of state in Canada. It is perfectly evident that in the view of the Minister of Marine, the right hon. Mr. Chamberlain has taken an entirely erroneous view of the condition of affairs in Canada. At the recent colonial conference Mr. Chamberlain referring to the prosperity of Canada and the increase of Canada's trade from 1896 to 1902 spoke in this way :

> The total imports of Canada increased in that period 14,500,000 pounds sterling, or at the rate of 62 per cent. That shows the enormous increased prosperity in the Dominion ; it shows how the energy of its inhabitants is developing its trade.

And when you come to think of it, I suppose some credit is due to the business capacity and energy of the people of this country. For my part I have never been able to find out the exact nature of the changes in the tariff of 1897 to which the prosperity of Canada during the past few years has been due. I have inquired as to that across the floor of the House on a great many occasions and I have never got a definite or satisfactory reply. I believe that the people of Canada are entitled to some of the credit for the increased trade and the increased prosperity of this country during the past six years, although it is quite true that speakers on the other side of the House, both in this Chamber and throughout the country affect to believe in an entirely different reason for our prosperity. If the government does not adopt my view on this question; if their friends do not adopt that view; if they do not agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who said that the prosperity of Canada was due to causes beyond the control of any government; if they do not believe in that, then Sir, they are altogether too modest, because while they have increased the trade of Canada by $184,000,000 since 1896, look what the Fielding tariff has done for the world. The following table shows how the trade of other countries has increased during the same period.

	Increase.
1896 to 1902, Great Britain	$800,000,000
1896 to 1902, United States	700,000,000
1896 to 1900, New South Wales	60,000,000
1896 to 1900, Victoria	35,000,000
1896 to 1900, New Zealand	35,000,000
1896 to 1900, Australian Commonwealth	145,000,000
1896 to 1900, West Australia	20,000,000
1896 to 1900, Argentine	40,000,000
1896 to 1900, Chili	134,680,000
1896 to 1900, France	680,000,000
1896 to 1901, Germany	552,000,000
1896 to 1901, Mexico	40,000,000
1896 to 1902, Canada	184,885,084

I do not suppose, speaking in sober reality, that any of these gentlemen across the floor claim that the increases in these different countries are due to the tariff brought down in 1897 by the Hon. Mr. Fielding. But may it not be truly claimed with regard to these different countries, that the advent of the Canadian Liberals to power in 1896 is as much responsible for the improved condition of trade in the whole civilized world as for the prosperous condition which fortunately has prevailed in Canada from 1896 to 1902.

Let me make one more observation to my hon. friend the Finance Minister. He seems to take it for granted that as the imports to this country have increased to an enormous extent since 1896, we are to find in that a necessary indication of prosperity. Sir, I take issue with my hon. friend on that point. I say that increased imports may accompany but do not necessarily indicate increased prosperity. Look at the condition of affairs in Canada to-day. We produce from $750,000,000 to $800,000,000 of manufactured goods, counting everything as a manufacture in the production of which motive power is employed. The long delayed census returns have not yet furnished us with a statement of the annual value of our agricultural products. If our home production should be decreased by $50,000,000 in any year, that might result in increasing our importations by twenty-five, thirty or forty million dollars. To this extent the manufactures and products which are now furnished by the Canadian people would be brought in from foreign countries. Would not my hon. friend the Minister of Finance stand up in the House and point to the increased revenue resulting from that condition of things and say : Look, the trade of Canada has increased, not $184,000,000, but

$225,000,000, and our surplus is not $13,000,000, but $25,000,000. And yet, is there any hon. gentleman in this House who would say that such a statement would indicate a healthy condition of affairs in this country ?

My hon. friend has gone very fully into what I may call the business returns of this country, and I will endeavour, in my figures I give to the House, not to duplicate those which he has furnished. I have some documents to present in a tabulated form, and, with the permission of the House, I will follow the example of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and hand them to the reporters without reading them in full.

In the good old days, when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) led the attack on the fiscal policy of the government of the day, there were great laments over the burden of taxation imposed upon the people of this country. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was very warm indeed on that point ; he was more than warm, Mr. Speaker, he was almost tearful when he spoke of the sorrows of the farmers and the burden of taxation laid upon them by an extravagant and corrupt government. I will present to the House a comparison of the taxation during the past six years with that of the previous six years under Conservative administration ; because I think it is right, when statements of large trade and abundant revenues are laid before the House, that we in the opposition should show the reverse side of the shield.

TOTAL RECEIPTS FROM TAXES.

1891	$30,314,151	1897	$28,648,626
1892	28,446,157	1898	29,576,456
1893	29,321,367	1899	34,958,069
1894	27,579,203	1900	38,242,223
1895	25,446,199	1901	38,743,550
1896	27,759,285	1902	43,389,112
	$168,866,362		$213,558,036

In 1891 taxation under Conservative government was	$30,314,151
In 1896 taxation under Conservative government was	27,759,285
Decrease under Conservative government	2,554,866
In 1902 taxation under Liberal government was	$43,389,112
In 1896 taxation under Conservative government was	27,759,285
Increased taxation under Liberal government	$15,629,827
Total taxes collected from 1897 to 1902 inclusive under Liberal government	$213,558,036
Total taxes collected from 1891 to 1896 inclusive under Conservative government	168,866,362
Increased taxation in six years of Liberal government	$44,691,674
Average annual taxation during six years of present Liberal government	$35,593,006
Average annual taxation during last six years of Conservative government	28,144,394
Average annual increase under Liberal government	$7,448,612

I might point out to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as a culmination of this statement, that according to the estimate of the hon. Minister of Finance we shall have imposed on the people of Canada during the present year no less than $47,520,160 of taxation. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he contemplates these figures, should really, for very decency's sake, pump up a few of the briny tears which he shed in the old days.

A few years ago the hon. gentleman contributed a very strong article to the 'North American Review' on the subject of protection and free trade, in which he said :

> In 1878, the actual taxation of Canada was $17,841,938, though, as there was a deficit in that year, the necessary taxation might be placed at $19,000,000. In 1889 the actual taxation was $30,613,522, being an increase of $11,613,522.

Let us pursue the comparison. In 1896 the actual taxation was $27,759,285, in 1902 it was $43,389,112 ; being an increase of $15,629,827, or considerably more than fifty per cent of an increase. What was the comment of the hon. gentleman when he wrote this article on the melancholy condition of affairs in 1889 :

> Comment is hardly necessary, nor, indeed, does space permit me to point out the enormous mischiefs which result in a young and poor country from absorbing so large a proportion of the earnings of the people, in defraying the charges of the federal government, as is now being taken in Canada.

Well, if no comment was needed then, is it not needed now, upon an increase in taxation of between $15,000,000 and $16,000,000 in six years ? I trust that when the hon. gentleman comes to address the House on this occasion he will give his views on the question of taxation, and explain wherein they differ from the views he held at the time he wrote this article. I referred to this same article last year or the year before, but my right hon. friend was not good enough to make any allusion to it, in the speech he then addressed to the House. I thought I might possibly have been mistaken in the identity of the gentleman who wrote the article. Although it purported to have been written by one Sir Richard John Cartwright, it might possibly have been some other gentleman than my right hon. friend who occupies the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce.

There is another consideration which I would like to present to the House. If, as members of the government claim, the pre-

sent tariff is a revenue tariff, why is the taxation continued at so abnormal a figure? Why does the government take from the people, for example, $1,000,000 more in excise duties on tobacco and $500,000 more in customs duties on sugar than would have been taken under the tariff before 1896? And why does the Minister of Finance retain the duty on breadstuffs which he regarded as so unjust and oppressive that while premier of Nova Scotia he moved the following resolution with regard to it:

> That while it is as a rule inexpedient to deal with Dominion questions in this House, in view of the obnoxious character of the duty on breadstuffs, the House must firmly protest against the imposition of such duties.

And the same view was entertained by the Minister of Trade and Commerce who, referring to Sir Leonard Tilley's surplus in 1882, said:

> I asked how it was got. $1,100,000 was derived from two of the most odious and oppressive taxes which were ever imposed in any civilized country before, under similar circumstances at least, the taxes on breadstuffs and fuel. If he really wants to relieve the people, let him remove the taxes on breadstuffs and coal.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce sits unmoved in his chair while a surplus of $13,000,000 is announced in this House, and forgets the commiseration he expressed some years ago for the condition of the people of this country labouring under two of the most odious and oppressive taxes which were ever imposed in any civilized country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the revenues have indeed been abundant during the past six years. There has been an increase of more than $60,000,000 over those of the previous six years, but let my hon. friend the Minister of Finance bear in mind that if the duties on tobacco, sugar, coal and breadstuffs had been removed, the condition of affairs would be very different. If my hon. friend had the courage to carry out his financial convictions, his boasted surplus would not exist by a good many millions. In making this point I do not wish to be understood as advocating the removal of the duties on these articles, but as merely contrasting the present position taken by the Minister of Finance with the former professions of himself and colleagues and asking them at present what they have to say about those promises and professions made in days gone by. I think I am warranted in putting that question by the language used by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I have here a statement of his views with regard to the pledges and promises of public men, which I think will commend itself to the judgment of the House:

> If a public man can hold one set of principles out of office and another set in office, responsible government is a farce.
>
> You have the right to hold the politician to his pledge, just as much as you would the man of business. The man who obtains goods from you under false pretenses is a cheat and swindler. What should you call the men who obtain votes by means of pledges which they never intended to keep? I say again, if you are prepared to overlook these things then you have no right to ask for fidelity from any man who hereafter represents you.

I credit these words to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I am told that he uttered them in days gone by. But whether he uttered them or not, I do not think he will challenge their soundness, and I ask him to apply those words to the record of himself and his political friends during the past six years as contrasted with the promises and professions which they held out to the people during the eighteen years they were in opposition.

The total expenditure of the country is a matter about which, standing on this side of the House, I think I should have a word to say. The total expenditure during the six years, beginning with 1891 and ending with 1896, reached the sum of $251,682,027. During the six years beginning with 1897 and ending with 1902, it amounted to $314,520,785, or an increase during that period of no less than $62,838,758 over the previous six years.

The figures are as follows:

TOTAL EXPENDITURE.

1891	$ 40,973,208	1897	$ 42,972,756
1892	42,272,136	1898	45,334,281
1893	40,853,728	1899	51,542,635
1894	43,009,234	1900	52,717,467
1895	42,872,338	1901	57,982,866
1896	41,702,383	1902	63,970,780
	$251,682,027		$314,520,785

The expenditure during the past year amounted to $63,970,780. During the last year of the late administration, 1896, it was $41,702,363, showing an increase in 1902 over 1896—the last year of the present administration over the last year of Conservative administration—of $22,268,397.

The average annual expenditure of the present Liberal government during the past six years, amounted to $52,420,131. Compare this with the average annual expenditure of the previous Conservative government, which amounted to $41,947,005, and you have an average annual increase under Liberal administration of no less than $10,493,126.

When I presented similar figures to this House last year the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was shocked and astonished that any one should so endeavour to mislead the House as to contrast the total expenditures during these two periods. Let me give my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce an authority which I am sure he will not call in question, an authority which I am sure he respects more highly than any I could cite. Let me cite to him his own authority, as contained in

an article published by him in the 'North American Review' some years ago. In that article he made the following contrast :

In 1845 the population of the United States was (by estimate).. 20,000,000
The taxes of the United States were..$27,531,630
The total expenditure was.. 22,935,828

Then by way of comparison, to show how Canada was going to ruin, as compared to the United States, he went on as follows :

In 1889 the population of Canada was perhaps.. 4,800,000
The taxes of Canada were.. .. .. ..$30,613,522
The total expenditure was 36,917,854

And he made a pitiful comparison between the position of Canada and that of the United States, based on that standpoint. Is it not fair, taking the right hon. gentleman on his own statement, to make a similar comparison to-day. Let us see how such a comparison will work out :

In 1845 the population of the United States was (by estimate).. 20,000,000
The taxes of the United States were..$27,531,630
The total expenditure was.. 22,935,828
In 1902 the population of Canada was (so far as we can ascertain from the census).. 5,410,000
The taxes of Canada were.. .. .. ..$43,389,112
The total expenditure was.. 63,970,780

I could not get my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to pay the slightest attention to that celebrated article when he addressed the House two years ago. Might I not ask from the hon. gentleman the favour of passing reference to that published statement of his. Might I not ask him to make a comparison between the figures of our present exependiture and that which he denounced in those days, and especially draw attention to the fact that he attributed all the wretchedness and misery and maladministration in Canada to what do you think. To the fact that in Canada at that day protection existed. Of course we know that, according to the right hon. gentleman's view, no protection exists in the present tariff, and I think we are entitled to some other argument from the right hon. gentleman to show that that which was food for comment and criticism so severe in days gone by, is now a matter of indifference to the hon. gentleman, even though it is exaggerated a hundred fold.

Let me now, Mr. Speaker, deal with the expenditure on a per capita basis. I am not objecting to fair and even liberal expenditure. We have a young and growing country, which needs to be developed, but I must say that a good deal of public money in this country is not used for very wise purposes and not expended in a very statesmanlike way. In making the comparisons which I do to-day, I wish to be understood as not carping at fair and reasonable expenditure, because I am always willing and ready to support the government in its expenditures, so long as they are made on some systematic plan and for some wise purpose, in the true interests of our country. But it is only right that I should bring to the attention of the country, in these times of growing trade, increasing revenues and prosperity, the fact that our expenditure is also increasing by leaps and bounds ; and we may well bear in mind the words which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, uttered only two or three sessions ago, that we cannot always expect to have these prosperous times, but must look for lean years in the future, years when the public revenue will not be by any means abundant. Now, the per capita expenditure, computed from the year 1896 to the present time, shows as follows. And I may say in passing, that the estimate of population for the several years has been based upon a comparison of the census of 1891 with the census of 1901, by methods which, I think, give fair and accurate results :

PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE.

Year.	Population.	Expenditure.	Per Capita.
1896..	5,070,000	$41,702,383	$ 8 22
1897..	5,120,000	42,972,756	8 39
1898..	5,175,000	45,334,281	8 76
1899..	5,230,000	51,542,635	9 85
1900..	5,285,000	52,717,467	9 98
1901..	5,340,000	57,982,866	10 88
1902..	5,410,000	63,970,780	11 82

The result of this is that, under the Liberal administration, our expenditure has increased about 53 per cent, our per capita expenditure, about 44 per cent and our population about 6½ per cent. What a text this would have been for my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). How he could deal with this subject now if he were inspired with the same sentiments he expressed so vigorously from 1878 to 1896. I have to express again the regret to which I have given voice before, that we could not have the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce come across the floor—just temporarily, of course, just for a couple of hours—and deal with the circumstances which face us to-day as he used to do in other times.

It will not be out of place for me to do as I have done before and to give to the House and the country an analysis of the increase of the expenditure of the various departments of the government from 1896 up to the present time. In every instance we find a substantial increase, and, in some cases at least, we find an increase, which I think, should give to some of us, and especially to economists like the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, food for very much thought :

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE ON ACCOUNT OF CONSOLIDATED FUND FOR 1896 AND 1902 RESPECTIVELY, WITH INCREASES.

——	1896.	1902.	Increase.
Interest on debt	$10,502 430	$10,975,935	$ 473,505
Administration of Justice	758,270	943,230	184,960
Civil Government	1,396,628	1,497,369	100,741
Fisheries	427,251	548,895	121,644
Geological Survey	134,368	224,015	89,647
Immigration	120,199	494,842	374,643
Quarantine	95,247	264,738	169,491
Indians	880,408	1,057,131	176,723
Insurance superintendence	10,039	13,500	3,461
Lighthouse and coast service	466,058	696,311	230,253
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions	534,917	624,956	90,039
Militia and Defence	1,136,714	2,060,979	924,265
Miscellaneous	172,364	1,146,121	973,757
Mounted Police	533,014	948,216	415,202
N.W.T. government	330,703	491,924	161,221
Ocean and river service	181,452	496,191	314,739
Penitentiaries	385,228	438,073	52,845
Police	22,703	60,241	37,538
Public Works	1,299,796	4,221,294	2,921,498
Railways and Canals	126,444	272,296	145,852
Superannuation	311,232	338,764	27,532
CHARGEABLE TO COLLECTION.			
Customs	896,332	1,176,024	279,692
Dominion lands	119,908	158,844	38,936
Inspection of staples	2,577	13,510	10,933
Post Office	3,665,011	4,023,637	358,626
Public Works	159,460	498,513	339,053
Railways and Canals	3,826,226	6,508,477	2,682.251
Weights and measures, gas, &c	97,295	109,672	12,377
CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.			
Dominion lands	82,184	370,838	288,654
Intercolonial railway	260,396	4,626,841	4,366,445
Public Works	114,826	2,096,334	1,981,508
Public buildings, Ottawa	Nil.	93,790	93,790
Prince Edward Island railway	Nil.	475,998	475,998

I do not pretend for a moment that these increases are all unjustifiable. On the contrary, I regard some of them at least as entirely justifiable; indeed I should be glad to see the increase larger in some cases. I should be glad to see a larger increase for the lighthouse and coast service, for I think that if there is a department of the public service which has been neglected more than another during the past six years it is this one. I should be glad also to see a greater increase in the expenditure for the government of the North-west Territories. Judging by the accounts I heard of the inadequacy of the public revenues for the purposes of the country during my recent trip to the west, I think that the grant that is made for this service might very well have been supplemented. But I bring this table before the House because I think it is right that the House and the country should know to what extent the various departments of the public service have increased the public expenditure during these growing times.

As to the public debt, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has dealt with that very fully in his speech. It is quite true that he shows a very good record so far as reduction of debt is concerned, if we are to conclude that his sentiments of fifteen or twenty years ago are absolutely wrong, and the sentiments he expressed only yesterday are absolutely right. But, if any importance is to be attached to what he said about surpluses in the old days, he cannot congratulate himself as much as he felt at liberty to do on the handling of the pub-

lic debt by the present government. Considering the marvellous prosperity of the country, and of the whole world in which Canada has fortunately participated, an examination of the growth of our net debt does not present any gratifying features. The increase of the debt for the last twelve years is shown by the following figures :

NET DEBT.

1891..	$237,809,031	1897..	$261,538,596
1892..	241,131,434	1898..	263,956,399
1893..	241,681,040	1899..	266,273,447
1894..	246,183,029	1900..	265,493,807
1895..	253,074,927	1901..	268,480,000
1896..	258,497,433	1902..	271,829,090

Net debt, 1902.. .. .. $271,829,090
" 1896.. 258,497,433

Increase in net debt under Liberal rule.. .. .. $ 13,331,557

In connection with this, it should be pointed out that the total revenue of the country from 1891 to 1896 was $220,681,395, and from 1897 to 1902 it was $286,719,524, an increase of more than $66,000,000. The details for the several years are as follows :

TOTAL REVENUE.

1891..	$ 38,579,311	1897..	$ 37,829,778
1892..	36,921,872	1898..	40,556,510
1893..	38,208,609	1899..	46,743,103
1894..	36,374,883	1900..	51,031,467
1895..	33,978,129	1901..	52,516,333
1896..	36,618,591	1902..	58,042,333
	$220,681,395		$286,719,524

Average revenue for 6 years, 1897-02.. $47,786,587
" " " 1891-96.. 36,780,233

Average annual increase during last 6 years.. .. .. $11,006,354
Revenue last year Liberal government (1902).. .. .. $58,052,333
Revenue last year Conservative government (1896).. 36,618,591

$21,433,742

It will thus be seen, Mr. Speaker, that during all these years of the present administration there has been an enormous increase in revenue. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in making his comparison in this regard, will bear in mind that if the Conservative government from 1891 to 1896 had had the same revenue which the hon. gentleman has enjoyed from 1897 to 1902, the public debt of this country could have been decreased by no less an amount than $45,000,000. My hon. friend thinks he is able to congratulate himself because, up to the end of last year, it was increased $13,000,000, and by means of the so-called surplus of the present year he will decrease it, I believe, by about $5,000,000, leaving a net increase of some $8,000,000.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was, as I said, particularly jubilant over the fact that he had a surplus, and I have no doubt that my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce shares that jubilation to the greatest possible extent. Would it be out of place, Mr. Speaker, for me to call to the attention of this hon. gentleman some utterances of by-gone days that seem to have in them possibly a spark of good sense, and to invite the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he comes to address the House, to tell us what he thinks of these utterances of the old days, and whether he is prepared to take the same view which he held from 1876 to 1896. I am afraid that my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the touching words of the old ballad, will have to say :

> I cannot sing the old songs I sang long years ago.

Now, the editorial utterances of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who was almost as good an editor as he is a Minister of Finance, are also worthy of attention. In the columns of the Morning 'Chronicle' some years ago he made this criticism of a Conservative administration :

> If these surpluses were created by the government in some magic way there may be in them a cause for thankfulness to Sir John Macdonald and his followers, but when it is considered that every dollar of the surplus is money taken out of the pockets of the people without a shadow of an excuse, money not required even by the reckless expenditure of the government, there is not much cause for rejoicing.

Now, would my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce do his best to digest the utterances of his colleague, and let us know, when he comes to address the House, what he really thinks of the views which were then entertained. But that is not all. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance broke out in the following year, when there happened to be another surplus, and this is the way in which he bewailed the unhappy lot of a country that was afflicted with a surplus :

> That millions of dollars should be unnecessarily taken yearly from the consuming classes of the country, and this without being absolutely necessary, is a cardinal principle of the Finance Minister, to which even his best friends do not unreservedly assent.
>
> They see that a surplus of millions at the capital is just so much money withdrawn from the trade of the country. How long can the Dominion stand the drain ? Certainly not many years longer.

There were no cheers, of course, because it was a newspaper article, but we can well understand how the cheers resounded, we can even remember how the cheers resounded, when sentiments of this kind were heard on every public platform of the country. But, Mr. Speaker, let me not neglect my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, because I am always pleased when I quote any utterance of his; he has so terse and vigorous a way of expressing himself that it is really delightful to hear him, because he puts in half a dozen

words these matters more forcibly and more eloquently than most of us could do by speaking fifteen minutes. This is the way the right hon. gentleman expressed himself in the old days :

> Taxation is an evil that nothing but the requirements of government can justify.

And the requirements of government this year do not justify the present taxation by some $12,000,000 or $13,00,000. Yet my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce seems to be pleased with the announcement of his colleague. I do not know how he will look upon it when he comes to address the House on the subject. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is considerable force in the views of the Minister of Finance, which I have read to the House, as well as in the very terse statement which the right hon. gentleman the Minister of Trade and Commerce gave to the House and to the country years ago, in the single sentence I have read from his utterances. Is there not some attraction to a certain class of people in this country when a surplus of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 is announced ? There are people in this country as well as in every other, whose chief concern about the public revenue is to appropriate some of it to their own use under the guise of a parlamentary vote. We had an instance of that not many years ago. The acting Minister of Public Works, in the absence of my hon. friend the member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in Paris, sent a circular around the country to his political supporters urging them to put in their demands for public work in their various localities, because it was apprehended that a general election might at no distant date be upon the country. I believe it had wonderful results. The announcement of this surplus by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance partakes of somewhat of the same character. Is it not good sense after all to look at the situation somewhat in the light in which it was presented to the country so forcibly by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and to ask ourselves whether it is wise, to so arrange our fiscal system that we shall come down to the House of Commons and say to the people of the country : Look, here are $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 that the government do not really require, and all you who have any demands upon the government, all you who have been talking about public works which are not in the public interest but are in some private interest, come forward now, because the government has this money on hand, and it is a good time to put in your applications, and they will receive all possible attention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to the trade returns which have been adverted to by the Minister of Finance, and to say that there is one matter which I think he might very well have referred to in his speech, which perhaps by accident he omitted, and that is the fact that our imports from the United Kingdom make a considerably better showing this year than they did last year. My hon. friend did not refer to that. I call attention to it, because I think that last year I called the attention of the House and the country to an opposite condition of affairs. Trade with the mother country does look better this year, I think it has increased about $6,000,000. But I wish to draw attention at the same time to the condition, as far as trade relations are concerned, which prevails between this country and the United Kingdom as compared with that which prevails between this country and the United States. Taking the imports for home consumption, and omitting coin and bullion, you find the position of affairs in 1902 to be as follows : Our imports from the United States were $114,744,696, our exports to the United States were $47,829,730, leaving a balance in favour of the United States as against Canada of $66,914,966. Taking the United Kingdom we find precisely the opposite condition of affairs. The imports from Great Britain in 1902 were $49,022,726, exports to Great Britain $117,381,221, leaving a balance in favour of Canada as against the United Kingdom of no less than $68,285,495.

IMPORTS—HOME CONSUMPTION.

(Less Coin and Bullion).

1902.

Imports from United States..	$114,744,696
Exports to United States*..	47,829,730
	$66,914,966
Imports from Great Britain..	$ 49,022,726
Exports to Great Britain*....	117,381,221
	$68,285,495

* Less gold-bearing quartz, silver concentrates, coin and bullion.

Now, this is not perhaps a very happy condition of affairs. I do not say that it is a condition of affairs which can be remedied altogether by the efforts of any government, but I do say that, adopting the argument of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) it is a 'genuine practical discrimination' against Great Britain. Thus, to show the terse way he has of putting things, I will read what that hon. gentleman said in 1897.

> These returns show that, in the very last year of their term of office, we exported to England, apparently, $66,000,000 worth of our products, we exported to the United States, $44,000,000, we bought from England $32,000,000 and from the United States $58,000,000 worth. There, if you will, is a genuine practical discrimination to an enormous extent, against England and in favour of the United States, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Does not the right hon. gentleman see that the discrimination is increased one hundred per cent to-day ? What has he to say about

it? Why does he not remedy it? If this was a ground of criticism upon the policy of the late government what is he doing as Minister of Trade and Commerce that he does not endeavour to alleviate this condition? Let us read his story of 1897 as applied to the conditions of to-day.

These returns show that in the year 1902, we exported to England, apparently $109,347,345 worth of our products, we exported to the United States $66,567,784, we bought from England $49,022,726, and from the United States, $114,744,696 worth. There, if you will, is a genuine practical discrimination to an enormous extent, against England and in favour of the United States, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Compare our imports from Great Britain and the United States and other countries from 1896 to the present time and observe and consider the result, in view of the fact that when they came into office they apparently wished the country to understand that they had given up their old theory of preferring the American dollar to the British shilling. They became very much attached to the interests of the mother country, they became very desirous of promoting our trade with the mother country and yet the condition of affairs prevails in the present year of which I have spoken. I will point out to the House by means of a table how it has continually progressed in that direction from 1896 up to the present time. Now, the table which I propose to give to the House shows the imports, including coin and bullion, for home consumption from the United States and Great Britain and from other countries from 1896 to the present time, and I distinguish therein between free and dutiable goods. I shall not read all the details, but I will avail myself of the same privilege that I requested before and ask to have this statement placed on record in 'Hansard.'

IMPORTS HOME CONSUMPTION, INCLUDING COIN AND BULLION.

FROM THE UNITED STATES.

—	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	Percentage of increase 1902 over 1896.
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	
Dutiable	29,101,646	30,482,509	38,063,960	44,471,824	53,897,561	53,600,278	60,181,808	
Free	29,472,378	31,166,532	40,641,630	48,535,342	55,946,817	56,884,730	60,625,242	
	58,574,024	61,649,041	78,705,590	93,007,166	109,844,378	110,485,008	120,807,050	106·25 p.c.

FROM GREAT BRITAIN.

Dutiable	24,366,179	20,217,422	22,556,479	27,521,508	31,561,756	31,701,654	35,062,564	
Free	8,613,563	9,194,766	9,944,438	9,538,615	13,237,974	11,316,510	14,151,198	
	32,979,742	29,412,188	32,500,917	37,060,123	44,789,730	43,018,164	49,213,762	49·22 p.c.

OTHER COUNTRIES.

Dutiable	13,771,934	15,520,834	14,004,649	17,439,840	18,887,478	20,667,824	23,413,124	
Free	15,261,780	4,711,958	5,486,850	6,544,464	7,282,730	7,066,992	9,357,659	
	19,033,714	20,232,792	19,491,499	23,894,304	26,170,208	27,734,816	32,770,783	70·59 p.c.

We see that the imports from the United States increased over one hundred and six per cent, from other countries nearly seventy-one per cent, and from Great Britain only a little over forty-nine per cent. I would gather from this that the Right Hon. Minfact that when they came into office that the alleged efforts of this government to promote trade between Canada and the mother country as compared with trade between Canada and other countries has not been very successful, to say the least.

There is another aspect of the case which might be put before the country. From 1867 to 1902 our average importation from Great Britain, excluding coin and bullion, was $42,549,216, in 1902 our importation was $49,022,726, or an increase of $6,473,510 over the average. During the same period our average importation from the United States was $51,608,862, and in 1902 it was $114,744,696, or an increase of $63,135,834 over the average. What is the cause of the enormous increase in our trade with the United States and the comparatively small increase in our trade with the mother country? It may be and very likely is due to some causes over which the government cannot possibly exercise any control. We know that we are in close proximity to the United States and

merchants can get goods more quickly from the United States than they can from the mother country. Then again, the American manufacturer perhaps caters a little more to the requirements of the Canadian market than the British manufacturer, but after all, you will observe that comparing the rates of duties, even taking into consideration the preference which prevails, as between ourselves and the mother country, and as between ourselves and the United States, the United States have practically the same rates as Great Britain, if you only take into consideration dutiable goods, and taking into consideration all classes of goods they have very much the advantage indeed. The rates on goods imported from Great Britain are: dutiable 24·03 per cent, dutiable and free 17·18 per cent; from the United States, dutiable 25·18, dutiable and free 13·20 per cent, or 4 per cent less than the average rate dutiable and free as applied to goods from the mother country; from all other countries, dutiable 27·26, dutiable and free 16·46 per cent.

	Great Britain.	United States.	All Countries.
Dutiable.. ..	24·03	25·18	27·26
Dutiable and free..	17·18	13·20	16·46

Thus, taking the average rate on dutiable and free goods, we see that Great Britain, even taking into consideration the preference, pays a higher rate than any other country and a very considerably higher rate than the United States. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was interrogated about this condition of affairs in a reciprocity convention in the United States, I think, two years ago and he made the following very straightforward answer :

> The Canadian tariff against England has a rebate of 33⅓ per cent, but the goods imported from the two countries are dissimilar and the rates of duty on the goods from England happen to be higher than the rates of duty on the class of goods coming from the United States, and the net result, the total duty, is almost the same.

I was somewhat amused at my hon. friend's use of the word 'happen' in that regard. I think we all pretty well know what was done ; goods coming to us from the mother country had the duty increased upon them in 1897, and then the merchants of the mother country were presented with a preference which left the rate of duty practically the same as that which is paid on the imports from the United States, even if you take into consideration dutiable goods alone.

Mr. Chamberlain brought this matter to the attention of the Canadian ministers at the colonial conference, and as the Minister of Finance has read a portion of the answer to Mr. Chamberlain's remarks it is perhaps only right that I should place before the House what Mr. Chamberlain said on that occasion. At pages 7 and 8 of the report, speaking on the British preference, Mr. Chamberlain said :

> But in Canada, before the conference of 1897, the Canadian government had decided to give us a preference which then amounted to 25 per cent, and this subsequently was increased to 33⅓ per cent. This was a preference voluntarily accorded by Canada on British taxable goods imported into the Dominion. Canada has therefore anticipated the general proposal of the premiers, and the time which has elapsed has been sufficient to enable us to form a judgment of the effect of an arrangement of this kind, and I have to say to you that, while I cannot but gratefully acknowledge the intention of this proposal and its sentimental value as proof of good will and affection, yet that its substantial results have been altogether disappointing to us, and I think they must have been equally disappointing to its promoters.
>
> I shall circulate to you another paper which contains very fully the whole of the statistics showing the course of trade in Canada since 1897, and the results of the preferential tariff. But I may give you in a word or two the most important conclusions. I am comparing now the import trade of British goods into Canada in the year 1896-97, with the last year for which I have the returns—1900-1901. The total imports of Canada increased in that period £14,500,000, at the rate of 62 per cent. That shows an enormously increased prosperity in the Dominion ; it shows how the energy of its inhabitants is developing its trade. Fourteen and a half millions and sixty-two per cent ; if you will kindly bear in mind those figures as showing the total result of all the import trade. Of that the free trade, upon which no duty is levied and upon which therefore no preference is given to British goods, increased £6,250,000, or at the rate of 67 per cent. The general trade, that is the trade from foreign countries which came under the general tariff, also increased £6,250,000, or at the rate of 62 per cent. But the preferential trade—the trade upon which this advantage had been given to British goods, only increased in the same time £2,000,000 and only at the rate of 55 per cent. So that the rate of increase under the preferential tariff was actually less than under the general tariff and also under the free tariff. Or taking it in another way, the total increase of the trade of Canada with foreigners during the period named, this is including both the trade subject to the tariff and also the free trade, was 69 per cent while the total increase of British trade was only 48 per cent. . . . .
>
> But now I want to point out another thing which I think will be of great importance, and which I am sure the government of Canada must have taken into their serious consideration. What return has been made to them by the foreigner for the advantage which the foreigner has derived from their tariff ? The exports from Canada to foreigners have decreased 40 per cent, while the exports from foreigners to Canada have, as I have said, largely increased. On the other hand, in spite of the tariff, in spite of everything in the natural course of trade and communication, the exports to the United Kingdom have increased 85 per cent in fifteen years, and the net result, which I desire to impress upon you, is that in spite of the preference which Canada has given us, their tariff has pressed, and still presses, with the

greatest severity, upon its best customer, and has favoured the foreigner who is constantly doing his best to shut out her goods.

Of course it is only right that both sides of the question should be presented, and it may be said in reply to Mr. Chamberlain that while the imports of Canada from the mother country are only 29·62 per cent of the aggregate trade between the two countries, nevertheless the imports of the United States from Great Britain are only 23·20 per cent of the aggregate trade between those two countries. In other words, Great Britain buys from the United States nearly four times as much as the United States buys from the mother country. This has continued year after year, notwithstanding the opinion of some that you cannot sell to any nation from which you do not also purchase. The experience of these two countries does not bear out that argument. The trade relations between Canada and the mother country are much more favourable to the latter than are the trade relations of the mother country with the United Sates, and yet we receive, notwithstanding the preference, exactly the same treatment as the United States does in the British market. This is a circumstance which we have urged upon the attention of this House over and over again. On this subject the Finance Minister has scoffed at our views in his speeches of days gone by, but they are views which according to his speech of yesterday he is prepared to take into more serious consideration than ever he did before.

There is another aspect of this matter which Mr. Chamberlain did not bring to the attention of the Canadian ministers, and which shows in even a more striking manner than the figures which he presented, the trade relations as between the mother country and other countries as compared with Canada. Let us look at the statement of the exports from the United Kingdom to foreign countries and to Canada during the past ten years. In preparing this table I have taken the latest returns that were available. I could not get returns later than 1899 for some of these countries and with regard to others I was not able to get the returns for the year 1890, with which I started the comparison. But giving the House the comparison as it is, here is what we find :

STATEMENT OF EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND CANADA.

——	1890.	1896.	1900.	Percentage of Increase 1900 over 1896.
	£	£	£	
France	25,175,280	20,424,280	26,986,320	32·19
Holland	23,634,667	21,304,250	24,024,334	12·77
Italy	12,802,240	9,195,560	14,350,760	56·06
Belgium	8,517,680	8,224,720	12,034,240	45·10
Spain	7,783,120	6,188,360	9,973,000	61·16
Sweden	6,048,278	5,490,778	9,805,778	78·58
Norway	3,673,778	3,500,950	5,742,778	64·03
Portugal	2,984,092	2,739,825	4,308,983	57·27
Mexico	2,133,750	1,976,250	2,620,750	32·67
Switzerland	2,094,960	2,068,280	2,493,120	20·54
	1891.			
German Empire	28,258,050	27,565,650	35,959,500	30·45
	1890.		1899.	
Russia	9,334,000	11,130,900	13,601,313	22·19
			1900.	
Denmark	3,753,389	4,348,000	6,005,167	38·11
Canada	8,928,033	6,785,956	9,215,994	36·00

Canada stands eighth in the percentage of increase and ninth in actual increase among these fourteen countries, notwithstanding the preference which has been so much relied upon by hon. gentlemen opposite as a means of creating better trade relations between Canada and the mother country. None of these countries gives to the mother country any preference ; they stood on the ordinary trade relations, and yet taking these fourteen countries, we find that so far as percentages are concerned, Canada stands eighth, and so far as actual increase is concerned Canada stands ninth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come to one or two matters that were dealt with by my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in his speech, and the first thing I desire to touch on is the post office revenue. The Minister of Finance told us that the Postmaster General in a recent speech which he delivered in Toronto, made a perfectly fair

comparison of revenue and expenditure when he omitted the Yukon. Why did not the Minister of Finance omit the Yukon when he made comparisons of trade returns? If it is a perfectly fair thing for the Postmaster General to omit the Yukon in post office comparisons, surely it is a perfectly fair thing for the Minister of Finance to omit the Yukon in trade comparisons. The Minister of Finance spoke of the decrease in letter rates which the Postmaster General has made, but why did he omit to mention the fact that upon almost every other class of mail matter the Postmaster General has increased the rates? Was it not well to bring both these matters to the attention of the House? And why does not the Minister of Finance say something about the wages which the Postmaster General pays to his post office employees and to his letter carriers. I have to go down nearly every session to the Postmaster General's office attending deputations of post office employees from all over Canada, who point out that their wages have not been increased for the last twenty or thirty years, and that they really have not enough now to keep body and soul together.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Postmaster General boasts of a surplus. Why, two of his mail drivers were fined in the city of Montreal yesterday because they were driving horses that were not in a fit condition. Why does not the Postmaster General invoke the services of the fair wage branch of the Labour Department? Why does not the Postmaster General call in the Minister of Labour to assist him in giving a fair rate of wage to the post office employees?

Mr. KEMP. Where is the Postmaster General to-day?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sorry that the Postmaster General is not in his place to-day. I have long thought that the services of the Department of Labour could not better be employed than in endeavouring to do something for the post office officials from one end of Canada to the other, who are complaining that while the necessaries of life have increased from 25 per cent to 50 per cent during the past six years, their wages have remained the same in order that the Postmaster General may boast to this House and to this country. that by leaving a portion of Canada out of consideration he really could pretend that he had a surplus in the year 1902.

Then the Finance Minister referred to the government railways. He told us that there is an alleged surplus—No, he did not say that there was an 'alleged' surplus; he said that there was a surplus, but I would prefer to call it an alleged surplus. Every one knows that the mode of arranging charges as between capital account and revenue account in the Railway Department has been changed by this government; and if the Minister of Finance appreciates so much the methods adopted by the Postmaster General, why did he not give us a comparison of the railway accounts on the former basis? Let us look at the way he got his surplus of last year. He charged no less than $4,626,841 to capital account, and then claimed a surplus of $57,898. And my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce thinks that a most gratifying exhibit of the railways of this country for the year 1902.

The hon. Minister of Finance told us what the government had done with regard to trade matters during the past six years. They had had trade negotiations with the mother country, and the net result of these negotiations, Mr. Speaker, you will regret to learn, is nothing. They have had trade negotiations with France, and you will also regret to learn that up to the present time these have resulted in nothing. They have had trade negotiations with the United States, and these negotiations up to the present time have resulted in nothing, except the interchange of very polite letters between the Prime Minister and Mr. Senator Fairbanks. Then, they had certain negotiations during the past six years with Germany. We bitterly complained last year and the year before that the papers relating to these negotiations had not been brought down. The year before last I went to the papers which were laid on the Table of the parliament of the Australian Commonwealth, and I got information there which should have been laid on the Table of this House. We were told that the papers were of a confidential character. They were brought down at the conclusion of the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance last night, and we do not find anything very confidential in them. I am not sure that they have all been brought down; I shall ask my right hon. friend about that perhaps, on a subsequent occasion; but I do say that there is nothing on the face of the documents brought down which in any way could justify the government in voting down the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he asked last session that those papers might be laid on the Table of the House. They began negotiations with Herr P. Hatzfeldt, I think; they continued them with Graf Von Posadowsky; but during the past two years they have been negotiating altogether with Herr Bopp, and the communications with Herr Bopp have been laid on the Table; and really, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of Canada in these negotiations has been a most remarkable one. We urged the government two years ago by a resolution which we proposed in

this House, to take some stand with regard to this matter. We urged them again last year. Two years ago when I moved a resolution on the subject I spoke very strongly with regard to the treatment of this country by Germany. That resolution, which the government voted down, was as follows :

This House is of opinion that equivalent or adequate duties should be imposed by Canada upon the products and manufactures of countries not within the empire in all cases where such countries fail to admit Canadian products and manufactures upon fair terms, and that the government should take for this purpose all such available measures as may be found necessary.

Strong language was used on the subject by members on this side of the House, but with no effect on the government. Indeed, the hon. Minister of Finance, so far as one could understand his language, seemed inclined to justify the attitude of Germany. The attitude of this government with regard to Germany reminds me very much of that well known play 'The Private Secretary.' You remember that when the old Indian colonel comes home and meets the poor littlte curate, the private secretary, and mistakes him for his nephew, whom he expected to find no milksop, he addresses certain questions to him. The young man gives very weak replies in very effiminate tones. By and by the old gentleman gets so exasperated that he seizes him by the back of the head, cuffs him and kicks him about the room, beats his head against the wall, and generally uses him very roughly. The young gentleman makes no response, but submits to it all, until after receiving an incredible amount of ill-usage, he braces himself up and says : 'now, look heah, if you do that again, 'Ill get weal cwoss with you.' That is about the attitude of the Canadian government towards Germany during the past six years. Germany has been excluding our products from her markets by imposing upon them an enormous tax, while admitting the products of other countries under her minimum tariff ; and all we have been doing during these years has been to say to her, 'if you do this again, we will get real cross with you.' Now, we are getting really cross with her, because we are going to impose a surtax against her. That may be a very good thing ; but, in the first place, I think action of that kind should have been taken by the government four or five years ago, instead of voting down resolutions which we proposed, and refusing the House any information on the subject. In the second place, so far as this surtax is concerned, I think we are getting too much government by Order in Council in this country. Practically the whole tariff is in such a position that the government can deal with it by Order in Council—can deal with it on the eve of a general election. If we are going to deal with Germany, we had better put the Act on our statute-book, and deal with her at once. I am willing to stay here all summer, if necessary, or any reasonable time, for that purpose. But if the surtax is to be imposed by Order in Council, why does the hon. gentleman deal with it in such a way that he will have to come to the House by and bye and have it made more elastic? In his speech he pointed out the necessity of making the tariff more elastic with regard to the importation of raw materials used in manufactures, and one would have supposed that in dealing with the surtax, he would have taken a similar course, instead of applying it to all products alike ; and if he gives the Governor in Council power to impose a surtax——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nothing about the Order in Council. The surtax is imposed directly. It is in force to-day, subject to the qualification that the Order in Council may make regulations with regard to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is dealt with now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is dealt with now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If that is the case, I am glad to know that it is in line with what we on this side of the House have advocated. But if the tariff on German goods is to be dealt with during the present session, it would be well to make the surtax elastic, because there may be goods imported into this country from Germany upon which it would be unwise to impose a surtax of 33⅓ per cent, while on other goods it might be wise to impose a very much larger amount.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who is to determine the difference ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This House, I think, ought to determine the difference ; and we will have an opportunity of dealing with that question when the hon. gentleman's resolution comes up for discussion. I think the House ought to deal with these matters instead of leaving them to be settled by Orders in Council. Certainly there is a number of instances of this practice in the resolutions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are there not some instances of this in the resolutions which the hon. gentleman proposes ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not with relation to Germany.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am dealing with the general subject of Orders in Council and with regard to materials for manufacturing steel rails, my hon. friend has

adopted that system, which, I think, is an unwise one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That has been in the statute for years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It has been followed in this country to some extent, but my hon. friend seems inclined to increase it, and that is what I am objecting to.

Now, the attitude of the government with regard to preferential trade is a most extraordinary one. I do not propose to deal with the question of preferential trade by any resolution which I will submit at this juncture, because I think it should be dealt with by itself at a future period. But I think I should say a few words with regard to the attitude of the government on this subject. This preference to the mother country was inaugurated in 1897 or in 1898 by the singing in this House of the national anthem and my right hon. friend the premier went across to Great Britain and told the people of the mother country why Canada had seen fit to make this preference. He told them that Canada was giving it as a free gift and did not want any compensation. I shall not read his language as it has been quoted to the House many times, but I cannot refrain from quoting these words :

It is a free gift. We ask no compensation. Protection has been the curse of Canada. We would not see you come under its baneful influence—for what weakens you must weaken us.

The Cobden Club arose in the purity of its free trade principles, and presented my hon. friend with the Cobden Club medal. Then he came back and we discussed the matter in this House and country. We were told, from one end of the country to the other, that Canada, by means of this 33⅓ per cent preference, had already obtained a preference in the British market. We were told that Canada had already a substantial preference in the British market. We on this side moved resolutions which are almost identical in terms with that finally adopted by the representatives of this government at the colonial conference. And these resolutions were voted down time after time by the government and its supporters. Let me read one of the resolutions which we moved in this House. Sir Charles Tupper moved in the sessison of 1901 :

That this House is of opinion that a system of mutual trade preference between Great Britain and Ireland and the colonies would greatly stimulate increased production in and commerce between these countries, and would thus promote and maintain the unity of the empire and that no measure of preference which falls short of the complete realization of such a policy should be considered as final and satisfactory.

Well, Sir, resolutions were adopted with regard to this matter at the conference. Let me read the first clause of the resolution in which the representatives of this government concurred :

This conference recognizes that the principle of preferential trade between the United Kingdom and His Majesty's dominions beyond the seas would stimulate and facilitate mutual commercial intercourse and would by promoting the development of the resources and industries of the several parts, strengthen the empire.

There is a difference in the language of the two resolutions, but none whatever in the meaning, yet my right hon. friend called on his followers, in the year 1900, to vote down the very resolution which he subsequently proposed to the colonial conference. In all the debates in this House on this subject we were told that we had a preference in the British market, and that we were not to approach the mother country in any huckstering spirit. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, in addressing more than one gathering on the other side, told his hearers, with the sanction, no doubt, of his colleagues, that Canada wanted no compensation for the preference given. Mr. Speaker, who is doing the huckstering now ? Who is not only huckstering now, but, by the somewhat undignified threat in the memorandum handed the imperial government, and expressed more broadly yesterday by the Minister of Finance is telling the British government that unless we get some compensation, the preference will be repealed. I wonder if, in such an event, we shall stand up and sing 'God Save the King,' or what action will we take. Perhaps when this preference is repealed, my hon. friends on the other side will get up and sing the 'Star Spangled Banner.' We were told that Canada had a substantial preference in the British market. If it had, why are my hon. friends demanding anything from the British government at present, and why are they threatening to repeal this preference ? Look at their whole attitude. Only two years ago my right hon. friend, in answer to myself, said that it was perfect folly to discuss the question of preferential trade unless Canada was prepared to adopt free trade. If the right hon. gentleman doubts my word, let him send for 'Hansard.' Last year my hon. friend the Minister of Finance told us that this one-sided preference was a good thing, not only for the mother country, but for Canada. Well, Sir, if it is a good thing for Canada, why are hon. gentlemen opposite huckstering about it ? Who are the hucksterers now ? My right hon. friend told us on one occasion that we had the attitude of those who were willing to wound, but afraid to strike. Who are willing to wound but afraid to strike now ? Who are making undignified threats ? Did you ever, Sir, in all the course of your parliamentary experience, see a more extraordinary exhibition of somersaults than that which the government has given us ? The fact is they began with Great Britain, as with the United States,

by giving up everything. They gave Great Britain a preference with a great hurrah. They told the mother country that we gave it in return for the splendid freedom we enjoy, that we wanted no compensation and did not want to see Canada cursed with protection. Five years afterwards they went to the colonial conference, and getting down upon their hands and knees, they asked for a preference in the British markets, and threatened, if refused, to take away from Great Britain that preference in our markets, which they said we had given to the mother country without desire for compensation and as her due. Let me point out that these gentlemen who were so merry about a certain resolution which I proposed to this House last year and also the year before, had better turn their jests on their own leader now. I was told then that protection to Canadian industry was absolutely inconsistent with the idea of mutual preferential trade. Yet here in black and white, in the records of the colonial conference, is the very proposition which I put before the country then.

I said to the people of this country that, as between the British manufacturer and the foreign manufacturer, we might, and we ought, to give a preference to the British; but that in doing that we should always safeguard the interest of the Canadian manufacturer. Here in this book we have the very self-same argument which was then so jeered at, placed by the Canadian representatives before the colonial conference :

> But the Canadian ministers pointed out that the Canadian tariff was by no means prohibitive, that large quantities of goods were imported, and that a great proportion of these came from foreign countries. In any lines in which it appeared that the goods would be manufactured in Great Britain it might be possible to so readjust some duties as to give an additional advantage to the British manufacturers, and thus turn over to him a volume of trade which at present is held by the manufacturers of foreign countries.
>
> The Canadian ministers stated that if they could be assured that the imperial government would accept the principle of preferential trade generally, and particularly grant to the food products of Canada in the United Kingdom exemption from duties now levied, or hereafter imposed, they, the Canadian ministers, would be prepared to go further into the subject and endeavour to give to the British manufacturer some increased advantage over his foreign competitors in the markets of Canada.

But I do not dwell upon this, having a number of other matters, perhaps of more importance in connection with the trade question, to deal with before I conclude, and I do not wish to impose upon the patience of the House.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says that this is not an opportune time to make any revision of the tariff. He talks to the protectionists and the free traders of this country very much as he did in 1897 and 1898. The time is not opportune to do certain things. He has put into his speech as much of protection as he thought his free trade friends would swallow, and as much of free trade as he thought his protectionist friends would support; and he has extended to the manufacturer this year the same invitation which he gave before and to which he referred in his speech—'call again.' There was a little bit of controversy between the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) as to what was said to the manufacturers last year. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is not usually regarded as a very stupid man. Some people in this country have occasionally considered him as a man of very acute intellect. Yet that hon. gentleman failed to grasp what the Minister of Finance meant when he was talking to the manufacturers last year. If the hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Fielding's) colleagues were deceived, it is probable that the manufacturers were deceived also. The Minister of Finance tells us that he invited them to call again because he knew they could call again in any case, not only this year, but next year and the following year. So, he considered there was no implied promise in saying: We will do nothing for you this year, but come next year. But the manufacturers might understand it differently. What was it we had the year before last? Oh, yes, the Joint High Commission. It had escaped me for the moment. It was because of the meeting of the Joint High Commission that we had no revision of the tariff in 1901—and I do not go further back than that year. In 1902, it was the Colonial Conference. This year it is a combination of both—the result of the Colonial Conference coupled with the possible resumption of the Joint High Commission. Now, of course, every one will regard that as highly satisfactory, and, in some quarters it will be applauded as very ingenious. The government holds these gentlemen off by threatening to repeal the British preference, and also by telling of another meeting of the Joint High Commission. The Minister of Finance tells them in effect: We do not know that it will amount to much; and, if it does not, we will take the tariff of other countries into consideration. This will be very pleasant for the gentlemen who are interested in this matter. In fact, they are told to call again next year for perhaps something may happen in the meantime to enable the government to grant them what they ask. We make no promises, says the Finance Minister; it may happen that a free trade sentiment will spread over the country, in which case, we can tell you to go about your business, for we have made no

promises—but you had better come back and see us next year. And, no doubt, these gentlemen are very highly pleased with the position of affairs; and the Minister of Finance, no doubt, will accomplish the result which he intended by putting his speech in that highly diplomatic form.

The character of our imports has something to do with the question, whether or not there should be a revision of the tariff this year. We all admit the necessity, as I have already said, of a liberal public expenditure for Canada and of a tariff which will produce a liberal revenue. But look at our tariff, and then also consider whether we have in Canada any resources which can be developed, any raw material which can be utilized in order that some considerable proportion of the commodities which we are buying from foreign countries may be made by our own people. I have here a statement giving a comparison of our imports from the United States in a number of lines. I do not confine it to articles imported for home consumption as I find that it would be too difficult to make the consumption owing to the way in which the returns are made up :

IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

	1896. Free.	1896. Dutiable.	Total.
Fisheries.. .. ..$	52,819	$ 318,674	$ 371,493
Forest..	2,054,423	.....	2,054,423
Animals and products	3,811,278	1,482,114	5,293,392
Agricultural products	2,672,895	8,045,580	10,718,375
Manufactures. ..	8,354,635	19,742,117	28,096,752
Fisheries.. .. ..$	31,380	$ 494,706	$ 526,086
	1902.	1902.	
Forest..	4,038,722	.....	4,038,722
Animals and products	4,573,595	3,838,859	8,412,454
Agricultural products	7,967,462	11,544,604	19,512,006
Manufactures. ..	25,532,647	46,885,102	72,417,749

In this table I have dealt with total imports. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance whether he thinks increases of that kind are necessarily indicative of increased prosperity in the country. But I have gone a little more into detail and have prepared a statement of dutiable imports from Great Britain and the United States —and I am dealing with total imports—so as to show a comparison between 1896 and 1902 :—

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPAL DUTIABLE IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN AND UNITED STATES, 1896 AND 1902. (TOTAL IMPORTS.)

	GREAT BRITAIN.			UNITED STATES.		
	1896.	1902.	Increase.	1896.	1902.	Increase.
	$	$	$	$	$	$
Animals	6,069	22,323	16,254	206,999	1,124,874	917,875
Breadstuffs	79,983	167,890	87,907	6,023,992	8,663,871	2,639,879
Fruits	.....	.....	.....	1,114,180	1,947,974	833,794
Hay	.....	.....	.....	28,832	121,624	92,792
Hops	13,923	23,631	9,708	37,733	89,196	51,463
Provisions	25,711	30,147	4,436	1,177,848	2,462,865	1,285,017
Vegetables	12,709	32,804	20,095	171,097	342,468	171,371
	138,395	276,795	138,400	8,760,681	14,752,872	5,992,191
Carriages	.....	.....	.....	1,246,633	1,356,891	110,258
Cement	123,436	148,818	25,382	22,642	588,510	565,868
Cotton and manufactures	3,366,502	5,078,587	1,712,085	1,076,081	1,603,917	527,836
Drugs, &c	250,689	643,531	392,842	510,667	780,531	269,864
Earthen and chinaware	381,495	684,912	303,417	55,892	241,135	185,243
Electrical apparatus	8,581	15,745	7,164	309,911	1,350,505	1,040,594
Fancy goods	916,933	1,058,683	141,750	230,988	389,990	159,002
Flax, &c	1,414,404	1,780,837	366,433	64,125	82,681	18,556
Glass and manufactures	215,344	388,504	173,160	419,179	523,820	104,641
Hats and caps	805,426	842,929	37,503	404,050	872,598	468,548
Leather and manufactures	117,315	257,750	140,435	1,024,285	1,466,382	442,097
Iron, steel, metals and manufacture of	2,733,860	5,135,622	2,401,762	6,395,765	17,681,776	11,286,011
Brass, copper, gold, silver and manufacture of	.....	.....	.....	555,589	813,852	258,263
Agricultural implements	.....	.....	.....	414,933	2,634,385	2,219,452
Paints and oils	597,686	736,829	139,143	1,215,534	2,262,437	1,046,903
Paper and manufactures	249,139	360,094	110,955	673,875	1,042,663	368,788
Wood and manufactures	.....	.....	.....	767,993	1,407,808	639,815
Wool and manufactures	6,970,010	8,881,941	1,911,931	208,430	354,621	146,191
Rubber and manufactures	118,657	217,812	99,155	211,669	525,218	313,549
Silks	1,901,627	2,414,599	512,972	.....	.....	
	20,309,499	28,923,988	8,614,489	24,568,922	50,732,592	26,163,670

Thus it will be seen that of the articles I have mentioned our imports from Great Britain increased between 1896 and 1902 by no less a sum thna $8,614,489 and during the same period the increase in our imports of the same articles from the United States amounted to $26,163,670, making a total increase during this period of six years of no less a sum than $34,778,159.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is there any reason why a very considerable portion of these articles might not be produced in Canada ? Is it wise to delay a revision of our tariff, even under present conditions, if, by a judicious and thorough revision of the tariff, we could produce or manufacture in Canada a very considerable portion of the articles to which I have called attention ? Now, I will give another tabulated statement which shows this increase in a more striking way.

The following is a statement of certain dutiable goods imported into Canada from Great Britain and the United States, which shows a large increase for the year 1902 over 1896 :—

	Increase 1902 over 1896.
Animals	$ 934,129
Breadstuffs	2,727,786
Provisions	1,289,453
Cotton and manufactures	2,239,921
Drugs	662,706
Earthen and chinaware	488,660
Electric apparatus	1,047,758
Flax	384,989
Glass and manufactures	277,801
Hats, caps, leather and manufactures	1,088,593
Iron, steel, metals and manufactures.	13,687,773
Brass, copper, gold, silver and manufactures of	258,263
Agricultural implements	2,219,452
Paints and oils	1,186,046
Paper and manufactures of	479,743
Wood and manufactures of	639,815
Wool and manufactures of	2,058,122
Rubber and manufactures of	412,704
Silks	512,972
	$32,596,686

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What was the heading of that last table ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That was the increase of the total imports of certain dutiable goods imported into Canada from Great Britain and the United States in the year 1902 as compared with the year 1896. I will send it over to my hon. friend if he desires to see it. I have endeavoured to make these statements with the utmost possible accuracy, and they have been gone over more than once. Possibly my hon. friend may find some trifling inaccuracies in some of them ; if so, of course, they are altogether unintentional, and I will make any explanation about them. It is difficult, as the Minister of Customs knows very well, to pick out these items from the various portions of the trade and navigation returns. A great deal of time has been spent upon them, and I think the table has been prepared with a fair degree of accuracy. In addition to these, in looking at the free list, I find the following striking increases in 1902 over 1896 :—

Breadstuffs	$2,387,318
Iron, steel, metals and manufactures of	8,794,842
Cordage	1,683,772
	$12,865,932

These figures deal altogether with increases, and do not take into consideration imports from countries other than Great Britain and the United States, the imports from which are comparatively small. Now, having regard to the enormous increase in our imports of many commodities and articles which should be produced or manufactured in this country, is it a matter of congratulation that we should have so largely increased the volume of our importations ? Would it not be more in the interest of Canada if these articles to the extent of $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 had been produced in Canada instead of being imported, and if the 50,000 Canadians who are said to have gone into the state of Massachusetts between 1895 and 1900 had remained in Canada ? Is it not apparent that, with regard to a great many of these articles, a very considerable portion of them might, and indeed ought to be, produced in Canada ? Why should Canada import :

Breadstuffs to the amount of	$11,731,268
Provisions and vegetables	2,981,109
Iron, steel and manufactures of	33,681,625
Woollen and cotton goods*	20,938,719
Electrical apparatus	1,373,022
Hats, caps, leather and manufactures of	3,835,119
Agricultural implements	2,654,000
Paints and oils	2,181,426
* Raw cotton not included.	$79,376,288

The aggregate of these articles which I have enumerated is the enormous sum of $79,376,288 worth imported into Canada in 1902, a good deal of which I think we could have, and a good deal of which I think we ought to have, produced in Canada. My hon. friend says : We are not going to revise the tariff. We have not time to revise the tariff, we have something else on our minds which will prevent us from revising it this session ; and therefore we will invite our friends to call again, and we will content ourselves with making the trifling changes in the tariff which have already been referred to. Sir, it seems to me that our policy in Canada should be to accomplish the following objects :—

1. To so arrange our tariff that all legitimate industries at present established in this country should be so protected as to insure as far as possible permanency under conditions of depression as well as in times of commercial expansion.

2. To invite capital and attract labour to the establishment of other industries which the resources and raw material of our country amply justify.

3. To preserve by means of an adequately protective tariff our own home market for our own people and to have the policy of the government so declared and understood.

4. In framing our tariff to have regard solely to the interests of Canada which have been committed to our charge although recognizing that in consulting our own interests we must not be unmindful of the tariffs raised against us by other countries.

5. To so frame our fiscal policy that labour in Canada shall be paid a fair living wage remembering always that our labouring classes and therefore our producers and manufacturers cannot be expected to compete on even terms with countries in which the condition of life among the labouring classes is altogether different. We do not desire to reduce our labouring population to the low standard of living, to that hard fierce struggle for existence which prevails in many countries. We do not want our labouring classes to compete without protection against the pauper labour of any country.

6. To utilize the labour of our own people in conversion of our own raw material into finished products required for use in our own country. It is surely bad policy to export our raw material, to send our labouring classes abroad to another country to find work in its manufactories and to send after both our money to pay for the finished product which we require.

Canada is bound to become a great agricultural country and her farmers are entitled to every possible protection and assistance. But we have enormous and varied resources the reasonable development of which will build up, not only in the east but in the west as well, great industrial centres of population which will afford a home market better than any foreign market for very large portions of our agricultural products. We know now that one of the matters of regret among the Americans who are coming by thousands into our great North-west is that they do not have in the west of Canada the home market which they had in the United States by reason of the great industrial centres which have been built up in the Western States. I believe that by a policy of adequate protection, such as the Liberal-Conservative party has advocated, is advocating and will advocate in this country, we will build up, even in the west of Canada, great industries and great industrial centres. The value of our home market cannot be placed too high. We know the value which has been placed upon it in the United States of America. We know that the United States have always carefully guarded their home market and it is apparent from the utterances of her public men and leading business men that they propose to preserve in the future. Those of them who have discussed measures of reciprocity with other countries have always declared that any system of reciprocity upon which they would enter must be of such a character as not to harm a single American industry and not to deprive a single American labouring man of one day's work. One of the latest pronouncements on the subject is that of Mr. Shaw, secretary of state for the United States. In dealing with the policy of the United States in the future he made the following very frank declaration :

> We say that it matters very much who produces that which the American people consume. American people shall have the first opportunity to supply the American market. Therefore adjust your tariff so as to give the American labourer, artisan and farmer the first opportunity to supply that which we can consistently. Then we have a surplus. What will we do with it ? We will sell it abroad. Higher than we sell it at home ? Yes, if we can. Cheaper than we sell it at home ? If necessary. Sell it for what you can get and we will have a large balance of trade, which brought in will make us all comfortable.

The following extract from a letter recently written by a leading manufacturer in the United States to the public press of that country is interesting. I refer to a letter, written by Mr. G. H. Seabury, of New York, in January, 1903 :

> The commodities that are undersold in foreign markets include steel, iron, machinery, locomotives, agricultural implements, sewing machines, cotton goods, pharmaceutical preparations, patented wares, furniture and minor manufactures that are produced in every section of our country. If these surplus exports were not sold at small margins of profit we would be unable to secure and hold our foreign trade.

As I have said before in this House, Canada, since entering upon her period of commercial development, finds herself peculiarly situated. She lies 4,000 miles alongside the greatest manufacturing and agricultural country in the world. She has a sparse population spread over an enormous area. She lies alongside of a country which protects by an almost prohibitive tariff its own home market. Canada, with 5,500,000 people lies alongside of the United States with a population of 80,000,000 and a home market absolutely protected. What is the result ? Look at the enormous manufactures of the United States; look at the enormous agricultural production of the United States. In times of great commercial expansion the home market of the United States takes nearly everything that is produced in that country ; at all events, the amount they export, although absolutely large, is relatively very small. They exported in 1900 only three and one-half per cent of the manufactures and eight, or nine, or ten per cent of the agricultural products. Well, things will go on all right during a time of commercial expansion when the home mar-

ket is capable of absorbing nearly the whole product, but when a time of depression comes, when the consuming power of the people of the United States is decreased, what will happen? A good deal will happen. Canada lies alongside of the United States, Canada is her best customer in manufactured goods, as the hon. member for North Norfolk truly says. Canada is her third best customer in all classes of goods. When the surplus of the United States comes to be dealt with, where will it be dealt with ? It will be dealt with in Canada and Canada may reasonably expect in the first instance to be the dumping ground of the American surplus. Canada, to some extent, is the dumping ground of that surplus at the present time. It is argued gravely by some people in this country that it is a good thing for the people of Canada that Canada should be the slaughter market for the manufactures and agricultural products of the United States. The argument seems to be this : It is said that if these goods are sold in Canada at less than the cost of production we get them cheap and therefore, upon the old free trade argument of years ago, it must be a good thing for the Canadian people to buy these goods in the cheapest market. What if the advent of these goods into the Canadian market closes up Canadian factories ? What if Canadian farmers leave their farms and go to the United States and find the employment which they cannot find at home ? I believe that for another reason a policy of free trade such as was advocated years ago can never be an acceptable policy in Canada. Free traders in Great Britain, possibly men who might be described as doctrinaires so far as this country is concerned because they do not realize the conditions which prevail here, regret that Canada has not followed the example of the mother country and adopted free trade. It seems to me that these gentlemen really do not know that of which they speak. If Canada had adopted the policy of free trade and opened her markets to the United States, our trade relations, bad as they are with the mother country, would be far worse and further than that, I believe that the commercial supremacy of the United States which would undoubtedly then have prevailed in our markets would have been coupled eventually with political supremacy. Therefore, I do not think, looking at our situation, that we can ever have anything like a policy of free trade in Canada, and if we are going to adopt the policy of protection, let us have a declared and pronounced policy so that the people may know what to expect and let us adopt a policy which will adequately protect all the interests of the country.

During the past six years the government of the country has not declared its fiscal policy as it should have done. We have had no definite statement ; no pronounced and declared policy. The Finance Minister, in 1897, told the people of this country that eternal vigilance was the price of protection. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said that the ship's head was now turned towards the sea of free trade, and he was glad of it. The Prime Minister folded his arms in dramatic fashion since the commencement of this very session, and he told the people that he was glad that, having commenced his political life as a protectionist, he had now become a pronounced free trader. It is true that the Minister of Marine told the people of Maisonneuve two months ago that the Prime Minister was a protectionist, but still two months have intervened and the right hon. gentleman may have changed his opinions since. Cabinet ministers and their followers have given conflicting views from time to time on the question. Last session the Minister of Finance made an announcement which was regarded by some of his followers as a declaration that the tariff would be raised this session. The hon. gentleman from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) distinctly stated in this House that that was his construction of the remarks of the Finance Minister, and he was not corrected by any member of the government at that time. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) made last session one of the most pronounced free trade speeches he ever made in his life. It would be well perhaps that I should refer to some of the language which he used then, in order to show his words, by way of contrast with those of other ministers. The Prime Minister congratulates himself that he has assembled in his cabinet men of every variety of opinion with regard to fiscal matters. Well, he certainly has a very strong contrast in some of them. Listen to what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said last session, and we will know when he gets on his feet now whether or not he is of the same opinion.

> I do not mean to say that a government may not be corrupt and yet not protectionist. That may be. But I do say that human nature being as it is, it is almost impossible for a government to be protectionist and escape being corrupt.

But the Minister of Trade and Commerce, according to ideas of gentlemen on his own side of the House, is in a protectionist government at present, and he says it is difficult to be in a protectionist government and not be corrupt. Of course, if he insists upon it, we are bound to take him at his word. The Minister of Trade and Commerce thus continued his remarks :

> And I will add this further ; I will add that while I think protection and corruption are practically inseparable ; I will add that I likewise believe for my part, that protection and true freedom are all but absolutely incompatible. On that I will give you words of another more eloquent than any I can utter. Here are some remarks which are very much indeed to the purpose. The gentleman whom I quote says :

'I come to expose to you the policy of the Liberal party. Let me tell you that policy may be resumed in the good Saxon word 'freedom' in every sense of the term ; freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of religious life and civil life, and last, not least, freedom in commercial life. . . . .

In the American Republic you have the line of cleavage which exists between the Liberal party and the Conservative party—the question of free trade. We stand for freedom, they stand for restriction ; they stand for servitude ; we stand for freedom.

I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage ; yea, bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which the American slavery was bondage ; not in the same degree perhaps, but in the same manner. . . . In the same manner the people of this country, the inhabitants of the city of Winnipeg especially, are toiling for a master, who takes away, not every cent of profit, but a very large percentage, a very great portion of your earnings for which you toil and sweat. . . . .

I do not tell you that we must have no taxation, but I do say that the government has no right to take a cent from you or me except for the necessities of the revenue, and if the government takes from you any portion of your earnings, whether the portion be large or small, to give to somebody else that government is as much a robber as the highwayman who puts a pistol to your forehead and says : "your purse or your life."

Admirable sentences, admirably expressed with that force and eloquence with which my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) usually puts the case before his audience.

Mr. BROCK. See them smiling.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). After the session the Finance Minister went to Yarmouth, and he spoke there ; the Finance Minister at Yarmouth, the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) in his organ and in personal interviews, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) and the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) in Argenteuil, the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) on the public platform and in his organ, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) at St. Hyacinthe, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) in New Brunswick, the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), the member for Hants (Mr. Russell) in Yarmouth, and many other members on the government side of the House have proclaimed their adherence to free trade, and have denounced any attempt to increase the tariff. On the other hand, the Prime Minister, through the mouth of his Minister of Marine, announced in Maisonneuve that he was in favour of legitimate protection to Canadian industry, and the Minister of Marine appeared on the platform before his electors as a protectionist. The member for West York (Mr. Campbell), the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), the member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes), the Prime Minister of Ontario, the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, the Hon. James McMullen, and a great many other very prominent gentlemen in the Liberal party have proclaimed themselves in favour of increased protection to the industries of this country, and they have supported the position of my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and have said that the government should have adopted the policy which had been advocated by that hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) before he left the present administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what really are we to make of the attitude of the Liberal party in that regard ? I leave it to you, Sir, if, after carefully digesting, as I know you have done, the speech of the Minister of Finance yesterday, you are one whit the wiser as to what the policy of the Liberal party is with regard to protection and free trade. I know, Sir, that by the usages and custom of the House you are debarred from making any answer to my question, and, of course, I put the question only in a formal way, but I am quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that if you were at liberty to answer you would be just as dumb as you are at present.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Now, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative party believes in a policy of adequate protection ; a policy of such adequate protection as will maintain and strengthen Canadian industries ; such a policy as will give our own market to our own people That policy we have declared in all parts of the country. We believe that such a policy is in the interests of all parts of Canada and of all classes of the community. I think that word 'adequate' attracted the attention of my hon. friend from Haldimand, and I will give him a very good authority for the use of that word by and by. In the western states the policy of protection has found favour with the farmers, because they see built up in all that western country great industrial centres ; because they feel the advantage of a protected home market, and because they know that without the protection of that home market they would get very much less for their products than they do at present. As I said before, I believe that the farmers in the western part of Canada will have the same experience, and that they will learn, even more than they do at present—and they do very largely realize it at present—the advantages of our home market ; the advantages to this country of the protection of the home market so far as all classes of the people are concerned.

It is sometimes said that the farmers cannot be protected. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce took that ground last year. He said the only way in which you could protect them would be by giving them a bounty. I want to point out to my hon. friend that there are people in this country whose claims have been denied by this government—I refer to the lead miners of British Columbia—who look on this matter in a somewhat different aspect. During my visit to the western part

of this country I found that they complained bitterly that the tariff fails to give them any protection whatever, while the farmer has a very considerable protection. After enumerating a number of implements upon which a duty must be paid by the miner, they proceed as follows :

Wheat protected by a duty of 12 cents per bushel ; oats protected by a duty of 10 cents per bushel ; hay protected by a duty of $2 per ton ; potatoes protected by a duty of 15 cents per bushel ; eggs protected by a duty of 3 cents per dozen ; poultry protected by a duty of 20 per cent ; cattle and sheep protected by a duty of 20 per cent ; hogs protected by a duty of 25 per cent ; fruits protected by a duty of 25 per cent ; condensed milk, canned at Truro, Nova Scotia, protected by a duty of 3½ cents a pound ; pease, corn, beans, canned, protected by a duty of 2½ cents per pound ; apples, pears, peaches, canned, protected by a duty that averages over 100 per cent ; preserved meats protected by a duty of 25 per cent ; ham and bacon protected by a duty of 2 cents per pound ; cheese protected by a duty of 3 cents per pound ; butter protected by a duty of 4 cents per pound ; and so on.

It will be observed that the lead miner of the west entertains an entirely different view from that expressed last year by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as to the possibility of protecting the farmer. I am not suggesting that the protection to the farmer is too high; I think it is not high enough. I believe that upon many agricultural products the duty ought to be increased, so that a country like Canada, possessing agricultural capabilities second to none in the world, should not be handicapped in competition with the United States and should not be obliged to import from that country nearly $28,000,000 of agricultural and animal products. The farmer is protected in this country to a certain extent. He should be protected to a greater extent, and the Conservative party will be prepared, upon attaining power, to give him a further measure of protection which in its opinion the interests of the country demands.

The tide of industrial expansion seems to be at its height on this continent. It has been expected that its ebb would come before this. It has not yet come, but it will come as surely as the ebb follows the flow of the ocean tide. All business men are agreed on that. When it does come, the protection afforded to Canadian industries by the present ad valorem tariff will decrease with the decrease in prices. In many respects it is insufficient at present. It will be utterly insufficient then, when the time comes that we shall have to face the slaughtering in the Canadian market of goods from the United States. Have we no suffering industries at the present time ? The hon. gentleman says that the time is inopportune for making any change in the tariff. What about our woollen industries our cotton factories, our iron and steel industries ? Do these not feel too keenly the stress of foreign competition ? We have the lead mining industry of British Columbia crushed by the united effects of an American combine, an American prohibitive tariff and a non-protecting Canadian tariff. The most magnificent mining country in the world is practically paralyzed for the want of protection, while my hon. friend says that we have not time to deal with this question at this session—we have more pressing and weighty matters in our hands, and these gentlemen had better come another year. Would it mean nothing to the immigrants who are pouring into the North-west to have 100,000 people added to the population of British Columbia, engaged in the lead mining and other legitimate industries which ought to be built up in that province ? An example of the value of a home market is found in the North-west at the present time. The people are pouring into that country, and we are finding there for the manufactures and agricultural products of eastern Canada a better market than they had before, while at the same time various industries in British Columbia have been stimulated by the fact of that immigration. These movements react on each other.

What is our position with respect to the United States ? We buy from them about $72,000,000 of manufactured goods, and we sell to them $6,024,000. We buy from them $28,000,000 of agricultural products and products of animals, and we sell to them of the same articles less than $8,000,000. All our producers and manufacturers are confronted in that country by a practically prohibitive tariff. I maintain that the Finance Minister does not take the proper view of the situation when he says that we had better postpone the revising of our tariff until after we have negotiated on trade matters with the United States. Their tariff is practically double ours, and we with a tariff half as high as theirs are going to negotiate with them. What is the objection to putting our tariff on a better and fairer basis first, and then going to negotiate with the United States ? Why do we have to wait until my hon. friend the Prime Minister gets further letters from Senator Fairbanks in reference to resuming those negotiations which I thought from the right hon. gentleman's remarks in Montreal about a year ago had come for ever to an end ? I say it is bad policy first to give to the United States such concessions as we gave in 1897, to continue these concessions to the present year, and then to say that we will avoid touching our tariff at all in order that when we come to negotiate with the United States we may go there handicapped. No, the stronger policy is the better one. Let us first deal with our tariff from the standpoint of our own interests, recognizing that in doing so we must have regard to certain conditions existing in other countries. Then, having dealt with our tariff in a strong and bold way, if the United States desire to

negotiate, we can inform them that we are at their service and ready to take up the matter at any time they may desire.

Sir we propose at this juncture to renew our declaration of policy of last year with regard to the tariff. As I have already said, the question of preferential trade will be dealt with later. The resolution which I wish to move is as follows :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be left out, and the following substituted therefor :—

This House, regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory, is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, as will at all time secure the Canadian market for Canadians ;

And that the financial policy of the government should include a measure for the thorough and judicious readjustment of the tariff at the present session.

Some criticism has been made upon the wording of this resolution. Some gentlemen have found it difficult to attach any intelligent meaning to the word 'adequate.' I have noticed on some occasions that the same hon. gentlemen made use of the word and found it good enough to serve their purpose. Let me say that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) favours 'legitimate protection.' I have his language declaring that policy, under my hand, used by him in a recent campaign in Maisonneuve. I suppose that 'adequate' is quite as definite as 'legitimate,' particularly when coupled with the proviso that the protection we ask should be adequate to maintain the Canadian market for Canadians. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), this session, when introducing his Railway Commission Bill, expressed his opinion that it would 'adequately protect' our shipping interests. Yet my hon. friend the Minister of Finance says that the phrase 'adequate protection' is absolutely meaningless. I commend his criticism to his hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I trust that the speech of the latter will be revised in accordance with that criticism. I find also that the provincial premiers introduced the phrase three times in their resolutions which the government is now considering. Would it not be well for my hon. friend the Minister of Finance if he adheres to the opinion he expressed in Halifax, to send these resolutions back to the provincial premiers for an explanation of this meaningless phrase which they have used. But I have a better authority than all these, one I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will not question. A certain editor of a newspaper published in Halifax some years ago, and published there still, used the following strong language with regard to the coal duty :

The coal duty is a confessed mockery—an organized hypocrisy. The coal owners of Nova Scotia have been fooled, as we predicted they would be ; they get no adequate protection.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who wrote that article, does not understand now the meaning of the term 'adequate protection' which was then used by him in that article. That only shows how some of us travel backwards in our education.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On both sides.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Most of us go a little forward, but my hon. friend, in this regard at least, has found himself travelling backward in his comprehension of the English language. With these excellent authorities, especially the last, perhaps the Minister of Finance may be inclined to reconsider his obiter dictum.

Sir, I concur in the eloquent words which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance uttered in his peroration. We all realize now the wealth of our resources, the splendour of our heritage. It is true that the Liberal leaders in days gone by did not entertain the same view of the great west which has been expressed so eloquently by the hon. gentleman. The great Conservative leaders of the past had opposed to them men who, in all sincerity, saw nothing in the province of British Columbia, save a sea of mountains, who saw nothing in our great west but a land incapable of paying for the oil required in operating a transcontinental railway. But let bygones be bygones. These gentlemen see now what the great Conservative leaders of bygone days saw years ago. We are glad that now we all think alike on this subject. We have a great country, a great heritage, and, therefore, great responsibilities. I fear not for the future of the west, nor do I believe that any narrow or sectional spirit now pervades or will pervade the people of that country. Like the people of the east, they will stand for a broad and strong Canadian policy, a policy which will give to our producers the advantage of our own markets, and to our labouring people a fair living wage; a policy which will keep our young men in our country and under which we can all unite in upbuilding a happy, prosperous and contented Canada.

I beg to move the following amendment to the motion of the hon. the Minister of Finance :

That all the words after 'that' in the proposed motion be left out, and the following substituted therefor :—'This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians ;

'And that the financial policy of the government should include a measure for the thorough and judicious readjustment of the tariff at the present session.'

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright).

As the hon. gentleman has appealed to me for my opinions as to the divers doctrines he has expressed, and the divers statements which may have been made in former times by myself and other members of the government, it would be, I think, rather discourteous on my part to decline to reply, and it is not my intention to do so. However, I will pay the hon. gentleman the compliment on this occasion of imitating his example of yesterday. And as to-day is Friday, and a number of our friends are disposed to return to their homes, I will take the liberty of moving to adjourn the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER. With the consent of the House I will now move :

That the debate be continued from day to day until completed, and that it be the first order of the day except on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, when it will be the next order after questions put by members.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I see no objection to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RAILWAY.

Mr. GEORGE BALL (Nicolet) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 36) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. He said : Mr. Speaker, in presenting this motion, I would like to draw your attention and that of the House to the facts of the case. This Bill was on the Order paper a short time ago, and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) thought he would render me a service by presenting it in my absence. My hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), lacking knowledge of parliamentary procedure—being, like myself, a new member of this House—thought he would propose the six months' hoist. Fortunately or unfortunately, I do not know which, the Bill had not been printed in French, and my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) raised the point of order. In this way the Bill remains on the Order paper, and comes up for its second reading to-night. Since the last occasion, I have made some inquiries, and I find what I am about to read to you :

The consent given by the House to the second reading of a private Bill does not necessarily commit the House to the principle of the Bill. The expediency of a private Bill being mainly founded upon allegations of fact which have not yet been proved. The House in agreeing to the second reading affirms the principle of the Bill conditionally and subject to the proof of such allegations before the committee.

Since 1868 no private Bills have been defeated on the second reading. It was done, however, before confederation but then Council could be heard at the Bar for or against the Bill.

In 1880 objection was made to the second reading of the Bill concerning the Credit Valley Railway Company. A long discussion took place on that objection and the Hon. Mr. Holton, who has always been considered as a high authority on parliamentary procedure, said that a private Bill should always receive its second reading, and Sir John Macdonald, in spite of the fact that objection was raised by one of his political friends, expressed the same idea as the Hon. Mr. Holton.

In 1879 Sir John A. Macdonald expressed the same principle on a Bill concerning the Saskatchewan Colonization Railway Company, and this Bill was also read a second time and referred to the committee.

In 1889, Sir John A. Macdonald, on the Ottawa and Montreal Boom Company said, it is greatly to the advancement of public business that private Bills should be sent to the various committees to be dealt with and then on the reports of the committees the great question whether the Bill would become law or not comes up. Though the objection made to the Bill which was then under consideration was because it was a Bill of public nature.

Now, the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), represents the Prime Minister in that right hon. gentleman's absence and leads this House. I would ask him kindly not to allow such attempts to be made to kill a Bill at its second reading. And for various reasons. Supposing that this principle were adopted to-day, what difficulty might we not look for in the future. There are on the list here a good many private Bills. All private Bills are generally read the second time in about half an hour, no matter what the number may be. Supposing that on each of these Bills, an hon. member should raise objection and seek to prevent the second reading, you can see what difficulty there would be. I would ask the protection of the leader of this House. I would like him to treat me as he treats every one else. I want British fair play.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). Before this motion is put, I beg permission to say a few words. The hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Ball) has certainly made out what appears to be a very strong case regarding the precedents in the second reading of private Bills. There is not the least doubt that it is in the interest of the House and of parties applying to the House that private Bills should be sent, as a matter of course, to committee to be discussed. But, in this case, we are dealing with a most extraordinary set of people; and I feel it to be in the interest of my county and the people I represent and only just to myself to bring the matter before the House,

so that I may explain the peculiar position in which we stand. This application of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway—the name is not unfamiliar to the old members of the House—is connected with the old Baie des Chaleurs Railway, which, as most members are aware, has been before this House on several occasions during the last ten or fifteen years. The Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company was originally incorporated in 1893, for the building and operation of a line of railway from Gaspé Basin in the county of Gaspé, to Sault Ste. Marie. It was made up of eight different sections of road, including the Baie des Chaleurs, the Great Eastern, the Montreal and Sorel, the Montreal Bridge, the Ottawa Valley, the Pontiac and Pacific Junction, the Ontario Pacific and the Intercolonial section. The year following this incorporation, an Act was passed in this parliament authorizing the transfer of the Baie des Chaleurs and the Great Eastern to this company and the system was operated under the name of the Atlantic and Lake Superior. For some years the promoter of this company, Mr. C. N. Armstrong, who is well known to the members of this House, attempted in various ways to bring about the successful completion of the undertaking. The charter of the Montreal Bridge Company was discussed last session in this House, and on that occasion, I believe, the House gained an insight into the methods that were employed. But for the moment I wish to limit myself more particularly to what happened in the county of Bonaventure. This new company, the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, took over the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and constructed some eighteen miles from Caplan down to New Carlisle. In 1900, when I had the honour of being elected to this House, the powers of the company were lapsed, and the subsidies which had been voted were also lapsed. But to-day we find this company coming again before parliament and asking for a renewal of its powers, and asking that we should extend for five years the time during which this undertaking may be completed, not only from Gaspé Basin to Sault Ste. Marie, but to enable this company to be incorporated and purchase the roads which are mentioned in the Bill, which would enable it to reach as far as the Pacific ocean over the unbuilt Grand Trunk Pacific.

I desire, Mr. Speaker, before they are given these powers that the House should be made acquainted with the manner in which they have dealt with the people of Bonaventure. The Minister of Railways, in December last, at my request, and to give effect to the law which had been adopted here in 1900 reviving the subsidy, issued a circular calling upon the people of Bonaventure county more especially, and the public at large, who had claims on the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway for the last section of thirty miles thereof, to send in their claims to the Department of Railways to enable him to distribute pro rata the $16,000 which had been reserved from the subsidy for the payment of labour, board bills and material. What was the result ? The Minister of Railways received, during five or six weeks, claims amounting to $226,000, a tabulated list of which has been prepared. These claims were sworn to, and were produced for that amount on thirty miles of the road. The claims that remain on the other seventy miles of road, not coming within the purview of the subsidy bill, were not filed. We have therefore reasonable cause to believe that this company owes $300,000 in the county of Bonaventure, to Liberals and Conservatives, poor men for the most part, labourers, local merchants, widows keeping boarding houses, and so forth. In spite of the fact that this company owes to-day $300,000, they have the audacity to come before this parliament and to ask for what practically amounts to a transcontinental charter. This company, Mr. Speaker, is practically out of business. In 1900 it transferred its charter to the trustees for the bondholders who are now operating the road. These trustees are represented in Montreal by Senator J. P. B. Casgrain, and the chief of these trustees is Mr. Joaquin Galindez, of London. These people do not make the application themselves, but it is the old company which has gone out of business, which has transferred its road, and which owes $300,000 in my county alone, and who wish to comprise in this scheme the Montreal bridge, the charter of which has expired, and a portion of the Montreal and South Shore Railway, which has been transferred to other hands. All these are comprised under the general name of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway.

I therefore feel it my duty, in justice to my constituents to inform the House of this state of affairs. Last year I had no opportunity of doing so, because the Bill was killed in committee without being discussed, since the very mention of the name was sufficient to cause the Bill to be thrown out. The year before, the trustees of the road, rather than take advantage of the two years extension of time which we had given them in which to build the two miles of road, introduced a Bill in the Senate, and which was passed in the Senate, extending for five years the time during which they could complete two or three miles of road. To-day the Private Bills Committee of Quebec was called upon to consider another Bill introduced by these same people under the name of the Quebec and Oriental Railway Company. These people ask for power from the legislature of Quebec to build a railway from Rivière du Loup to Metapedia parallel to the Intercolonial Railway. They ask for power under a simple resolution of their board of directors to transfer the Atlantic and Lake

Superior and the Baie des Chaleurs Railway over to the new concern. If that should happen, Mr. Speaker, I wish to know in what position the unfortunate people of Bonaventure will be if this road is so transferred. Under all these circumstances I thought it my duty to call particular attention to this Bill. My county is not the only one interested, all the counties to the south of the St. Lawrence in the province of Quebec are interested, in fact almost every county up to Montreal, and thence across the river, and from Montreal up the Ottawa valley, on to Sault Ste. Marie, and by their connections out to the Pacific coast. I think that before these people are allowed to leave Bonaventure they should settle with their debtors there. At the request of the government I will willingly consent not to move the six months hoist, because I know it is somewhat contrary to precedent. Now that I have laid down the lines upon which I oppose this Bill, I am satisfied to leave it to the Railway Committee, confident that ample justice will be done in the matter. For these reasons I will consent to the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BALL. I wish to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil).

Mr. SPEAKER. It is against the rules of procedure.

Mr. BALL. I want to explain the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. But the hon. gentleman has no right to speak at this stage.

Mr. SPROULE. I only rise to say that my hon. friend (Mr. Ball) was under the impression that he had a right to speak and answer what was said by the member for Bonaventure. I was going to suggest to him that he will have every opportunity to speak when the Bill comes before the Railway Committee. I thought that it was scarcely likely the hon. member for Bonaventure would move the six months hoist for an ordinary private Bill, something that has rarely or never been done in this House, seeing that a discussion of the Bill can more advantageously take place in the committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). We should be careful not to limit ourselves by establishing a precedent. There can be no question whatever as to the right of the House to reject a Bill, even a private Bill, on the second reading, if special and urgent reasons of a general public character be urged against it. It is quite conceivable that even a private Bill might be of such a character that the House would desire to reject it, and we should do nothing that would seem to imply that we are under any restriction in that respect. As a rule, these private Bills involve no principle, and I think it is only just to the hon. gentleman that this Bill should go to the committee. But we should not limit in any way by a precedent the right of the House to reject even a private Bill on the second reading.

Mr. SPROULE. It was because my hon. friend the other night waived the right of speaking on the Bill that he desired to speak to-night.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I think it is well for the House to reserve to itself the unrestricted right of disposing of a Bill on the second reading, and more especially so if the House is in possession already of sufficient facts, or if it has sufficient knowledge with respect to the undertaking itself, to deal with it at this stage. I have no objection at all to the Bill going to the committee, but I may say to my hon. friend that I am sufficiently acquainted with the transactions of this company and with the condition to which their affairs have fallen to make it impossible for me to consent that this Bill should become law. I am of the opinion that not only the Bill in some portions is objectionable, but that the Bill as a whole should be rejected by this House. I think that would be the sense of the committee which will have to deal with the matter if it should go to the Committee on Railways and Canals, but if the House feels that it knows enough about the transaction to say that it is useless to send it to the committee because there can only be one result of the reference, then, I think, my hon. friend will at once yield to the reasonableness of the position which is taken in regard to it and allow us to dispose of the matter now. We have a great deal of business to go before the Railway Committee and sending it unnecessary work is a thing, which, I think, we ought to avoid doing. I am quite sure the committee cannot look with favour upon the passage of this Bill. The company is in an absolutely demoralized condition and it has left things in such a shape that great difficulty is experienced in unravelling its affairs for the purpose, not of trying to save something for the company, but of trying to get some small percentage of the wages for the labouring people who have worked on the road. That is the condition in which this company stands. I do not think anything like it has been known in the history of railway construction in this country. Certainly there is no company that has ever approached parliament with less claim for consideration at the hands of parliament than the present company. It may seem to be a little ungracious to say that the hon. gentleman's Bill should not proceed further, but I think he must realize that it is useless to go further even if the House should be willing to accede to his request.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to hear the hon. Min-

ister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) speak as he has done in respect to this Bill. This is the first time since I have been a member of this House that I have ever heard anything of this kind in connection with the second reading of a Bill. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) is to be congratulated on the position he has taken. There are many hon. members of the House who would like to know something of this legislation and I think it is not too much to ask that the matter should be left to the Railway Committee. I am sure the Railway Committee will go thoroughly into the matter and if the statements made by the hon. minister are found to be correct, I am sure the Railway Committee is composed of men who will deal summarily with the Bill if it is of the character described. If the statements made by the hon. minister are correct it will take a very short time for the Railway Committee to deal with it. I think it would be unfair to many of us here to kill a private Bill when the motion for its second reading is made.

Mr. SPROULE. And it would establish a bad precedent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not wish to press any objection to the Bill going to the committee. I merely stated what will be the probable result in view of the knowledge I have in a case of this kind. I would not press my objection to the Bill being referred to the committee if it is the desire of hon. members that it should be.

Mr. INGRAM. We have not all the knowledge that the hon. gentleman has in connection with this Bill, and for that reason we desire to have it sent to the Railway Committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very good.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

OTTAWA VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SPROULE moved the second reading of Bill (No. 59) respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Monk.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). Mr. Speaker, I may say that this Ottawa Valley Railway is a section of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway. It forms part of the same concern. Five or six miles of the road have been constructed from St. Andrews to Carillon in Argenteuil county. It forms part of the system of this defunct Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. For the same reason that I allowed the other Bill to go through I consent to this Bill being read the second time reserving my right to take the same objection to this Bill as to that of the parent company.

Mr. INGRAM.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

NEW CANADIAN COMPANY.

Mr. BELCOURT moved the second reading of Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the new Canadian Company, Limited.—Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the mover of this state whether the road covered by this Bill runs parallel with the line dealt with by the two former Bills which have been read a second time? Probably the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) could tell us.

Mr. MARCIL. Bill (No. 83), I may explain, has no connection with the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, but I understand, it is part of the undertaking of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway.

Mr. INGRAM. It runs parallel with the other two lines does it not?

Mr. MARCIL. It runs from the Gaspé basin through the interior of Gaspé. This is more of an application for power to build docks, jetties, &c., at Gaspé basin than to build a railway. This is not a railway company at all.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a miscellaneous private Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Mutual Fire Insurance Company, of the city of Montreal, and to change its name to the Montreal Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. LaRivière.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 97) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Bank of Canada.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Royal Trust Company.—Mr. Casgrain.

Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 105) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Standard Car Truck Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Isolated landing pier, Cross Point, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). This work is now

under contract and the total cost will be $11,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What does an 'isolated' landing pier mean ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Cross Point is in Bonaventure county, opposite the town of Campbellton, N.B., the Restigouche river dividing the two. Campbellton is an enterprising and progressing town, and is the market centre for a large section of the country. The Restigouche is a tidal river. At low tide the steam ferry is unable to go beyond the middle of the river and for many years Mr. McAlister, who represented Restigouche, together with the then member for Bonaventure, urged that a pier should be built here so as to enable teams to reach the middle of the river to connect with the ferry. I am glad to say that we have succeeded in getting this done. The word 'isolated' was put in a couple of years ago because it was thought the wharf would be erected in the centre of the river, but it was found that this would not be practicable, and a wharf is to be built from the shore to extend to the middle of the river. This expenditure of public money has been of great public utility and has given great satisfaction to the people in that district.

Heavy repairs to wharf at Crane Island, $3,000.

Mr. MORIN. What kind of a place is this and is the wharf used for sailing vessels or for steamers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The officials have reported to me that this is being repaired principally to protect the lighthouse, which is situated at the end of the wharf.

Mr. AVERY. Is it on private property ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, government property.

Landing pier, Father Point, $61,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the minister explain what has been done for this large expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new pier at Father Point 800 feet long and the total cost is $86,000. The work is under contract and this vote is to complete.

Mr. INGRAM. When was this work started ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was let on the 8th of November, 1901.

Mr. CLARE. You appear to have voted $8,000 for this in 1901; $25,000 last year, and now you want $61,000. That is more than the contract price.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not more than this contract. It is $25,000 and $61,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this a timber wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What kind of timber ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hemlock and spruce.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is quite a difference between hemlock and spruce as regards the price. Is there any special part of hemlock ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The specifications permit both to be used. I am not prepared to take the responsibility of saying so, but I understand that hemlock lasts as well under water as spruce.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). So long as the specifications call for hemlock, that is all right; but if they called for spruce and hemlock were used, that would be different.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister tell us what was done with the $15,000 that was voted in 1901-2 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only explanation is that the money was not spent, and the vote lapsed. The total amount of the contract, as I have stated, is $86,000.

Grande Vallée—pier, $36,000.

Mr. MORIN. Is the pier anywhere near a wharf that has been built at that place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not aware that there is any other pier or wharf at this place.

Mr. MORIN. There was money voted last year and two years ago for this very place. There was $25,000 voted last year for that very same pier, and this year you are asking for $36.000 more.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may explain to my hon. friend that the amount of the contract for this work was originally $53,900, and while there was a small vote in 1901-2, none of that money was spent. There has been spent up to the 30th of June, 1902, $14,857, and since then nearly $9,000. $36,000 it is estimated will be required to be spent during the next year. That will pay the contractor to complete this work with the exception of $3,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the whole work will cost $54,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $59,500.

Mr. MORIN. Will the hon. minister tell the House the population of that town ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no information of the population. I do not think there is any town there of any size.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). What kind of timber is used in this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that there are considerable timber limits in that district. Large mills have been erected, and this pier is built for the purpose of allowing the shipping to be carried on. Large business has been developed in the district. The timber used is no doubt spruce and hemlock, and perhaps pine; I am not sure about that.

Mr. AVERY. Is this the property of which a deed has been given ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A deed of it has been given to the Crown free of charge.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister tell us about what population there is in the neighbourhood of this place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand the hon. minister to say the department have a deed of this property. Who is the property deeded from ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I may say that Grande Vallée is situated in the county of Gaspé adjoining my county. This wharf was not built for the population that is there, because according to the last census the population was very small. It was then somewhat over 300. This wharf is on the St. Lawrence side of the county of Gaspé. It was built for the purpose of enabling a large tract of timber limits in the interior of the county to find an outlet to the St. Lawrence. When this wharf is completed and schooners are able to reach this point, it will afford an outlet for the whole south shore of the county of Gaspé, which is now practically a terra incognita, and will greatly benefit the whole district. I am sure the money is well invested.

Mr. COCHRANE. Who owns the timber limits ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). That I cannot say.

Mr. HACKETT. What stream is this on ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). It is on the St. Lawrence, but there is a river running into the St. Lawrence at this point, on which there is a large water power. It is a section of country which up to the present has been entirely neglected, and a work of this kind will change the whole complexion of the place.

Mr. MORIN. Will the hon. minister tell us why, when a few years ago there was no wharf at this place, there should be such great necessity for the spending of from $20,000 to $50,000 there ? Is that expenditure for the benefit of commerce generally, or for the benefit of somebody who sits in this House not very far from here ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very pleased to inform my hon. friend that the reason for building this wharf is to develop a large section of that portion of the province of Quebec in which there are timber limits and great opportunities for business.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who owns the timber lands ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know the company, but this wharf will give facilities to bring goods there and take away the lumber.

Mr. MORIN. It certainly appears to me passing strange that while a few years ago there was nothing there, all at once some one who sits not very far from here went down there and bought a large tract of timber land, and then we find the government stepping right in and making this large expenditure, the main object of which is evidently to help somebody out of a hole. That certainly appears ridiculous to me, and I do not see why it should not appear equally ridiculous to the hon. Minister of Public Works. I am not opposed to the expenditure of public money where it is necessary, but such expenditure where and when it is unnecessary, is a ridiculous waste of the people's money. Just look at the census. Before 1901, there was not a soul in that section of the country, and last year we find that there were only 314 people there, all of whom are labouring men working in the sawmills and the woods. It is all very well for the hon. minister to tell us that this expenditure is in the public interest, but it is a different thing for us to put any credence in such a statement. I have seen lately in one of the Quebec newspapers that the party who bought these timber limits, has refused a sum of money which would clear him a profit of $100,000 out of the operation.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who is the gentleman ?

Mr. MORIN. I do not like to give his name, but I can look across there and see him.

An hon. MEMBER. You cannot see him now.

Mr. MORIN. No, he is not there. I would like to put the hon. minister another question. The other night he told us that when the government built a wharf, he would see that the government owned it. Will this particular wharf belong to the government or will it not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This property belongs to the government—the land on which it is situated and the work itself. Perhaps the best justification for building this wharf is the statement which my hon. friend has made, that since it has been begun, the value of property has been so much increased there, that property owners can make a large profit on their holdings. True it is that this is an

undeveloped section of the province of Quebec, but the giving of this facility for the carrying on of the lumbering trade will enhance the value of the limits and give employment to a large number of people. This expenditure was authorized by parliament some three years ago.

Mr. MORIN. Yes, at the time of the elections.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We committed ourselves to the work, a contract entered into, and I am now asking for the money to meet the obligations undertaken by the Crown. I am pleased to hear the hon. gentleman state that the development of the country is so good that those interested in that section of country will reap great benefit from this work.

Mr. MORIN. Who authorized the government to give that money for that wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Parliament.

Mr. MORIN. Who recommended the grant ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Minister of Public Works at that time.

Mr. MORIN. There must have been somebody else behind him. I have carried on considerable lumber business myself, and I have never had the government build a wharf for me or anything else. When I wanted to build any work, I had to build it myself and pay for it. How is it that just at election time, some men from the Eastern Townships should go to that country and buy a large tract of timber, and then have the government step right in and find the money to build a wharf for them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My own experience is that of the hon. gentleman. I never got anything or asked anything from the government. But he was mistaken about the election. There was no election on when the vote was authorized by parliament.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman was incorrect in stating that when the vote was passed that there was no opposition on this side.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. What I said was that parliament did authorize the work and that a contract was entered into by virtue of that authority, and I am only asking a vote to carry it out.

Mr. BENNETT. In view of the strenuous opposition offered last year, when the vote for this work was originally submitted, we are justified in making comments on it today. The facts were these, as shown by 'Hansard.' The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell), who is always out of the House when the question comes up for discussion, invested in some timber limits in that locality. It is not an arable section, its chief value being the standing timber. Here then we have the hon. member for Stanstead wanting the Crown to aid him in his enterprise and taking the government and the Minister of Public Works by the throat, with the result that the government pledge themselves to an expenditure of $70,000 for the sole advantage of his lumber company. We should have the assurance that this will be treated as a business enterprise. It is true that the hon. gentleman was not in charge of the Department of Public Works when the vote for this work was first taken, and is consequently not personally responsible for its inception, but he should pledge the House and country that the government is going to tax the hon. gentleman from Stanstead and his company a rental which will give a fair return on the outlay. Let me read, for the benefit of the House, a list of these docks built at the expense of the public exchequer. Here is a list of docks in the province of Quebec, built at the expense of hundreds of thousands to the people of Canada, showing receipts from those docks for the last year :

Carleton, $28.07 ; Cedars, $17.10 ; Coteau du Lac, $27.84 ; Greece's Point, $10.24 ; Isle aux Grues, $0.12 ; Lacolle, $9.76 ; Percé, $24.71 ; St. Irenée, $55.69 ; St. Thomas de Montmagny, $2.62.

In view of the fact that these docks are used by public corporations and private parties and that they have cost the country hundreds of thousands, I think the hon. minister, before this item passes, should promise the House that there shall be a fair return of at least $500 from the docks now under discussion. This should be done especially because the company, when they have completed their lumbering operations will leave it in the hands of the people, a work from which no revenue can be obtained.

Mr. SCHELL. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is evidently not familiar with the timber trade of the eastern provinces, or he would not make the statement he has made. When he speaks of the spruce timber being cut off in a few years, he is completely outside the facts. Price Bros., for instance, have been cutting on their limit for over sixty years. Spruce reproduces itself in from sixteen to twenty-five years, and operators claim that they can cut indefinitely from the spruce forests of the province of Quebec. If the limit that has been referred to is of such large extent as has been alleged—and it would need to be pretty large to make it worth the money spoken of—no question arises as to that timber ever being cut out. There seems to be a disposition on the part of certain speakers on the opposition side to reflect upon an hon. member of this House because he had an interest in this property. So far as that hon. member is concerned, he is not now interested in this property. It is well known that he sold out to a large company of which he is not a member.

Mr. BENNETT. Sold out at an enhanced value, I suppose.

Mr. SCHELL. The value may be enhanced or it may not. But the plain fact remains that there is no danger, if this is a large spruce limit, of the timber being cut out; this dock will be as useful twenty, or forty or fifty years from now as it is to-day.

Mr. BENNETT. We on this side must thank the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) for the information he has given. His statement is—and I accept it as true, I know he would not make the statement unless it were true—that the hon. member for Stanstead was either sole or part owner of this property and was desirous of unloading on some company, and, to increase the value, he gets his party friends to spend $70,000 of public money there, of which he gets the benefit. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Schell) did not say so directly, but I am sure he is blaming the government for this action and I say he is quite right in doing so. The hon. minister is taken to account by the member for Glengarry. What does the hon. gentleman complain of? He is complaining that after this great amount of $60,000 or $70,000 for this dock was appropriated, the owner unloads it on an incorporated company and gets the benefit. I agree with the hon. member for Glengarry that the minister and the party should be censured for having made such a grant. Another point brought out by the hon. member for Glengarry—and I must thank him for it also—is that if it were true that the timber could be cut out in fifteen years or so it might be a hardship on the hon. member for Stanstead to ask him to build a dock; but it would not be a hardship to ask him to build the dock instead of having it built by the public, because the timber constantly reproduces itself in from sixteen to twenty-five years. It will be seen, therefore, that the hon. member for Stanstead had a more decided advantage that I thought he had. In view of the complaint made by the hon. member for Glengarry I am sure the hon. Minister of Public Works will agree not to allow the dock to be used by the company that has purchased the rights of the hon. member for Stanstead—at least the hon. member for Glengarry says they have done so—without giving the country a rental of at least eight per cent on the expenditure, and also keeping the dock in repair.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see how I am to make an agreement contrary to the law. These people will have to pay dues according to the rates fixed. There is a large business done, and the dock ought to yield a good revenue.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are the dues?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the rates here; they are under another department.

Mr. SCHELL.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is evident from the list read by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) either that the dues are very small or, in the case of many of these docks, no business is done. I cannot but feel that there has been a great deal of public money spent in these public works without ministering to any real public need. No man can convince me that a revenue of from twenty-five cents to twelve dollars from works that have cost thousands can indicate anything but that the money spent on these works has been almost wholly wasted. When I think that along the shores of Lake Ontario, in such ridings as that I have the honour to represent, where millions of bushels of grain are shipped and large quantities of goods imported, there are towns whose post offices give a large revenue to the country, yet where not a dollar of public money has been spent, I am convinced more than ever that there must be something radically wrong in such a vote as this. The proposition now before us seems to be one of the most absurd ever submitted to the House since I have had the honour of being a member—that we are to spend something like $60,000 at a point where the minister tells us there is not a town. I venture the assertion that if we were to look at the Postmaster General's Report we should find there is not even a post office there.

Mr. MORIN. There is not—I have looked it up.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have no objection to hon. members of this House buying timber limits, but the objection that I raise is to the expenditure of public money for the benefit of corporations or private individuals. And against this the minister should set his face determinedly. I believe that the minister feels deep down in his own heart that there has been a wrong which it will be his duty to make right at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was obliged to go to Montreal this evening. He left in my hands a copy of the estimates with some items marked to be reserved, and amongst them I find the item now under discussion. If there was an agreement that this and other items should be allowed to stand until the House goes into Supply again, I do not think we should discuss the matter at greater length. I presume the hon. Minister of Public Works will allow these items that are marked to stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am most anxious to meet the wishes of the members of this committee, but the proposition I have to make is better for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier than that presented by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) and it is in accordance with the arrangement I entered into with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier before

he left. We all have rights in these matters. This is the third or fourth time the items have been allowed to stand on account of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Monk's) absence. To-day, when he was going away I agreed—and I am anxious to carry out that agreement, and I submit it is more generous than what the hon. member for West Toronto is asking—that the general vote for the province of Quebec should stand with the understanding that when it comes up, any item in the Quebec list can be taken up and discussed. This will give greater latitude than would be given by merely picking out four or five items and passing the others. This carries out the understanding we had with the hon. member before six o'clock.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I hope the minister does not mean that he will pass all these items, because I think it is possible that a motion will be made to strike out this item. I think the time has arrived when jobs of this kind should be stopped. I am satisfied that the minister, if he wishes to make a reputation for himself in his new office, will see that this sort of thing is ended. Here we have a member of this House engaged in the lumber business, going down there where there is not even a post office, where there is not even a resident, and gets thousands of dollars nominally expended on a wharf. Has anybody inspected that wharf? Is there a report of the inspector of the work? Is there a wharf in existence? Possibly this is the stuff which sailed down the Bay of Fundy, and formed a portion of some of the money spoken of by Senator Ellis which was sent from the Dominion government to assist the Liberal party in New Brunswick elections. We may as well look these things squarely in the face. So far as I am concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that I would like to see this item stricken out, unless we get some more satisfactory data in connection with it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend had paid careful attention to the discussion——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I listened to every word that was said. I object to the hon. gentleman's insinuation that I did not pay attention to what was said. I can tell him everything that transpired in the conversation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not intend to offend the hon. gentleman. What I meant to say was that he could not have understood the situation, or given it that thought that it requires. I said that parliament some three years ago had committed itself to this contract. I believe the matter was discussed at considerable length on a previous occasion, I am not sure but that there was a vote on this question on a previous occasion. If the item was struck out of the estimates now, it would not save the country from paying the amount already expended, with the added cost of a suit brought against the Crown. The government are legally bound to the contractors to carry out the work. Perhaps about one-half the money has already been spent; therefore no member of this committee under these conditions would feel disposed to vote to strike the item out of the estimates. The contract has been entered into and the amount will have to be paid; if the vote is cancelled, then the country will have to pay such damages as the court may find in favour of the contractors, in addition to what they have already earned.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister tell us from whom this dock was purchased, who are the contractors, who owned the timber limit? Let us have the names of the people in connection with this matter. Don't be afraid to bring out the names of the men.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think it is within the province of the department to have all the information the hon. gentleman asks for; but all that we have and all that is reasonable, I am ready to produce. It has been stated here, though I have no personal knowledge of it, that the member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) was largely interested in timber limits in this district. I would like to know how many business men there are in this House who have not business interests in various parts of the country where public works are constructed, and whose property will be more or less affected by our legislation. It is quite true that there may be extreme cases where the money expended will benefit an individual or a corporation rather than the public at large. In this particular case, all I know is that statements have been made that an hon. member of this House was interested largely in timber limits in that district. There are many men sitting in this House at present, and have sat in it in the past, who have greatly benefited by the expenditure of public money in different parts of the country where they happen to be owners of timber limits, or who may be engaged in other business. The development of the country would not go on unless men of their energy and ability engaged in business. The argument that no money should be spent in a locality because certain individuals will benefit from it more than others, I do not think any one giving it serious thought would endorse. We have spent something over $80,000,000 on our canal system, which has directly benefited certain parties along the rivers, and certain large centres more than other parties and other centres. We have lately gone so far as to free the canals of the dues that were charged to people using them, believing that it was in the general interest of the country to do

so. In this case, I know that in 1901 or 1902 a vote was taken committing parliament to this expenditure, and a contract was entered into. The hon. gentleman wanted to know the names of the contractors. They are Heney & Smith, of Ottawa. This contract was entered into on the 29th of June, 1901; and, as I have already stated, about half the money has already been paid to the contractors.

Mr. CLARKE. When was the first vote taken ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1901 or 1902.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have not heard the name of the party from whom this property was purchased. The minister told us the government had purchased this dock and had a deed of it. From whom was that deed obtained ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the deed here, nor could it be expected that a minister should have these documents.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The minister should have all this information at his fingers end.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All reasonable information, but not unreasonable information. I have stated on the authority of the deputy minister that a grant of the land required here has been made over to the Crown.

Mr. INGRAM. Was there any deed of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I am informed there was a deed. Of course, it could not be a legal grant without a deed. Supposing that this property belonged to an individual member, the deed would come from him. That seems to be the insinuation. I do not know, the deputy minister does not remember. But the point in which this committee and the public are interested is to know whether the Crown has been granted the property and at what price. In this particular case the grant was made free.

Mr. FOWLER. Was the contract entered into before any vote was passed by this House ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have given the date of the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that what the committee is interested in is to know that we are committed to the contract. Is it to be said that if we have allowed, without knowledge, an item to pass whereby we become committed to a contract that is unwise and injudicious, in which the country's money is spent to no good purpose, and because a portion of the money has already been expended, that we are bound to spend the rest, or, in other words, to throw it away ? On the very face of it, this seems to be a job, and not a very creditable one at that. If the information we have got out peacemeal be correct, an hon. member of this House goes down and buys a large timber limit in a comparatively unknown forest, and by some kind of understanding with the government, I presume come to beforehand, he is promised that he will get a dock there, and the country is going to spend $70,000 or $80,000 to benefit his property. There is no business to be done, no boats running there, no trade; but the government commences an expenditure. For whose benefit ? Simply for the purpose of benefiting a member of this House. That seems to be the whole story so far as the information goes at present. Now, the country had better know that. Then the minister went on and told us that the very fact that this man sold his interest in that timber limit at such an enhanced value is no evidence that it was a vote of this House which made the place valuable. It was nothing else which made the place valuable. There was no trade to be done, it was a forest, it was on the river, I presume. And when the government agreed to make an expenditure of $80,000 to build a wharf, it is no wonder that the property has become valuable. The result is that an hon. member supporting the government helps to vote the money and then sells out at a greatly advanced price, and we are told that because we are committed to it we must go on and make this expenditure. The country had better know this, because, so far as we know, or so far as any information is vouchsafed to this House, this is a most discreditable transaction throughout, unjustifiable, and I was going to say corrupt. I think I would be quite justified if I did so. I want the people of my part of the country to know this. They have tried very hard to get a few thousand dollars spent to improve harbours and to build wharfs where there are large and enterprising manufacturing towns surrounded by a prosperous farming country and where an extensive trade is being done. Yet, they cannot get this government to provide proper facilities to carry on their trade. But, the government will go to the province of Quebec and start to build a wharf where there is no trade, where there is nothing but a timber limit, the property of a member of this House, where there is not even a post office, or a settlement, not even a trade to be done, not even a boat calling there, and yet we are committed to an expenditure of $80,000, and because we inadvertently became committed to it, not having this knowledge when we committed ourselves, which, if we had had it we never would have submitted to vote the item—because we have been committed to it without proper knowledge, then, it is said, we must go on and carry it out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Why does the hon. gentleman say that the cost will be $80,000 ?

Mr. SPROULE. That which has been already done the hon. member tells us, must cost $59,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is under contract, and there should not be any mistake. The cost is $59,500.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to get an answer from the hon. minister to my question. Which came first—the vote or the contract for the erection of this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The vote came first.

Mr. FOWLER. When was the contract let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 29th June, 1901.

Mr. FOWLER. And the first vote was last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the first vote was in 1901.

Mr. FOWLER. How much was that vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Five thousand.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the amount of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fifty-three thousand nine hundred.

Mr. FOWLER. Was it intended with that vote of $5,000 to build this wharf ? Had the engineers gone down there and estimated that $5,000 would be sufficient to build the wharf that was afterwards to cost $59,500 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the hon. gentleman now leading the opposition (Mr. Sproule) will see that it is hardly fair to say this matter was done without the knowledge of the House. There was a very full discussion last year, and if I am not mistaken a vote was taken on this very item.

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well then I have been misinformed. I could not vouch for that statement, but I was under the impression a vote had been taken. However, 'Hansard' will show.

Mr. INGRAM. There was no discussion when the item was brought up in the first instance, and that is what the opposition complained of last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is wrong for this House to grant a vote of money without having knowledge of the total amount of the cost.

Mr. FOWLER. That is our contention.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree with hon. gentlemen. I have no fault to find with that proposition. I think it is right. It should be the duty of the minister of the department to furnish that information to the House. I think it is due to the House and the country that when a vote is taken of a small amount for the reason that it would not be spent within the current fiscal year the estimated cost of the undertaking should be submitted so that parliament would know what it was committing the country to.

Mr. FOWLER. I am glad to see that the hon. minister takes that view. It seems to me that as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said, this smells very strongly of jobbery. It seems that in order to get a candidate in a certain county in the province of Quebec, it was necessary for a deal of this sort to be made. The deal was, as appears from the statements that have been made, that in order to get this gentleman to run in a certain county in the province of Quebec it was necessary to make him a promise that this property which he had bought and which was not valuable from the fact that there were not then the necessary facilities for carrying on the lumbering business, would be made the object of a large expenditure of money. Then an arrangement was made for the vote that was passed in this House. The thin edge of the wedge was put in at first. The small amount of $5,000 was put in the estimates for the purpose of committing the House to the greater expenditure which was to follow and without any estimate whatever from the engineer and without any information being vouchsafed to the House as to the expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) say what authority he has for making the statement that there was an agreement in regard to this matter ?

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. minister dispute that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly, as far as I am concerned and on behalf of the government, I am prepared to take the responsibility of saying that there is no knowledge on the part of any member of the government of any such thing. I have admitted the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the interest of an hon. member in the landed property and in the timber limits, as I could not dispute it, but I do desire to say on behalf of myself and on behalf of the government that there was no arrangement previous to the election, or any discussion in regard to the matter whatever. Unless the hon. gentleman has some authority for a serious statement of this kind, he is not justified in mak-

ing it. He as a lawyer, and as a member of this House will see the necessity for giving some authority for such a statement.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a very strong rumour in the county of Stanstead that such an arrangement was made, and I may say further to the hon. minister that the facts of the case, as disclosed to-night and in the debate of last year when this matter was up, show clearly that there is a very strong ground for the rumour that prevails in Stanstead. What do we find ? We find that one hon. member who knew that this matter was coming up, and who should have been here to stand up and explain it is conspicuous by his absence. I speak of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell). The first vote was a small vote of $5,000, when, if there had been any examination at all, it must have been known to the department that it would require a very much larger amount of money to build that wharf there. Now, the hon. minister comes down and asks for $60,000.

Mr. MORIN. They asked for $25,000 last year.

Mr. FOWLER. And how much this year?

Mr. MORIN. Thirty-six thousand.

Mr. FOWLER. Making upwards of $70,000 for this purpose. We find that they are making this expenditure of public money in a place where there are no people to serve except the one individual who owned the property, not even a post office in this place, while there are important towns and harbours all over the country requiring an expenditure of public money. Take the great city of Toronto, where it was impossible to get a grant of any size from the government to provide the necessary facilities for the great metropolis of this country ; yet $70,000 of an expenditure is to be made in an obscure place where there is no post office, simply to enable this gentleman who had made a bad bargain in his purchase of this property to unload it. The facts of the matter have been clearly shown by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell). The committee must be grateful to the hon. member for Glengarry for the exceeding amount of light he has thrown upon the question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During the discussion last year I think the amount of the contract was given to the House.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not remember whether it was or not, but I know that a great part of the discussion last year was with respect to the deed to the property on which the wharf was going to be built, and we found the Minister of Public Works first declaring that no one owned it, and then that he thought it was Crown land. Now we find that it was private property, and that some one has given a deed to the department. In view of the fact that last year there was considerable discussion with regard to this, it is very surprising that the deputy minister should say that some one gave a deed of the property, but who he does not know. The hon. gentleman from Glengarry (Mr. Schell) says that the property belongs to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell), and we are much obliged to him for that information.

Mr. SCHELL. I beg to correct the hon. gentleman. Personally, I do not know anything about the circumstances, and I did not say that I did. The member for Simcoe said that the timber would be cut off in a few years, and I rose to correct that statement. I went on further to say, as the name of the hon. member for Stanstead was mentioned in connection with this, that I had seen in the 'Canada Lumberman' where this property had been sold for a certain sum.

Mr. CLARKE. How much ?

Mr. SCHELL. I cannot tell you now, but you can get the paper in the reading room. I mentioned these two points, and if hon. gentlemen attribute any further statements to me, they are mistaken.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) has just confirmed what I said. He stated that the property belonged to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell), who had since sold it to a corporation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Schell) tells us that he read that statement in the 'Canada Lumberman.'

Mr. CLARKE. It has not appeared in the 'Canada Gazette' yet.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps it will appear there next. I must congratulate the minister that he has come around to our way of thinking, and has promised that there will be no more jobs of this kind while he is minister.

Mr. SPROULE. I want more than that promise from the minister. We must have the papers showing who first applied for the building of the wharf and upon whose advice the expenditure was undertaken. It would be better that the minister should leave the vote over, and get the information in the meantime.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be the part of wisdom to allow this item to stand until the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is present ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Everything that was said to-night was said last year.

Mr. CLARKE. Of course, I could get the 'Hansard' and read what was said last year, but if the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) understood that this

item was to be reserved, that understanding should be carried out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be very particular indeed to carry out any arrangement I made with any member of the opposition.

Mr. CLARKE. I believe that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The arrangement which I propose is much broader, and I might be found fault with if I narrowed it down to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. CLARKE. If the narrower arrangement suits us and suits the hon. member (Mr. Monk), no fault can be found with the minister if he agrees to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My proposal is that the general vote for the province of Quebec should stand, with the privilege to any hon. member to discuss any and every item as fully as he wishes. If hon. gentlemen look at the 'Hansard' of last year they will find that the amount of the contract, the names of the contractors, and all other information was given, and that parliament has committed itself to this work. We cannot set up against the contractor that parliament did not possess full knowledge, and we are under obligations in the highest sense to pay the contractors for the work that has been undertaken.

Mr. INGRAM. It is due to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) that this item should stand until he is present. Last year the statement was made in the House that the only condition under which he would be a candidate was that the government would expend a large sum of money at this place, and that, when the government promised that, he consented to be a candidate. That charge was made last year in the House, and it is made again this year. I remember distinctly that when the matter was up last year the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lovell) was in his place that day, but when this discussion came on he was not in his seat. It is due to that hon. gentleman (Mr. Lovell) that he should be in his place in this House to say whether or not the rumour is well founded. So far as I am concerned, putting one piece of information I have received with another, I have no doubt in my mind that this was an inducement held out to the hon. gentleman to be a candidate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lovell) had not been a member of this House before ; he had large interests at this place, and we find that here, where there are something like 314 souls, men, women and children, the government is going to expend a sum of nearly $60,000. Last year we objected that the government had no title to this property, and to-night the minister is not in a position to give us any information on that point. Last year we were told that Rocky Point, where the pier is being built, was Crown land, and now we are told that some private person has given a title, but who that private person is the government does not seem to know. Last year we complained that the government came down with a vote for $5,000 for a work that would ultimately cost $60,000, and to-day we say that parliament had not the information before it necessary to consent to the work in the first place. We are told that we should ask this information in the first instance, but every one knows that from time to time certain items may slip through because the opposition feel that they do not want to carp over every item. We want to find fault only with the items which we think we are justified in finding fault with, and this is one of the items. Let this item stand until the member for Stanstead can tell us whether or not there is any truth in the rumour that he would not be a candidate until it was promised that this money would be expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are two points which the hon. gentleman makes. The first is that the item ought to stand. The agreement with the hon. member was that one item should stand and that all the items in this vote might be discussed under that item at a future time. I do not think the hon. gentleman could say that any broader or fairer proposition could be made.

Mr. SPROULE. I confess that I am very much against that principle, because when we have passed items in that way, we have been stopped from discussing them on the ground that they have passed the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not if we made an agreement that they might be discussed.

Mr. SPROULE. But we are practically committing ourselves to the vote when we have not the information properly before us.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The other point the hon. gentleman makes is that the information was not properly given. If he looks in 'Hansard,' he will find that the information was given.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Stanstead, it is stated, refused to be a candidate until it was agreed that this money should be spent for his benefit.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not the point I am referring to. If any hon. gentleman has a charge to make against the ex-Minister of Public Works, who proposed this vote and explained it, there is a proper way to make that charge. We are now passing an appropriation to pay the balance of this contract. That is what is under consideration.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman's predecessor did not take the same view of this question that the hon. gentleman is now taking. He said that the hon. gentleman

with the rest of his colleagues were as responsible for this matter as he was.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is perfectly correct. Every gentleman acquainted with our constitutional system knows that.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman's predecessor in office stated the position; and, as the Minister of Justice has passed over 'Hansard,' I will read what his colleagues said last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman need not read it, because I admit that the government is responsible for this contract. The majority in parliament are also responsible. As Minister of Public Works, I am committed, the ministry is committed and parliament is committed to this contract. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the minister why it was necessary to get a deed of this property, because on page 1034 of 'Hansard' of last year, the Minister of Public Works is reported as having stated that no site was purchased, because it was not necessary to purchase a site, the work being built on a rocky point that did not belong to any one. If the minister says there is a deed of the property, I would like to know why this deed was obtained, and from whom it was obtained.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman must see that that is an unreasonable proposition, because parliament voted the money last session to carry out this contract. In view of the statement then made by the late minister that the government did not own the property, we are now in a much stronger position, because I have made the statement that the deed has been procured. As to whom it was purchased from, I have promised to bring down the document so that every man can see it.

Mr. FOWLER. That is the strongest reason why the vote should not go through now, because we have not that information. I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman wants to press it, in view of the rumours that are floating about in regard to the connection of the hon. member for Stanstead with this transaction, and in view of the fact that a deed has been obtained when it was said last session that there was no need of obtaining a deed. I think we should have this information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The passing of this item does not prevent any hon. member from bringing that up.

Mr. FOWLER. Then the minister could use the same argument that he has used already. He has stated that we committed ourselves so far last year and the year before that we cannot back out of this transaction now; and yet he wants to take the vote and still further commit the House. Then he will say, you passed this vote without the information, and now, what do you want the information for, when you have committed the House to the whole expenditure?

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister ought to let this item stand for the present and furnish the information we require. We should have the deed of the property, we should be informed who applied for this dock to be built and who recommended it, and should have all the papers connected with it. We should be informed what the engineer's estimate of the cost was before the work was undertaken. We require all this information to enable us to judge of the matter before we commit ourselves any further to it. Then, the hon. member for Stanstead is not present, neither is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who wished to be here when this matter was discussed. These are strong reasons why this item should be held over.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will answer the hon. gentleman's questions seriatim. He says the item should stand until we are informed who recommended this vote. I have already stated that it was recommended by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. SPROULE. There must have been some one who applied for it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have stated that there was no further information about it in the department. How can I bring down information that is not in the possession of the department?

Mr. CLARKE. Is it possible that there was no application made for the expenditure?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have answered one question. The next is as to the report of the engineer. Parliament authorized the expenditure after the minister had stated that there was no report of the engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister submit it without a report of the engineer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am only giving the facts as they are. I have nothing to keep back. There is no reason for letting the item stand in order to bring down what does not exist. The minister admitted that there was no report, and still parliament voted the amount.

Mr. INGRAM. Against the wishes of the opposition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The opposition did not oppose it.

Mr. INGRAM. They protested against it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They did not vote against it, and parliament passed the item. I cannot agree to the suggestion that this should stand because either

the ex-Minister of Public Works or the hon. member for Stanstead is not present. If there was not the fullest opportunity given to bring the matter up when they were present, I would say there was some reason for the request; but under the circumstances I can see no reason why this item should be delayed further.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to me that the very fact that there is no request from any person in the records of the department, as the hon. minister has just told us, for the erection of this wharf, is a confirmation of this very rumour, so prevalent through the county of Stanstead, that the hon. member for Stanstead became a member of this House on the understanding that he was to have the value of his property enhanced by the building of this wharf at the public expense. If such were not the case, there would be some recommendation or some petition to the department showing the desire of the people of that section for the construction of this work.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In the absence of the hon. member for Stanstead, who should be here to defend himself, I notice that there are two members present from the adjoining locality of Bonaventure and Restigouche. These hon. gentlemen could throw some light on the question.

Mr. HACKETT. We are now called upon to vote $36,000 in connection with a certain pier at Grande Valée. While I have no desire to embarrass the hon. minister and wish to expedite as far as possible, the work of the session, I feel bound to call attention to the fact that while at this place there are only three hundred people.

Mr. MORIN. Three hundred and fourteen.

Mr. HACKETT. While at this place, with a population of only three hundred and fourteen, we are called on to spend $36,000, in the province of Prince Edward Island, where we have a population of 100,000, the government are only spending $34,000 on public works. That is not right and I protest against it in the name of the people I represent. If you cannot spend more than $34,000 in Prince Edward Island, you can surely have no justification for spending $61,000 in Grand Valée. In the interest of fair play and justice, this item should be allowed to stand until the hon. member from Stanstead is here to explain the facts. If he thinks that by absenting himself, he is going to escape being called to account we should prove to him that he is mistaken. Any hon. member who gets a timber limit from the government should be prepared to stand up in this House and defend himself against the criticisms made on such a transaction as the present, but the hon. gentleman does not want to go into the facts. He has made his escape by the back door and left this item to be discussed by his friends. I think we should insist on this item standing over.

Mr. MORIN. I wish to show exactly the position of this thing. There is no doubt something wrong in it. The hon. minister has admitted that the government had no engineer there. The hon. member from Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) is a lumber man. Lumber men do not engage engineers to locate their work but select the places themselves where they require wharfs, and evidently in this case the hon. member interested said to the government: I want the wharf at a certain place and you will build it there. According to the admission of the hon. Minister of Public Works, the government did not know anything about the best locality where to build that wharf. Well, who did? It must be clear to everybody that they were completely in the hands of the parties interested and are eating and drinking their own condemnation.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We have no evidence whatever that there is any such wharf in existence. No engineer, no officer of the department, has ever seen the wharf.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Let us have the wharf in the House.

Mr. CLARKE. Bring in the wharf.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since that contract was let, there has been an engineer in charge of the work.

Mr. MORIN. The hon. minister tells us that this wharf is for the benefit of the public. How is it that for the last two hundred years, down the gulf of the St. Lawrence, the shores of which are inhabited by fishermen who require wharfs, there never has been a wharf built except at this locality, and that is down in the interests of the hon. member from Stanstead and promised at the time of the election in 1901. That in itself shows that there must be something wrong.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We are making only a reasonable request when we ask the hon. minister to allow this matter to stand over. The discussion to-night shows this to be one of the rankest jobs that ever disgraced this or any other government, and to call on the followers of the government to vote this thing through without the fullest information is putting a very severe test on their party allegiance.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman wants information he will get it. What information does he require?

Mr. AVERY. Last year the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said that the deed of that property was all right and that it did not belong to any body but the government. But when the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) was asked who owned the property where the dock was built, he said that it was owned by the firm of Lovell and Company. The ex-Minister of Public Works then said that if he had known that he would not have undertaken the work and that he would not continue it until the government had a proper deed of the land. He must have been misled or he would not have put a dollar into that dock until the deed of the property was given. We would like to know who misled the Minister of Public Works last year when he spent several thousand dollars of public money in building a dock for a private individual who owned lumber lands in that locality ? If public money is to be spent, it should be expended where the people generally get the benefit and not for the special advantage of one individual. I am in the lumber business myself, and if at any time I require a wharf for my business, I have to build it myself, and that is the case with other lumber men. If the hon. Minister of Public Works will let this item stand over and thoroughly investigate the matter, he will conclude to spend no more money there. We have spent more money on that dock than the country can afford, taking into consideration any benefit the country will get from it. The hon. minister would do well if he would stop all proceedings on that work, because I do not think it will ever be of any public advantage at all corresponding with the amount invested. It will be a detriment to the country to keep it up, and the benefit will go to one individual.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has misquoted the ex-Minister of Public Works last year. According to 'Hansard' he said :

> I quite agree that we should have titles in every case, and my officers have received positive instructions on that point. They are within hearing of my voice and they know that I have given them the most positive and severe instructions.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Instructions as to what ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to the deed.

Mr. CLARKE. What page is the hon. minister quoting from ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Page 1042.

Mr. FOWLER. That refers to the Caraquet wharf.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps so. But, so far as the point under discussion is concerned, to clear that up, I have informed the Committee that the deed to this property has been procured.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). From whom ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not that information.

Mr. BENNETT. It might be given as some defence of this scheme if it could be shown that other persons would be served besides this company. But the map shows that this part of Gaspé is so rough that the local government have not even surveyed it into townships, or parishes. The place where this work is situated has the suggestive name of 'Grand Valley of the Mountains.' It was stated here last year, and the hon. member for Stanstead has had an opportunity to deny it, that he, being the owner of this property in Gaspé, was desirous of having a dock established there. He was not a member of the House before this parliament, and the facts seem to bear out the rumour current among his friends in his own riding, that he became a candidate upon condition that this large public expenditure should be made for his benefit. It is due to the hon. member for Stanstead to give him an opportunity to contradict that rumour, and I am prepared for my part, to carry on the discussion until the hon. member for Stanstead is summoned to give his explanation of the matter. Why should not the minister allow this item to stand. A reference to the census shows that at the place where this work is to be there are only about thirty heads of families. This saw-mill must be a very small one. I do not know the capacity of the mill or the extent of the timber limit. But I will be bound to say that, when the facts of the case come out, it will be found that the amount paid for the mill and the limit is about equal to the government's expenditure on this work. In fact, as stated by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell), the government is spending $60,000 to enhance the value of the property of the hon. member for Stanstead. About half the amount has already been expended. Let the hon. minister put down his foot and stop the work on this dock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You would not save any money by that.

Mr. BENNETT. Why, certainly. The hon. minister will have to settle with the contractor; and he knows that the contractor cannot go into court without getting a fiat from his department through the Minister of Justice. Let the contractor be paid for what he has done, and we may be quite sure the lumber company will finish the dock, as they are to get the benefit or it. It is plain beyond the shadow of a doubt that the whole thing, from its inception, was a political job. And, now that the country has spent $30,000 to enrich the hon. mem for Stanstead, I am prepared for one, to vote against any further expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) suggests that the discussion should be kept up merely for the sake of the discussion. Now, it seems to me that an arrangement made between the parties in this House should be carried out——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What arrangement has been made between the parties? None whatever. There may have been an arrangement between private individuals on either side——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If there is no other reason for further discussion than has already been given, I cannot see what objection there can be to the proposal I submitted. I have offered to allow the general vote to stand with the understanding that when it comes up any special item in the Quebec list can be discussed by any hon. member whether he is present now or not.

Mr. CLARKE. It is due to the hon. minister to say that I do not dispute the accuracy of his statement respecting the arrangement entered into between himself and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), but I do say that that hon. gentleman, who is absent, must have misunderstood what the agreement was, because, as I have explained, he left with me a copy of the estimates with several items, including the one under discussion, marked to be reserved. Evidently he did not understand that this item was to pass.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. minister says that an arrangement was made between the two parties. I want to tell him there was nothing of the kind. It has been a fashion in this House—it may have come in before hon. gentlemen opposite took office, but it has been very carefully followed by them—for the government to reserve an item in a given list with the understanding that any item on the list may be discussed when it comes up; then they bring it up at a time when the people interested are not here, and it goes through without discussion. I want to tell the hon. minister that this item is not going to get by in any such way; I give him fair warning of that. We are going to get at the facts in this case, or we will know the reason why.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I was not present in the earlier part of the discussion. May I ask what amount has been spent on this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $20,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I happen to be responsible for this work. I was in office when representations were made to us that there was a very large trade to be developed if a wharf was built at Grande Vallée. We had the survey made, and, after a good deal of discussion and, perhaps, of hesitation, the government decided to go on with the work. The expenditure now under discussion is not a new one, and it seems to me rather late to treat it as it is being treated now. The whole thing came up before the House last year. There was some discussion but the item went through. Now a contract has been entered into, and the government of the country is pledged to that work. Whether the House made a mistake or not, the government is pledged. This is the case in two words. But there is not so much mistake as hon. gentlemen opposite seem to believe. It is to my knowledge that, in the past, both long ago and in recent times, the country has built wharfs in places where there was not a large population. It is not necessary that there should be a large population at the place before a work of this kind is gone on with. The hopes of the future are an element in every public work of importance. But whether we have made a mistake or not, the House authorized the Minister of Public Works last year to go on with the work. There is no answer to that. If we have made a mistake, well, so much the worse for us. But the country is bound to pay for that work now. It has been said, and I believe truly said, that certain parties, among whom is a member of parliament, will benefit by that work. I do not know of many public works in which some people are not benefited. We do not build wharfs for heaven's sake all the time. We build wharfs for the people living on this planet, not for those who are in heaven, but for those who are on this very planet that we are so happy to live on. Now this work comes within that category. It is built for people who are living under God's sun, and the hon. member for Stanstead is among them. He has bought limits there. There are many members of parliament who have property in places where wharfs are built. Are they guilty of any job? Are they guilty of any crime? It is not a crime against civilization or against God to build public works for the benefit of people, whoever they may be. Members of parliament, to my knowledge, have often benefited by works which have been constructed in the past, and which are going on now. Well, this work is of some magnitude for Grande Vallée. It may be a little exaggeration of the blessings that we have freely distributed in this country. But this country is prosperous. The Minister of Finance has just told us that we have a surplus of $13,500,000, and out of that surplus we are bound to pay to the contractors of Grand Vallée the balance of the work.

Mr. POPE. I quite agree with the request of some gentlemen on this side of the House that Mr. Lovell should have an opportunity of explaining his connection with this matter. He comes from a county

adjoining my own in the Eastern Townships. There is in the public mind a scandal connected with this affair that ought to be cleared up in the interest of the firm of Lovell & Sons, of which the hon. member for Stanstead is the head. At the time of the convention when candidates were chosen for Stanstead county, Mr. Lovell came to the convention called by the Conservatives, and there it was generally understood that he was desirous of being the candidate, not solely on account of his love of the Liberal party, but for the purpose of furthering some object that he was understood to have in view. That was the general understanding at this meeting. He made a proposition which was accepted by the Conservative party of Stanstead county, that so far as that election was concerned it should be run free from any corruption or expenditure. Whether that agreement was kept or not, it is not necessary for me to inquire. But we were surprised in the first place that Mr. Lovell should be desirous of being a candidate; we were surprised in the next place that he attended our convention; we were surprised in the third place that he made this proposition, because it has not been the habit of the Liberal party in Stanstead county to run elections upon that pure and angelic basis. Well, Sir, that was our feeling, and as we prosecuted our inquiries, we were confidentially told that Mr. Lovell had some axe to grind, and that was the reason he was a candidate. Now he bought a limit from the government, a very small piece of land on the lower St. Lawrence. There was nothing else there but a forest, he built a mill and acquired these limits, and then it seems that he wanted a wharf. In Mr. Lovell's county and in the district in which he lives, it is firmly believed, I am sorry to say to his discredit, that this wharf is the price of his candidature for the Liberal party. Now, Sir, I think it is a grave situation, a disgraceful situation, and one that Mr. Lovell should be prepared to stand up in this House and either refute or acknowledge, as the case may be. Therefore I think that when we ask the government to allow this item to stand, it is done as much in the interest of Mr. Lovell and of his character as of anybody else. Since that time the property has been sold. Mr. Lovell and his sons, so I understand by the public press, are no longer owners of that property, it has passed over to other hands, and Mr. Lovell is reputed to have received something like $100,000 out of his property.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How much did he pay for it ?

Mr. POPE. He paid very little. They are making the price of this wharf out of it. Now, Mr. Chairman, don't you think that this is a most extraordinary situation, that this country should go to work and spend $50,000 or $60,000 in building a wharf for a property the total value of which is only $100,000 or $125,000 ? It is a most extraordinary position. The expenditure is unwarranted on that basis alone. On a property that is only valued at $125,000 we have no right to expend $60,000 of the public money for its development. I think we have a right to protest against it on that ground alone as a business proposition, to say nothing about the other question that has been raised.

Now, before I sit down I wish to say that, taking all these matters into consideration, the statements that have been made at the very outset of Mr. Lovell's candidature for Stanstead county that he was to receive some consideration, that he had some object in view in running for that county besides being the candidate of the Liberal party, and when we find this item put in here and this charge made throughout the country, throughout the Eastern Townships, all around Mr. Lovell's home, in the very village where he lives—I say in view of all these circumstances it is a duty the government owes to itself, irrespective of party, that that hon. gentleman should be given an opportunity to stand up in this House and defend himself from these imputations. I say this, Sir, because the name of Lovell & Sons as an honoured business concern has been above-board in our section of the country. Moreover, this gentleman is sitting in his seat here in parliament for the last time. He is an old man, and whatever the results of the next battle may be in Stanstead county for membership in this parliament, Mr. Lovell will not be the member for Sanstead county. There is not much quesion about that. Now, having had such a business career in that section of the country, I think this is not the way that he should retire from political life, leaving this stain upon his character. Therefore, I say that the minister in justice to Mr. Lovell and his family, in view of his business record, should allow this item to stand until the whole matter is properly explained so far as Mr. Lovell's connection with it is concerned.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that this contract was let in November, 1901. Now if that statement is correct, I would like to know what is the use of the government going through the farce of entering into a contract pledging us to pay $53,000 for a work when the contract was made in November, 1901 ? Is it not a bit of a farce to enter into an arrangement without first coming to parliament and laying before us what the work is supposed to be, what the cost of the work is to be ? But after the government entered into a contract it comes down and, as a matter of form, asks us to pass a vote. They first expend the money and then come and ask parliament to vote it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already stated—the ex-Minister of Public Works will be able to speak for himself—that he took the responsibility of recommending this work, and the government assumes responsibility for it now. Last session parliament, after full discussion, endorsed the contract after it was made.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister be good enough to tell us the size of the wharf, how much work has been done on it? Is there such a wharf in existence? I have asked that two or three times.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no doubt that there is such a wharf in existence. The work has been taken charge of by a special engineer of the department named Mr. Dubuc. The works placed under contract comprise the construction of a breakwater-pier composed of a substructure of seven cribs of ballasted cribwork having a total length of 900 feet and a breadth increasing from twenty-five feet on top at the shore end to twenty-nine feet at the outer end and which are to be sunk flush with the low water level, spring tide, and topped by a continuous superstructure standing eighteen feet above the said low water level, spring tides.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How much of it has been done? Is there any report of the progress made?

Mr. COCHRANE. Did you say eighteen feet above low water?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Eighteen feet above low water.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman the first estimate made?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I have the total amount that has been paid out.

Mr. FOWLER. How much is that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $20,000. The material must be on the ground by this time and under the contract the work must be finished within a month or two.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the work been continued during the winter months?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand form the reports of the department that the material was got out during the winter, that it is now on the ground and that the work will soon be completed.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who are the contractors?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Messrs. Heney & Smith, Ottawa.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is only fair that under the special circumstances in this case the hon. minister should not press the vote. It is a fact that there is no public interest to be served by this dock save the interest of this lumber company which own the land adjoining and if the hon. minister stops the work at present and does not do anything more upon it, he knows very well that the lumber company will complete the work. It will not be the first contract that this government have broken after contracts have been let. The hon. minister knows that hundreds and hundreds of contracts equally as binding in point of honour and from a business point of view were broken by this government. When the hon. gentlemen came into power they found from one end of this country to the other a contract solemnly entered into by the Postmaster General with mail carriers. What did the hon. gentlemen do? Without even giving a cent of compensation they cut these contracts in two, refused to carry them and refused to give these men permission to go into court to seek damages to which they were entitled. This is only going to be a case of hardship on this lumber company who own the property if called upon to complete this dock which, if completed, will be serving them and them alone. I think it is fair to ask the hon. minister that no further money shall be spent on this work and let this company complete the work. There are no surveyed lands in the neighbourhood, the dock is not going to serve any public interest after this company get through with their saw-mill operations which appear to be on a very limited scale and thereafter the work will stand as a monument to this government's waste of public money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should be very sorry to shut off any discussion. I have made that proposition over and over again. I think the hon. gentleman leading the opposition will see the fairness of my suggestion because I do not think he can point out any reason why the item should not be proceeded with now. In my opinion time would be gained by disposing of it for the present with the understanding that if any question is asked or any discussion is desired at any future time the subject will again be brought up without any objection from myself or from the government.

Mr. SPROULE. Over and over again when we requested that any particular item should be allowed to stand it has been agreed to by the hon. minister at once. Why is this one forced through? When it is a fact that we have no information in reference to the grave suspicion of the worst kind of jobbery connected with it, I submit that in the absence of that information we are justified in asking it to stand over. The hon. minister asks us to give the vote the approval of this committee by allowing it to go through and reserving the discussion until later, but, we say the time to discuss it is when we get the information we want

from the department and when the hon. members are present who are interested in it. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) are the parties who should be present. Surely the hon. minister will allow the item to stand.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I must protest as energetically as I can against that word 'jobbery.' I did not commit any jobbery when I was in office or elsewhere. I am not guilty of any jobbery. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has been on the Public Accounts Committee for six years. He has investigated the accounts to the best of his ability, which is large, and yet he has not found any jobbery that I have committed. I protest against that word; it is unfair. That work has been carried out in good faith. Whether I made a mistake or not is another question. I was not a party to any jobbery. We have built works elsewhere. In the Yukon we built roads where there was no population. We have been spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in building roads where there were no settlers. We have spent nearly $1,000,000 in building a telegraph line in view of future prospects. In Grande Vallée we have acted on the same principle. I thought in perfect good faith that it would develop that part of the country. The work was recommended to me by several members of parliament, especially by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) who, I am sorry not to see in his seat. The work was undertaken in good faith. There was no jobbery. I protest against that word. I hope it has not been applied to the department or to myself. If it has been I must protest against that with all the energy I possess.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the statement of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is a little premature. I think it is a little bit uncalled for. If the hon. gentleman had been in this House for the last hour and a half or two hours, during which, as by degrees, we got out the little information we could, and listened to the discussion, he would have known why it was characterized from this side of the House. We were told the circumstances which took place, of the rumours that were prevalent in regard to the transaction, the name of the original owner of the property and the purpose for which the wharf was to be built. In answer to the request I made twice or three times in succession as to who recommended this work, I was told that there was no record in the department that anybody recommended it. When we asked for the engineer's estimate for the cost of the undertaking, we were told that there was none. I do not say that the ex-Minister of Public Works was in it. He may have been innocently led to do this work but I have not a single word to take back. I say it is surrounded by suspicion, by more than a strong suspicion of jobbery, and it is the very strongest justification for demanding that this item shall be held over until we get the information from the department, or until we know something more about it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) may take back or not take back what he has said, but there is no jobbery in it, and before a member of parliament has the right to use the word 'jobbery' he must be in a position to prove what he is saying.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I challenge my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) to prove that there has been any jobbery. The word 'jobbery' is not parliamentary, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) who is an old hand, knows very well that before he is in a position to use such strong and uncalled for language, he should have some evidence to sustain him. Where is his evidence? It is not forthcoming and it cannot be forthcoming. The only suspicion is that there is a member of parliament who has timber limits in the neighbourhood, but perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) himself has some property near some wharfs that have been built by the government.

Mr. SPROULE. Not a cent nor never had.

Mr. McISAAC. Nor never will.

Mr. SPROULE. Nor never will in that kind of business.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is no jobbery, and my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has no right to use that word. He may not take it back, but if he does not that will not strengthen his position. The work has been given in good faith; the contract has been awarded and the matter was discussed last year. Let me add that one of the men interested in that work is dead and in his grave.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We cannot get at him.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, but in view of that sad circumstance it would be a little fairer to let bygones be bygones. The work has been done and the country is bound to pay for it. The hon. gentlemen opposite have made their case last year and this year again. Last year they had some ground for opposition because it was the first time a vote was asked, but parliament has approved of it, and parliament is responsible and the government is responsible for the price of the work. Hon. gentlemen know right well that the contract cannot be cancelled. This whole thing is a tempest without any cause whatever at the present time.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) argues that last year there might

be some reason for a protest. He says that the contract having been let we can do nothing but pay the shot, but last year when the discussion came up the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) told us himself that the contract was let and that we should not discuss it then. He argued in that way last year because in the year previous they slipped in a small vote of $5,000 for a work which they must have known would cost twelve times that amount. The Hon. Mr. Tarte tells us now that we cannot repudiate this contract. Fancy this government talking about not repudiating contracts when they repudiated not only the contracts in the Post Office Department, but contracts in the Militia Department, entered into with the Messrs. Sanford for the supply of clothing, and they did that so hastily that they had to recall their action when they found that no one else could do the work in so satisfactory a manner. Twenty thousand dollars have been spent on this work up to the present time. It would be far better for the country that you should stop the contract; pay the contractor for the work he has done and pay his estimated profit on the work that is to be done.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Does the hon. gentleman mean that after having spent $20,000 on a useful public work you should let the whole thing go.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And the material for the balance is on the ground.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It would be a waste of money to do that.

Mr. FOWLER. It would be far less a waste of money to stop the whole thing than to go on spending more of the money of the people for the benefit of a single individual, or the benefit of a corporation who bought out that individual's rights. To hear these gentlemen opposite talk you would think this is a work for the general benefit of the country. Why, the argument which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) uses to defend this could be equally as well used to defend the worst kind of a job that could be perpetrated. There are 314 souls living at this place according to last census, and every adult of them is in the service of the hon. member for Stanstead or his company. It is not for their benefit you are building this; it is for the benefit of the hon. member for Stanstead and no other. In view of what has been said by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), in view of the very strong rumour which I first stated to the House that prevails in Stanstead, and in the Eastern Townships; in view of the serious reflection there is upon the character, upon the honour, upon the integrity of one member of this House that he has used his position—if it be true, and I do not say it is true, for I do not know whether it is true or not—in view of all this it seems to me that if the government had the interests of the hon. member (Mr. Lovell) at heart, they would want to have that hon. gentleman here to stand up upon the floor of parliament and explain to this House and to the country his whole connection into the matter. If they were true friends of the hon. member for Stanstead that is the course they would take. I say, Sir, even though the expression may be objectionable to the ex-minister; I say that while it may not be jobbery, yet it smells most strongly of jobbery. We find the government spending $60,000 in the interests of a supporter, and spending that money for no other purpose than the private purpose of that hon. member. We find first a vote of $5,000; next year a vote of $25,000, and this year a vote for $36,000. We find all this, and we have reason to protest against it. Last year we were told that a contract was let and certain work performed. Last year we were told that nobody owned this property and that the title of it was in the clouds, but this year there is a deed of the porperty although the department is entirely innocent as to whom that deed came from. Why are they so innocent about it? Surely they knew that we would require information on that point this year, and yet they come here without information and attempt to rush this vote through by means of the brute force of their majority. That is all they have to rely upon. If this is an honest transaction; if there is no jobbery in it; if the skirts of the hon. member for Stanstead are absolutely clean, and the skirts of the government clean as well, because one involves the other; then it would be far more seemly on the part of the Minister of Public Works to let this item stand until the member for Stanstead is here to defend himself from this serious charge. I trust that in the interests of parliament; I trust in the interests of public life in this country, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lovell) can properly defend himself and can clear himself from the very strong suspicion which at the present time attaches to his name.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If the item were suspended, there would be twice as much noise about it as we hear to-night. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat would point to that fact as the best evidence that there was jobbery. The Minister of Public Works may do as he likes, but if I were in his place I would go on with the item, because there is nothing wrong with it. It is a fair expenditure of money. It may be a little large, I grant. On various occasions different governments have spent large sums of money on works which at their inception did not seem to be very meritorious. In this case, if the name of a member of parliament had not been connected with the work, there would not have been ten words said about it in the House. But there is a member of parliament who has properties in that neighbourhood. Members of the

opposition are in their right in criticising the item. This is a political game. Criticism is a good thing ; I do not object to it at all ; but criticism does not make black what is white. In this case, I say it again, if a member of the ministerial party had not properties in that neighbourhood, the item would have passed like a shot. But there is a member of parliament in that position. This is political warfare——

Mr. BENNETT. This is a political wharf, too.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, I grant that politics has a lot to do in the world ; but politics has made at times a good deal worse work than this wharf will be. This work will be a useful one. It will develop a large lumber industry.

Mr. CLARKE. Hear, hear ; that is the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Where is the objection to developing the lumber industry of this country, even by means of a wharf ? We are developing all kinds of industries by means of improvements. If I were the Minister of Public Works, I would ask that the item go through.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman knows as well as anybody that the development of the lumber industry belongs to the province of Quebec, and it gets the benefit.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The province of Quebec has not the right to build wharfs. That is a sacred right of this parliament.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am delighted to see that the ex-Minister of Public Works does not hang his head in shame. I notice that the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has gone out ; the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Reid) has escaped ; and the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) is not in his place.

Mr. TALBOT. Restigouche is 500 miles from this place.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I beg pardon ; it is right opposite Gaspé. I know where the county is just as well as any member on the other side, and I want to tell them that the hon. member for Restigouche cannot be gotten to stand up in the House and defend this job. Bring him in and he will condemn it as well as every man in that part of the country. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) charged the Minister of Public Works last year with building wharfs along the shores of the St. Lawrence river so thickly that there was not room for them on the shore, and they had to hang them on the trees. This is one of those docks, I suppose. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the great North-west, where settlers from the United States and from the old lands are now going in such large numbers, is entitled to legitimate and necessary expenditures, and the territorial legislature should be strengthened by grants of money for the development of that country, instead of throwing it away on the rocks around Gaspé. Perhaps the ex-Minister of Public Works can tell us from whom the deed of this property was obtained. We have been asking that all night.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think the deed was given by Mr. Lovell himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Where is the crime in that ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We have been trying all night to get that information.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not see why it was not given immediately. I would have given it immediately.

Mr. CLARKE. I wish you had come in sooner, then.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I was better engaged.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think 'Hansard' will show that I did say that if the property belonged to Mr. Lovell, the deed must have been got from him. I may say that previous to six o'clock the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) stated that he wished to be absent this evening. I said that, so far as I was concerned, I was willing that the general vote for the province should stand, so that all the items might be discussed, and the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition was willing that this item should pass, as I had given all the information I had with regard to it. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works is now here, and has confirmed everything I said. That being the case, if any hon. gentleman on the other side will ask for any information that has not been furnished, it will be given if it is in the department, and there will be an opportunity for further discussion under the arrangement that has been made. Then I ask that the item be allowed to pass.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not by a long chalk. It might as well be understood that if this item passes to-night and is discussed generally, we cannot afterwards vote on it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is it not a most interesting feature of this debate to see a member of parliament like my hon. friend getting up and saying that Restigouche is just opposite Grande Vallée ? It is not even in the same province.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I did not say anything of the kind. Restigouche is in the province of New Brunswick, across the river.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am very glad that my hon. friend has at last found that Restigouche is in New Brunswick. He should

have known it before. It is not on the same river at all. There are about 500 miles between the two places. Here is a member of parliament, one of the leaders on the other side of the House, who criticises an estimate on the ground that Restigouche and Grande Vallée are a few steps apart, when there are about 500 miles between the two. We cannot take him seriously. He is good to make war in South Africa, but he is no good to criticise items of this kind; he is not in it. When my hon. friend speaks of rocks, he again speaks of things he does not know. Gaspé is one of the most fertile districts of this country. There is not only lumber there, but fertile lands. We are glad in the province of Quebec to give as much money as is necessary to develop the west, but we insist on having our share of honest public expenditure. My hon. friend reminded the House last year that a member of parliament unwisely said that we had built so many wharfs in the province of Quebec that there is no room for navigation there. Well, a good deal less money has been spent building wharfs in the province of Quebec than in Ontario. We have not said anything against this; we do not kick, to use a vulgar expression. We are pleased with our lot, but it seems to me that when we are only asking ordinary favours, amongst which is this Grande Vallée wharf, we should not be treated as if we were a lot of thieves. We are not going to get out of the country with that wharf. It will stay there and will be very useful for the development of an important industry—the lumber industry. Moreover, I repeat, the district of Gaspé is one of the most fertile districts of this country, and that wharf will not only be useful for lumber operations, but also for settlers. Everybody who knows anything of colonization in the province of Quebec knows that the settlers there must go into the forests. We build roads for them. On this occasion we are building a wharf, not only for lumbering operations, but for the settlers those lumbering operations will bring in there. The settlement of Lake St. John's district, in which there are to-day over 40,000 people, is due to colonization and lumber operations. The province of Quebec is not like our North-west. In the North-west a man has only to take a pair of oxen and go on with his work, but in the province of Quebec we have first to cut down the timber, and the best friend of the settler is the lumber merchant, when he is carrying on his work in an honourable manner. Everybody who knows anything of the way in which the province of Quebec has been settled knows that. I do not see why we should take up more time discussing this wharf. If the name of a member of parliament were not mixed up with it, it would not be discussed. This work will be useful from the standpoint of the settlers. My hon. friend should not forget that there is not a railway there. He has railways in his county, but this section of country has none, and if we do not give the people there a wharf, what are they going to have?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). For the last twenty-five years, I have almost sworn by the hon. gentleman, but can have faith in him no longer. When an hon. gentleman stands up in this House and says it is 500 miles from Restigouche to Gaspé, he shows a lamentable ignorance of the geography of his own country.

Mr. TALBOT. I make the same statement too.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Nobody pays any attention to what the hon. gentleman says. Nobody would ever charge him with knowing anything even about his own province, but from the hon. gentleman who has just spoken we expected something better.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I move that a good surveyor be appointed immediately to measure the distance.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In our county we have railways, but we have paid for them ourselves to the tune of $250,000, and we want the province of Quebec to tax themselves in the same way. The ex-Minister of Public Works, who has just skipped out of the Chamber, says that the government have built wagon roads there for the farmers. But that is supposed to be done by the province in the new districts, and we find that that is one of the large corruption funds which the Ontario government uses to corrupt electors. All the roads outside colonization roads have to be built by the municipalities themselves, and I object to our spending the hard cash of the people of Ontario in building roads through the bush in the province of Quebec, or in constructing docks for the benefit of private companies. I am surprised that the hon Minister of Finance would allow an item of this kind to go into the estimates and that the hon. Minister of Public Works would permit this kind of thing to go on.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot see that there is anything to get very warm over in this item. Last year the government were asked what amount of trade was to be done at that port and what was the real object of building the wharf, and there was no one present to give the information. I would like to point out to the government that while we cannot expect the present Minister of Public Works, who has but lately assumed the position, to know all the details, but surely it is due to the House that when a public work is being built, especially in a constituency which returns a supporter of the government, the least we should expect is that the member for that constituency should be in his place to give that explanation to the House which the minister is not

prepared to give. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) absented himself from the House last year when this vote was up. He was in this House yesterday and must have known that the estimates of the province of Quebec were to be discussed this evening, and yet we find him still absent. In view of this fact, and in view of the rumours which went the rounds during the general elections, and which have been current since in connection with that hon. gentleman, surely he ought to have deemed it his duty to remain here for the purpose of explaining what amount of trade is to be done in this place, and what is the object of building this work there. I see no reason why we should not be entitled to this information before passing this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What information ?

Mr. INGRAM. The information as to what trade the government expect will be done at this point. No explanation has been given us of that. There is no hon. gentleman in a position to give it except the hon. member for Stanstead, and he remains away. I can see no reason why this item should not stand until we get that information. Certain rumours have been circulated against that hon. gentleman, and in justice to himself and to his constituents, he ought to be here prepared to deny them. In view of the very vague information we have in connection with this item and the suspicious circumstances surrounding it, I think that it should be allowed to stand over. Why are we refused this information ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What information ? I have stated over and over again that all the information which is in the department has been given. But hon. gentlemen are putting questions that cannot be answered. Information was given before the ex-Minister of Public Works entered the Chamber, and he has confirmed what was said. It is alleged that a corrupt bargain had been made between the ex-Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Stanstead——

Mr. INGRAM. Nobody said that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I am mistaken I shall be glad to withdraw what I said. But I certainly understood hon. members to say that there was a corrupt bargain on behalf of the ex-Minister of Public Works.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

An hon. MEMBER. It was said fifty times.

Mr. COCHRANE. I deny it emphatically. It was not said fifty times; it was not said once.

Mr. LENNOX. 'Hansard' will show that it was not said.

Mr. INGRAM.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am in the judgment of hon. members when I say that the statement was made that there was jobbery or corruption, that there was an arrangement made for the hon. member for Stanstead to become a candidate on the understanding that this work would be gone on with.

Mr. LENNOX. That was said.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I denied that on behalf of the government.

Mr. COCHRANE. You don't know anything about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as my knowledge went. And the ex-Minister of Public Works is here, and he denied it emphatically. It is only fair that I should say to the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) that I have offered, particularly in this instance, to give all the information asked for that is in the possession of the department.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand the hon. minister to say that, if this item is passed, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who is unavoidably absent, or any other member will be free to discuss this matter on an item to be reserved.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I stated so distinctly, and I think it is only fair that it should be carried out.

Mr. INGRAM. I was interrupted in my remarks by the Minister of Public Works, who desired to say that any information desired should be furnished to the committee, if it was in the department. But what we complained of last year, and what we complain of this year, is that the information is not in the department. The only one who can furnish it is the hon. member for Stanstead. No doubt he recommended the work; he was directly interested. There must have been some reason given in support of the application, but he has never communicated it to the House, nor has the government. The minister talks about the amount of trade to be done. Has he ever furnished us any information which would enable us to judge what that trade was likely to be ? Nobody charged the ex-Minister of Public Works with jobbery in this matter. What we said and what we say, is that it was commonly reported in that constituency that he had become a candidate on the understanding that this work was to be carried out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would not that be a corrupt job ?

Mr. INGRAM. We have stated that that rumour was in circulation. Let the hon. member come here and deny it; if he does not, he rests under the stigma of it. If such a charge were made against me I should feel it my duty to myself and my constitu-

ents to remain in the House when the vote in relation to the matter was under discussion, so as to clear myself. The fact that the hon. gentleman is not here is prima facie evidence that there is something in the rumour. I do not desire to lecture hon. gentlemen opposite, but, when there are works going on in the constituencies, it is only fair to the House that they should give us the benefit of the information they have, which must be more detailed and intimate than the minister can give. We are entitled to all reasonable information; but it seems like pulling teeth, to use the common comparison, to get information we desire. And, if we criticise we are accused of mere carping. Of course, our criticism is regarded by hon. gentlemen opposite as much less lofty than that indulged in by them when they were on this side, when the McMullen's and others carried on the discussion. I am glad to say that the criticism of the opposition has been much fairer since 1896 than it was when hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side. Even with the much greater provocation that we have had, you never hear language used in this House such as they used. If the hon. minister wishes this item to pass, he should have a statement of the trade expected to be done, so that we may understand what is the object of spending this money.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a word with reference to the ex-Minister of Public Works, because he worked himself into a good deal of excitement, and it almost seemed to me he was trying to draw a red herring across the trail. Is not Quebec, he asked, entitled to have public money spent within her borders? No person objected to money being spent in Quebec wherever it was proper to do so. We are quite willing to see expenditures in Quebec, where sufficient information is given us to lead us to believe that the expenditure is in the public interest. But it is because the minister cannot or will not give us the information necessary that we ask the item to be held over. When the item was first read, the request was made, in a good-natured way that it should be allowed to stand in the absence of the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). On the other hand, the Minister of Public Works proposed that some other items should be allowed to stand. To-night, the minister seeks to stop us from discussion on the ground that we are committed to this expenditure. But we were told the same thing last year; and, if we allow the item to go without discussion, no doubt that fact will be quoted to prevent discussion at any time in the future. We asked who recommended this work, and the Minister of Public Works said that he did not know that anybody recommended it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no, I did not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. The ex-minister stated that it was recommended by members of the House.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I stated that it was recommended by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), who is not now in his seat. If the Minister of Public Works will look in his department, he will find also that there was a pretty large petition from the settlers there. The work was strongly recommended.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that not fully justify the position we take? The hon. minister told us there was nothing in the department. I asked specifically if there was any application from the people in the locality, and I was told that there was not. Surely, if there was urgent need for this work somebody must have applied for it. We asked that the item should be allowed to stand that the minister might look up the information. I asked if there was an engineer's estimate, and was told that there was not. Surely there must be such information in the department, but that information is not given to us. Are we doing an improper thing when we ask that the item stand till the information be given us? I hold that we should be doing much less than our duty as an opposition if we allowed the item to pass until all reasonable information was given us. We urged that other items should be gone on with, so that those items might be passed to which there was little or no objection. But nothing will suit the hon. minister but that this very item which we do not want passed, shall be passed. We only ask reasonable information, that we may know whether we are justified in voting this money or whether we should move that the item be struck out. We do not want to do that, because we believe the information is available, and if the Minister of Public Works was as agreeable as he usually is, he would allow that item to stand.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Members of parliament have a right to ask for information, and I would be the last to decline to recognize such a right. But what I objected to was the strong expression used by my hon. friend. He is a man of long experience and knows the value of words; and when, on entering the House I heard the word 'jobbery'—well, I did not like it, it is not a pleasant word to hear concerning a work with which one was connected. I am sure so far as I am concerned there was no jobbery and nothing improper.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is any satisfaction to the hon. gentleman, I may say that I had no reference to him when I spoke of jobbery.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not object to hon. members asking for information, but no information in the department would justify the use of that word by my hon. friend.

Now, if our hon. friends opposite insist that this item should not go through, it is for the minister to say what he will do. So far as the department is concerned, there was the ordinary information. There was a petition, there was a survey made, there was an estimate made. My hon. friend who is now Minister of Public Works is still a little fresh. It is easy to understand that he cannot possibly know all the details of the office over which he presides. But I remember well the facts in the present case. There was a petition, there were the ordinary representations made in such cases. The information is available just as the wharf is available.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The information has at last been vouchsafed to us by the ex-Minister of Public Works. I do not mean to say that the present minister was withholding it deliberately, although he had his deputy at his elbow, and should have known something about the business.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If the chief engineer had been here the whole thing would have been explained.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). So it transpires that a member of parliament sitting in this House is the gentleman who has handed over the deed of this property to the government of Canada. What was the consideration given for that ? If there was none, the deed is valueless. If there has been a money transaction, then that hon. member has violated the Independence of Parliament Act. We find that all the circumstances point to the fact that it was through the influence of this member of parliament and to benefit his own property so that he could sell it, that this expenditure has been made. And we have heard to-night from another Liberal who says that there was an enormous rake-off, and this wharf has been constructed and the people are taxed to pay for an expenditure that is not justified. So far as I am personally concerned, I do not intend that this thing should continue. These gentlemen may just as well be given to understand that the people of this country have rights, and members of parliament have rights, and we intend to exercise them, and that this jobbery should cease of building docks along the shores of the county represented by the Finance Minister or along the shores of the St. Lawrence where they are not needed. These things have got to be justified, or else they will not be allowed to pass.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If there were any doubt as to whether we were asking for useless information, that doubt has been dispelled by the information given by the ex-Minister of Public Works. We have been told over and over again by the Minister of Public Works that there was no information, or that the information asked for was not available in his department. We are now informed by the ex-minister that the information asked for is available and that it is in the department.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It was there when I left.

Mr. RICHARDSON. So we have not been asking for that which does not exist. I myself made use of that very objectionable word, and I think I used it advisedly ; I said that if this debate went to the public without the information which we asked for, it would have the appearance of the rankest jobbery. I did not say it was that, but it would certainly leave that impression. I hope the Minister of Public Works will not call upon the supporters of the government to vote this thing through without giving us the fullest explanation that is possible to be had.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has spoken for some time, and he has not submitted one question saying what kind of information he would like to have. I have stated time and again that all the information with regard to this matter has been furnished to the fullest possible extent. I have also stated that last session when this matter was before the House the ex-Minister of Public Works gave all the information in his possession with regard to it.

Mr. SPROULE. I have the questions all written down here, and the answers that were given. The first was : Who applied for this wharf ? and the answer was : No person, so far as I know. The next question : Who recommended it ? The answer was : I do not know. The next question was : What was the engineer's estimate for the cost of this work ? The answer was : We have not any. The next was who gave the deed of it ? We could not get that either.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must take exception to this statement. In the first place the question was asked : Who is responsible ? I said the Minister of Public Works last session took the responsibility and the government took it with him. The ex-minister last session gave this information, and he was more familiar with it than I could be :

> The improvement of the St. Lawrence is one thing and the erection of the wharf at Grande Vallée is another thing. We are attending to the improvement of the St. Lawrence better than it has ever been done in the past. It is of no use to make so much fuss—for it is fuss that is being made now and nothing else. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) is not in his seat at the moment. He is one of those who came to the government and represented to us that, if there was a wharf built there large lumbering interests would be fostered and developed.

That answers both questions. Large lumbering interests would be established at that place and for that reason parliament authorized that work.

Mr. SPROULE. Why does the hon. minister say it is not in the sessional papers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Every one is liable to be mistaken. I spoke from the information of the official of the department. It is the usual custom to have petitions in these cases, but he was speaking then with the information fresh in his mind.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If I remember right I received a deputation or two.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no record kept of deputations as a rule.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If there was any information asked for that was held back or was not brought down I would be only too glad that the item should stand. I perhaps would have granted the request of my hon. friend even then had it not been for the arrangement which has been made with gentlemen who wish to discuss the subject. That was the only reason why I desired that we should pass the item. If there was any information in the possession of the department that I could bring down, I would be only too glad to do so. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works continued :

> We considered the case and came to the conclusion that it was a meritorious work. Now it is not fair and it is not good policy to say that improvements must always be made at places where there is a large population. If by the erection of this work you help population to settle there that will be a good thing.

And so on. This information was all given when the hon. gentleman was in office and that large amount was given committing parliament to this contract. I think after this full discussion and in view of the arrangement that the subject may be brought up again this item might be passed for the present. I am placed in a position in which I could not adopt the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite unless some hon. gentlemen can say that there is some information wanted which has not been brought down.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. Minister of Public Works has put his argument fairly, if he will abide by it. I have refrained, and that is very hard work for me, during the last two or three hours while this has been going on from taking part in it but it has occurred to me several times that we might arrive at an understanding of this animated discussion. The hon. minister says if there is any information that any hon. member of the committee desires it will be brought down and that for that purpose the item will be allowed to stand. I submit it is quite evident that there is in the department certain information most valuable to this committee, information that will probably help the elucidation of the matters in dispute and which should be brought down. For instance, we have the assertion definitely that there was an estimate by the engineer. It was thought at one time that there were two. There was at least one estimate made by the engineer. We have a right to have that document brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not understand what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand that the engineer made an estimate of this work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has been given.

Mr. LENNOX. That estimate has not been brought down to the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS It has; that information has been given to the committee.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not argue with the hon. mininster as to what has been given in the past. I understand that when I stand on the floor of this House I am entitled to all the information which is given to the House. As the hon. gentleman has suggested that hon. members should ask for the information they require, I respectfully ask, without reference to whether it has been or has not been given in time past, that it shall be given now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope the hon. gentleman will not think I am interrupting him when I say that I have given that information on several occasions.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister misunderstands me. The estimate of the engineer, I understand, to be in writing. It is a document in the department. The examination of that document is important and that document should be brought down to the committee so as to enable the committee to inspect it and form an opinion upon it. Then, we have heard from the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that there was a recommendation. That recommendation may or may not be in writing. If that recommendation is in writing it should be brought down to this committee. It is a subject of information to which we are entitled.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What recommendation does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. LENNOX. The recommendation for the prosection of the work—the recommendation by some important supporters of the government. These things all have to have their inception.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have said that there is no such writing in the department.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works seems to think there is.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What ?

Mr. LENNOX. The recommendation of the hon. member for Gaspé and several others.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They called upon him, he says.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not going to debate that because I may not be right on that point. There is an estimate; that point is clear. That is one source of information that I as a member, do ask for. I want the recommendation done in writing if a recommendation exists. If it does not exist that point goes by. The next point I come to and about which I ask the hon. minister to furnish us information is the petition. It is acknowledged, I suppose, that there was a petition sent by a number of persons as stated by the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There was a deputation or a written petition—I do not remember exactly which. I remember very well that the hon. member for Gaspé came on several occasions and with several people to ask for that work. That I remember very distinctly indeed because it was in his own division, but members of parliament do not always write. They come up often and see the ministers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works said that there was a petition signed by the people.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There may have been. I know I received a petition or two. As to the engineer's report the policy of the department is that before any work is offered for tender there is an estimate made. There is a survey of course because we cannot prepare plans without having a survey made and it was made in this case as in all other cases. In the ordinary way plans and specifications were prepared.

Mr. LENNOX. I was speaking of the petition. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works seemed to be perfectly clear when he first spoke upon this subject that there was a petition. He repeated that more than once. I noticed also that just a little while ago the hon. Minister of Public Works intimated to the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works that he might be wrong about that and I know that the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works intimated that he still thought he was right. I am not going to argue that he is right, but to put our position in the weakest possible way we may say that it is a subject of doubt. It leaves the probability that there is a petition on file in the department. While the bare possibility remains that there is a document on file in the department it is unfair to this Committee to ask us to pass this item until the hon. minister has ascertained definitely and conclusively that no such document exists in the department.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Suppose there is none ?

Mr. LENNOX. Then it is for the minister to candidly say to the committee that there is none.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If there is one he will bring it down.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not understand that the minister has stated that he has actually made a search to see if there was a petition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that I did not inquire if there was a petition ?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know as to that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did inquire and there are no papers further than I have explained.

Mr. LENNOX. Do I understand the minister to say that since this question has come up a search has been made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, you can understand that.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand that since this has come up a search has been made in the department. Is that right ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is right.

Mr. LENNOX. Then I put the responsibility on the minister that it will turn out that he is mistaken in this matter. There is no question, however, that there is a deed, and it is said that deed was given to the government for nothing. It is very important for us to know whether that was a voluntary deed or a deed for a consideration. I submit that the facts show that whether there is an expressed consideration in that deed or not, there was actually a consideration for that deed and a valuable consideration necessarily passing from the government to this Mr. Lovell. It was all-important to this Mr. Lovell the member for Stanstead, that that work should be executed in consideration of the execution of that deed, and not otherwise. For no other cause moving him to it he gave this deed to the government. It is a consideration passing from the government to a member of this House, and therefore this deed should be submitted to this committee for consideration. We should have such documents as now remain into the custody of the department, we should have a clear explanation of the absence of this petition in case it is absent, and we should have the plans prepared by the engineer and then we will be in a position to intelligently consider this estimate. Summing it up, I ask the Minister of Public Works does he

not now see—I don't think he will because he has been pretty candid and courteous to us so far—does he now not see that there are requests for information which ought to be supplied before this item goes through? What difference can it make whether it goes through now and is discussed hereafter, or is allowed to stand over until we get the information ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have explained to the hon. gentleman frankly, and I think the ex-minister endorsed it, that no estimate of the work had been made previous to the vote of 1901-2; that afterwards an estimate was made. The hon. gentleman has asked me several questions, and I ask him now, whether the written estimate would be of any value after the contract was made ? The contract was entered into in 1901; that shows the cost of the work, and any estimate made previous to that would be of no value whatever.

Mr. INGRAM. It would show a change in opinion as to how this work should be done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no change. The contract was entered into and that was the cost of the work.

Mr. LENNOX. It is important that we should have the engineer's estimate because by it we could form an opinion as to whether or not it would be better to continue this work ; whether it would be better to abandon this work, let the money we have expended go, and pay fair damages in equity; rather to further waste public money in this matter.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand, this contract was entered into in 1901 for $53,900, and up to date $20,000 has been expended by the government. How is it that before the $53,000 is expended and paid by the government, the minister comes forward and asks for another vote that will make a total of $61,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a revote of $5,000. The total cost is $59,500. The work is under contract. I am informed that the material is on the ground, that the work is being proceeded with and as soon as the money is voted the progress estimates will be ready. There would still be a balance to be provided of $3,500. The engineer has estimated the cost of superintendence at $5,600, and, as I have explained, it would require $3,500 more to pay for the full cost of this work.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not object to the cost of the dock; I never object to the cost of any government work which may be necessary. The point in this case is that a member of this parliament is engaged in a deal with this government. He disposed to the government of a site for a dock. He has a timber limit adjoining. The government then turns round and builds a wharf to increase the value of his property at a place where there are no settlers except a few men who are working in his one-horse mill. That to my mind is the serious part of the whole business, and I think the minister should meet the wishes of the committee and let this item stand over until the whole matter is explained. Nothing will be injured by doing so. We want the hon. member from Stanstead to be here and give us a statement of the facts of the case. Is the country going to pay for a private dock for every friend of the government who happens to have a timber limit ? Is that the line on which hon. gentlemen opposite are going to carry on the affairs of the country ? I think the ex-Minister of Public Works is responsible for this, and it is hardly consistent with his usual high standard of morality.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am responsible for worse things than that. It is a first-class thing.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister tell us what consideration was paid for that deed ? Is it in the department ? Was it submitted to the Minister of Justice ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say, first, that I would be only too glad if I had any reasonable excuse to grant the hon. gentleman's request; but, after the explanations that have been made, I cannot see that there is any ground why this contract should not be carried out. With regard to the deed, the ex-minister says it was got from Mr. Lovell, or rather from his company, or his son, without consideration. How much interest the present member may have in the company I do not know. I am not in a position to deny all the statements and rumours that have been made here; they have to go for what they are worth; but every possible information that it is in my power to give has been given.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). May I ask the hon. Minister of Justice, would this deed be of any value without a consideration ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not know anything about the deed. I have no present recollection of it; but I know the facts, and as we have been talking of this thing for a couple of hours, it might be interesting to get the facts. If my information is correct, the wharf is built on the shore on a site which is vested in the Crown. That which it was important to get from the lumber company was the right of access to the wharf, and I understand the intention was to convey that right of access to the Crown. Whether that was given or not I cannot say, but it was never contended that the site upon which the wharf is situated was ever vested in any one but the Crown.

Mr. FOWLER. Do I understand the Minister of Justice to mean that the site belonged to the province of Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not quite prepared to say that. That is a very big question, which has been discussed many times in the courts—whether riparian rights of this kind are vested in the province or in the Dominion. There is a great deal of difference between the right of property vested in the province and the right of user vested in the Dominion.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this at the mouth of a river or estuary ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is not at the mouth of any river, but is on the shore of the St. Lawrence. I understand that it is on a point jutting out into the St. Lawrence river. I have never seen the wharf itself.

Mr. SPROULE. In the face of all that information, which we have got now after two hours' trying, is it unreasonable that we should ask that if there was a deed it should be produced, as well as the plan and the engineer's estimate on which the item passed the council The ex-minister says there was such an estimate.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is an estimate of that kind before every work is offered for tender. There is no objection, of course, to bringing down the plans, but it has never been done on such an occasion since I have been in the House.

Mr. SPROULE. We have had plans of public works laid on the Table over and over again.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Not after the contract has been given. Had my hon. friend asked for the plan before the work was awarded his request would have been reasonable. Of course there is no objection of bringing down the plan, but the plans are usually produced when the money is first asked and not after the contracts are given out.

Mr. SPROULE. I could state cases of my own knowledge to the contrary, where the plans were brought down after the contracts were let.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is no objection to that.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it unreasonable that we should ask that to-night ? Not one of the requests we have made has been granted, and we ask that the item should stand until a search is made into the department and the information brought down which we require.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is it fair, after three hours' discussion, to ask for the plans ? I have given a description of the work. In my twenty-three years' experience, after a contract has been let, I have never heard of a request to bring down the plan. I have answered every question ; I have given all the information in the possession of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. That is another thing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are not superhuman, and cannot give information we do not possess.

Mr. COCHRANE. You did not tell us who gave you the deed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Just as soon as the question was put I sent to find out. In the meantime, my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works told the committee, and I verified his statement. The property was vested in the Crown, and nobody else could give the deed.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why did you get a deed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already explained that while the property belonged to the Crown, there was a doubtful question of right of way, and a deed was got from the owner of the property over which the right of way ran.

Mr. COCHRANE. When the hon. gentleman was asked for the information, he refused to give it, and we did not get it until the Minister of Justice came in. What I object to is that we should make this enormous expenditure for the benefit of a private corporation and not of the community generally. To my mind, it has all the indications of a job. The ex-Minister of Public Works objects to my calling it a job, but that certainly is to my mind the most apt description I can give to it. Just fancy spending $60,000 where there is not a post office, where nobody resides except the men working in a saw-mill, and all for the benefit of a member of parliament who was the owner of the timber limits, and who sold them to a corporation at a big profit, which he could not have done unless the government had come to his rescue and built that wharf. I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works whether he does not think that we have good reason for our belief that there is a nigger in the fence ? If this deed is not for the property on which the wharf was built, why were we not told that last session ? Now we are told that the deed is only for the right of way to the wharf, and that it was given by a member of this House, but I am satisfied that he would not have given a deed for the right of way if the government had not undertaken to spend $60,000 for his benefit in the erection of this wharf. The building of this wharf made his property more valuable and enabled him to sell it for a much larger amount than he could otherwise have got.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no other information that I know of, directly or indirectly, in the possession

of the department that can be given with regard to this matter, and it seems to me very unreasonable, after we have discussed it here during three hours, to ask that the item should again stand over.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to make a proposition to the Minister of Public Works. We are old enough and civilized enough, surely, to understand what we are doing. Here we have been three hours and a half talking about the same thing over and over and nothing done. We should be more reasonable. If one party says: We will not give up, and the other party says the same, the result will be we must all stay here till I don't know when. Somebody has got to give up. Now, is it unreasonable to ask the Minister of Public Works simply to jump over this item, and then vote as many others as he pleases. We can vote all the other items for Quebec to-night, and we can take this one up some time next week.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already granted that request a dozen times—that the item should be discussed at some future time.

Mr. MORIN. Well, let it stand then. Will the hon. minister agree to that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will carry out the understanding I reached.

Mr. MORIN. Well, now, we are all as contrary as we can be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry if my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) is in that humour. I am trying to meet hon. gentlemen opposite and I think they should try to meet me in the same spirit.

Mr. INGRAM. In the list left by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) are several items marked to be reserved, and this is the very first one. It seems manifest that that hon. gentleman understood that the items would not go through. But if the hon. Minister of Public Works is determined that it shall go through I am afraid that we shall see the early hours of the morning before it does.

Some hon. MEMBER. All right.

Mr. TALBOT. Go on with your threats.

Mr. MORIN. What would be the use of that to anybody?

Mr. INGRAM. Last year, the Minister of Public Works of that time (Hon. Mr. Tarte) vouchsafed this information in the House, speaking of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux):

> He is one of those who came to the government and represented to us that, if there was a wharf built there, large lumbering interests would be fostered and developed. We considered the case and came to the conclusion that it was a meritorious work.

The hon. Minister of Public Works says that he has not this information in his department. I would ask any business man in this House if it is reasonable to suppose that the government entered upon this work without first getting any information about it. Last year we asked for the facts, and we could not get them, nor are we getting them now. We are told in a general way that this expenditure will have the effect of encouraging the lumber industry. Is it anything but reasonable that we should ask that this item be allowed to stand until the hon. member for Stanstead is in his place, he having been associated with the lumber interest to be developed? He could give us information which would enable us to judge whether the government is justified in making this expenditure to encourage the lumber industry at that point. If, when the information is given us we conclude that this is not a justifiable expenditure of public money, we can vote against the item. But why, in the name of decency, should we be pressed to swallow this vote without having the means of judging whether it is a good one or not? If that is the stand that the hon. Minister of Public Works takes with regard to such items, I, for one, lose my respect for him, though I have hitherto entertained the highest regard for the hon gentleman's fairness. I have discussed this question seriously, and, I think, in a proper way. I have said nothing that I feel like taking back, nothing that an opposition member is not quite entitled to say in view of the circumstances surrounding the item. I have not charged any jobbery or bribery, but I have contended, and I think justifiably, that this expenditure was entered upon in an unbusiness like way, seeing that due information was not furnished when it was first proposed. I have protested a hundred times in this House against this way of deciding upon the expenditures of public money. If hon. gentlemen wish public works carried on in their constituencies, the least they can do is to furnish the minister with information which he can lay before the committee and make every vote a business proposition, giving the reasons why, in his opinion, the money should be voted. We point out the serious nature of this expenditure, and it is a serious matter. No man would pretend to say that, at a place where there are only 314 souls, and where there is not even a post office, we are justified in spending $60,000 without any sufficient reason given. This is business, pure and simple; and the opposition's part of that business is to investigate; and, if any rumour justifies us in being suspicious of the matter, it is our duty to ask for an explanation why it is placed in the estimates. Because we ask for that information, is that any reason we should be compelled to stay until daylight? I think we are perfectly justified in asking that this item be allowed to stand until the

hon. member for Stanstead is here to give us the facts we desire to know.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The ex-Minister of Public Works, I think, is about the only gentleman on that side of the House who knows anything about the locality of this public work. He has passed there on his pleasure yacht on the down trip. Would he tell us what is the nature of the shore there? It struck me when I saw it, as rather bold and rocky——

Mr. BENNETT. It is a bluff.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The ex-minister spoke of good soil. My information is that it is a place absolutely unsuited for farming; that you could not get grain in with a peg awl, and if you did, it would not grow. What settlement is there in rear of this place, or what settlement can be expected?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The appearance of the place is very picturesque. The leaves, the green trees are charming. The province of Quebec has some rocks, and it has some beautiful plains also. In that locality there are rocks, trees, rivers and scenery which, no doubt, would captivate the poetic mind of my hon. friend. If I were allowed to offer any advice to-night, as the hour is pretty far advanced, I would say that we had better go to bed and discuss this item later on, after we get further information, if there is any. I do not say that there is no more information to be obtained. The site has been given free. My hon. friend complains that it was given free.

Mr. BENNETT. Was there any consideration in the deed?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, the consideration was the public service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Before we go home, I would like to recall the attention of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) to an observation he made a few moments ago. I have no knowledge of this particular matter, but I have knowledge of another matter to which the hon. gentleman alluded, and to which I want to call his attention, so that, if he was serious, he may have an opportunity of explaining himself. He said he proposed to stop the jobbery in connection with public works along the shores of the county represented by the Minister of Finance. I want to know if my hon. friend has any reason to suppose that there is any jobbery in connection with public works along the shores of my county, and if so, I should be exceedingly pleased to have him put his statement in a somewhat more definite form. If he was serious I would be glad to have him enlarge upon it; if he was not serious I will give him an opportunity to withdraw.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I did not use the word 'jobbery' in relation to the Minister in connection with public works along the shores of his county; but I have no hesitation in telling the Minister of Finance here that I consider it is a very extraordinary thing indeed that the Finance Minister of this country should come down and ask for the expenditures that he does annually along the little coves and bays of the shores of his county, where there is no revenue derived from them whatever. I tell the Minister of Finance further that if there is no jobbery in connection with it—I am not here to prove it or to make a charge—but if there is no jobbery in connection with it, it is about the only part of the Dominion of Canada where I have ever seen any public work carried out since he has been on the treasury benches where there has not been more or less of jobbery. In connection with the Public Works Department and other departments of this country, rumour is very current of transactions such as the one I asked the minister about to-night specifically, concerning hemlock and spruce. When the specifications called for spruce, hemlock is put in, in works not a thousand miles from the city of Montreal and from Sorel. I have nothing to retract of what I said.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The question is whether or not the hon. gentleman said there was jobbery in the public works of the county I represent. That is the question. If the 'Hansard' does not say that the hon. member used the word 'jobbery,' then I am wrong and will apologise to him. If the 'Hansard' does say that the hon. gentleman said there was jobbery, then I ask him to come forward with some evidence, or to acknowledge that he has made a mistake.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would ask the hon. member for Victoria to make the same explanation of his charges of jobbery in the neighbourhood of Montreal. He has insinuated that when I was in office I had made changes that were tantamount to jobbery. Well, I invite an investigation on those points. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I did not state that the minister was a party to it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If there was anything wrong, I am responsible for it. If there was jobbery, I am certainly guilty of it, and am responsible. But there was no jobbery, and my hon. friend is just as far wrong as his neighbour was who used the word 'jobbery.' When a member of parliament gets up and charges jobbery, he must be prepared to prove it, otherwise he has no right to use the word. It is no use to take military airs and speak of jobbery. If my hon. friend wants to have an investigation before the Public Accounts Committee of the changes that have been made at Montreal, I will be ready to meet

him. He may call all the officials that are available, and let us have an investigation.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think it has been clearly established before the country to-night that a member of parliament supporting the Finance Minister in this House, has given a deed of a property to the government after the government had expended $60,000 on a dock in order that he might enhance the value of some other of his property. I think no further proof is required that there has been jobbery in connection with this transaction. I have nothing to retract, and the people of this country, I am satisfied, will open their eyes to the situation. It is all very well for these gentlemen to get up with their bluffs, they are talking to the wrong individual. We have it admitted that a member of parliament has given a deed. What consideration did he give for the deed ? It was given, I presume, in the form of a wharf. Another hon. member, a Liberal member that I see over yonder, stated that he had sold the property for over $100,000 which cost very little.

Mr. SCHELL. Did I state any sum at all ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The sum of $100,000 was mentioned.

Mr. SCHELL. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The sum of upwards of $100,000 was mentioned to-night by some hon. member. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what the sum was ?

Mr. SCHELL. I do not know what the sum was.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of the stand taken by the Minister of Public Works, I am obliged to move that this item be struck out. I regret that I have to take this step, but I am compelled to do so in view of the fact that all the information is absolutely refused, and we have no other alternative. If the hon. gentleman says we are not entitled to know what amount of business is done at this point, or what amount of business was estimated to be done, if he declines to furnish us with that information or to let the item stand until we can get that information, then there is no other alternative but to move that the item be struck out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I acknowledge that the committee are entitled to all the information available. I am responsible as the minister of the department, and on my responsibility I have stated over and over again that I have given all the information available. The hon. member will acknowledge on reflection that he has made an unreasonable request, and one outside of my power to grant. By passing this vote we do not deprive him of another opportunity of getting any information that may be had in that direction. If I had understood that there was a desire that the item should stand we would not have objected. But, after the understanding I had with that hon. member and the liberal proposition I made, I thought it was dealing very unfairly with the committee, not to say anything of myself, to press this. I have no objection at all to the vote being taken.

Mr. INGRAM. We have the estimates marked by one of the members of the opposition who takes a special interest in matters relating to the province of Quebec. He requests certain items to be allowed to stand. Amongst these is the Grande Vallée item which he requested to stand. Last year when this item was up the hon. gentleman who was interested in getting this item in the estimates was absent. That hon. gentleman was present yesterday and he knew these estimates were to be taken up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nobody expected these estimates would be up to-night. I did not expect it at all this afternoon.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of the arrangement entered into at three o'clock that after the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) addressed the House, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was to move the adjournment of the debate, an arrangement which I know was entered into, what then had the House to do for the balance of the evening if it could not take up the Public Works estimates ? The hon. gentleman knew that and yet he absents himself from this House. The hon. minister says that he has no power to force the hon. gentleman to make a speech or to give an explanation. If that is the character of that hon. gentleman, the sooner the House knows it the better, and if the hon. gentleman refuses to get up and state the information which he has in his possession, or repudiate the rumours which have been circulated against him, the House will not have a very high regard for his standing. Let the item stand over until he is in his place and if he then refuses to give the information, we will not hold the hon. minister responsible for the information we are asking for. I do not see any justification for the hon. minister's course at all, and I believe that he is simply trying to bluff this item through the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think the hon. member has any ground for that statement.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot see any other reason. I am obliged to be frank with the hon. minister. If the hon. gentleman could say that we were asking anything unreasonable in respect to this item, I might be willing to change my mind on that point. The hon. gentleman says that he has no information in the department. I am not find-

ing fault with the hon. gentleman as to that, but I am finding fault with his attempt to bulldose the item through the committee and not give us an opportunity of hearing the explanation of the hon. gentleman who got this vote put into the estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am leaving an opportunity.

Mr. INGRAM. You are not leaving an opportunity.

Mr. TALBOT. We on this side are willing to stay.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not require any suggestions from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot). I have had as much parliamentary experience as he has.

Mr. TALBOT. With a good deal more talk.

Mr. INGRAM. And with better effect, I think, than the talk of the hon. gentleman. I wish to say in respect to this item that there is no opportunity of discussing the matter again except on concurrence, and every one knows that during concurrence is no time to debate an item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree that if there is any desire to vote, now is the time.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman knows that on the last day when concurrence is run through there is no opportunity to debate an item. Then, why not let the item stand over ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Why not vote now ?

Mr. INGRAM. I will take advantage at a later period of doing something in this matter that will take up more time of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister made a statement that I do not think he was justified in making. He said that if objection had been taken to this item before the discussion took place, he would not have pressed it. The very moment it was read from the Chair objection was taken and the request was made that in the absence of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) it should be allowed to stand. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier gave us a copy of the estimates with a number of the items marked for the specific purpose of allowing these items to stand during his absence. The hon. minister repeats that he has given all the information until the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works comes in and gives us information that we had not received before and which he believes is in the department. The hon. minister tells us that this information is not in the department. We remember that last year when this House remained in session for four hours discussing an item the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) declared again and again that there was no information in regard to it, and yet, next day, he brought down all the papers and laid them on the Table. Are we not justified in believing from the information we have about the deed, about the estimates and about the plans and specifications that there are papers in the department which we should see. We are denied the right to see these papers. My hon. friend makes the request that the item should be allowed to stand. The hon. minister says that he was prepared to grant that long ago. But, that is not what he is prepared to grant. He is prepared to force the item through and then he says: I will reserve one item upon which you can have the discussion. That is not what we want. There are many of these items to which we do not object, but to this one item we do object and we want more information before we allow it to pass. Our position is not unreasonable. We have dealt very reasonably with the hon. Minister of Public Works, and I regret to see the obstinacy that he displays now because he has usually been very fair and agreeable. We have been disposed to allow many items to pass that otherwise we would not have allowed to pass so easily but for the fact that we thought he was ready to give us all the information he could. I do not think this should be forced through. I think it is very improper and very unfair and it is not paving the way towards that good feeling that has existed heretofore between the opposition and members of the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have explained so often that I need scarcely repeat that if I had any further information on the matter I would be glad to bring it down and that if hon. gentlemen allow this item to pass we will reserve the right to discuss it at any future time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is no doubt in the world that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) deliberately marked certain items that he wished to be held over. If he had only wished the privilege that the hon. Minister of Public Works refers to of reserving one item he would have indicated that but the hon. gentleman deliberately marked a number of items and the distinct understanding was that these items were to be held over, not that they were to be passed and the discussion had upon one item, but that the whole of those items were to be held over and we charge the hon. Minister of Public Works with breaking faith here to-night. This is the first time we have had to do it. He has always kept good faith with this House, but for some unaccountable reason, whether it is the absence of the hon. member who is so seriously involved in this matter I do not know—but undoubtedly for some unaccountable reason he insists on pushing through this item and violating the agreement entered into with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Mr. HACKETT. I suggested one or two hours ago that this item should stand. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier was very desirous that he should be present on the occasion of the discussion of this matter, and I think it is a highhanded act on the part of the government that they should carry this item through without having the hon. gentleman here. We are told that the government business must be carried on. We have been here a month without doing any business of importance. We are now settling down to business and at a very important time when we think that matters affecting the people should be discussed we are simply bluffed and sat upon and told that we are of no importance, and that we, representing the opposition, have no rights in this House. Some remarks have been made about jobbery. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works repudiated the idea that there was any jobbery. The greatest jobbery that was ever perpetrated in Canada was perpetrated in Prince Edward Island in 1900, when the government, without having any appropriation, or having a dollar of money voted by this parliament, expended money at Skinner's Pond for the purpose of gaining votes for their candidate against your humble servant. I charge him now, and I charge the government of Canada with that. There was not one dollar voted for this expenditure, and yet one month before the election they took money that should go for another purpose, in order to try and corrupt the electors of West Prince. The ex-minister cannot deny it. I have the proof. They talk about cancelling contracts, but they cancelled the contract for a most useful public work at Summerside and there is not one dollar in the estimates to-day to show that they intend to continue that work. A very unkind remark was made imputing ignorance to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes). The hon. gentleman was told that he was quite ignorant about the geography of this locality, whereas the fact is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) was right and the man who corrected him was wrong.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have measured the distance spoken of to Restigouche, and it is a little over fifty miles across country. I have been over the whole region, and I knew what I was talking about.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) was quite right, and the hon. member who contradicted him was wrong. Now, with regard to this work. The government proposes to spend $60,000 on a pier in land where there is no water at all, and while they expend this large amount of money on building a pier where there is no water we have plenty of water around the shores of Prince Edward Island where there is need of a number of piers, and the whole province only gets a vote of $34,000. This place has a population of 314 people and Prince Edward Island has a population of 105,000, and it is contrary to justice and equity that you should spend $61,000 at this little place and only $34,000 for all Prince Edward Island. We are prepared to keep up this discussion until the sun rises to-morrow morning and the best thing the minister could do is to hold over this item until the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is present.

Item voted: Yeas, 36; nays, 19.

Mr. SPROULE. It is time that we should adjourn now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are a few items here which perhaps we might pass to-night, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) would consent.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister will not get his items through by pursuing these tactics. I have seen staying exhibitions here which were good for one day, and the next day, too.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope that my hon. friend will not get angry. I suggested that some unimportant items should be taken up, but I said that if the gentleman who leads the opposition did not wish to do so, then I would not proceed.

Mr. SPROULE. I expressed the desire, as plain as the English language could express it, that the committee should now rise.

Mr. INGRAM. I should like to add that, judging from the treatment we have received to-night, the Minister of Public Works cannot expect to get many more items through. I wish to say further that the hon. minister and his department have been treated with the greatest courtesy by the members of this House, and I am sorry that he has treated us in the manner he has done to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. INGRAM. We have always got along very nicely, and I think I am speaking within my rights. I say we have treated the hon. gentleman with courtesy; but if that is to be the spirit with which we are to discuss these matters, then I wish it to be understood that on every item on which I have doubts, I will speak as fully and freely as I choose; and if the hon. gentleman cannot get his items passed as easily as he would like, he has only himself to blame.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In moving that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, I have only to say that the hon. gentleman has a perfect right to exercise all his privileges as a member of this House.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 20, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 115) to incorporate the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Tobin—by Mr. Bureau.

Bill (No. 116) respecting the Restigouche Boom Company and to change its name to the Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Company.—Mr. Logan.

REPORT PRESENTED.

List of Shareholders of the Chartered Banks to the 31st of December, 1902.—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

THE DEATH OF SIR OLIVER MOWAT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, before we proceed further with the business of the House, it is my painful duty to inform it officially of the death of the lieutenant governor of the province of Ontario. Although Sir Oliver Mowat never was a member of this House, he was for some time a respected member of another branch of the legislature, and for more than forty years he occupied in the national life of this country a position of such prominence that the House would be remiss to a proper sense of its own dignity if it failed in some way to record its appreciation of the great loss the country has sustained. This loss will be all the more keenly felt because Sir Oliver Mowat was one of the last of the few survivors of that generation of exceptionally strong men who, after the union of Upper and Lower Canada in 1840, contributed to revolutionize, peaceably but thoroughly, the relation which had previously existed between the colonies and the parent state, and to shape our destinies and institutions to the form and condition which we now enjoy. In that remarkable galaxy of men which included Brown, Macdonald, Cartier, Dorion, Mackenzie, Holton, Galt and McGee, Sir Oliver Mowat was one of the most remarkable, and to him belongs the undisputed distinction of having given more continuous years to the service of the state than any other man in our history. If we examine his career, we realize what gigantic strides have been made in the comparatively short period of a single life, from those old days when the provinces of British North America were a few small and scattered Crown colonies to the present status of Canada, a nation. His life embraces the whole space that has elapsed from those old days when the rights, the opinions, the sentiments and the feelings of the people were haughtily scorned and trampled upon by an audacious oligarchy, to those happier days of our own time, when questions arising from the conflict of opinions and sentiments inseparable from human affairs, are settled by the regular and normal action of constitutional government. He was a mere youth when the abuses of the former regime culminated in the rebellion of 1837, and one of his last official acts was to help to obtain without violence, legitimate, honourable and fair concessions to the just claims of the minority in the province of Manitoba. During the whole of that space of time, Sir Oliver Mowat took an active and ever-growing part in the contests, agitations and struggles which eventually brought about confederation. His was a remarkably successful career. It can be said of him as was said of the Duke of Wellington, that he scarcely ever met a reverse and never lost a battle. Whatever he understood, to whatever task he applied himself, he easily came to the front rank. After having completed his classical studies, he chose the bar as his profession and rapidly rose to the greatest eminence as a lawyer. He entered politics in a time of violent perturbation, and at once took a prominent part as a debater in an assembly composed of men capable of adorning any assembly in the world, and of such ability as to be equal to any emergency. Then he was appointed to the bench, where he was distinguished by all the qualities of an able and learned judge. After a time he re-entered politics, and became the premier of his native province, a position which he maintained for twenty-four years in the face of stirring opposition, and only abandoned at my invitation to enter the Dominion government in order to give us the benefit of his advice, experience and ability in the settlement of very important and irritating questions. During these twenty-four years that he was premier of the province of Ontario, every man must agree that he gave to that province a government which can be cited as a model for all governments, a government which was honest, progressive, courageous and tolerant. If there was one thing in particular which marked his career at this time of life, I think it could be found in the policy which he always maintained of giving a broad, generous and tolerant treatment to the minorities of that province. In this he performed a great service not only to the province of Ontario, but to the whole people of the Dominion of Canada. Still, if I were called on to say what in my estimation is the one characteristic which will chiefly mark the career of Sir Oliver Mowat when it comes to be reviewed by the historian of the future, it seems to me that the one special feature of his character and career, which will stand out in bolder relief than any other, is that of all the men who contributed to shape our institutions and bring them to the degree of excellence they

have now reached, he perhaps performed the largest share. I do not believe that this statement can be successfully disputed, for there is abundant authority to justify it. True it is that he did not take as active a part in the preparatory work which eventually culminated in confederation as some of the other men with whom he was associated, for after the principle had been affirmed by the Quebec conference in 1867 he withdrew from the political arena to become a judge, and for some years was removed from political contests. George Brown has the credit of having, by his powerful agitation, forced the issue of confederation; Sir John Macdonald has the merit of having brought confederation into active operation; but to Sir Oliver Mowat belongs the credit of having given it its ultimate character as a federal compact. Shortly after the confederation had been launched, and while its fundamental principle was still on trial, while its orientation was still uncertain, while it was doubtful if the union of the provinces would be in reality as it was in name, a federative union or a legislative union though federative in name, he gave up the quiet and dignity and repose of a judicial life to enter again the political arena and become the leading champion of the federative principle. At that time Sir John Macdonald was the most commanding personality of our national life; perhaps it may be said that he was then in the zenith of his fame and power; and for twenty years his most successful opponent was Sir Oliver Mowat. For twenty years Sir John Macdonald, as the head of the government of Canada, and Sir Oliver Mowat as the head of the government of the province of Ontario, were engaged in a contest which, whether it was on one point or another, always centred around the federative principle of the constitution, and terminated in its actual triumph. It is a well known fact that Sir John Macdonald was not at heart a federationist; he was a legislative unionist. It is a matter of history that if Sir John Macdonald had had his own way at the conference of 1864 at Quebec, the union of the provinces, instead of being federative would have been legislative. It is a matter of history that after he had become the leader of the new government after confederation, his constant efforts were directed towards centralization. It is equally a matter of history that on every occasion it was a part of his policy to claim for the federal administration powers which under the compact of union, seemed fairly to belong to the provinces. On the other hand, Sir Oliver Mowat was a very pronounced federalist, and Sir John Macdonald found, on every occasion, the premier of Ontario before him, determined and resolved to uphold and maintain the federalist principle of the constitution. It is a matter of history that in all those contests, Sir Oliver Mowat invariably came out successful. The interpretation he gave to our constitution was invariably maintained by the courts, and he is certainly entitled to be pronounced the most correct interpreter of our constitution that Canada has yet produced. Of course, on these questions men differ and opinions are not identical. There are men who believe undoubtedly that the views held by the late Sir John Macdonald were the most correct views. There are others who believe that the views held by Sir Oliver Mowat more accurately interpret our constitution. But whatever may be the opinions we entertain, whether we agree with Sir John Macdonald or Sir Oliver Mowat, we must admit that as between the two great men who did so much for Canada, at all events the merit of constitutional ability in the interpretation of the constitution seems to belong rather to the gentleman whose loss we so deeply deplore. There was, however, another point upon which Sir Oliver Mowat and Sir John Macdonald were in perfect agreement. Much as they differed on the question of the interpretation of the constitution and other questions, they were both extremely devoted in their attachment to the land of their ancestors. On every occasion it was their motto to be true to British connection. Sir Oliver Mowat was ever true to the province of which he was the premier, true to the Dominion of which he was one of the architects, and true to the British empire of which we form a part. It is no doubt the wish of every one of us to do what we can to show our respect to his memory. Unfortunately we can do very little in this way. I am informed that his funeral will take place on Wednesday, and no doubt every hon. member of this House would wish to be present if possible. To meet this desire, I move :

That when this House adjourns to-morrow it do stand adjourned until Thursday next, in consequence of the death of the Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, and out of respect to his memory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I consider, Mr. Speaker, the motion which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has proposed to be an eminently proper one, under the circumstances, and I give it my most heartfelt support. In the death of the Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat, a great figure has passed off the stage, a man who linked the present generation with the generation of great men of the past, to whom my right hon. friend has referred. Sir Oliver Mowat truly had a great public career. Great not only in the sense of the unusual success which attended his efforts as a public man, but in this sense also that he has left behind him an honourable name, absolutely unstained. He leaves behind him a name which commands the respect, the esteem and the affection of all his fellow countrymen, regardless of political opinions.

I therefore second the motion which the right hon. gentleman has proposed, and do not think it necessary to speak at greater length, as he has said all, and more than all, that I could say on this occasion.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). If I might be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to add my humble testimony to the eloquent tributes which have just been pronounced upon the passing of Ontario's Grand Old Man, I would say that in Sir Oliver Mowat's death Toronto has lost its foremost citizen, Ontario has lost its most highly honoured and cherished son, and the Dominion a patriot whose fidelity to the interests of Canada and of the empire has never faltered. As one of the representatives in this House of the city of which, for more than threescore years, Sir Oliver Mowat had been a resident, I am happy to know and to feel that on this occasion I speak for all parties and creeds and classes in Toronto, when I say that from the moment Sir Oliver Mowat first entered the arena of public life, as a member of the city council, until at the close of a long and useful and honourable career, full of years and of honours, he was called to enter into his eternal rest, he enjoyed the respect and esteem of his fellow citizens. The record of Sir Oliver Mowat's life work will be an incentive and an inspiration to the rising generation, and to future generations of Canadians as well, to strive to emulate his example and to devote themselves to the promotion of their country's interests and welfare. It only remains for me to join most sincerely in the eulogies which have been passed upon the deceased statesman; and on my own behalf as well as for my colleagues, to respectfully tender an expression of our deep sympathy to the bereaved family, whose grief is shared by Canadians from end to end of the Dominion.

Motion agreed to.

LUMBER COMBINE.

Mr. W. SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to be permitted by the House to remind the government that several days ago I laid before the Minister of Justice certain representations concerning an alleged combine between the dealers and the manufacturers of lumber, in consequence of which the price of lumber in the country west of Lake Superior has undergone a very marked increase. The general impression is that the increase is at least partly due to some improper agreement or combine between the dealers and the manufacturers and I would ask the government whether attention has been given to the statements which I myself and certain other members from the west have laid before it?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This matter has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member who has just taken his seat, also by the hon. member for Selkirk, and also by another gentleman connected with public affairs, who waited on me on Saturday. There are two sections of our laws under which the matter might be considered. One is the section in the Criminal Code dealing with unlawful combines. The other is that section of the Tariff Act which makes provision for an investigation in the case of any combine, whereby the price of any article is unduly enhanced, and for a reduction or abolition of the duty in case the charges be proved. I was called on by Mr. Greenway on Saturday, who brought the matter to my notice, and referred particularly to the combine clause. I pointed out that before we could take any action, a fair case should be made out by some responsible party. While the matter was brought to the attention of the House, some one should take the responsibility of making a formal statement of the case. I understood Mr. Greenway to say that he would assume the responsibility, and that he would forward us a letter setting forth the facts. Until we receive that letter the matter is not before us in a shape which will admit of any action. Mr. Greenway said that he would forward such a statement in a few days.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS. (Saskatchewan). I would like to say a word with reference to the matter brought up by the member of West Assiniboia. There is no doubt at all that a combination exists.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIS. I understand the hon. member closed his speech with a motion to adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no motion before the Chair.

Mr. DAVIS. Then I will move the adjournment of the House. I was going to say that there is no doubt at all that a combine exists in the west at the present time with reference to lumber. To my mind I do not think that anything that can be done to the tariff will give the people relief, for the simple reason that most of the lumber that is used by the people of the North-west at the present time is of a rough quality and there is no duty on undressed lumber. What the government should do in the future, in granting licenses to parties to cut lumber in the North-west Territories, is to insert a clause in the license which would provide that if it is proven that a combine exists, the party holding that license, and who is known to have entered the combine, shall have his license cancelled. I think if a clause of that kind were inserted in licenses granted by the government to parties who cut lumber in the Territories on Dominion lands, in case

any of those parties who cut lumber entered a combine, it would have the effect of cancelling their licenses and they would lose what interest they had in the limits. However, if anything can be done in the way of bringing the matter to the attention of the government and if taking the duty off dressed lumber will remedy the grievance, I am satisfied. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I did not expect this question would be brought up at the present time, but as it is now before us, I think it desirable that certain documents and information which I have in my hands should be placed in the possession of the House. On several past occasions when we have made allegations that a certain condition of affairs existed, we have been met with a demand for proof. For my part I do not think it is any portion of the business of a member of parliament to act the part of a private detective ; it is our business to state that certain conditions exist, and it is the business of those who are charged with the duty of carrying on the affairs of the country to accept that statement or disprove it. However, on this occasion, if there is any question as to the existence of a hard and fast lumber combine, a lumber combine which not only dictates the price at which lumber shall be sold to retail dealers, but dictates who shall sell that lumber and who shall not, and whose jurisdiction extends throughout the North-west Territories—if there is any question, I say, of the existence of that combine, I will take the liberty of reading these papers for the information of the House and of the country. This correspondence passed between a reputable building contractor in Alberta, and the managers of certain sawmill businesses in British Columbia. The paper I am going to read are originals. The letters from the saw-mill men bear their own printed headings, and they are signed by their own signatures ; so there can be no question as to the facts of the case. The correspondence opens in September, 1902. This gentleman writes me to say that he was in business as a building contractor, and had been in the habit of purchasing such lumber as he required to carry on his business, but at a certain stage of the game, when the combine was sufficiently entrenched, he applied to purchase lumber and was unable to do so. I will read the letters in the order of dates :

The Hastings Shingle Manufacturing Co., Limited.

Head Office,
Vancouver, B.C., September 8, 1902.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 23rd ult., addressed to Mr. Austin McNair, was handed to us for reply, as he is out of the shingle business and is now in our employ.

We regret we are unable to make you quotations on shingles as we find that you are not a member of the Western Retail Lumbermen's Association, and as there is a member of the association in your town, we regret we are unable to make you quotations.

Thanking you for the inquiry, we are,

Yours very truly,
THE HASTINGS SHINGLE MANUFACTURING CO., Limited,
J. D. McNair.

The British Columbia Mills, Lumber and Trading Company.

Vancouver, B.C., September 24, 1902.

Dear Sir,—We have your favour of the 20th, and note contents. In reply we beg to say we would have much pleasure in continuing to ship you lumber to Cochrane as we did in the past to Banff, but you are now in a district under the control of the Western Retail Lumbermen's Association, and we are unable to supply lumber to any who are not enrolled as members of that body. If you can secure admission we will be pleased to quote you. The proper mode of procedure to secure this end would be to write to the secretary, Mr. Isaac Cockburn, of Winnipeg.

Yours very truly,
BRITISH COLUMBIA MILLS, TIMBER AND TRADING CO.,
Hastings Saw-mill branch.
per H. S. Galbraith.

Harrison River Mills, Timber and Trading Company, Limited.

Harrison River, B.C., September 24, 1902.

Dear Sir,—We thank you for your inquiry re lumber, which is just to hand. Please let us know if you are a member of the 'Western Retail Lumbermen's Association.' We cannot sell you down in that country unless you are. If you are not, you might apply to I. Cockburn, Winnipeg, secretary of the association and become a member, then we should be pleased to supply you. Let us hear from you again.

Yours very truly,
THE HARRISON RIVER MILLS, TIMBER AND TRADING COMPANY, Limited.
J. F. Boyd, Secretary.

The Western Retail Lumbermen's Association.

September 30, 1902.

Dear Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 26th instant, I would like you to inform me of the business that is to be done at Cochrane. How many cars are there sold there in a year ? What stock of lumber is carried by the dealers already there.

Yours very truly,
ISAAC COCKBURN,
Secretary Treasurer.

You will understand, Mr. Speaker, that the secretary-treasurer of this association, resident in Winnipeg, was assuming to dictate who shall sell lumber at Cochrane, in the district of Alberta. On October 7th, there is another letter from Mr. Cockburn :

From what you state there is no business for two lumber yards. Perhaps Messrs Murphy Bros., would sell out to you. I will write to them the necessity of keeping sufficient lumber in stock for the requirements of the district.

(Sgd.) ISAAC COCKBURN.

That is to say, this man was unable to get lumber at Cochrane from those who

were in the business there. He desired to buy it from those who had it, and he was not allowed permission to buy it. He applied to Cockburn in Winnipeg for permission, and was refused it.

On October 14th there is a letter from the Harrison River Mills Timber and Trading Co., Limited, who write as follows :

We are just in receipt of your favour of 10th instant, and regret to hear that you have been unable to obtain membership in the Western Retail Lumbermen's Association. We are sorry that we cannot sell to you even at Morley unless you are a member of the above association. If there is not a member at Morley, why not make application for that point. We will be glad to sell you the lumber if you can just arrange your membership in the association. Awaiting to hear from you we remain,

Yours truly,
HARRISON RIVER MILLS
TIMBER AND TRADING CO.
J. F. Boyd. Secretary.

The British Columbia Mills and Trading Co.

Vancouver, B.C., October 15, 1902.

Dear Sir,—We have your favour of 10th instant and note the contents. It certainly seems to be too bad that the Western Retail Lumbermen's Association should not use more judgment in admitting members if the situation at Cochrane is as bad as outlined by you, and we see no reason to doubt it. We do not think there will be any objection to our selling you at Morley, and we would advise you to write at once to the secretary inclosing your application and fee for membership at that point. We are writing by this mail to our agent at Winnipeg to urge your claims for recognition and authorizing him to state to the secretary that we have always found you reliable and straightforward and so eligible for recognition. We are having a price list for delivery at Morley mailed to you and would be glad to receive orders.

Yours very truly,
THE BRITISH COLUMBIA MILLS,
LUMBER AND TRADING CO.
C. W. Beecher,
Assistant General Manager.

On October 21st, there is a letter from Murphy Bros., Cochrane, Alberta :

Gentlemen,—Yours to hand *re* lumber, if you let us know the quality you want of each. If we haven't got it we will get it for you. The price will be right. We let you have it as cheap as possible.

On October 23rd, there is a letter from the British Columbia Mills Timber and Trading Company, head office at Vancouver, B.C. :

We have your favour of the 18th, and thank you for contents. We regret very much that we cannot ship you lumber to Morley to be rebilled to Cochrane and at the same time act in accordance with either the letter or the spirit of our agreement with the Western Retail Lumbermen's Association. If you contemplate starting a yard at Morley we will do all in our power to have you enrolled as a member, and will also see what can be done in the matter of you being a resident member at Cochrane. In the meantime with much good wishes for your future prosperity we beg to remain,

THE BRITISH COLUMBIA MILLS,
TIMBER AND TRADING CO.
per H. A. Galbraith.

On October 29th, there is a letter from the British Columbia Mills Timber and Trading Company :

Since our last favour to you we have been advised by our Winnipeg agent, who has been endeavouring to get you put on the list for Cochrane, that he thinks there is no reason why you would not be put on the list for Morley, but that you could not get on for Cochrane. Such being the case we trust you will forward your application and fee for membership at Morley to Mr. Cockburn, and as our agent, Mr. Ovas, has placed the matter before him, we have no doubt you will be admitted for that point.

Trusting that you will then furnish us with your requirements, which it has always been our pleasure in the past and will be in the future to execute to the best of our ability, we remain,

Yours very truly,
THE BRITISH COLUMBIA MILLS,
TIMBER AND TRADING CO.
C. W. Beecher,
General Manager.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the evidence proves conclusively that there is a combine in restraint of trade and for the purpose of increasing prices, bringing it within the limits of the Tariff Act. And, as a representative of the country affected, I ask for action under that Tariff Act; and I ask for action immediately. The case is that the price of finished lumber—dressed lumber, for flooring, ceiling and siding—has been increased by $9 per thousand feet in the part of the country I represent within the past fourteen months. There may have been some reason for a moderate increase in price, but there is no change in conditions in British Columbia within the last fourteen months that would warrant an increase to the amount of $9 per thousand on this class of lumber. I think it is desirable to call the attention of the House to the facts at this time, when there are thousands and tens of thousands of people entering the territories and settling on the plains. As these people cannot secure the slightest shelter for themselves their families or their stock without buying the necessary lumber, an increase of the cost of lumber to the amount of $9 a thousand feet is such a serious matter as to constitute one of the most effective checks to the tide of immigration that could be given. This is a question in dealing with which we cannot afford to lose time. The people are there. They need the lumber. They need it now. And this precious Western Retail Lumbermen's Association is holding them up to the extent I have mentioned for this class of lumber. I may point out, for the benefit of the House, that while these gentlemen have a very strong grasp of their business

affairs, they are not altogether destitute of a sense of humour. They have published, not for general circulation, but for private perusal, a list of members of their association. Now, this lumbermen's association is, in fact, an organization of the mill men, who hold the retail dealers under their thumb, as you have seen by this correspondence. But in this peculiar list that they have published, the mill men figure as 'honorary members' and the retail men as 'active members.' So, it would appear as though the dealer, who is at the mercy of the mill man is the active force in carrying out this iniquitous combine. The retailer, of course, comes in direct contact with the unfortunate consumer, but he is the victim of circumstances as the consumer is; and it is the mill man, the honourary member, who is really in command, as this correspondence shows.

I have placed this evidence before the House and before the country. It does not admit of contradiction, and it should not be necessary to place it before the House, because the facts are so patent that there is no gainsaying them in any way, shape or manner. An organization which not only increases the price of such a necessity as lumber at such a critical time as the present, but actually dictates to the people of this country whether they shall do business or shall not do business, is something worthy the immediate attention of this House, and the strongest attention that this House can give it. For my part, I take the liberty of saying that, as a preliminary canter in dealing with the question, the best thing to do would be to take the duty absolutely off dressed lumber, as it was taken off rough lumber some years ago for the same reason.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). I would like to ask my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) a question. If there is a combine, as he says, and perhaps there is, would the removal of the duty, as he suggests, bring about the removal of the combine?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not a prophet or a mind reader. But I believe the removal of the duty would have a most salutary effect. And as the condition of affairs is exactly that contemplated by the clause in the Tariff Act when it was placed before the House and accepted by the House, I ask, as a preliminary canter—as I have said—that that Act be given effect at once. Afterwards, if this does not result in breaking up the combine, other measures may be taken.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question put by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) and dealing with the question very briefly, I may say that while in Winnipeg a few days ago, I met several of the independent dealers in lumber who reside in that city, where the headquarters of the combine exist. The members of the combine had promised that, if the matter were investigated before the city council, they would appear and state their case. Subsequently I accompanied the independent dealers to the meeting, but the members of the combine refused to put in a defence to the charge that there was a combine unless their evidence was taken in private—they would not allow reporters or independent dealers to be present, but their evidence had to be kept absolutely secret. Of course, the independent dealers and the city council refused to hear their defence. There is no doubt whatever that there is a combine, a combine of the worst kind, injuriously affecting the west and hampering its development. I produced before the Minister of Justice some twenty-one pages of type written matter showing that a combine exists and that it has existed for the last year or two. I also produced—if not, I have it among my papers—a copy of the constitution and by-laws of the combine. There should not be much difficulty in his arriving at the conclusion that this combine is operating there now and that the situation needs relieving at once. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion one of the steps that should be taken, and taken at once, is to remove the duty from dressed lumber. Now, it is true that may not give all the relief that is desired. I do not think it will, but I am told by men in the business, including Mayor Arbuthnot, of Winnipeg, and other independent dealers, that if the duty is taken off it will largely go to break up the combine. Afterwards the commission can go to work and break up the combine by what ever means are found necessary. I would ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to facilitate the movement of this commission as much as possible, and I shall be very glad to place before him all the documents in the original that he may desire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, there will be one difficulty about the course that has been suggested, namely, taking off the duty on all kinds of lumber. The provision seems only to apply to articles upon which there is a duty. I have now before me the section which the hon. minister invokes. That section is as follows:

That whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe that as regard to any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of such article, or dealers therein, to unduly enhance the price of such article or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Superior Court in any province of Canada, to inquire in a summary way into and report to the Gover-

nor in Council, whether such trust, combination, association or agreement exists.

Then follows the provision in regard to the attendance of witnesses, &c. It proceeds :

If the judge reports that such trust, combination, association or agreement exists, and if it appears to the Governor in Council that such disadvantage to the consumers is facilitated by the duties of customs imposed on a like article when imported, then the Governor in Council shall place such article on the free list, or so reduce the duty upon it, as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in such article.

I do not know whether my hon. friends have looked carefully at the schedules of the Tariff Act, and they are so long that I hardly like to trouble the House with them, but the schedule which provides for free lumber is very comprehensive indeed. It seems to me to include almost every kind of lumber that would be required. That particular kind of lumber upon which there is a duty of twenty-five per cent is described as follows :

Boards, sawed boards, planks and deals, planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved, 25 per cent.

Then

Lumber and timber manufactured, n.e.s., 20 per cent.

That, of course, is coupled with a provision for free lumber covering a whole page of this book with which I will not trouble the House at the present time. It seems to me that the complaint which comes from the west is a striking illustration of one fact which I have had occasion to mention before in this House, namely, that these combines do not always depend on a protective tariff. We have combines in the United States, we have them in free trade England at the present time, we have them in Canada in regard to commodities the greater portion of which come into Canada duty free. I agree entirely with the hon. gentlemen who have said that it might prove a serious handicap to the development of the west, particularly at this juncture, if the price of lumber were to be unduly raised, and I agree with hon. gentlemen who have said that this matter should demand the immediate attention of the government. But, whether or not a remedy is to be found in the suggestions which have been made by these gentlemen is to my mind quite a different question. I would be inclined to think that the remedy so far as it is to be found under the law as it at present exists, is to be found in the direction mentioned by the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) under the provisions of the code to which he referred this afternoon.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the only direct remedy we have to-day is to be found in the Criminal Code. Some years ago, when the Criminal Code was amended at the instance of the late hon. member for West York (Hon. Mr. Wallace) and when the clause which I am now about to read was introduced, it was designed for the very purpose and that alone of attacking combinations :

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars and not less than two hundred dollars, or to two years' imprisonment, and if a corporation, is liable to a penalty not exceeding ten thousand dollars and not less than one thousand dollars, who conspires, combines, agrees or arranges with any other person, or with any railway, steamship, steamboat or transportation company, unlawfully——

(a) To unduly limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any article or commodity, which may be a subject of trade or commerce.

Then,

(c) To unduly prevent, limit, or lessen the manufacture or production of any article or commodity, or to unreasonably enhance the price thereof ; or

(d) To unduly prevent or lessen competition in the production, manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, transportation or supply of any such article or commodity, or in the price of insurance upon person or property.

In 1899, as a result of the contention of those who had looked into the question, it was found that it was almost impossible to establish to the satisfaction of the court that the price had been unduly increased or that trade had been unduly restricted and I had the honour of introducing a Bill into this House, chap. 65, to further amend the Criminal Code so as to take out the word 'unduly,' which Bill passed this House and the Senate and is now the law, so that the Criminal Code is now much more effective and practical. I noticed the other day that a prosecution which was started against the coal combine of Brantford succeeded. They were indicted for a conspiracy to unduly enhance the price of coal, and they were convicted a few days ago at the assize court. I have no doubt whatever if the present combination amongst the lumbermen is such as has been stated they could be indicted and convicted. Certainly, if the letters read by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) are correct, and I have no doubt they are, these people are clearly amenable to the Criminal Code, section 520 and could be indicted under it. It seems to me that that would be the only direct way of attacking them, because, while the duty may be taken off, so much lumber comes in free of duty that you cannot successfully affect them there. I am very much inclined to believe, from the time at which this is brought to the attention of the House and from the way in which it has been brought, that this is rather an effort to strengthen Mr. Greenway's hands in the coming provincial election than for any other

purpose. This has been going on for quite a while. Why did not Mr. Greenway and these dealers and builders in the west invoke the Criminal Code ? Why did they not avail themselves of this direct means of putting a stop to this combination and severely punishing the parties implicated ? I think it is the Criminal Code that they should have resort to in a case of this kind instead of taking the duty off lumber, and if these parties were as desirous of affording relief to the people of the west as they profess to be they would have adopted the course which I have suggested rather than come here to endeavour to assist Mr. Greenway in the way in which they are doing.

Mr. J. CLANCY (Bothwell). I have looked very carefully through the Trade and Navigation Returns and I am unable to find that a single dollar's worth of dutiable lumber has come into the country during the past year. Therefore, I would say to hon. gentlemen who are seeking relief by taking off the duty that so far as I see no lumber of that class has come into the country during the past year.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I may be permitted to read over the representations which I made to the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) to assure the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the suggestions which he has made and which other gentlemen have made towards seeking a remedy for the conditions which exist up there, were suggested on my representations.

Mr. SPROULE. What date is that.

Mr. SCOTT. My letter to the Minister of Justice is dated the 25th of March.

Mr. SPROULE. Of last March.

Mr. SCOTT. Of last March. After reciting the conditions I say.

> In view of the above statements which can be amplified, I beg to suggest that the government should at once investigate the conditions of the trade with the view to applying, if found advisable, the provisions of section 18 of the customs tariff, 1897, or of section 520 of the Criminal Code, 1892, as amended by the Act of 1900.
>
> I further suggest that the government should consider the possibility of a remedy for the grievances complained of by amendments to the timber regulations so as to provide for the forfeiture of licenses in case the holders become parties to any such unlawful combination, association, or agreement as aforesaid or otherwise, so as to retain a measure of control over the operations of the manufacturers and dealers.

With regard to the point which has been made, that scarcely any lumber is imported into Canada as a dutiable article, I may say that the consumers and independent dealers who are making these complaints allege, that the classes of lumber which are dutiable are used by the combination practically to put a duty upon the whole of the rough lumber which ostensibly is free from duty. The members of the combination refuse to sell lumber to any person who buys any lumber outside of Canada. The whole of the lumber that the dealer buys must be bought from a member of the combination, or otherwise the dealer or the consumer is refused lumber by the members of the combination. They, therefore, claim that the removal of duty upon dressed lumber is likely to afford a considerable measure of relief. But, as has been said by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and others, if this relief is not sufficient, certainly the matter will be pressed further, and other remedies will be demanded.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I did not understand what answer the Minister of Justice gave to your letter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I regret that the Minister of Justice is not here just now, because he would deal with that point. I think, however, that I can safely go this far, although a layman : That if this matter is to be dealt with under the Criminal Code, the proper party to deal with it is the Attorney General of Manitoba, because it is the duty of the attorneys general in the respective provinces to initiate proceedings under the Criminal Code.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. Any private individual can do it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly ; but through the attorney general. What I mean to say is, that it is not the business of this parliament or of the Minister of Justice to initiate proceedings under the Criminal Code.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say it was.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I merely call attention to that point. With regard to the North-west Territories, that perhaps will have to be qualified because the territories are in an exceptional position ; but I believe the point has been raised that this combination has its foundation in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia.

Mr. SCOTT. It covers the whole country from Lake Superior, west.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The combinations, if combinations exist, are to be found, I believe, in the province of Manitoba and in the province of British Columbia, although their operations may extend into the territories.

Mr. SCOTT. From Lake Superior to the Pacific.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That may be, but I think the combination has its existence, if it has any existence at all, in the provinces, although its business happens to extend to the territories, and there may be a question as to how far you can prosecute in the territories people who are

in the provinces and who do not come within the limits of territorial jurisdiction. However, that is getting into the law of it and I do not want to do that. In the provinces at all events the initiation of these proceedings lies in the attorney general of the province, and not in any of us here at Ottawa. Under the combine clause of the tariff, of course, the initiative would be with the government here, but that also is a judicial proceeding and you have to take every formal way of going about it.

Motion (Mr. Davis) to adjourn negatived.

QUESTIONS.

AMHERST, NOVA SCOTIA, POST OFFICE.

Mr. BELL—by Mr. Borden, Halifax—asked :

1. Is any part of the post office building at Amherst, N.S., occupied by a tenant or tenants?
2. What rental is received from the several tenants ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Hon. James Sutherland) :

Two rooms in this building were occupied for many years, free of rent by the late W. M. Fullerton, barrister, &c. At his death, about eight or nine years ago, his brother took possession and continued in such possession of the larger of the rooms up to the time of his death, a few months ago. By his permission, A. D. Ross, J.P., has for the past two years had the use of the smaller room.

CHIEF VETERINARY INSPECTORS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the salary of the chief veterinary inspector for the Dominion ?
2. What was the object of the chief inspector's trip to England, from April to November, 1901, for which an expense of $1,062.70 is detailed in the Auditor General's Report ?
3. How much has been paid to the chief inspector for travelling expenses since the 30th of June last ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. Two thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars per annum. Two thousand five hundred dollars to 1st February, 1903.

2. The visit of the chief inspector, then Dr. McEachran, to England in 1901 was for the purpose of attending the British congress on tuberculosis ; said visit extended from July 3rd to September 1st, his expenses being $602.

The present chief inspector, whose appointment dates from 1st February, 1902, was sent to Great Britain in March, 1901, as veterinary quarantine officer, remaining there until November of that year. His duties consisted in the inspection and testing with tuberculin of cattle purchased for export to Canada.

3. Four hundred and eighty-five dollars and nineteen cents.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. CHARLES A. L. FISHER.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the salary of Charles A. L. Fisher, employed in the Department of Agriculture as inspector of public works ?
2. What public works has he inspected since the 30th of June last ?
3. Has he furnished a written report of such inspection ?
4. What is the amount of his travelling expenses since the 30th of June, 1902 ?
5. Has he passed an examination under the Civil Service Act ?
6. Is he a qualified physician ?
7. By whom was he recommended to the Minister of Agriculture ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. One thousand five hundred dollars per annum.

2. Canadian Pacific Railway construction work from West Selkirk, Man., northward. Mackenzie & Mann (Canadian Northern Railway), from west of Carman, Man. Mackenzie & Mann, (Canadian Northern Railway), from Grandview, Man. Mackenzie & Mann, (Canadian Northern Railway), from Erwood, N.W.T. Mackenzie & Mann, (Canadian Northern Railway), from Neepawa, Man. Mackenzie & Mann, (Canadian Northern Railway), from north of Beaver, Man. Canadian Pacific Railway, from Yorkton, N.W.T., north-westerly. Canadian Pacific Railway, from Forrest, Man., westward. Canadian Pacific Railway, from Waskada, Man., west. Canadian Pacific Railway, from Wellwood, Man., west. Canadian Pacific Railway, from Snowflake, Man., south-easterly. Canadian Pacific Railway, from Kirkella, Man., north-westerly. Canadian Pacific Railway, from Lardo to Gerrard, B.C. Canadian Pacific Railway, from Field to Ottertail, B.C. Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway, from Cascade to Carson, B.C. Payne Mines, tramway and other construction work at Sandon, B.C. Alberta Railway and Coal Company, from Lethbridge, N.W.T. Crow's Nest Coal Works, Fernie, B.C. Crow's Nest Southern Railway, work from International Line, B.C. Consolidated Lake Superior, work at Sault Ste. Marie, Ont. Welland Canal works, near Port Colborne, Ont. James Bay Railway works, from Parry Sound, Ont. Breakwater works, Depot Harbour, Ont. St. Anthony Lumber Company's works, Whitney, Ont. Galop Rapids canal works, at Cardinal, Ont. Galop Rapids canal works, west of Cardinal, Ont. Harbour works, at Montreal, Que. Quebec bridge works, at Quebec, Que. Intercolonial Coal Mining Company's works, Westville, N.S. Nova Scotia Steel Company's works, New Glasgow, N.S. Cumberland Railway and Coal Company's works, Spring Hill Mines, N.S. Dominion Coal Company's works, Glace Bay, N.S. Sydney and Louisburg Railway Company's works, Glace Bay, N.S. Dominion Iron and Steel Company's works, Sydney, N.S. Cape Breton Railway work, from Port Hawkesbury, C.B. Inver-

ness Railway and Coal Company's work, from Point Tupper, C.B. Halifax and South-western Railway work, from New Germany, N.S. Hillsborough bridge works, from Charlottetown, P.E.I. Prince Edward Island Railway work, from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour, P.E.I.

3. Yes, as published in the Minister's annual report for 1902, pages 54 to 69 inclusive, up to October 31st, 1902.

4. Four hundred and fifty dollars and forty-two cents.

5. No; such examination is not required.

6. No; the Act does not require him to be.

7. It is not usual to answer questions of this character.

CENSUS OF 1901—COST TO DATE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What is the total amount which has been expended upon the census of 1901 to date?

2. What is the total amount expended upon the census of 1901 during the month of March, 1903?

3. When will the work of taking the census of 1901, and completing the reports, be terminated?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding):

1. The total amount expended upon the census of 1901 to April 7, 1903, is $1,121,513.01.

2. The total amount expended upon the census of 1901 during the month of March is $8,585.31.

3. The work of taking the census of 1901 was completed in that year, and the reports will probably be completed before the close of the current calendar year.

IMMIGRANTS FOR ONTARIO.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin) asked:

Has the government made any efforts to induce any of the immigrants coming to Canada to settle in Ontario?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The government in promoting immigration into Canada leaves it to the immigrants themselves to select the places in the Dominion where they desire to settle.

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS—PRODUCTION OF BUTTER.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What is the total amount of butter produced by the Dominion experimental farms for the year ending 30th June, 1902?

2. What quantity of said butter was exported?

3. Who was the agent employed for the sale of said butter?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding):

1. The quantity of butter made at the Central Experimental Farm was 3,646 pounds. No butter is made at any of the branch experimental farms.

2. None was exported. The butter referred to was sold in Ottawa.

3. No agent was at any time employed for the sale of the said butter.

EXPENDITURE ON CANALS.

Mr. DAVIS asked:

What is the total amount spent on canals in Ontario since confederation, including repairs; and the amount spent in Quebec since confederation, on the canals, including repairs?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The total amount spent on canals in Ontario, including repairs, since confederation to April 1, 1903, is, $50,298,183.93. And the amount spent in Quebec on canals, including repairs, since confederation to April 1, 1903, is, $34,753,175.63.

NAPANEE POST OFFICE.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Sproule asked:

1. Is any part of the post office building at Napanee, Ontario, occupied by a tenant, or tenants?

2. If so, what rent is the tenant, or occupant, paying?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. Jas. Sutherland):

1. Yes, by Mr. Gilbert Bogart, the late postmaster.

2. No rental is collected. Mr. Bogart who was for thirty-eight years postmaster at Napanee always occupied two private rooms in the public building; and after his resignation, a year ago, according to his own statement, he continued to occupy the said rooms by permission from the collector of customs.

PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. SHERRITT asked:

Who has the contract now for conveyance of His Majesty's mails between Parkhill post office and the railway station? What remuneration is he receiving per year for the same? Has a new contract been let lately for this work in the future? If so, to whom has the contract been given, and at what figure? Was the contract let by public tender; and if not, why not? Who recommended the change, and why was the contract taken from the party at present doing the work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock):

1. The Grand Trunk Railway Company—twelve trips per week, and Mr. George Simpson twelve trips per week.

2. The payment to the Grand Trunk Railway Company is included in the annual subsidy for this and other services. Mr. George Simpson is paid 13⅜ cents per double trip or $85.13 per annum.

3. The contract of Mr. George Simpson expires on the 30th of June next. It has not been renewed. A four years contract has been entered into with Mr. Sandford

Tudor from the 1st of July, 1903, for the service now performed by Mr. Simpson on the same terms and conditions. The statute does not require tenders to be invited for contracts involving expenditure of $85.13 a year. This contract was not therefore advertised. On the termination of the contract with Mr. Simpson, the department is quite free to find a new contractor for the service. Mr. Simpson having no right over others to be selected for the new contract. The department being satisfied that Mr. Tudor would prove a desirable contractor, arranged with him. It is not usual to state on what advice the department acts under such circumstances.

ASHCROFT—BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Is there a contract for the carrying of the mails from Ashcroft to Barkerville, British Columbia, and branch lines?
2. When was the contract made; for how long; and at what price?
3. Has the contract been renewed without new tenders being asked for in the usual manner, by newspaper advertisement and posters?
4. If tenders were asked for, in what newspapers were the advertisements inserted; or how was publicity given to competitors?
5. If the contract is still continued, what is the rate of payment per annum?
6. Does the Postmaster General intend to ask for tenders in future; and when; or is it his intention to permit the present contractors to carry the mails without any competition being asked for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock):

1. Yes.
2. First of October, 1899, for a period of four years. Contract price $23,250.
3. No.
4. Tenders have not been invited.
5. The contract is still in force, the rate of payment being $23,250 per annum.
6. The subject is now under consideration.

PRICES OF BINDER TWINE

Mr. McCREARY asked:

Have the prices of penitentiary binder twine been fixed yet? If so, what is the price of each grade of binder twine?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll):

1. Yes.
2. Pure manilla 650 feet, 11½ cents per pound; pure manilla 600 feet, 10¾ cents per pound. Kingston special, 500 feet, 9½ cents per pound. Ton lots for clubs of farmers ¼ cent per pound less.

BRITISH COLUMBIA LABOUR TROUBLES.

Mr. PUTTEE asked:

1. Has the commission been appointed to inquire into the labour troubles of British Columbia?
2. What are the names of the commissioners?
3. What are the instructions to the commissioners?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock):

1. Yes.
2. The Hon. Gordon Hunter, Chief Justice of British Columbia and the Rev. Elliott S. Rowe.
3. To conduct an inquiry into, and concerning the nature and causes of labour disputes, strikes or lockouts in British Columbia, for that purpose having all the powers conferred on commissioners by cap. 114, R.S.C., and to hold sittings at different places throughout the province.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, I think that I may fairly congratulate my hon. friend the leader of the opposition on having delivered last Friday the very mildest criticism upon a budget speech to which it has ever been my good fortune to listen. I do not at all mean to say that in certain other directions the hon. gentleman was not aggressive enough; but I refer to the budget qua budget simply; and on that I may congratulate him on having delivered himself of an address which could by no possibility have excited in the slightest degree the susceptibilities of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding). I am aware that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition had his difficulties. It is, I have no doubt, in the recollection of this House how almost six years ago to a day, the predecessor of that hon. gentleman, in his usual fervent fashion, made the very rafters of this building ring with his denunciations of the desolation, the woe, the misery and the mischief which my hon. friend beside me was about to inflict on the industries of Canada. That hon. gentleman foreheard the wails of the manufacturers of Canada and foresaw the ruin of our industries, and I can understand that the hon. gentleman who now so worthily fills the place formerly occupied by Sir Charles Tupper, bearing these denunciations in his mind, had his difficulties. He must have contrasted the predictions of 1897 with the realities of 1903, and come to the conclusion probably, that the less said about the ruin and destruction which was then predicted as the result of our policy, the better for himself and for his party.

I observe that the hon. gentleman has either developed or inherited a taste for that description of scrap-book literature with which we were so familiar in the time of his predecessor. It is a great honour to me that the hon. gentleman should have devoted so much attention to divers speeches and articles of mine. I hope he reads them constantly; I hope they will do him good, though I fear the good seed is falling on stony ground, where it is apt to be choked by the brambles of protection. However, as Cromwell was wont to say, in spite of his malignancy, I trust the day of grace will yet come; but I would advise him as he has a taste for perusing these curiosities of bygone literature, to read, and read carefully, the speeches addressed to this House by his honourable predecessor in the years from 1873 to 1878 and thereafter. If the hon. gentleman will do that, he will find two things: he will find, first of all, that his predecessor, Sir Charles Tupper, was most emphatic in pointing out to the House during the first period to which I have referred, that a government's first duty was to create and ensure prosperity. In the succeeding period, he will find that hon. gentleman invariably gave credit to himself and the government of which he was a member, for all the prosperity which he alleged, obtained in the country. Were my hon. friend Sir Charles Tupper present, I do not doubt that he would, with equal fervour and energy, with as much loudness and possibly as much consistency and logic explain to the House how it is that, in the eternal fitness of things, credit is only due to a government for the prosperity of a country when that government happens to be Conservative.

As I have said, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition had his difficulties. He was confronted with the very largest surplus our country has ever enjoyed and he was not able to put his finger on one single tax which he considered oppressive or unjust. He was not able to suggest the reduction of the duty on one single commodity, rather the contrary. It is true he did suggest that my hon. friend beside me, on one or two occasions, had commented adversely on some of the taxes which are still maintained, but was most careful to say that he himself had no objection to these taxes and had not the slightest desire to advocate the reducing or removing of any one of them. And in like manner, although he had to deal with the very largest expenditure Canada has ever seen, he was particularly careful to say that, so far as regards our expenditure, the only criticism, the only attack, he would level against us was that in certain directions, which he was good enough to specify, we did not spend sufficient money.

When my hon. friend dealt with the fact that while our expenditure was very large, our surplus was very large, we were likewise able to show a volume of trade and commerce larger than ever before, all the criticism which my hon. friend saw fit to indulge in, on that subject, was that in his opinion he thought the people were getting too much for their money. And he was disposed to cut down the purchasing power of the people and make them pay more for the goods they were purchasing than they were called on to pay under the existing tariff.

We can well understand that the hon. gentleman, in dealing with a tariff such as the hon. Finance Minister has presented to the House, finds himself woefully handicapped by his own previous utterances and those of his party. He might try to disguise his feelings, but I fear it was not pleasant to him to find that my hon. friend beside me was able to point to all the indices of prosperity, on which my hon. friend and his party were accustomed to rely in former times as indicating the prosperity of a country and a great many more important ones which they were never able to produce, but which have attended the administration of Canada under a Liberal government. Sir, it was perhaps small wonder that under such circumstances the hon. gentleman should appeal to me. It was small wonder that he should say to me, as he did almost in so many words: 'Owing to my peculiar position I really cannot undertake to criticise the budget of the Minister of Finance, but you might do it.' And he was good enough to intimate that he thought that I might do it well. I am deeply grateful to my hon. friend for his good opinion. I am half disposed to meet my hon. friend half way and I will go this far to gratify him. I will define for his benefit and that of his friends beside him, the conditions under which I might, to quote his words, sing one of my old songs and indulge in some of the criticisms I was apt to bestow some years ago on the occupants of these benches when I was in opposition. For instance, if we had to-day an exceedingly unfair and oppressive system of taxation, under which we were practically putting two dollars into private pockets for every one that went into the public treasury, I might see my way to deliver myself of some severe criticism. If to-day, I found out trade was utterly stagnant and had been so during a quarter of a century, if it were just at the point where it had started out in 1873, I might concede that there was some ground for criticism. If I found our population growing as slowly as it did in the period of Conservative administration, when, if the truth had been told, it would have been shown that in ten years of Conservative rule the total growth of Canada was less than what I believe it to be in any one year of Liberal administration, I might have had occasion for fault finding. Were we confronted with three or four years of successive deficits I would be disposed to criticise, and

very severly criticise, the budget. Does my hon. friend recognize the picture ? Does he recognize the condition of things that prevailed from 1891 to 1896 ? Does he appreciate the contrast between that period and the subsequent one from 1896 to 1903? Does he realize to what condition seventeen years of continuous misrule and maladministration by a Conservative government had brought the people of Canada, and where seven years of Liberal administration have placed it ? Sir, I will relieve the hon. gentleman of a misconception or two. In the public accounts, if my hon. friend will look at the records he will find the following deficits :— In 1894 there was a deficit of $1,210,000; in 1895, $4,156,000; in 1896, $530,000. Let him now look at the record of Liberal administration. He will find in 1900 a surplus of $8,054,000; in 1901,$5,648,000; in 1902, $7,290,000; and in 1903 we will have a surplus of $13,000,000.

And if he will look back to the year of grace of 1873, he will find that the total volume of the trade and commerce of Canada then amounted to something like $217,000,000; and twenty-three years later, in 1896, it amounted to $230,000,000. It had increased in those twenty-three years at the rate of about half a million dollars per year. Let him turn to the Trade and Navigation return, and he will find that from 1896 to 1902, the gross increase in the volume of trade of Canada was to the tune of $184,000,000, and I believe that before this fiscal year closes that increase is likely to be nearly $230,000,000. I do not wish, on this occasion, to say too much on the vexed question of population which I treated about a year ago. But I would say this—that there is the strongest possible ground for believing that since we came into office the exodus has stopped, the tide of immigration has been flowing into our country instead of out of it, in all human probability from 1897 down to the present year, the average increase of the population of Canada has been from 125,000 to 200,000 a year, and will reach, probably, 250,000 in the current year.

Sir, whoever drew the brief which the hon. gentleman expounded to us a day or two ago must have had in mind a certain time-honoured legal maxim which my hon. friend, who is a good lawyer, no doubt has oftimes availed himself of in his forensic experience. It is a well known maxim, I am told, among my legal friends, when you have no case, abuse the plaintiff's attorney. And my hon. friend, if he did not attack or abuse the budget, showed no great hesitation in attacking the adversaries' attorney. There was one statement the hon. gentleman made in which I heartily concurred. He intimated that the tariff, after all is said and done, is only one factor in determining the prosperity of a country. That is true. It is quite possible that a country may, under certain circumstances, prosper in spite of a bad tariff, even a very bad tariff. It is quite possible that circumstances may occur under which a country may fail to prosper in spite of a good tariff. A good tariff may minimize distress, while a bad tariff may exaggerate it. But I do not say, and have never said, that the tariff was the only factor in determining the prosperity of a country. A little later on I propose to review in detail some of our expenditures, and I shall then be glad to give my hon. friend my reason and justification for believing that we are not lavishly or foolishly expending the great surplus which it has been our good fortune to possess, or the great revenues we now receive. I desire also, a little later on, to touch on our attitude towards Germany and the effect of our preferential tariff, as well as on the general policy which ought to be adopted at the present time. Just now, however, I prefer to deal with my hon. friend's speech, and to call attention, somewhat in detail, to a few of the remarks he made. I think my hon. friend was rather disposed—unintentionally, perhaps—to belittle the progress and advance which Canada has made. I have looked with some care over the table he has prepared showing the relative figures of increase for Great Britain, the United States and other countries, as well as Canada. That document, which was drawn up with some skill, either by the hon. gentleman himself or by the party who, as I say, prepared his brief, was prepared with a certain end in view. I defy any man to read the statement of the hon. gentleman, in which he shows that a great many other countries have increased largely as well as Canada during the past few years, without seeing that whoever compiled it designed, when this document was placed—as doubtless it is to be placed—in the hands of the faithful throughout the country, to conceal, as far as might be, the progress that Canada has made relatively to other nations. If hon. gentlemen will consult that table, they will see that the United States have increased $700,000,000, Great Britain $800,000,000, the Australian colonies $145,000,000, France—though I think that is a mistake—$680,000,000, while Canada, he admits, has increased $184,000,000. For the average reader, who is not aware what these figures really represent and mean, the only inference to be drawn—and, I think, the only inference that was intended to be drawn—was that, after all, we need not say so very much about the progress of Canada, seeing that other countries have increased as fast as we have done. I had rather foreseen that something of that kind might come to pass. If hon. gentlemen will do me the honour to turn to page xviii of the last report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as follows :—

Countries.	1895.	1901.	Increase, 1901 over 1895.	Percentage of Increase.
	$	$	$	p. c.
Canada	200,204,242	392,499,953	192,295,711	96·05
Japan	133,084,033	251,605,612	118,521,579	89·06
Australia, Commonwealth of	276,385,168	448,314,198	171,929,030	62·21
United States	1,525,362,564	2,258,802,809	733,440,245	48·08
Netherlands	1,050,913,000	1,511,204,358	460,291,358	43·80
Italy	429,424,191	596,938,670	167,514,479	39·01
Germany	1,770,379,422	2,344,939,000	574,559,578	32·45
Belgium	591,708,471	781,500,118	189,791,647	32·08
Argentine Republic	207,633,260	271,817,196	64,183,936	30·91
United Kingdom	3,128,380,466	3,903,127,860	774,747,394	24·77
France	1,369,084,100	1,617,745,300	248,661,200	18·16
Spain	281,020,130	291,284,871	10,264,741	3·65
Cape Colony	146,281,249	150,114,017	3,832,768	2·62

They will see that during the six years from 1896 and to the 30th June, 1902, the trade and commerce of Canada increased from $200,000,000 to $329,000,000, or a percentage of increase of 96 per cent. Next to us came Japan, which increased from $135,000,000 to $251,000,000, an increase of $118,000,000, or 80 per cent. Next came the Commonwealth of Australia, whose trade of $276,000,000 increased to $448,000,000, an increase of $171,000,000, or at the rate of 62 per cent. The United States increased from $1,525,000,000 to $2,258,000,000, that is $733,000,000 or 40 per cent. The Netherlands had increased in round numbers from $1,000,000,000 to $1,500,000,000, in all $460,000,000, or 43 per cent. Italy increased from $429,000,000 to $596,000,000, an increase of $167,000,000, or 30 per cent. Germany increased from $1,770,000,000 to $2,344,000,000, an increase of 30 per cent. Belgium also increased at the rate of 32 per cent. The Argentine republic increased at the rate of 31 per cent. Next comes the United Kingdom, which increased from $3,128,000,000 to $3,903,000,000, an increase of $774,000,000—an increase for the great United Kingdom of 24 per cent. France increased, according to my figures, from $1,369,000,000 to $1,617,000,000, an increase of $248,000,000, or 18 per cent. Now, what I want to call attention to is that, in the statement presented by the leader of the opposition, though his facts are correct enough, he has so worded it and so placed it that the average reader, unless he were tolerably familiar with the details of these computations, would come to the conclusion that the increase in Canada was no great matter after all. In my table Canada is placed in her rightful place, at the head of the column. The proportion of increases is shown, and that proportion is 96 per cent for Canada against 48 per cent for the United States; 96 per cent for Canada against 24 per cent for the United Kingdom. And it is not altogether without significance, Sir, as hon. members will see if they turn to my report and turn to the hon. gentleman's speech, that Canada stands first in my list and last in his. Now, my hon. friend proceeds to say that we ought to take good care of the manufacturers of Canada, seeing that we produce $750,000,000 to $800,000 of manufactured goods. I would like to know, as a matter of curiosity, what my hon. friend defines as manufactured goods, and what he includes in these large totals.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There was a question of that kind before us about a year and a half ago, when everything was defined as manufactured which was produced by motive power. And I think I stated in my remarks that the term included everything so produced.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, I find that he does define the term 'manufactured goods' as those produced by motive power. Now I would like to know what he means us to infer. Does he mean us to infer that the $750,000,000 or $800,000,000 worth of goods of which he speaks are what are ordinarily known as manufactured goods; because I strongly suspect that in the list to which he referred he will find a great many things that are not usually included in the term 'manufactured goods.' I find, for instance, in the list which I think he must have consulted, that sawmills are put down for $52,000,000 of the $750,000,000 or $800,000,000 of manufactured goods. I think that grist mills which produce flour are put down for something like $42,000,000. I find that sugar, whereof the value of the raw material is $15,000,000, is put down for $17,000,000 of manufactured goods. I think my hon. friend will find that to take these crude statements which are commonly furnished of the gross amount of manufactured goods, and apply them to a discussion of a policy which we may pursue, will lead him into serious error. The actual truth of the matter is, I believe, that these are taken largely from the census of 1891, and that census certainly includes a vast number of articles

which are hardly known as manufactured goods in the ordinary acceptation of the term. If my memory serves me, there are nine or ten millions of cheese included in that list; there are some nine or ten millions of blacksmiths' work included; there are a great many millions included of millinery and dressmaking and a great variety of other things, which no doubt are useful products, but which, under ordinary circumstances, do not fairly fall under the head of manufactured goods.

Then the hon. gentleman goes on to institute an elaborate comparison of the receipts from taxes under the late regime and under the present regime. Here, Sir, I take issue with my hon. friend in toto. I say to my hon. friend that the statements which he makes are wholly misleading, because he is disregarding a cardinal fact. He has paid no attention whatever to the difference between the real taxation inflicted on the people under a protective tariff, and the actual taxation inflicted on the people under a revenue tariff, even if it be a high one. The difference is this, that substantially the great bulk of the taxes go into the treasury under the present tariff, whereas under the administration which preceded ours an enormous percentage of the taxes which the people of Canada had to pay did not go into the treasury but went to swell the profits of private individuals. The people under our tariff have the satisfaction at any rate of knowing that what is taken out of their pockets goes into the treasury, and can be used for the benefit of the whole people. The hon. gentleman appears to be entirely unable to understand—although I fancy certain of his friends, the manufacturers, do understand—that after all is said and done ours is a revenue tariff and theirs a protective tariff. The tariff which ours superseded was a protective tariff, and the best proof of that is the fact that under our regime the exports and imports into this country have grown very largely, especially the imports. The very essence of a protective tariff, as he has shown in other parts of his speech, is to exclude goods and diminish revenue ; the essence of a revenue tariff is to receive goods and to see that such taxes as may be levied upon them go into the treasury and are applied for the benefit of the whole people.

Now, a little later on, I noticed the hon. gentleman made certain statements to the effect that the Minister of Finance at one time or another objected to several of the duties that now exist in our tariff. But the hon. gentleman does not propose to reduce them, he does not propose to abate them, he does not propose to remove one single tax that now presses upon the people. In fact, he tells us that he does not complain of it, he does not propose to reduce it, he considers that the tariff in that respect does not require in the slightest degree any amendment.

Then he proceeds to dilate at some length on what he calls the percentage of expenditure. Now, I have pointed out that if my contention be correct, if as I say, the taxes which we levy differ from the taxes which were levied by the hon. gentleman's predecessors in this respect, that our taxes go into the treasury and their taxes were divided between the treasury and private individuals, then there is no foundation whatever for any comparison to be made between the taxes levied under the two systems. But, Sir, I entirely deny the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's computation so far as it is based on population. About a year ago I had the honour of laying before this House a variety of statements, all tending to show, in my opinion, that the census of 1891 was an impudent fraud. It will be within the recollection of hon. gentlemen here that yonder table was littered knee-deep with evidence proving most conclusively, I repeat, that the grossest and most palpable frauds had been committed in the census of 1891. I have no doubt, from the examination I then made and have since made, that the census of 1891 exaggerated the then population by several hundreds of thousands—how many it is impossible absolutely to ascertain. I have no doubt whatever that during the four or five years of the serious depression which succeeded 1891, the increase of Canada was very slow, if indeed there was any increase at all. If that be true—and I recommend hon. gentlemen who doubt the facts to examine again the evidence—then I submit that the statements made by the hon. gentleman as regards the per capita expenditure are entirely without foundation. I believe the actual facts of the case are these: That in 1895 or 1896 the actual population of Canada had barely reached the nominal figures which were stated in 1891; that since that time, owing to the stoppage of the exodus, owing to the enormous development of the North-west, owing to the tide of immigration that has been flowing into Canada under our administration, the population of Canada has been increasing from 125,000 to 150,000 or perhaps 200,000 a year; and that within these last six or seven years there has been added to the population of Canada not less than 800,000, perhaps 900,000 people. Sir, if the hon. gentleman wishes to go into a computation, I recommend him to revise his statements on that basis, and if he does, he will have very little reason indeed to plume himself on the results of a per capita comparison between the expenditure of 1896-97 and that of 1903.

I note again that the hon. gentleman, in criticising our expenditure, is exceedingly careful to point out that he does not object to a liberal expenditure; he rather desires, in point of fact, that a heavy additional expenditure should be incurred. Well, Sir, he may be right as to some of those matters. It is not my purpose at the present moment to enter into an examination of the

question under that head. But I note that the hon. gentleman, when he comes to deal with one phase of the situation, when he deals with the fact that we imported from the United States a very much larger amount of goods than we exported, I note one remarkable thing, and that is that my hon. friend entirely omits all the coin and bullion, all the gold products of Canada that were exported to the United States. Now, I would like to know what my hon. friend's private opinion of that point is. According to our trade and navigation returns we exported roughly $70,000,000 worth of goods to the United States and we imported from them $114,000,000. He arbitrarily deducts $24,000,000 and makes our exports $47,000,000 instead of $70,000,000. Is it the opinion of my hon. friend that Canada is any poorer because Canada parted with a few tons of yellow dust in return for $24,000,000 of valuable commodities of other kinds. I would like to know what my hon. friend's opinion on that head is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was following the example, in making that computation, of a great financier on the other side of the House, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid that my hon. friend misunderstood the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). However, the hon. member for North Norfolk can answer for that matter himself, but I would like to know if he accepts that. I think an hon. gentleman who is posing as a financial critic ought to explain to us: Does he consider that Canada is any the poorer for parting with a few tons of gold dust and getting very many millions of dollars worth of valuable commodities in exchange? I would like to know. Is that his own opinion?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from North Norfolk is going to speak in this debate and he will answer the hon. gentleman most fully on that point.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have no doubt, but, my hon. friend, with very lawyer-like caution and subtlety will not commit himself to an opinion on that point. It bears very materially on the question. To my mind a country is none the poorer because it exchanges a certain amount of gold dust for a large amount of valuable commodities of other kinds. That is my opinion of the subject. I give it without reservation, without fear or favour, without even the fear of the hon. member for North Norfolk. My hon. friend dwelt at considerable length on the fact, which is perfectly true, that there has been a great increase in our trade with the United States, very largely due to the great increase in the growth of our manufactures and in the numerous demands for raw products that our manufacturers have made upon the United States. But, the hon. gentleman ought to remember this, and all hon. gentlemen might well remember it, that when we are dealing with the question of trade with the United States, when we compare the trade which we carry on with the United States with the trade which we carry on with the mother country, it is a question of geography quite as much as a question of tariff. It is plain to anybody, plain to a demonstration, that that in itself if it were not for our reciprocally barbarous tariffs, our geographical position would naturally induce us to carry on a very great trade with the United States, to our mutual advantage. At this present moment, everybody knows, that in a great many matters it is infinitely easier for our manufacturers and merchants to trade with the manufacturers and merchants of the United States than it will ever be to trade with any country on the other side of the Atlantic. In the greater part of the United States, measured by population it only takes twenty-four hours for a letter from any part of older Canada to reach its destination, and a telegraph or telephone message will reach it in an hour. Moreover, the conditions of manufacture, the conditions of the life of the people in the United States and particularly in the northern states are so closely analagous to those prevailing in Canada that it is exceedingly easy for them to understand the needs of our market; whereas, in the mother country it is not by any manner of means so easy to communicate with us or to supply our wants, and consequently it is no wonder at all that our trade with the United States should increase more largely than our trade with Great Britain.

But, the hon. gentleman went on to deal with the preferential tariff. He went on to analyse the effect of the preferential duty on English goods. He says that the tariff on dutiable goods coming from Great Britain is about 24 per cent, while the tariff on dutiable goods coming from the United States is about 25 per cent, and he draws the deduction, perhaps not unnaturally, that our preference to Great Britain is a matter of very little moment, that our tariff is really, substantially, quite as favourable to the United States as our tariff is to Great Britain. This is a question which will bear a little looking into. I have been at some pains to have the actual effect of this preferential tariff of ours with Great Britain properly analysed. No doubt the hon. gentleman was perfectly correct in one sense. The hon. gentleman has taken our trade and navigation returns, he has looked at the dutiable column, and he has deduced from that that the average duty under the preferential tariff is 24 per cent, whereas had the hon. gentleman condescended to look a little more closely into the matter he would have found that there is only a certain proportion of our imports

from Great Britain which come in under the preferential tariff. The hon. gentleman would have found that such articles as wines and spirits, and I think, tobaccos, are excluded absolutely from the operation of the preferential tariff. If he had desired to know how that tariff operated he ought to have deducted the value of these articles and the amount of taxation which is levied upon them. He ought, in the second place, to have deducted the amount of goods imported from Great Britain, which, for one reason or another, were not permitted the benefit of the preferential tariff, in all, something like $5,000,000 worth, more or less. Had he done so, he would have found that the dutiable imports from Great Britain which enjoyed the benefit of the preferential tariff amounted to $28,730,000 roughly, that the total taxation on these amounted to $5,395,000, and he would have found this further fact, which I commend to his notice, which I commend to the notice of the House, and which I commend to the notice of our English friends, that under the preferential tariff on these $28,730,000 worth, the average duty levied was not 24 per cent, but 18 8-10 per cent. While I am on the subject, I may just as well say that I think, perhaps, it was an unfortunate thing that at the recent colonial conference that that very able man, Mr. Chamberlain, acting on very imperfect information, in my opinion, rather belittled the effect of preferential tariff. Now, I want to call the attention of the House to this fact: The hon. gentleman has recourse to the trade and navigation returns. He takes the average for a number of years and contrasts that with the average for another number of years, and he says: After all is said and done, there has been very little improvement in importations from Great Britain, because, during five years of your administration the average importation has shown very little increase over that of your predecessors. What are the actual facts? If my hon. friend will turn to the Trade and Commerce Report, he will find that in the year 1890 the dutiable goods—which need only enter into our computation at present—the dutiable goods imported from Great Britain were $33,000,000. That by the year 1897, under the operation of the tariff of these gentlemen opposite, had fallen to $20,000,000. That, since 1897 has risen from $20,000,000 to $35,000,000.

Now, Sir, the man who tells me—whether he be an Englishman or whether he be a Canadian—the man who tells me, in the face of those figures, that the preferential tariff had no effect whatever in increasing the importation of English goods into Canada, in my humble opinion, knows very little about what he is talking of. I say that the effect has been very marked and very important, and I say that if you choose to look a little below the surface you will find two very imporant things well worthy of being brought to the attention both of this House and of our English friends and customers. You will find that our trade with England in dutiable goods, although relatively smaller than our trade with the United States, is in all human probability much more profitable than the trade which the United States carry on with us. That was a subject which I had occasion to examine into pretty fully during the period that the Joint High Commission was sitting in Washington, and I make the assertion without much fear of contradiction by those who are acquainted with the details, that it will be found that the profit the English merchant derives from the $35,000,000 of goods which he sells to Canada is vastly in excess of the profit which the American manufacturer derives from the $60,000,000 of dutiable goods which he sells to Canada. More than that, and it is reasonable it should be so, the trade with Great Britain is a natural one, it is not a forced one. The trade with the United States under the peculiar conditions that prevail there is largely artificial and a forced trade, and one thing is very clear about it, that whatever else effect our tariff may have had; whatever effect our tariff against the United States may have had in some respects, it most assuredly did largely diminish the profits which heretofore have been made by American manufacturers out of their Canadian trade.

Then, Sir, there is another matter also worthy of consideration. In looking at the trade returns of the various countries I find this fact which again I commend to the attention of our English friends. We are at present importing of all kinds of goods from England about $50,000,000 worth. The United States, with a population of 75,000,000, were importing in the years 1899 and 1900 a matter of $90,000,000 and a matter of $100,000,000 worth, respectively. I believe they have done a little more during the past two years, largely in consequence of the disturbed conditions of American trade consequent on the steel and coal strikes. But this result remains, and this result is one worthy of notice: that while the average Canadian family will consume about $50 worth of English goods in the course of the year, the average American family will consume—taking the two years I have spoken of as fair samples—about $6 worth of English goods. Per head, Canada consumes something like seven times as much English goods as do the people of the United States.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) made a reproach against my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and against the government of which he is a member, that in all our trade negotiations we have done nothing. That we had attempted to trade with the United States and we had gained nothing; that we had attempted to trade with Germany and we had gained nothing; that we had attempted to trade with France and we

had gained nothing. Well, Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman what this government and what the people of Canada have done within the past few years. They have shown the people of the United States, by the best of all object lessons, that we can live without them ; they have shown them that we can increase our trade and commerce in a much faster ratio than theirs ; they have shown them that we can successfully compete with them in the markets of the world if they do not choose to allow us to compete with them in the markets of their own country. And let me tell the House that that knowledge and, what is more, the demonstration of that fact, was an essential underlying factor before we could hope to to secure any favourable conditions of reciprocity with the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Show the Americans that we can do without them ; show the Americans that we are formidable competitors to them ; show the Americans that Canada is growing in trade and commerce at any rate, and probably in population, quite as fast as they themselves are, and you will find that they will be very much more disposed to trade with us, and very much more amenable to reason than we have found them in the past. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has asked what we will do if Canadian farmers leave their farms and go to the United States to find employment in the factories there ; and he gives us to understand, I suppose, that those things never happened under the regime of our predecessors, the Conservatives. Well, Sir, I think that I remember when every train from Canada, under the blessed dispensation of the National Policy, was crowded, crammed brimming over with men who were moving from Canada to the United States, and our census returns show that in the seventeen or eighteen years that the Conservatives held power, the loss of population to Canada—not counting the immigrants whom they alleged they had brought into the country to the tune of about 886,000—our returns shows that numbered within the ten years from 1881 to 1891, the loss to Canada of Canadians and the direct descendants of Canadians might be counted, not by the ten thousands, but by the millions.

But there are two points on which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) dwelt, and on which I desire to say a word or two. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that it was the policy of his party to protect the farmers. That is a laudable, desirable and most important object in which I heartily concur, and I would like to see how the hon. gentleman proposes to do it. We stand here to be instructed ; we desire to know. We are not above, if the hon. gentleman can show us how, taking a useful hint from that hon. gentleman. Last year the people of Canada produced about 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, and possibly next year they will produce 200,000,000 bushels of wheat—the chance is that in a very short time they may produce 300,000,000 bushels of wheat. We consume in Canada, all told, something like from 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 bushels a year. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) be good enough to show me how he proposes by protection to add one cent to the value of wheat grown in Canada ? I should like to know. I should like to understand under what conditions, if we grow 200,000,000 bushels of wheat and if we require 20,000,000 bushels for our own use, the hon. gentleman is going to protect the growers of the remaining 180,000,000 bushels. I am open to conviction ; I carry an open mind.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why do you keep 12½ cents a bushel on wheat now ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is for the hon. gentleman's predecessors to explain; hon. gentlemen opposite do not complain of it. If the hon. gentleman wants my opinion of the matter, I tell him that it is not of the smallest value to the farmers of Canada. I should like to know in what way the hon. gentleman proposes to protect the Canadian wheat growers. We sell about $20,000,000 worth of cheese chiefly in the English market. I suppose we consume about $2,000,000 worth in Canada. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman would protect us in that. We sell nearly as much bacon and hams. I would like to know how he proposes to protect us in these articles. The actual truth of the matter is this : He cannot protect the Canadian farmer, and he knows it well. He cannot add, by any device or means of his in the way of protection, one cent to the value of the wheat grown in Canada. But he can do something else : He can—and he is ready to do it—enormously diminish the value of the purchasing power of the wheat which the farmer raises. That, I grant, he can do. There his powers for mischief have an almost unlimited field.

Now, Sir, here is an audacious statement—I will give it in the hon. gentleman's own words :

> What is our position with respect to the United States ? We buy from them about $72,000,000 worth of manufactured goods, and we sell to them $6,000,000. We buy from them $28,000,000 of agricultural products and products of animals, and we sell to them of the same articles less than $3,000,000.

Whoever, as I say, undertook to dry-nurse my hon. friend has led him astray. That, while I acquit him of intentionally designing to mislead, is an ill-advised statement. It is quite true, and I make him a present of the fact, that the nominal amount of goods coming under those heads which we imported from the United States in the year 1902 was something like $28,000,-

000; but of what did they consist? I will give the House one item, perhaps the largest. We imported from the United States in 1902 something like $8,663,000 worth of wheat, and we exported some $7,443,000 worth, to the great detriment of the farmers of Canada. We imported from the United States in the same fashion a variety of other dutiable articles, amounting in all to $14,752,000. Of these we re-exported, almost entirely to England, $7,812,000 worth, leaving of dutiable articles which may be said to have entered to some extent into competition with the products of our farmers, a matter of $6,940,000 worth. Now, I want to go over these importations a little in detail. I want to show how terribly the farmers of Canada have been handicapped by this importation of $23,000,000 which my hon. friend speaks of. The first important item, after breadstuffs, is fruits, of which we imported $1,947,000 worth. I observe that of these an exceedingly large percentage consists of oranges, which it was no doubt very much to the detriment of the farmers of Canada that we should import. The next largest item, nearly three quarters of a million, consists of raisins, currants, almonds and prunes, which were also imported very much to the detriment of the farmers of Canada, who, I presume, have of late gone largely into the manufacture of raisins, prunes and almonds. I notice, in like manner, when we come to the free list, that the articles which enter into competition with the products of the farmers of Canada, are of a very formidable character. Of dutiable goods, we imported about $14,000,000 worth, the greater part of which was sent across the ocean. We likewise imported about $12,000,000 worth of free goods. Of these, the first item is broom corn. I candidly admit that I do not know whether it enters seriously into competition with the products of our farmers or not, and I am open to correction. The next item on the list, a very important one, is bananas, of which we imported $714,800 worth; and the next is pineapples, of which we imported about $90,000 worth, doubtless greatly to the detriment of the farmers of Canada. The fact of the matter is, these fruits are not the products of the United States at all. For convenience, we import them through the ports of New York or Boston, as the shortest route to the western markets of the western provinces. Of hemp undressed we imported $669,000 worth. Of Indian corn we imported $2,480,000 worth, of which we straightway exported to England $1,200,000 worth in the shape of Indian corn, and the other $1,200,000 worth a little later in the shape of fat cattle. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that the farmers of Canada were seriously damnified by the importation of this Indian corn which they exported in the two ways I have mentioned? Are the farmers to be worse treated than our manufacturing friends, to whom we allow the full rebate on everything they export on which they show they have paid the full duty? We imported of flaxseed $1,714,000 worth. I do not think that enters seriously into competition with the products of our farmers, though tobacco may, of which we imported $1,900,000 worth. The next item is furs and skins undressed. Do my agricultural friends think they were seriously injured by the importation of $1,000,000 worth of undressed furs? Of hides and skins we imported, chiefly from the South American republics, through United States ports, $2,174,000 worth, and we exported nearly an equal amount. We imported $330,000 worth of raw silk, greatly to the detriment of the farmers of Canada, and $221,000 worth of raw wool and sent out about as much. The actual result is that of the $28,000,000 worth of agricultural and animal products which, according to my hon. friend, we imported from the United States, to enter into competition with the products of the farmers of Canada, if you make a fair analysis, you will find that very nearly one-half were promptly re-exported, giving employment to Canadian ships and Canadian railways, and that the remainder are largely articles, such as bananas, raw silk and the other things I have mentioned, which can by no possibility injure the farmers of the Dominion of Canada.

Briefly, I find that on the $28,000,000 of imports of agricultural products and animals and their products, about five and a half millions, on a fair computation, may go into competition with farm products of Canada while, as the hon. gentleman says himself, we in turn sell the United States about $8,000,000 of similar products. The truth is that along our border of some 4,000 miles, there will always be found a number of places where it is convenient and mutually profitable to interchange products; and were it not for our tariffs we would carry on those exchanges to our mutual profit on a much larger scale, and I fail to see that, on a fair analysis of the case, the farmers of Canada are placed at any such disadvantage, as my hon. friend was, I think, very unfortunately led to suppose. My hon. friend repeats his statement a little later on, and evidently he and his friends intend to use it in their discussions in the country as a proof of the extreme injury done, under this tariff, to the farmers of Canada. But I am convinced that, if a fair examination be made, we will find that we make a reasonable and fair exchange in those products. We do not sell our neighbours anything like the quantity of goods, and it would be to our mutual advantage to interchange with them to a greater extent. But it is manifestly contrary to the facts to say that at this moment the exchange against us is so unfair that we buy $28,000,000 from the Americans while we sell them but $8,000,000 worth. The bulk of those imports are re-exported, and of those that are not, the greater bulk

do not enter into competition with our farm products at all, while a large part of the remainder are merely bought from the United States for convenience sake as in the case of hides from South America and bananas and other articles that I have mentioned.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to spend any further time on the speech of my hon. friend. I am afraid that time will hardly permit me to do what I should have liked to do—to analize minutely our expenditure. But I will lay before the House certain facts which, I think, will go far to convince them that we are not after all liable to the charge of gross and undue expenditure and extravagance in the administration of public affairs. Let me take the statement which Mr. Foster laid on the Table of the House in 1896, when he was Minister of Finance. He then computed the requirements of the public service for 1897 at something like $38,300,000 for his main estimates. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) the other day brought down an estimate something like $50,750,000. There is a difference there and a large difference—a difference of about $12,000,000. If the hon. gentlemen were able to show that we have idly and needlessly added $12,000,000 to the public expenditure, then we would justly be liable to severe censure. But when you come to analyse this expenditure, what do you find ? You find, in the first place, that out of this augmentation of $12,000,000 at least $6,000,000 are directly transferred from one pocket into the other. That $6,000,000 is made up of such items as increase in the sinking fund, extra expenditure on railways and canals, which are recouped by the receipts therefrom, and extra expenditure on the Yukon Territory, which Mr. Foster was not called on to provide, and for which we have received from the start to the present hour, full compensation in the shape of the increased revenue derived from that particular territory. That being the case, the gross expenditure, for which we should be called on to account, is reduced to something like $6,000,000. But to what is this increase of $6,000,000 due ? It has been caused, for the most part, by the necessity of largely extending and increasing such services, our light-house and coast service, which everybody who knows anything of the condition of Canadian trade admits to be an expenditure that ought to be encouraged as much as possible, and which, as my hon. friends opposite have urged, ought to be enlarged ? That is one large item.

The second is our increased expenditure on immigration, and I venture to say that for every penny we have expended on that head the country stands to receive—and that too, speedily—a dollar in return. Then there is the expenditure for agricultural purposes in various ways. For that also the country has received and is receiving a large return in the continuous increase in our exports of agricultural products. There is also a heavy increase from North-west administration rendered necessary by the vast influx of settlers into that country. Is that a wasteful expenditure ? And so it goes all through. I shall not dwell so much on this at present, partly because I have scarcely the time at my disposal and partly because the hon. gentleman himself does not assail our expenditure as extravagant and unnecessary. On the contrary, he admits that large and liberal expenditure is needful and declares that he would be prepared, in many cases, to spend more than we are doing.

But, let me call attention to these three things. First of all, when comparing the expenditure of 1896-7 with the expenditure of 1903, you would do well to bear in mind that the population of the country has increased very considerably. There has been, by my estimate, an increase of 800,000, or of 900,000 people. In any case, even admitting, which I never will admit—the correctness of the census of 1901, our population has certainly increased 500,000 or 600,000. Consequently a larger expenditure is justifiable and necessary. In the second place, it is well to remember that the income of the Canadian people to-day is fully double what it was seven years ago, and an expenditure is now justified, when you have a volume of trade and commerce of $400,000,000, which might have been unreasonable and extravagant when it was only $200,000,000, with a revenue in proportion. And in the third place, you should bear in mind that coincident with the extraordinary prosperity of Canada, there has been a great increase in the cost of materials and wages all over the country, so that the works executed to-day by the Minister of Public Works and other members of the government must of necessity require a very much increased expenditure. The increase of wages alone must involve a very large additional expenditure compared to what was requisite in 1896. Therefore, taking these three causes into account, you will see that there is little ground for condemning the government on the score of enormous and unjustifiable expenditure. Population has increased, there has been an increase in the volume of trade, our revenue has increased, wages have increased, there has been a great rise in the cost of materials as compared with 1896, to all of which is due the increased expenditure of $6,000,000.

My hon. friend wants to know what I think about surpluses. I have no objection to tell him. There are three excellent uses to which a surplus may be applied. It may in the first place, be applied to the reduction of taxation. In the second place, we may apply it to paying off the public debt, and in the third place we may apply it to the construction of useful and productive public works. All are good. The question of how a surplus is to be applied is one to be always settled with a due regard to the circum-

stances of the moment and a due consideration as to which of these particular modes is the best to take. It depends upon a great variety of considerations. You may have a young or an old state. It depends upon the position of the people, whether they are prosperous or whether they are in pinched circumstances. It depends lastly, and very largely, on the possibility of rapid development. I have no hesitation in saying, so far as the government of Canada is concerned, we believe, having regard to the present condition of Canada, that the best way we can use our surplus is to open up our new territory, provide means of communication, cheapen transportation, and so avail ourselves of the great advantages of our position. When the question is put: Which is the best for Canada, whether to attempt to increase population and production by the active aid of the government, or to pay off our debt and diminish our taxes, it is a fair question for debate. But, in this case, I think the House and the country will sustain the government in declaring: Now is the time to use the advantages which are ours and to develop the great resources we possess. Sir, there is a tide in the affairs of nations as well as of men, and Canada is at the crest of the wave at this moment, and Canada will do well to take advantage of the circumstances of her position.

I desire to say a few words with regard to the late conference in London, and the demands which were made on Canada. I have already dealt with the question of the preference and have ventured to express my regret that the British ministers who took part in that conference were not sufficiently well advised of the advantage of the preference to British trade. And I am very glad to be assured, as we were by my hon. friend, that the facts were fully brought to their notice before the conference broke up. And I am glad to know, from recent editorial utterances in England, that they are waking up to the fact that the preference is of very real and substantial value to them. There is another question, incidentally connected with the administration of this country and its finances, on which I would like to say a word or two. The request has been made that Canada should co-operate for the defence of the empire. It has been placed before us in several different ways. We have been asked to say what we will contribute to the navy; and we shall be asked what we will contribute to the army that is necessary to defend the empire. There are two policies before us, and it may not be amiss to say a word or two as to which of these policies is, on the whole, the best, not only for Canada but for the empire at large. One body of our advisers seems to think that the best way for Canada to give aid to the empire is to place a large sum of money at its disposal, and ourselves maintain a standing army of larger or smaller proportions. Now, it is possible for Canada, no doubt, to maintain a small standing army—not a very large one. That is possible. The cost will be great. The advantage to Canada will be small. The advantage to the empire will be smaller still. It will be of very little account to the British empire if we are able to put at their disposal one, two, three or four battalions of a little standing army. But there is, in my opinion, a more excellent way, a way far more suitable to the genius of our people, far more likely to promote the real interest of Great Britain, and far more likely to enable us to afford real assistance to the empire should assistance be needed. That way is for us to lay to heart the lessons taught us by the recent Boer war; to make it, as I would like to see it made, a part of the education of every able-bodied man in Canada, that he should learn some of the elements of drill, and learn how to handle his rifle and become an experienced and trained rifle shot. I believe that for a sum perfectly insignificant, barely half of the cost of the smallest standing army that any one could well propose to maintain, you could have, in a few years in Canada, a body of five hundred thousand riflemen able to give a good account of their enemy at a thousand yards and upwards. And I say that if you but train your people in that fashion you could provide a neucleus of a force through which a most substantial aid could be given to the empire should it ever be imperilled. It is to that I should like to see the energy of the people of Canada and of the Department of Militia devoted. It is an old saying among people of English blood that their first idea, when they have a holiday is to say: It is a fine day, let us go out and kill something. That may be rather barbaric, but it is instinctive. There is scarcely a lad of spirit from one end of Canada to the other, but, if he had the opportunity and the bodily strength, would like to become—would even make considerable sacrifices to become—a good rifle shot. I would avail myself of that instinct and that genius of our people, and would endeavour so to train our people that they might be able, in case of need, to put in the field a force which, if they are to judge from the experiences of South Africa, would render the greatest service to the empire, or to ourselves were we, unhappily, called upon to defend our hearths and homes from an invading foe. There is a mode in which we can, I think, without doing violence to our condition, or without interfering in any way with the habits of our people, prepare to render substantial assistance to the mother country. And I am glad to say that the Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) is already commencing the work and moving in that direction. Were this done, other advantages, advantages of no slight character, would be

likely to flow from it. Every man who knows anything of the training necessary to make a good rifle shot, knows that efficiency is impossible unless one practices the virtues of sobriety and temperance. Moreover, it is one of the things that will go far to instill in our people a spirit of self-reliance, making us respected by other nations as well as by ourselves.

And now, Sir, what is the policy of the opposition, and what is the policy of the government? My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has told you in his speech and in his motion that his policy is taxes, and more taxes, and yet more taxes. I have pointed out, that it is possible for us to protect some, but it is impossible to protect the whole masses of the people. You may give advantages in this way to the few, but you cannot give advantages to the whole population. I doubt very much if the policy which he proposes, and which some of the manufacturers propose—as the hon. gentleman has stated, not because there is any serious difficulty at the present time, but because they dread that at some future day they may be exposed to undue competition from the United States—would really result in producing any of the consequences they hope for. As I read the signs of the times, there is at this moment, beyond all doubt, some danger of over-expansion and overproduction both here and in the United States. There is some danger of a glutted market. And the best advice that I can give, the best advice that any can give in the House or in the country is, that, under the circumstances, it would be well for all concerned, manufacturers and others, to take stock of the situation, to make use of these fat years to make provision for the lean years which must assuredly come sooner or later—not to over-expand, not to overproduce—to pay off debts, if they have incurred them; to place ourselves in a position of having good reserves; to confer (for I am far from objecting to that) with their brother manufacturers and with the chiefs of finance and with the leaders of our banking institutions. They say very truly: Our market is limited, and there is danger of a glut. But the way to avoid a glut is not to go recklessly and without precaution, increasing their productive power, but to make provision in the good times for the possibility they dread that some time or other the slaughter market from the other side may overtake them.

Sir, the policy of the government has been announced by my hon. friend, and it is briefly this: To deal fairly with all, making ourselves the tool of none; to insist upon it that those who come to us for aid should explain openly and in the light of day what they desire at our hands, and why they desire it. My hon. friend did well, my hon. friend deserves commendation in that, when the manufacturers approached him, he refused to have any hole or corner meeting with them, in that he told them: State your case, gentlemen, and it shall have every consideration; but state it openly so that the public may know what you want and why you want it, and that all classes whose interests may be affected may have a chance of being heard before us. Sir, we desire wherever it is possible, to make new territories available; we desire, wherever it is possible, to help forward all efforts by constructing railroads and other means of communication, in making those territories available. We desire to cheapen transport to the utmost extent that it is possible to do so; we desire above all to encourage, as far as lies in our power, agricultural and kindred industries, and all other industries. We desire to encourage a well selected immigration; and I hope and trust—and in that regard I believe that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, has that likewise much at heart—I hope and trust that the immigration which is now pouring into Canada may be as good in quality as it is great in quantity. I have more than once stated on the floor of this House, and I see no reason to conceal my opinion, that immigrants from old Canada, immigrants from the United States, possessed of capital or even without capital, are far more valuable to us, man for man, than any immigrants that can come here from across the sea. I desire to see above all, the exodus from our own country stopped, and to see the people who in former times went to the United States, remain at home and use their energy, use their ability, use their resources to develop the unbounded territory which is now stretching open to us in the North-west.

For the rest, Mr. Speaker, I say to my hon. friends beside me, I say to my hon. friends opposite me: Be content to go on as we have gone; be content to do as we have done; and in the next decade it is no idle flight of fancy to say that the man who holds the postition of Finance Minister in 1913, may reasonably expect to come down to this House and tell them that in place of a volume of trade and commerce of $400,000,000, he has a volume of trade of $1,400,000,000; that in place of a revenue of $60,000,000, he has a revenue of $160,000,000; and it would not surprise me to know that in place of a surplus of $13,000,000, the Finance Minister of the future, if he treads in our footsteps and goes on as we have done, will have an actual surplus of $30,000,000. It is well within the possibilities, it is a thing which has been done again and again in the country to the south of us, in many of the states of the union results equal to these have been actually achieved. Are we Canadians worse, are we Canadians less vigorous, are we less able to make use of our territory than the Americans have proved themselves able, in times past, to make use of theirs?

Now I put it to you, Sir, and to this House, I put it to the people of Canada, which

policy do you prefer? Sir, in 1878 the national policy, so-called, was started by these hon. gentlemen, with every conceivable circumstance in its favour. It was coincident with a return of prosperous times, which it had done nothing in the world to produce. Hon. gentlemen had a perfectly free hand. They had able leaders. They had an absolute majority, a huge majority, an unlimited supply of funds, a perfectly submissive Senate at its back, and a largely gerrymandered constituency to deal with. I have shown you where they had arrived in 1896, I have shown you their four years' deficit, I have shown you their twenty-five years of stagnation, I have shown you our depopulation and disgrace. Sir, compare those seventeen years with our seven years; compare our surplus of $13,000,000 with their four years' deficits; compare the million of people we have put into Canada within the last seven years with the miserable showing they had to make in their seventeen years. I say that never since the creation of the world was such an object lesson presented for the consideration of intelligent men as the object lesson which the Trade and Navigation Returns, and the financial returns of the country, show to-day as between the Liberal and Conservative administration. Let us go on in the way we have been going, and I for one, Sir, have no fear whatever of the result.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker—I owe to the courtesy of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) the privilege of addressing the House to-day. He had been charged by his leader to reply to the speech delivered this afternoon by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I asked him whether he would be good enough to give way to me on account of the fact that I have some engagements which will keep me away from the House during the last days of the week and he kindly consented to do so.

The government have resolved to decline to make any changes in the tariff. The hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce have given us the reasons for that decision. There is no doubt whatever that the government feel confident that they are following the proper course. Their motives cannot be impugned. The hon. Minister of Finance, with his usual adroitness and ability, has endeavoured to convince the House that, in point of fact, there was nothing else to be done than what the government are doing. He has told us that the country is prosperous. This is the first reason that he has given us to justify the government in declining to make any general revision of the tariff. He has also informed us that the government have applied for a preference from the British government. The British authorities have not yet replied to that application. The government are desirous of getting a reply before making a general revision of the tariff, so the hon. Minister of Finance has told us. The third reason that has been offered to us is the negotiations that have begun between the United States government and this government with the view of coming, if possible, to a commercial arrangement. These reasons are strong enough in the opinion of the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches to engage them to stay their hands.

Nobody will attempt to deny that this country is prosperous. It would be, indeed, inexplicable that a new country, that a wealthy country like Canada should not be prosperous at the present time. We have had a succession of good crops. There is a wave of prosperity and progress all over the world. We are not the only nation that is prosperous. All the civilized nations of the world are enjoying a great wave of prosperity and progress. The hon. Minister of Finance has proudly told us that by the first of July next, the revenue of this country will have reached the splendid figure of $65,000,000. He also rejoices in the fact that he is in the position to announce a surplus of $13,500,000 on the first of July. There are three main agents of revenue in this country—the customs, the excise and the revenue coming from public works, railways and canals and other works. There are also, to a limited extent, revenues from the sale of lands and other sources. The excise is undoubtedly and exclusively, so to speak, a means of taxation. The customs are a means of taxation when they are applied in a certain way. When they are applied in another way they are both the means of raising revenue and developing the industries of the nation. In 1897, Canada imported for home consumption, $66,220,725 of dutiable goods, $40,397,002 of free goods, a total of $106,617,676. The duties collected on that amount reached a total of $19,891,996. On that amount the average duty paid was 18·613 per cent. In 1902, we imported for home consumption a total of $196,480,190, $118,657,496 of dutiable goods and $77,822,694 of free goods. On that total the average duty collected was 16·466 per cent, while on dutiable goods the average duty paid was 27·265.

There was a total of over $32,000,000 of revenue raised by customs in 1902. This is a very large amount of money. We paid that amount of money because we bought $196,480,190 worth of foreign goods. The total trade of this country in 1902 was $423,910,044. The imports reached the amount of $212,270,158 and the exports amounted to $211,640,286. We imported from the United

States $129,794,147 and we exported to the United States $71,197,684—this of course includes bullion, foreign goods and everything else. Therefore the balance of trade against us so far as the general imports and exports are concerned amounts to nearly $50,000,000. As I have said, we imported a total of $196,480,190 for home consumption, and out of that amount we imported from the United States for home consumption $114,774,696, leaving $82,435,494, which we imported for home consumption from other countries. Our total imports from Great Britain for home consumption were $49,022,726, and our total exports of home produce were $196,019,763. The total exports to the United States out of that amount in home produce was $66,607,784; the total exports to Great Britain being $109,347,345. Now, Sir, permit me to call the attention of the House to the composition of the exports of Canadian domestic products to the United States. Out of the $66,607,784 worth that we exported to the United States, there were $33,145,856 of minerals; $4,184,403 of products of the fisheries; $4,139,262 of animals and their produce; $15,517,528 of forest products; $2,555,216 of agricultural products; and $6,024,373 of manufactured products.

Then, we have exported to Great Britain $6,374,877 of products of the fisheries; $14,154,467 of forest products; $52,687,998 of animals and their products; $27,973,503 of agricultural products, or a total of farm products amounting to $80,661,501. We have exported to Great Britain $7,322,602 of manufactured products. My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) insisted very strongly this afternoon on the fact that in his opinion the imports of agricultural products to Canada from the United States do not interfere very greatly as yet with the interests of our farming community. That may be so, but we all remember that during the last session of parliament we had a very important and interesting debate in the course of which every one of our friends from the North-west complained bitterly, that the importation of American horses was destroying a large and important industry in the North-west Territories. What is true of that industry is true of others. We are importing large quantities of produce and we are importing large quantities of horses and sheep. We have imported also large quantities of corn. We are all agreed or nearly all agreed that corn is one of those products which should be imported free into a country like this. But, Sir, I ask : whether it would not be a proper policy for this country to adopt to raise the tariff as an average on the farm products of the United States just as high as our American friends have raised their tariff on Canadian products.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is it not probable that if the Canadian tariff was on the same lines as the American tariff as far as farm products are concerned, that we would develop our farming industry in a direction where capital is afraid to invest now ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In 1902 our exports of manufactured products to the United States amounted to $6,024,373, and we imported of manufactured goods from the United States to Canada to the amount of $69,536,000. It is an interesting search to look carefully into the American statistics. The last statistics of the United States show that the main bulk of the imports from the United States into this country go to Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba, and the North-west Territories. There are $90,935,713 of imports from the United States dumped into these four provinces. Though the same provinces export to the United States products to the amount of only $27,599,746, leaving a balance of trade of not less than $62,333,967 against these four provinces. The maritime provinces import from the United States $7,841,571, while they export to that country $5,496,697. British Columbia is the only province which has a balance of trade in its favour in its intercourse with the United States, its exports to that country being $9,385,720, as against imports from the United States to the amount of $7,011,930.

These figures, Sir, are not new; but I thought that it was necessary for the argument that I am going to offer to the House, that they should be placed before you. They show that in our commercial intercourse with the United States, our American neighbours have the best of us. It cannot be disputed that they are exporting to this country very large quantities and volumes of their goods of all kinds, while we are exporting to them very little. They do not do us any favour in taking our lumber; they need it. Neither do they do us any favour in taking our minerals; they need them. If they did not require these things, they would not take them. We export to the United States a very limited quantity of agricultural products and a very small volume of manufactured goods. I ask whether that is a state of affairs that is pleasing and advantageous to us. I ask whether it would not be to the interest of this Canadian nation to put an immediate end to such a condition of things. Am I very far from the truth in saying that even those who have been brought up in the ideas of free trade or of a low tariff, would agree with us if they had not some pretext for avoiding the issue ? I want to know if there is a Canadian business man, whatever his political persuasion may be, who will stand up and say that it is a sound condition for a country to have always the balance of

trade against it. Nobody can say that it is a sound state of affairs, and the hon. Minister of Finance has so well felt the strength of that unanswerable argument that he has offered us reasons why the issue should be avoided at the present time. He tells us that the government hope to come to some arrangement with our neighbours. What arrangement, I ask ? Surely the government do not contemplate lowering the tariff on manufactured articles, so far as the United States are concerned. The government have not intimated such an intention, and I do not believe that any government in Canada would venture, in the face of the high tariff of the United States, to regard it possible for this country to lower our tariff in favour of that country. How could we compete with our neighbours in the manufactures ? The last American census has established that there are ten billions of American and foreign capital invested in American manufactures, that that large capital has produced thirteen billions of manufactured goods in the year 1900, and that the population of wage-earners engaged in those industries is over five millions, or about equal to the whole population of Canada. I ask again how we could compete with such a powerful nation as the United States are to-day ?

But it is represented to us that it will be an advantageous thing for Canada to have reciprocity with the United States in natural products. Let me say first to those who are of that mind, that I do not think they could get it. The protectionist principles and policy are solidly implanted in the minds of the American people—not in the minds of the manufacturers or the workingmen alone, but perhaps more especially in the minds of the farming community. It seems to me that, instead of trying to get reciprocity, our bounden duty to-day should be to adopt a policy of protection for our home products. The United States exported in 1901 $943,811,020 of farm products. How can we compete with a nation equipped, as the American nation is, insofar as its farming industries are concerned. My right hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, (Sir Richard Cartwright) has told us that we are exporting a good deal of agricultural products. The right hon. gentleman seems not to have taken in account, in comparing our position with that of the United States, the fact that a large part of the agricultural products of the United States are consumed in that country. In point of fact, only about thirty per cent of the wheat grown in the United States is exported. Over seventy per cent of that crop is consumed at home. Not more than twenty-five per cent of American corn is exported. The balance is consumed by the Americans themselves, and what is true of corn and wheat is equally true of other agricultural products. Reciprocity with the United States could not, in my humble opinion, benefit us in any way. We could not sell the Americans anything that they do not produce, and if we were to open our gates, they would simply flood our country with the products which they export now to England and elsewhere. In other words, they would destroy many of our farming interests and put us out of business in the export trade. The United States are not a market for our farming community. neither are they a market for our manufacturing community. How much have we exported in manufactured goods during the past year ? In 1901 we exported $16,012,208 worth of manufactured goods. In 1902, we exported $18,000,000 worth. Compare that with the United States. In 1901, the United States exported $412,155,066 worth. In 1901, we exported $24,781,486 worth of agricultural products. In 1902 we exported $37,-152,688 worth. I am indeed very sorry that I cannot agree with the hon. Finance Minister and the government when they give us, as a reason for not revising the tariff, that it is inexpedient to do so while we are awaiting the result of negotiations with the United States. We have done a good deal of waiting. Over and over again, during the last twenty-five years, we have endeavoured to come to some understanding with our friends on the other side of the line. The right hon. gentleman at the head of the government, in a very able address to the Manufacturers' Association last year, solemnly promised that we would send no more deputations to the United States. We are told that this time it is the United States who are coming to us. Well, I have had a good deal of experience in matters of this kind, and I have a notion that, before such letters as have been read to the House were exchanged, some little understanding took place. However, these letters were very convenient this session, and it was undoubtedly the right of the government to give us that excuse—that pretext, let me call it, in all deference.

The other excuse which has been given us is that the government have applied to the British government for a preference and are awaiting an answer. I thought that they had given us a very clear-cut reply. The right hon. gentleman, the Prime Minister, and some of his colleagues took part in the colonial conference. At that conference they tried to come to some arrangement with the British authorities, and the only result we have is the refusal to-day of the British authorities to admit our cattle. And since the colonial conference took place, we have met also with another refusal—the refusal to permit us to compete for the supply of meat for the British army. If we wait for the British government to give us a preference in their markets, I am very much afraid that the revision of our tariff will not take place until we are much older. Let me say that it has been somewhat of a surprise to many of us to find that the

right hon. gentleman and his colleagues pledged themselves at the colonial conference to give to the British islands a further preference on manufactured goods in return for some preference to be given us in another direction.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, the language is very clear. There is a clearly expressed intention in the memo. of the ministers that they are prepared to give a further preference on conditions that are not clearly defined. I feel free to speak—more free than I was formerly—my mind on that point. I do not hesitate one moment to say that we have gone very far, we have gone too far, in the British preference. Perhaps, the first preference was justifiable. I shall explain, later on, under what conditions the British preference was enacted. I do not think the Canadian people would be ready to-day to stand any further preference in favour of British manufactured goods than that which has already been accorded. I hope I am not offensive—I do not mean to be—when I say that the reasons I have discussed for not revising the tariffs this year are diplomatic reasons. The members of the government, nearly every one of them, are unfriendly to a protectionist policy. I do not divulge any secrets in saying this; they have made their views public and known. I am only commenting on a fact of public notoriety. The large majority of the government are favourable to a low tariff policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, and it is their right to be so. I grant that they are in perfect good faith. They are in favour of a low tariff, and some of them, if they could, would favour a very low tariff, if not free trade. The real reasons why the tariff was not revised last year, and especially why it was not revised this year, are to be found in the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance. He has told us we should make this country a cheap country to live in. And his sentiments have been echoed by the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) this afternoon. The Minister of Finance told us that we must take good care not to antagonize the masses of the people, especially the great North-west. He has invited us to the realization of the fact that the control of the affairs of this country is passing from the east to the west. He has told us that if we wish to invite immigration, if we wish to fill up our splendid North-west lands, we must have a tariff as low as it is possible to make it. He believes that a high tariff is inimical to immigration, is inimical to the masses of the people. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is a student of political economy. And I give him credit for entire loyalty in the expression of his sentiments. Let me say—and it is a pleasure for me to say it—there is no more honourable man than the Minister of Finance. Whatever my differences with him may be on some points, I have always felt, when I was discussing questions of importance with him that I was talking with a man who was always in perfect good faith and loyalty. He thinks, Sir, that a high tariff is inimical to immigration. Will he permit me to offer a comparison to which I would call his attention and the attention of the country. We are supposed to be under a regime of fairly low tariff, under the regime of a revenue tariff, while the United States of America are under the highest protective tariff in the world. The following figures show the number of immigrants entering Canada and the United States respectively for the years given:

IMMIGRATION—CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Canada.	
1897 to 1900	141,261
1901	49,149
1902	67,379
United States.	
1897	230,832
1898	229,290
1899	311,715
1900	448,572
1901	487,908
1902	648,743
1903 (to 1st June)	355,492

And the last week has been a record one so far as immigration into the United States is concerned. And what about the homestead entries into Canada and the United States? In 1900, in Canada there were 7,426 homestead entries; in 1901, there were 8,167; in 1902, there were 14,633. And in the single year 1901 in the United States there were 111,319 homestead entries, covering an area of 15,455,000 acres. In other words, in one year the homestead entries in the United States have been as many as the entire entries in Canada since 1872, and that under the regime of the highest protective tariff in the world.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is convinced that a high tariff is inimical to the agricultural interests. Let him compare the result of a high tariff in the United States, with the result of a low tariff—I call it a low tariff in this country. Our tariffs have always been low; the United States tariffs have always been high. The tariffs of the United States, from the birth of the nation up to to-day, have been, as a rule, twice as high as the Canadian tariffs have been. By the census of 1900 the population of the United States was estimated at 75,997,687. The rural population was, in 1900, 40,364,613, being an increase during the decade of 4,549,605, or an increase of 12·7 per cent; while the total population increased 21 per cent. The exports of agricultural products are also an interesting statistic.

In 1870	$ 361,188,483
1880	675,961,091
1890	629,820,080
1895	553,210,026
1900	885,858,123
1901	943,811,020

In other words an increase of 132 per cent in exports of agricultural products under the regime of the highest protective tariff in the world. The progress in farms and farm values is also worthy of interest.

PROGRESS IN FARMS AND FARM VALUES.

Farms Nos.

1870	2,659,985
1880	4,008,907
1890	4,564,641
1900	5,781,988
Or an increase since 1890 (in round numbers)	1,200,000

Farms Value.

1870	$ 9,262,803,861
1880	10,197,096,776
1890	13,279,252,649

Live Stock.

1870	$ 1,525,276,457
1880	1,500,464,609
1890	2,208,767,573
In 1890 the total farm values of the American nation was	$15,982,267,689
In 1870 it was	8,899,966,998

The figures of the census of 1900 for the whole country are not available. However, the Agriculture Department reports an increase of more than $350,000,000, in the farm values of the cereals alone in 1900 as compared with 1896. The value of the live stock on the farms of the country which was in 1896 $1,727,926,084 was in 1900 $1,981,054,115.

The exports of agricultural products have been increasing all the time in the United States in spite of the large consumption of their home market:

1897	$ 569,879,297
1898	853,683,570
1899	784,766,142
1900	835,858,123
1901	944,059,568
Every year there has been a large surplus of exports over imports, the last year being	415,718,885

Now, Sir, so much for agricultural products and immigration. What about population, under the highest protective tariff in the world? In 1870 the population of the United States was 38,588,371; on the 1st of June, 1901, it was 77,647,000. In other words, the United States of America have doubled their population during the last thirty years, always under the regime of the highest protective tariff in the world. What have we been doing in this Canada of ours? We have a great country, as rich in minerals, in farming land, and in every other respect as the United States. In 1870 our population was 3,689,255; in 1891, the census gave us a population of 5,371,315. If our population had increased in the same ratio as the population of the United States we should have now 7,378,514. In other words, we are short 2,007,199. In 1891 the population of Canada was 4,833,239. From 1891 to 1901 our population increased by only 538,076. In 1891 the population of the United States was 63,884,000. In 1901 the population of the United States was 77,647,000, or an increase of 13,803,036. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and the hon. Minister of Finance have spoken in glowing terms of the trade of this country. They have told us that we are forging ahead by leaps and bounds. I am glad to say that this is true. This country is going ahead, but would it not be possible to go ahead quicker than we are going now? Because a man is prosperous in his business, is that a reason, if he is a man of ability and of courage why he should not endeavour to do better than even in the past? To judge of the trade of the country it is not out of place to see how the balance of trade lies? The balance of trade is to a very large extent the book-keeping of the nation. The hon. minister of Trade and Commerce reminded us to-day that we have had a balance of trade for some years. He has forgotten to tell us that during the last year the balance of trade has been slightly against us. We imported in 1902 $212,270,158 worth. Our exports were $211,640,286. The balance of trade against us was $629,872. We are losing ground. The hon. Minister of Finance knows it, all students of the blue-books and trade of this country know it. We are losing ground year by year. In 1901 our balance of trade was not as high as during the year previous. It was only $6,072,107. In former years it was more. We are losing ground because we are importing too much, because our tariff is not high enough. Why are we losing ground when we have such vast resources at our disposal? The United States are not losing ground. Look at their balance of trade. I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) to these figures. He is in sympathy with the protectionist policy. He is, I say it again, and he knows it. I know his mind as well as he knows his mind. He is a protectionist as pronounced as I am, not quite as open as I am, but as pronounced as I am. He has done his best to keep the tariff where it is, and I compliment him on his efforts on that account. But it is my special pleasure to call his attention to the splendid results that are achieved elsewhere under a tariff that he would like to see adopted in this country. What are the balances of trade in the United States? In 1897 the excess of exports over imports was $286,263,144; in 1898, $615,432,676; in 1899, $529,874,813; in 1900, $544,541,898; in 1901, $664,592,826; in 1902, less, but still large, $478,398,453. In the last six years the excess of exports over imports in the United States has been over $2,500,000,000. Why is it so? Simply for the reason that the United States are keeping up a tariff which on dutiable goods is

49·83 per cent and on free and dutiable goods 28·91 per cent. While the tariff of Canada in 1901 on dutiable goods was 24·835 per cent, and on goods dutiable and free 12·424 per cent. In 1902, on dutiable goods our tariff was 25·182 per cent, and on our total imports 13·207 per cent. The progress of manufactures in the United States has simply been marvellous. When those who, like me, are believers in strong national tariffs speak of manufactures, we seem to annoy some of our hon. friends who do not share our views. The word 'manufacturer' is obnoxious to them; they are called sharks, they are called thieves, they are called by all sorts of bad names. Let me say immediately that in this discussion the manufacturers of this country enter in a very limited way. There are only a few hundred manufacturers. My hon. friends on the treasury benches have received during the last years the support of as many manufacturers as have my hon. friends on the other side of the House. During the last election in Maisonneuve the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) and his friends made it a point to get the signatures and the names of the manufacturers of the city of Montreal on his nomination paper. This is not a question between the manufacturers and the masses of the people; we are, I hope, but one people in this country. In 1870 the exports of the domestic manufacturers of the United States amounted to $68,279,764 and in 1901 they amounted to $412,155,066, or 28·22 per cent of the total exports of the United States, the agricultural exports being 64·62 per cent of the total. During the last ten years the number of manufacturers in the United States has increased 44·2 per cent. The value of the products of American manufactures in 1900 was $13,019,251,604. The number of people engaged as wage-earners being 5,310,598, and the capital invested $9,853,630,789. The United States has become the leading exporting nation of the world. Last year the total exports of the United States reached the wonderful amount of $1,487,764,991. England comes next with exports amounting to $1,365,048,400; Germany next with $1,338,733,000 and France next with $804,069,800. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is proud of his surplus, and he tells us that by July the first he will have a surplus of $13,500,000; he has had several surpluses since he has been in office. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like to know what surpluses they have had in the United States.

In 1900 the total receipts of the United States were $669,595,431 and the total expenditure $590,068,371, leaving a surplus of $79,527,060.

The total receipts of the United States in 1901 were $609,316,530 and the total expenditure $621,598,546, leaving a surplus of $77,717,944; or in two years the surplus of the United States amounted to $157,245,040.

Having given those figures, having compared the result of the relatively low tariff of Canada with the high tariff policy of the United States, I want to ask: What the present fiscal policy of this country is and means? The United States have maintained a tariff, not only for revenue, but for protection. We claim to-day to have a tariff for revenue, and the balance of trade during the last year has been against us. What is our tariff? Is it not a tax-gathering tariff? Is it not a stand-by tariff? Is it not a marking time tariff? Are we not marking time now? The tariff of this country is practically the same that was adopted in 1879.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It has been weakened a little instead of being strengthened.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It has been weakened, let me say immediately, to a certain extent by the late Minister of Finance, Mr. Foster. I was then in the Conservative party, and I know that in the province of Quebec we did not share his views at all when he reduced the duty on certain articles. We thought he was going in the wrong direction then. The Liberal party came into office in 1896, and in 1897 there was a revision of the tariff. A large element of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec especially, had joined the Liberal party. The province of Quebec had been for many, many years a Conservative province; a Liberal-Conservative province. This is not the occasion to discuss the reason why some of us, many of us, thousands of us, after the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, thought fit to part with our former allies in Ontario and to join hands with the Liberal party as then constituted and led by Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. SPROULE. That's where you made a mistake.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, I don't think we made a mistake then. I do not regret anything we have done. Speaking for myself, I have nothing to regret. I think it was a very useful thing for this country that the Conservative party was defeated when it was defeated. If it had been defeated before, it would have been better for itself and better for the country, perhaps. It is not good that a party should remain too long in office, no matter what party it be.

Mr. CLARKE. Time for a change.

Mr. HOLMES. There is not much consolation for you in that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There was a revision of the tariff in 1897. An inquiry had taken place. The Minister of Finance and some of his colleagues, I was one of them, went into several towns and cities in this coun-

try to consult public opinion and to take consultation with the large interests at stake. Some of us were protectionists. I was then a protectionist, as I am now. My former colleagues will not reproach me with not having done everything I could to keep the tariff as high as possible. I carried on the fight to the best of my ability. There was a compromise. The tariff was revised. On the whole, the tariff has not worked badly; it would be going a great deal too far to say that it has; it would not be fair to say so. But I say that the tariff has not worked as well as a stronger and higher tariff would have worked. Of course, if the past utterances of some of my hon. friends of the Liberal party had been carried out, the tariff which is in existence to-day would not be where it is. We would have simply wrecked and destroyed this country. It was out of the question for any government in 1897 to try to carry out the utterances which some public men had delivered in the past. They were the first to recognize this. It was perhaps a little painful to them; but it seems to me that they were wrong in feeling sorrow, because I have yet to find a man who has been in public life for any great length of time who has not been obliged to change his orientation many times. The revision of the tariff of 1897 has placed it about 2 per cent less high than it was before. We did not do more than that. And when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was this afternoon denouncing the former tariff, the tariff that I supported myself, when he was telling us that the tariff enacted in 1879 and kept on the statute-book up to 1897 had simply allowed the manufacturers to pocket the money of the people, I was saying to myself, if it was so, I do not know what it is now. Because there is not much difference in the two tariffs; the present tariff is about the same thing. We even raised the tariff in 1897 as against the United States on many articles. Open the tariff book and you will find that on many articles we raised the tariff in order to give the English preference. In keeping our tariff as we have kept it, we have been looking on, while many nations of the world with which we are trading have increased their tariffs. The United States have kept their tariff as high as they could. In 1897 they raised it, not for revenue only, but to encourage their home industries. Last year my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in his budget speech said that he would not revise the tariff that session, because there were reasons why he should not do so. The census returns of manufactures were not available, and the London conference was on. But the words of the hon. Minister of Finance, which I read in the House on another occasion, conveyed to the country the impression that the tariff would be revised this year. The business men of the country took those words as a pledge for a revision of the tariff at this present session. The words of the Finance Minister of last year were a great deal more definite on that point than his words of this year. Last year my hon. friend did not argue on principle against a revision of the tariff. He did not argue that the masses would chafe under a higher tariff. He did not point to the people of the west as an obstacle against a revision of the tariff. He simply said, we are not ready now, because of the reasons I have stated; but we realize that conditions have arisen in the world that will make it necessary for us to revise the tariff at some future day. These words, I say, were understood to mean a revision this year. I can appeal to the business men of the country—they took the words of the hon. gentleman as a promise. This year my hon. friend does not make any promise of a revision in a short time, but he tells us that he is afraid a revision of the tariff in the direction of protection would bring high prices; he is afraid the people of the North-west would organize against it. Why should the people of the North-west rise and organize against a national tariff more than the people of any other part of the country? I want to know that. We are prepared to do anything in reason for the people of the North-west. We would be glad to do it in the future as we have been glad to do it in the past; but they must remain Canadians commercially, as Canadian as we are in the older provinces. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance told us that the manufacturers do not need a revision of the tariff in the direction of further protection—that it is not a higher tariff they require, but more labour and more space. Mr. Speaker, give the manufacturers of this country, the industries of this country, a proper policy, and the labour will be on, and the space will be on. Would my hon. friend the Minister of Finance permit me to tell him that this is the weakest argument he has ever propounded in this Chamber. Why, why, why! the industries, the manufacturers of this country could not find labour, they could not find space, in a country like this! They could not find space room in a country like this! The argument is not worthy of the hon. gentleman's great ability. He tells us that the manufacturers are holding the market. How are they holding it? We exported to the United States last year $6,000,000 of manufactured goods, and the United States sent to this country $69,000,000 worth. How then are we holding our own? Where are we? My hon. friend surely has not weighed the figures which he has before him. Because if he had, it would be impossible for him to use such an argument. My hon. friend has given utterance to expressions which will not be easily understood. He said in his speech:

> Later on there might be some changes, that there may be a necessity, at some early day, to make further tariff changes than these which

I now propose, but if so, the extent to which these changes will go and the character of the changes, may, to a considerable degree, depend upon the attitude of certain other countries toward Canada.

What is to be the character of the changes? When some people go to ridings where low tariff ideas prevail, the words of my hon. friend will be read to the electorate as indicating that the changes will not be towards protection, and when such candidates as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) will go before the people, they will say: Now we have a promise of a change towards protection. I say, without any hesitation, that this is not a policy, it is simply politics. This country wants a definite and clear policy on such an important question.

My hon. friend believes that our manufactures are holding their own. He has in his own province a very important industry—an industry, which, if it were fostered and encouraged and developed as it should be, and as a similar industry is fostered and protected in the United States, would become one of the sources of wealth of Canada. I refer to the iron industry. Would my hon. friend permit me to inform him that during the last six months there have been $25,000,000 lost in that industry. There has been a loss of $25,000,000, direct and indirect, in connection with the iron industry during the last six months.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) That is because it is protected. That is the reason it has gone down.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If that be so, how is it that the hon. Minister of Finance is just adding in his budget an item of protection on steel rails. It is largely because the iron industry is not protected as it should be, that the depreciation in the stock has been what I have just stated.

That cannot be denied by any one who knows the state of affairs. There are other industries, which are losing money and which went on with their operations, relying upon the words spoken by the hon. Minister of Finance last year. I would not be a prophet of evil, but I have good reasons for knowing that within a short period, unless my hon. friend the Minister of Finance makes further changes in the tariff on other lines, there will be financial difficulties, there will be losses on some industries which my hon. friend well knows. I know that there are in Ontario and the province of Quebec several industries which cannot live under the present tariff. There is one thing that surprises me. This Liberal side of the House is rather empty to-night. I would like to see it full. But what surprises me is that there are so many members of parliament on this side who have told me that they share my views, who have written me and told me repeatedly that they share my views, and who have not been able to impress their views on the government. I say it openly, I say it from the bottom of my heart, that I fully expected that the Liberal party, with which I have been connected during the last ten years, would carry out the policy it was understood in 1896 they would carry out. I am weighing my words. I know what arrangement, what understanding took place between some public men. I know what took place. I do not divulge any secrets. I know what we did in the election of 1896 in Montreal. I see within the radius of my eye public men who, at our request, came to the city of Montreal, went to the manufacturers, with the knowledge of the leaders of the party, and told them not only would the tariff not be disturbed, but it would be changed in the right direction when the proper time came. There was no secret about that. I shall not give names. There are men who hear me—I am sorry there are not more on those benches—who know that I am perfectly right. I am out of office because I could not stay in office under the present circumstances. I have had only but pleasant relations with most of my colleagues and have for the most of them the greatest respect. But I could not possibly stay in office when I knew that the policy we are following now is not the right policy—when I knew what understanding took place formerly. The tariff has worked as well as it could because we have been passing through years of prosperity. But after all we have not developed so marvellously. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, and my hon. friends from the maritime provinces, should take a lesson from the past. Before confederation they were most of them free traders.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) We are still.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know that some of them, very respectable and venerable, are still free traders. We respect their views, but may I ask them to consider the position as it is to-day? They are losing representation in this parliament. Why? Because they have lost population. And why have they lost population? Because they have not sufficient industries. They are very proud of their Sydney works, and we are proud with them, and ready to encourage them. But, if we are to carry out those free trade views to which some of them are still devoutly attached, we would remove the duty on coal and we would not consent to have a duty on steel rails. They would object, and yet when we ask our hon. friends from those provinces to be logical, to give protection to some of our industries, as we are obliged to give protection to their special industry, they reply that they are free traders. They are protectionist where their special industry is concerned, but they decline to join us in the preparation of the tariff that would cover the whole country.

I am asked what kind of a tariff I would like to have. In point of fact, before I arose

to speak, some of my friends said to me: Are you going to tell us what kind of a tariff you would offer to the country if you were in a position to make the tariff? I have no objection to say what I would do if I were once more 'the master of the administration.' I would have a policy that would favour and protect and foster and develop the manufacturing industries and the farming interest of our country just as effectively as the American tariff protects and fosters and develops the manufacturing industries and the farming interests of the United States. I do not say that that tariff should necessarily be as high as the United States tariff is, but it would be built on the same lines. Let us take a leaf out of their book. It seems to me that it is a very poor consolation for us to hear, in reply to our request for a higher tariff, that the control is passing from east to west. In my humble opinion there should be no east and no west. We should have Canada, and Canada only, in view. The control of the policy of the country must be national, not sectional.

The best markets of this country at present, in my opinion—and it will be so more and more—are the home market and the British market. Let me quote Mr. Carnegie on the value of home markets. This is from his St. Andrew's address:

> In economic circles 'the law of the surplus' as I have ventured to call it, attracts increasing attention. The manufacturing establishments are increased year by year until they become gigantic, simply because the more made, the cheaper the product. By giving men constant employment, and having a reputation of never stopping, the best men are attracted and held—an important point. The manufacturer on a large scale can afford to make many contracts in distant parts of the world, and even some at home, at a direct loss in times of depression, knowing that, upon the whole, the result will be less unprofitable by running full than running short time or stopping. Hence, those possessing the most profitable home market can afford to supply foreign markets without direct profits, or even at a loss, whenever necessary. . . . Politicians give far too much attention to distant foreign markets, which can never amount to much; and far too little to measures for improving conditions at home, which would increase the infinitely more important home market.

Our friends in the United States have progressed marvellously, as a whole, under a high tariff, but the farmers have, perhaps, benefited more than any other class of the community. Let me read a few words from the final report of the industrial commission, page 196:

> Tariffs in the United States have been agriculturally justified on the ground of their indirect influence in furnishing home markets for the products of the farm. Alexander Hamilton, while secretary of the treasury, in his well-known report on the encouragement of manufactures, regarded this relation as a vital feature in his memorable policy. By the creation of manufactures, he pointed out that such a home market was created. By the diffusion of these manufactures throughout the country the consumer was brought nearer the place of surplus production, and the necessity for distant transportation was thereby eliminated and a near-by market secured more permanently than any foreign market could be.

That is common sense.

> Another fact bearing directly on the question of the promotion of agriculture by tariffs is the fact that the level of prices for farm products is determined very largely by the price which the surplus portion of the country's product brings in the world market, where competition with all other countries is active. The retention of an increasing proportion of the farmers surplus for domestic consumption, and the exportation of a decreasing proportion of the crop, would tend to the maintenance of a higher level of prices to the farmer under the conditions of a practically exclusive home market. It is this consideration that encourages rural enterprise to produce less of those articles, a part of which have to be sent abroad in competition with all other countries such as grain, and more of those articles which are in increasing demand for domestic use, namely, small fruits, dairy products, poultry, eggs, &c. This implies that diversified and intensive agriculture is necessary for the improvement of farm prices, without coming into competition with foreign producers for so large a part of the surplus crop as has been the case in the past.

Now I wish to ask who is the hon. member within hearing of my voice who will deny—I appeal to the most pronounced free trader—that great centres of population such as Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Hamilton and others are the best markets for the farming community? Our farmers do not produce for export alone. What pays them better is what they take every day or every week to the market. Who can deny that? If you increase the population of the country, if you develop the industries of the country, you increase at the same time, the home market for the benefit of the farming community. That point cannot be disputed, and still it does not seem to appeal to our low tariff friends. They would rather stand by their theories than grapple with the facts face to face. I have just said a word of the English market. England is the greatest food importing country in the world. We are not alone in the field. The United States, Germany, France, Denmark, in fact all the nations of the world export to England.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S..) Free trade England.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. After having been high protection England. She is now free trade England, it is true, but is it not equally true that free trade England is to-day protecting her farming community against Canada? Is it not a fact that free trade England declines to admit Canadian beef for protection's sake? Mr. Hanbury has told us that openly. I am reminded that England is free trade. Is there a man in this parliament who would venture to say that

we could practice free trade as England practices it to-day ? If there is a man ready to do that, let him rise in the House and ask parliament to pronounce in its favour. We can export to England nearly everything of which we have a surplus. Let us build up our agricultural interests by a strong tariff ; in other words, let us strengthen the position of our farming community as the Americans have strengthened the position of their farmers. Let us build up a strong basis for our farming interests, and then let us compete in the markets of the world with all other nations. Two things must go together, transportation and the tariff, and those two things should be organized scientifically. We should not delay, we have in the past only been marking time.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce reminded us this afternoon that we have lost several millions of our population. The United States have attracted them. They have crossed over the line and most of them have become American citizens. The maritime provinces have lost more, perhaps, than any other part of the country; my province has lost a great deal. Why have we lost so many of our children ? Because there was on the other side of the line a nation with a strong national policy that had built up its industries. In 1894 the United States, under Mr. Cleveland's administration, lowered their tariff a little, although it still remained very high. Immediately a depression followed and a crisis was at hand for the American people. The Democratic party was defeated, and in 1897 the United States congress reined the tariff. Let me read the heading of it : 'An act to provide for revenue for the government and to encourage the industries of the United States.' These are plain words, there was no ambiguity as to the object of the tariff of 1897. It was enacted to counteract the evil effects of the tariff adopted under the Cleveland regime. In a very interesting book entitled 'The Elements of National Economy,' Prof. Robert Ellis Thompson speaks in this way of the tariff question of the United States :

> Nine times in one hundred years the American people have changed their financial policy, sometimes carried from protection toward free trade by the influence of specious theories, but as often driven back to the policy of protection by hard experience. The two periods of longest continuance in any policy is the protectionist period which followed the establishment of the government (1789-1801) and the protectionist period in which we are now living. Four times the scaffolding of the tariff has been torn down from the uncompleted edifice of our industrial development, and as often the work has been begun again,—if not from the foundation, yet from a point much less advanced than had been reached under the previous protective tariff. This time it seems to be the nation's purpose that the scaffold shall be kept up till the roof is on.

It is such a policy as that I would like to help build in this country. I would like indeed that the work be started immediately. This session will not close, I am confident, without that vital question being sifted to the bottom. I for one will do my best to achieve that end. The government has made a change or two in the tariff, but that is not a policy. The government is telling us that they do not know when it will be, in their opinion, advantageous for the country to revise the tariff. They tell us that the character of the tariff has not yet been outlined in their minds.

The hon. leader of the opposition has made a motion which is practically a repetition of the motion he made last year. Let me compliment him on the speech he has delivered. On both sides of the House it is admitted to be one of the ablest utterances that have been made on the question of a tariff in this parliament. It is delightful to hear questions of that importance discussed in such an able manner as the tariff is being discussed at the present time. The Minister of Finance has made an able speech. The right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce has also delivered one of those bright efforts for which we always cheer him, even though we do not share all his views. I do not say that the motion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition meets all my opinions and sentiments, though it goes far my way. His speech is clearer than his motion. His motion has the right ring; but if I am allowed to do so, I would like to supplement it and to make my own position clear before the country by proposing at a later period the following motion : In reading it I am giving notice of a motion that will be studied by my hon. friends on both sides of the House. It reads as follows :

> This House desires to express the opinion that in order to assure the permanency and the further progress of the existing industries, as well as the creation of many new ones that only wait the proper policy to spring up ; to inspire greater confidence to Canadian, British and foreign capital ; to secure for the farmers now tilling our soil and those that we invite to share the blessing of our institutions and the wealth that Providence has placed at our disposal, the full advantages of a prosperous home market ; to comply with the legitimate desire of the working classes to see their labour rewarded by fair and uninterrupted wages and by comfort in their families ; to render impossible the slaughtering of our markets by the produce of foreign industries, of foreign combines, of foreign agriculture and of cheap labour countries ; to bring about a quicker development and a more rapid expansion of our vast resources ; to promote closer commercial relations between the different provinces of the Dominion and between this Dominion and the mother country ;
>
> It is the bounden and imperative duty of the government to revise and readjust, without delay, the present tariff in such a manner as to leave no doubt as to the determination of the Canadian people to adopt and maintain a fiscal policy adequately and firmly protective of the large national interest at stake. And also to

carry out an energetic transportation policy which will give to our merchandise and products of all kinds commodious, quick and cheap access to the markets of our country and to those of foreign nations trading with us.

This is the motion that I will offer to the House at a future date. I will not discuss to-day the tariff in its details. In other words, I will not discuss the different industries, which, in my opinion, deserve immediate consideration at the hands of this parliament. I hope that this question will be thoroughly discussed at this session of parliament that we may make our views known and when we have placed them before the country, the country will decide. I hope that the government will come to a better understanding of the position. I still hope that they will do so. I have gone over the province of Ontario. I have addressed Liberal audiences at their request. I have found everywhere a strong sentiment in favour of a higher tariff. The members of the government from the other provinces perhaps do not know the strong feeling of the province of Ontario as well as I profess to know it. I know I will be told that the government has carried by-elections. We all know what by-elections mean in this country. We all know that they are carried on side issues. We know what a large influence the government has. Perhaps I may be told that the policy I am advocating engenders trusts and combines. My hon. friends who are friendly to the policy of free trade England will be good enough to remember that combines in free trade England have more influence than they have in the United States. There are perhaps more combines in England than in the United States. In the United States combines do not control one-tenth of the manufacturing interests. Therefore, that is no argument. Now, all the nations of the world are equipping themselves. I hold in my hand the tariff recently adopted by Germany. It is practically a prohibitive tariff especially from the farming standpoint. I am glad that the hon. Minister of Finance and the government have at last retaliated against Germany. Why did they not adopt the same policy against the United States? The tariff of the United States is just as unfair to this country as the tariff of Germany is. If the principle that they are advocating and that they are asking their friends to sanction is sound, is good as far as Germany is concerned, the same principle should be applied as against the United States.

Now, let me say one last word about the North-west Territories and Manitoba. One of the influences—perhaps the main influence—which has prevented the revision of the tariff comes from the North-west Territories. That I happen to know. Our North-west friends are wrong in their views. We are prepared to give them cheap, easy, commodious transportation. They have never applied in vain to the older provinces. We have voted cheerfully all the money they wanted, and we are prepared to do so again —I am speaking for myself. Knowing the sentiment of the province of Quebec I speak as I do. We are prepared to do everything to develop the North-west Territories. Why should they be anxious to buy from the United States more than they buy from us? The older provinces are manufacturing provinces to a very large extent. If we establish cheap transportation between the west and the east why should we not supply the west with our goods? We are prepared to increase our transportation facilities by rail and by water. Let us bind this Dominion solidly together. National unity follows commercial intercourse. We are settling the west with foreign elements. Let us have as much intercourse as we can with those foreign elements. Let us trade together, let us unite the country solidly together by a strong Canadian tariff and by a scientific system of transportation. There is no reason why the west should antagonize the east, any more than the maritime provinces should not join hands with us. If they had more industries in the maritime provinces they would have more population. There are already industries in the west. I will have an opportunity of asking my hon. friends from the west to vote perhaps on certain industries that have applied to me for some protection from the farming standpoint, and from the industrial standpoint. Sir, there should be no west and no east. There must be a united Canada and a Canada united with the British empire. The British isles are our best market. I echo the sentiments that have been expressed in this regard by the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce. This young Canadian nation cannot be an independent nation for many years to come. We would be gobbled up by the United States; they would simply swallow us at the first difficulty we would have with them. Small nations on the continent of Europe are not in the same position as we are. Because there is a balance of power to be maintained in Europe by the bigger nations between themselves. France or Russia will not allow Germany to swallow up a small nation. But on this continent we would be swallowed up by the United States without any body caring very much for us, if we were an independent nation now. Within ten or fifteen years we may be, we will be I hope, a nation of ten millions or twelve millions people. And unless we have closer relations with England we may have difficulties. Let us begin now the work of making solid the union of this Dominion with the British empire on a commercial basis. Let us bind this Dominion together and let us bind the Dominion with the British empire.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We have great destinies before us. Why do we not have a

policy worthy of our future ? Why wait, wait, wait this year and next year ? Waiting is not a policy worthy of a nation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friends on the treasury benches recognize the necessity of revising the tariff and of having a stronger policy, since they tell us to wait for that policy. Why should we wait such a length of time when our neighbours to the south are invading the markets of the world. We are losing power in the commercial world, the balance of the trade was against us last year.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, to have wearied the House with such a long speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am in a peculiar position. As I have said, my relations with most of my colleagues have been of a most agreeable character. I have confidence in the integrity, in the honour of most of them. I have worked harmoniously with the great bulk of the Liberal party. I have done what I could for them in days when they were not as strong as they are to-day. I remember very well the days when the Liberal party was scattered to the winds after the Mercier episode in Quebec. My friends, the Liberals from that province were not as strong then as they are now. They found allies in the Conservative party, and let me say to some of them that they have never been loyal to those allies. Let me reproach them on the floor of this parliament for their lack of loyalty and sincerity towards some of us. They know that I am speaking by the book. I for one have been stabbed in the back on more than one occasion, but I forgot all that. A public man must forget and forgive, when he has the true interest of his country at heart. I remained in the government knowing that behind me there were men who were stabbing me in the back. My former colleagues know it just as well as I know it myself. I remained in office for loyalty sake to my leader and to those of my colleagues with whom I was working for the best interest of the country. On the question of the tariff, I could not compromise any longer. It may be said that I am not a good party man, and I stand ready to accept that reproach. If I am asked to give up opinions in which I firmly believe in order to remain in office, I cannot do it. There are things on which a public man cannot compromise ; on which he cannot give up his views. The question of the tariff ; the question of transportation, on which I have spoken in the House so often, are two questions on which I hold strong views that I could not possibly give up. I felt that I was no longer in sympathy with several of my colleagues and I went out of office. I have no ill-will towards them. I do not know if I will remain in Canadian politics. I like my country ; I like Canadian politics ; but life is short and I do not know whether I will not trust to my luck on another scene. It would not be a disgrace to the French Canadians ; it would not be a disgrace or a bad thing for the French Canadians to have one of their number sitting in the imperial House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have been offered a seat in the English House of Commons, which I have not accepted as yet. I do not know what I will do. If I had money I would go, and I think it would not be going back on my native Canada, I would be able to serve her in the imperial parliament as I have served her here. Well, we shall see later on. I give this explanation because I want to close these remarks by saying that in the position which I take I have no personal ends to serve. My ambition is satisfied. I started very humbly in life ; I had the great privilege of being a member of this parliament and of being a minister of the Crown. I cannot go higher in this country or elsewhere. My ambition is altogether satisfied. The position which I take to-day has no other object and no other motive than to serve my country to the best of my ability. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House for having spoken so long.

Mr. LOGAN. At the request of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and on his behalf, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 21, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Sproule.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

David Wardrope Wallace, Esq., member for the electoral district of Russell, introduced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Mr. D. C. Fraser.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to

be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, the financial statement presented to this House a few days since by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, is a statement different in character, in some material respects, from many that preceded it. It has attracted wider attention than any statement of a similar kind in the history of the confederation. It was looked for with interest in foreign countries, and certain features have aroused great interest in the United States, Germany and France. This statement presented to the House and the country the record of a period of unexampled prosperity. It is a record of increasing wealth, expanding commerce and abundant revenues, for which we need to thank divine Providence, and we should not permit ourselves to believe that we created the conditions by which we profit and that a higher power has nothing to do with the shaping our destinies and interests. The statement of the Minister of Finance gave a reflex indication of the thrill that now stirs this nationality with a sense of new born power, and we may approach its consideration in a spirit of thankfulness that the affairs of this country are in such a prosperous condition, and realizing also that we are upon the threshold of an era of great development which will require the exercise of prudent statesmanship and wise direction.

There are certain features in this financial statement which give me great satisfaction indeed. The imposition by Germany against Canada of a discriminating duty, because of a preference given by this country to the products of Great Britain was utterly unjustifiable. The imposition by Germany of discriminating duties against Canada as a punishment for the preferential duties in favour of Great Britain granted by Canada was an act entirely without warrant. The two countries are on an entirely different basis as regards their commercial relations with us. Great Britain is our mother state and we have advantages in her markets not accorded to us by Germany. No duties are levied in the one case, heavy duties are levied in the other, and the assumption by Germany that we should receive discipline because the mother country, which gives us a free market, is treated differently from the German empire by our tariff, was a high-handed and indefensible act. When we take into consideration the state of our trade with that country, the character of this act becomes more apparent. Our imports from Germany last year amounted to $10,919,944. Our total exports to that country were $2,692,578. The percentage which our imports bore to our total trade with Germany was 81 per cent. Our exports of the produce of Canada, however, were $1,298,634, which would leave our percentage of exports to our total trade 89 and four-tenths per cent. Under these conditions, the action of Germany was little short of insolent, and I cannot but approve most heartily of the action of the hon. Minister of Finance in imposing discriminating duties against that country. And the action of the Canadian government in resenting that move on the part of Germany has aroused the attention of the world and won the approval of the world, outside of Germany. It is instinctively felt that, in taking this course, we have simply stated our rights and asserted our honour. I see it stated in the newspapers that the German government propose to impose a prohibitive tax on Canadian imports. This surtax imposed by our government seems to have led to some earnest use of surtax on the part of Germany, and the feeling against us, I presume, is a very strong one. Well, Sir, I should say to the government and to the Minister of Finance : If the German government wishes to embark upon this course of action, meet them upon their own ground ; and if they prohibit the entry of our exports of $1,300,000, and we prohibit the entry of their exports to us of $11,000,000, then, after trying the thing awhile, let the German financiers and economists figure out what the balance of loss or gain is on the transaction. I think we can stand it, and I feel disposed to say that we had better do it and that it is a good time to assert our own sense of propriety, our own sense of the unfair usage to which we have been subjected. I repeat the government's course in this matter meets my unqualified approbation, in fact I admire the courage which has marked the government's attitude.

Now, in listening to the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and also in perusing the remarks of the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte), to which I had not the pleasure of listening, I find that exception is taken to the course of the government in failing, at this juncture, to enter upon a revision of the tariff, and the assertion is made that the condition of our affairs is of a character to render it proper and necessary to enter upon this revision. Now it strikes me, Mr. Speaker, on the contrary that the reasons assigned by the Finance Minister for deferring action upon the tariff, except in the few inconsiderable instances in which he has changed conditions, are good reasons. We do not know, at the present moment what the premises are upon which we shall be called upon to act. As the Finance Minister says we have the question of preferential trade not yet definitely settled. We do not know what may come of it, but the outcome must necessarily have a very material bearing upon the course which we may pursue with regard to tariff legislation. Then we have the probable reassembling of the Joint High Commission

and of negotiations with the United States relating to proposals to have enlarged trade relations between these two countries. If these negotiations are successful, of course the conditions of things will be different from what it would be if the negotiations were unsuccessful. We must necessarily predicate our tariff, to a large extent upon the outcome of the negotiations with the United States, and the relations which may be permanently settled between these two countries. For these reasons—without expressing at the moment any opinion as to the abstract propriety of protection or free trade—I hold that it is the part of prudence to refrain, at present, from definite action until we know the terms we shall have to confront and the conditions we shall have to meet.

In regard to the British preference, my hon. friend from St. Mary's division, in his speech last night, if he is correctly reported, held that this question is already closed, that we have a clear and decisive answer from the British government. Well, this may be the case; at all events, I am quite disposed to agree with this hon. gentleman as to what will be the outcome in this question. I do not believe to-day, and I never have believed, that we could obtain from Great Britain preferential treatment in her markets to any material or tangible extent. I think that the experience that we have had with the preference we have given to Great Britain warrants us in the expectation, now, after four or five years trial, that there will be no response to that concession. And I think that when we examine into this case a little more deeply, we shall be warranted in arriving at the conclusion that Great Britain is not in a position to offer us any preference in her market under any conditions whatever. The reasons that lead me to this conclusion are based upon the scrutiny of British trade returns. These returns show the comparative insignificance of Great Britain's colonial trade as compared with her foreign trade. For instance, I find that in the year 1901, the last year for which we have the returns, the total imports into Great Britain were £531,990,000 sterling. Of this total, £416,416,000 were imports from foreign countries, or 79·73 per cent. The imports from Greater Britain, that is, from all the British colonies and dependencies, amounted to £105,573,000, or 20·27 per cent. Great Britain's total imports from Canada, according to these British returns, amounted to £19,854,000, or 3·7 per cent of the total imports. Now, when we take the exports from Great Britain, we find that the total for 1901 was £347,864,000. Of this amount, foreign countries took £234,745,000, or 67·4 per cent, while Greater Britain, that is the colonies and dependencies, took £113,118,000, or 32·06 per cent, while the Dominion of Canada took £9,250,000, or 2·6 per cent. Now, when our trade with Great Britain is so small that the imports she receives from us are only $3.70 for every $100 of her total imports, while, of every $100 of British exports Canada only receives $2.60, it strikes me as being unreasonable to suppose that England will engage in a system of discrimination in our favour against the vast bulk of her trade with foreign nations, and with the certainty that it will lead to retaliation and bad relations with those countries. I do not think, Sir, that we need expect anything of that kind. Great Britain cannot meet our wishes; such a course would be ruinous to her foreign trade and would immediately involve her in a commercial war with foreign countries. Mr. Chamberlain, at the conference last year, put a low estimate on the value of our preference of 33⅓ per cent, and did not consider it equivalent to a preference in our favour on breadstuffs to the extent of even four per cent. That is, a preference by Canada of 33⅓ per cent on all her imports was not equal to a preference of 4 per cent on a partial list of imports into Great Britain. I confess that, when this breadstuff tax was put on in England, I anticipated without doubt that exception would be made in favour of Canada. I assumed, as a foregone conclusion, that we could expect nothing less; and I confess to a feeling of great surprise when the result proved that the English government did not intend to give us that 4 per cent preference on breadstuffs as a return for the 33⅓ per cent preference which we gave on all our imports from Great Britain.

I imagine, nay I am almost certain, that there is a reason which does not appear upon the surface, and that reason is, not that Great Britain did not desire to do this, not that the rulers of that country felt that it would be an undue concession to us; but I imagine the reason is that it was not considered prudent to do so, that it was known that if this were done it would result in hostile action upon the part of foreign governments. And so we had in this small matter of a four per cent preference and England's declination to give it to us in return for a 33⅓ per cent preference, a proof that England will be deterred from any such action as granting to Canada a preference, by considerations outside of the matter of her trade relations with her colonies. Mr. Chamberlain, in the course of his remarks so far as we have them, asserted that our preference had been a matter of small consequence anyway, that it had not to any appreciable extent stimulated trade with England. Well, I beg to differ with Mr. Chamberlain in this matter. This preference has had two effects. In the first place, it has arrested the decline in our trade with England, a decline which was making rapid progress when this preference was adopted. In the second place, it has led to an expansion of that trade, and a brief examination of the returns will prove this beyond peradventure, as the following

figures of our imports from Great Britain will show :

Year.	Imports.
1893	$43,148,000
1894	38,717,000
1895	31,131,000
1896	32,500,000
1897	29,412,000
1898	32,500,000
1899	37,060,000
1900	44,789,000
1901	48,000,000
1902	49,250,000

We had gone down from $43,000,000 to $29,000,000 before this preference was adopted, between the years 1893 and 1897 ; and we had gone up from $29,000,000 to $48,000,000 between 1897 and 1902 after the preference had begun to work, showing an increase of $19,000,000, or 40 per cent in those five years, against a rapid decrease in the preceding term which these figures reveal. Now, this proves that Mr. Chamberlain is wrong, this proves that there was a decline in trade with England, that that decline was progressive and regular. These figures prove that the preference, or something else, arrested that decline, and that there set in an expansion, which amounted to $19,794,000 in five years. Surely Mr. Chamberlain should have been satisfied with this record, and certainly he was not possessed of the facts with regard to trade when he made the assertion that the Canadian preference was a matter of small moment to England, and had produced no tangible results worthy of consideration.

The idea of English statesmen, Mr. Speaker, is one that, in my opinion, we can never meet. I assert again that it is my firm conviction that we should never have given a preference, that one in return cannot be given, that the condition of England's trade with foreign countries renders it impossible for her to do it, and regard for her own interest will prevent her doing it. But there is an idea abroad about a zollverein, free trade within the empire. Well, we could arrange matters probably upon that basis, absolute free trade, the admission of all British products to her colonies free of duty. But, if that is a scheme that meets with the approbation of the British people, it is one that cannot be wrought out. In my opinion, we can never accept it, certainly we cannot accept it under present conditions. I do not believe we ever can. It is not a matter, at all events, that looms up in the near future as one that can be arranged.

Now, with regard to the preference on grain, amounting in round numbers to four per cent, I assert, Mr. Speaker, that the free admission to the American market for our wheat and other cereals would be worth more to our producers than an English preference of four per cent. I assert that the free introduction of American competition on the part of American grain buyers and millers with our own grain buyers and millers, to the wheat fields in the Northwest and to other portions of Canada, would result in greater advantage to our producers of grain than a preferencee in the English market to the extent of their tax upon breadstuffs would do. I think that we may conclude that our aspirations for an advantage in the form of a preference will never be realized, that we come up against the hard-headed common sense of English statesmen and public men, who realize that it cannot be given. She will not permit a considerable tax upon raw material. The competition between England and her commercial rivals is too keen ; the competition with Germany, the competition with the United States, is so keen that a due sense of what is necessary in England's interests will deter her public men from saddling upon her people this or any additional burden in the shape of a tax upon raw material represented in the shape of a tax upon bread. We had better dismiss our dreams in this regard, our hopes of realizing what is impossible, and let the preferential question drop, it will drop in my opinion, for under the conditions of trade as they exist, I believe that we can never realize it. The present preference is purely sentimental, it is a sentiment that is not convertible into current coin. We have not even been able, in return for this sentimental preference, to get the cattle embargo removed. We have not the slightest concession granted to us in return for the preference of 33⅓ per cent ; and its one only good effect, if it has a good effect at all, is that it lessens the burden of customs taxation upon certain lines of imports.

I should not, Mr. Speaker, follow to-day the example of the hon. gentleman who spoke last night, and enter upon an extended discussion of the question of protection. I do not think that at this juncture in our public affairs a discussion of that question as an abstract theory will have practical results, because it is nothing more than academic in reality. As I said before, we have the decision on the part of the government to let the matter of revision of our tariff stand over until we know what developments will take place, what the conditions will be when we are called upon to act. That being the case, it is unnecessary, and a waste of time, in my opinion, to enter upon a free discussion of the principles of protection versus free trade or a revenue tariff policy.

I shall have something to say, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, upon the question of reciprocity with the United States. That question has filled a large place in the history of Canadian fiscal discussions, since long before confederation and down to the present time. The desire for closer trade relations led to a treaty securing for us reciprocity in natural products away back in 1854. We enjoyed the benefits that resulted from that treaty until 1866.

It was then abrogated. We know, those of us who will take the pains to look up the history of Canada during that period, what the practical result of reciprocity was so far as it affected the interests of Canada. We might draw from the experience of that period lessons as to what would be the probable result of a similar line of policy if entered upon again. And so satisfactory, in the opinion of the Canadian public, was the result of that period of reciprocity that Canada has earnestly sought for a renewal of that condition of affairs for many years since then. We sought strenuously to avert the abrogation of the treaty in 1866. Emissaries from this country visited Washington a few months after the treaty was abrogated. After the Liberal party came into power in 1874, one of its first acts was to despatch a commissioner, Hon. George Brown, to Washington, who, in conjunction with Lord Thornton, the British minister, negotiated with the State Department a reciprocity treaty which was not ratified by the Senate. Various other attempts were made, and we have only been debarred of late years from making these attempts by the apparent hopelessness of the efforts which have been put forth. The question is one which has sunk somewhat in public estimation as to its importance for the last two or three years, but it is a question which is as important to-day to Canada, perhaps, as it ever has been. It is a question which has probably to receive again the consideration of the government of this country, and the consideration of the government of the United States, and if it does receive that consideration, it will do so under circumstances, in my opinion, more conducive to a favourable result than have existed since the abrogation of the treaty in 1866. The hon. leader of the opposition, in his speech a day or two ago, asked the reason of the enormous expansion of American imports. Well, the reason is quite obvious. We have maintained a moderate tariff policy towards the United States and the rest of the world ever since this Commonwealth, or Dominion, came into existence. Our duties have from time to time been advanced, but they are still at a moderate rate, at a rate which does not materially impede importation from the United States or any other country, at a rate which, of course, has afforded some protection, which has led to the development of large manufacturing interests, but still at a rate which is not at all a prohibitive rate, under which imports may steadily increase from the outside world, and under which they have steadily increased. Now, our frontier stretches alongside of the United States for 4,000 miles. The people of the United States are our neighbours. They have a very thoroughly developed manufacturing system, the most extensive in the world. Although England exports more manufactured goods, the supply of the domestic market of the United States amounts to much more than the total manufactures of Great Britain. They have an enormous manufacturing interest, and they have reached the point where they are capable of supplying their own requirements, and have a large surplus available for export. Now, necessarily, they are seeking foreign markets. Their conditions as to soil and climate and as to the wants of the people are similar to our own, and they have succeeded in making a long list of articles which exactly suit our wants and which cannot very well be obtained elsewhere. The facility for getting goods there is so much greater than across the ocean that this in itself would act very powerfully in the direction of securing the trade to them. Our merchant can call up by telephone, in New York, or Boston or Philadelphia, his correspondent, asking him to make a small shipment of goods, they will be on their way in a few hours, and they will be here in two or three days. To sort up his stock he can buy as little or as much as he pleases. The advantages are so great, because of the facility for placing orders and shipping goods, and because of the juxtaposition of the wholesale man and the consumer that an enormous trade would naturally grow up and for various reasons, these amongst others, we have developed an enormous import trade from the United States. If the Americans had afforded us the same facilities and the same reasonable kind of treatment that we have afforded them there would be no question raised to-day as to whether our trade relations were on a satisfactory basis. There would be no question raised as to whether we should enter upon the kind of policy that they have been pursuing towards us. The hon. leader of the opposition says that our tariff should be put up as a preliminary to negotiations. Put it up and then you will have something to offer the Americans, put it up, and if they do not give you what you ought to have we would then have the very tariff we ought to have. It is my conviction that this course, adopted at this juncture, would have exactly the opposite effect from that which the hon. leader of the opposition supposes it would have. If we were to enter upon a revision of the tariff such as we would perhaps desire to do in case we should get no adequate concessions from the Americans, it would be a tariff of a character which would create irritation, it would be a tariff of a character that would very likely defeat the object we had in view. It would be flouted in the face as a menace, it would be practically saying to them: Here we have done this; you do what we want or we will keep this tariff in force. I do not think that would be prudent or politic. We should approach the United States in a different manner. The time is near at hand when, in my opinion, we are certain to get

very material concessions. I am quite optimistic about the matter. I believe that we will get concessions that will be entirely satisfactory, and so I am thoroughly convinced that it would not be .prudent in our interest to enter upon a course such as we might enter upon, in all probability such as we would be justified in entering upon if no concessions were made.

Our relations with the United States must necessairly, largely govern our tariff policy. It is the country with which we have the largest amount of trade, it is the country with which our trade relations at the present time are most unsatisfactory and our relations with that country must largely govern our tariff policy, and the adjustment of this tariff policy is a matter of so much importance that we do not want to enter upon that adjustment rashly without a full knowledge of the conditions. We want to move slowly and cautiously, we want to move with certainty. In regard to my own feelings about this matter, I am pretty well known in this House to be an advocate of reciprocity. I commenced it long ago. I dare say my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will remember that I was chosen by Mr. Mackenzie in 1875 to defend the Brown draft treaty when the attack was made upon that treaty in this House by the opposition, headed by Sir John A. Macdonald, and since that time I have been undeviating in my support of the policy of enlarged trade relations with the United States. I have always believed, I believe to-day that nothing will secure greater results or greater advantages to Canada than to remove the absurd restrictions which exist between those two countries, and to enter upon a broader and more reasonable policy as to trade affairs between the two great Anglo-Saxon Commonwealths of the North American continent. But, I have felt, and that feeling grew stronger when the Joint High Commission met at Quebec and Washington, and when I, in common with my brother commissioners, was brought more fully into contact with the question of the trade relations between Canada and the United States, that we have not been fairly treated. I realized more fully than ever before the unfair character of American fiscal legislation towards us, and I have felt a sense of resentment at the character of the American policy towards Canada. I have been actuated in the course I have advocated and in the position which I have taken upon this question by the belief that if we could not get what was fair from that country, that if we are to continue to live under the conditions that have existed during the past, we had better set up housekeeping for ourselves, and adopt a policy which we under normal conditions might not deem it advisable to enter upon.

It was not, Sir, that I was in love with protection as an abstract proposition, it was not that I was dissatisfied with the condition f affairs that existed under our present tariff rates, provided that we were met in the same spirit by our customers, it was not this that prompted me to the course that I believed the proper one to pursue; but it was primarily the conditions that existed between this country and the United States. Last session I introduced a resolution in this House. I introduced it for a two-fold purpose. In the first place, I believed that what was set forth in that resolution represented the feelings of the great majority of the Canadian people, and I thought that the formulating of this resolution would have a tendency to demonstrate as to whether my view upon that matter was right or wrong. I thought in the second place, Sir, and perhaps this was the consideration that had the most weight with me, I thought in the second place that if that resolution did represent the feelings of the mass of the Canadian electors, that it would be very well to have the United States public men in a position where they could consider the resolution, make inquiries if they chose as to whether it represented any considerable degree of public sentiment; whether it represented a public sentiment that was likely in the end to crystallize into legislation if they did not meet us with fairer terms. I put this resolution upon the 'Hansard' largely for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the United States the fact that Canada realized that their treatment of the United States was unfair; realized that we had submitted to that treatment for many years without protesting, and proposed in the future to reverse the action we had pursued; and in the event of failing to secure concessions from the United States that were reasonable and just, that we proposed to adopt the policy foreshadowed by this resolution.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman pardon me. Did the hon. gentleman endeavour to get an expression of this House at that time in order that the United States would know that that was the policy to be adopted.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may say to my hon. friend that I did not; that I did not introduce that resolution with the intention of asking the House to give an expression. On the contrary, I definitely stated that the resolution was tabled for the purpose of having mature consideration by the House and by the country; that it was a matter of so much importance that I did not ask hasty action, and that in fact we had not reached a position for action to be taken with that clear conception as to what was the best course under the circumstances, and under circumstances that might develop. The resolution was as follows :

That this House is of the opinion that Canadian import duties should be arranged upon the

principle of reciprocity in trade conditions so far as may be consistent with Canadian interests ; that a rebate of not less than 40 per cent of the amount of duties imposed, should be made upon dutiable imports from nations or countries admitting Canadian natural products into their markets free of duty ; and that the scale of Canadian duties should be sufficiently high to avoid inflicting injury upon Canadian interests in cases where a rebate of 40 per cent or more shall be made under the conditions aforesaid.

Or, that our minimum rate of tariff should be high enough to afford as great a degree of protection as was afforded at present; and that 40 per cent to that rate which was sufficient to protect our industries, should be added in the cases of all countries, without discrimination or naming any, that failed to admit our natural products free of duty.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that resolution outlines in the rough the course that it would be proper for us to pursue if conditions continue as they are. It outlines in the rough the very conditions we have adopted within a few days with regard to Germany, and even if we were to make a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and that country placed itself upon the same footing as England does in admitting our natural products free of duty. I think the same resolution could with propriety still be put on our statute-book, discriminating against other nations that failed to treat us in the manner in which we would be treated by the United States and Great Britain.

And with regard to this position, Mr. Speaker, while I advise, as Mark Hanna said some time ago : To stand pat on the tariff question; yet, I will state that I think 'pat' is inclined to make a move unless things take a reasonable and desirable shape. And while I am a strong advocate of reciprocity; while I sincerely desire to secure a treaty which will be to the advantage of this country and the United States; yet if we fail, if we are to have meted out to us the same treatment that we have had meted out to us in the past thirty years; I go for drastic measures and I think that I may point to the highly significant remarks of the Finance Minister who said : That the government would be governed by existing conditions, and while he believes in free trade yet they must be governed to some extent by what was done by their adversaries—and I give the Finance Minister credit for being too good a politican to resist a great popular movement for the resenting and punishing of a line of conduct perpetrated towards us such as has been perpetrated for many years past.

The repressive policy entered upon by the United States in 1866, I wish to say a few words about. I noticed in the 'North American Review' the other day, an article from the Attorney General of Nova Scotia which gave the exports and imports from and to the United States during the period of reciprocity, which will require some revision by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia before he has them just right. When the reciprocity treaty went into operation in 1854, we had the governments of Prince Edward Island, of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick, and of the two Canadas; four different provincial governments, and I have had the returns compiled from the American sources of information and from the Canadian sources, and in the Canadian returns I found it impossible to secure the returns from Prince Edward Island. This, of course, would be inconsiderable and would not materially affect the result. The import and export statistics for the period from 1854 to 1866 inclusive derived from Canadian sources are as follows :

Imports from the United States, 1854 to 1866 inclusive..	$332,927,000
Exports to the United States, 1854 to 1866 inclusive..	259,875,000
Balance of trade in favour of United States..	$ 73,052,000

The American returns for the same period give somewhat different results. According to the American results the imports from all British America, Newfoundland and British Columbia included are as follows :

Imports from the United States, 1854 to 1866 inclusive..	$343,326,000
Exports to the United States, 1854 to 1866 inclusive..	318,760,000
Balance of trade in favour of United States..	$ 34,566,000

The balance of trade by the American returns is $34,566,000 and by the Canadian returns $73,052,000. Now, the American people in abrogating the treaty in 1886 were governed to some extent by the impression that the treaty was working against them; that the balance of trade was against them and in favour of Canada. This was the case in the last year ; it was the case because the notice of the abrogation had been given a year in advance, and there was great pressure to rush into the United States everything that it was possible to get in during the time that was left, before August, 1866. But the operation of the treaty during all the period it was in force was to the advantage of the United States, and gave to that country during that period a substantial balance of trade in its favour—seventy-three millions, according to our returns; thirty-four millions, according to their returns. No reason was given for the abrogation of the treaty, which was really to the advantage of both countries, and would have been more advantageous as the years went by. The abrogation was an act of folly on the part of the United States and an act of unfriendliness as well, and the policy pursued since that time and up to a recent period has been one dictated, in my opinion, by the belief that the inflicting upon us of a repressive policy would drive us into the arms of the republic.

The truth was, Mr. Speaker, that we were obliged to seek new markets. The truth was that the abrogation of the treaty revolutionized the trade of Canada. The truth was that this act of the American government gave a new face to the history of this continent, and turned aside the tide of the forces that were setting powerfully in the direction of bringing these two peoples together, and put in place of these forces other forces that repelled them from each other, and brought them to the position they occupy to-day. In 1866 our direct exports of farm products to Great Britain were $3,544,000, and to the United States, $25,042,000. In 1902 our direct exports of farm products to the United States were $7,694,000, one-third of what they were in 1866, while to Great Britain they were $80,661,000, a twenty-two fold increase during the same period. And so our whole fiscal history was reversed. Now conditions were introduced, conditions which the Americans were not aware of, which they have only recently become aware of. All this time they have been living in a fool's paradise, supposing that we were dependent upon them for a market and that they could exercise the same influence on sentiment in Canada which they did in 1866. Our total export trade last year in animals and their products was $59,161,209; and in agricultural products, $37,152,688, a total of $96,313,897. Of this amount Great Britain took $80,661,501, or 83·7 per cent of the whole amount; the United States, $7,694,478, or eight per cent of the whole amount; and all other countries, $7,967,918, or 8·3 per cent. So that England last year took over four-fifths of our total export of farm products to all the world. This is a condition of things greatly different from what existed in 1866, when the United States took twenty-five millions and Great Britain less than four millions.

Under these conditions it is not surprising that the Canadian farmer has practically forgotten about the American market. The benefits that he enjoyed by free access to that market during the existence of the reciprocity treaty are largely a matter of history to him. He has had no practical lessons of those benefits. He realizes in a sort of abstract way that two markets are better than one, that it could do no harm to have access to the American market, that it would indeed be quite beneficial to him; but he has not that keen desire for access to that market that he would have if he were aware of the conditions that would exist if the restrictions were removed. So that, in debating this reciprocity question to-day, we have to recognize a certain degree of apathy with regard to it existing in Canada as well as in the United States.

We have opposed to this treaty, I think me may say, the manufacturing interest; we have probably opposed to it the transporting interest; and we have opposed to it the political influence which is represented by the people in this country who believe that nothing good can come out of the United States, and who do not want to have anything to do with the Americans. We have in favour of this treaty a sort of passive feeling on the part of the agriculturists, and keen desire for it on the part of the lumbermen and the fishermen. These are the forces arrayed for and against the proposition to secure better trade relations with the United States.

We have some developments of our trade in farm products—for I am dealing with this question largely from the farmer's standpoint—that are rather singular, rather unexpected to those who have never examined the question, and are rather suggestive. Last year, while we exported to the United States $7,694,478 of farm products, we imported from that country for consumption, according to the unrevised list which I have, and which will not be varied very much by the revised list, $15,437,213, or somewhat more than double the amount we exported to that country. Among our imports of agricultural and animal products where our purchases for consumption exceeded our sales to the United States, were the following articles: Corn, oats, wheat, wheat flour, corn meal, oatmeal, seeds, small fruits, tobacco leaf, broom corn, hemp, flax seed, horses, hogs, poultry, eggs, butter, cheese, lard, bacon, hams, salt beef, salt pork, hides, skins, wool, and so forth. All that list of articles we imported from the United States for consumption in excess of our exports to the United States for consumption in that country. Well, that is rather a suggestive list. Very few people would imagine that this country, which was believed to be dependent on the United States for a market, which was supposed to be a suppliant for access to that market, would show such a condition of trade in farm products. But such is the case; so that if we were to adjust the commercial relationship of the two countries upon the basis of free trade in natural products, the advantages would be by no means all on one side. Upon the basis of free trade in natural products the balance advantages would perhaps not be on our side. We have west of the Rocky Mountains, the great province of British Columbia, a productive mining region, which has its most economical source of supply of farm products in Washington and Oregon. We have in the maritime provinces a million people who would derive their food supplies from American territories if they could sell their lumber, potatoes and other articles free of duty there. We have a great market for farm products in the mining and lumber regions of Ontario and Quebec. If natural products were on the free list, and there was free interchange between the two countries of all the products of the farm, the balance of trade would be very slightly, if at all, in favour of the one country or the other.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman's proposition involve that Dakota and Washington Territory should supply British Columbia rather than our own western provinces ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I spoke about Washington and Oregon, and not about Dakota.

Mr. GOURLEY. With reference to Nova Scotia, we would not have the agricultural trash they raise in the United States if it were given to us free.

Mr. CHARLTON. Patriotism would have a good deal to do, of course, with arriving at that decision. Now, after this period of more than thirty years of trade relation such as I have described, we had a culmination of affairs in 1902 in our trade with Great Britain and with the United States, which I will briefly allude to. Last year our total imports from the United States were $129,000,000. In 1866 they were $28,794,000. Last year our total exports to the United States were $71,177,000, and the apparent balance of trade last year in favour of the United States was $58,592,000. Last year our total imports from Great Britain were $49,435,000, and our total exports to that country were $117,320,000, and the balance of trade in favour of Canada was $67,884,000.

But a revised statement of our trade with the United States and our trade with other countries, taking into account the imports and the exports of precious metals, would vary that statement, and it is interesting to hear how our trade with the United States would stand on that basis. Last year we imported from the United States $6,062,000 in coin and bullion, which left our total imports from that country, less this coin and bullion, $123,732,000, and our total exports to the United States were $71,177,000. Our exports of precious metals were :

Coin and bullion	$ 1,635,000
Gold dust and nuggets	19,677,000
Silver and silver ore	2,055,000

Or a total of precious metals of $23,367,000, which, deducted from the total exports, left our exports of domestic products and products not the produce of Canada, $47,829,000. If we deduct the $2,894,000 of exports not produced in Canada, it leaves our exports $44,825,000.

My hon. friend from South Oxford yesterday afternoon, in criticising the statement of the hon. leader of the opposition with regard to this very point, wanted to know what difference there was between the exports of precious metals and farm products and anything else. It was, he said, an exchange of what we wanted to sell for what we wanted to buy, which was true enough. But all the nations treat the precious metals on a different basis from ordinary exports. We raise wheat, corn, bacon, cattle and all the products of the farm for sale. We have to dispose of them. They are raised for that purpose. But gold and silver are quite different in their character, and all the nations are seeking to strengthen their gold reserve. There is not a nation which does not look with disfavour on the exportation of gold. They look at that in quite a different light from the exportation of what they have raised for the express purpose of selling. We may at least make a distinction between the class of products we raise for the purpose of selling and the precious metals, which it might be in our interest to reserve here as a financial basis—a basis for credit and banking, and the various purposes for which gold is used.

After deducting this export of precious metals and counting the $47,829,000 as our actual exports, we have a balance of trade with the United States against us of $75,925,000. That balance of trade has swallowed up our $67,000,000 of favourable balance with Great Britain and left about $8,000,000 to provide for somewhere else. This is not a healthy and desirable condition of trade. The United States, year after year, have had enormous balances of trade in their favour, and the result is they are one of the wealthiest nations in the world ; $600,000,000 is no unusual balance in their favour. I look upon it as disastrous to our interests to permit the present condition to continue.

These tables then present the following salient points : First, we have an enormous expansion of exports of farm products. Next, we find that Great Britain takes over four-fifths of the farm products of this country. We are dependent from Great Britain for the sale of $83 out of every $100 we raise. Next, we find a great shrinkage in the export of farm products to the United States—a shrinkage of two-thirds of the amount exported in 1866. Then we find there has been nearly a five-fold expansion of our import trade from the United States since 1866—from $28,000,000 to $129,794,000. We find next that we have had a stationary export trade with the United States. If we deduct the precious metals we exported to the United States in 1866 including inland short returns, $44,000,000 worth, not including the precious metals we exported last year of the products of Canada, not including precious metals, $44,825,000 worth. So we have on the one hand an import trade from the United States five-fold greater than in 1866, while our export trade to the United States remained at practically the same amount. We find that in the thirty-six years that have elapsed since 1866, we have increased our imports from Great Britain $9,370,000, or 23½ per cent.

It will be interesting to glance for a moment at our free list, which is a large one. It amounted last year to $84,314,877. Of this amount the United States had $60,879,347, of which $6,000,000 was coin and bullion. Now, we must take from the United States raw cotton, anthracite coal, hides probably, flax seed and some other articles.

But we can reduce that free list by one-half if we desire to do so—reduce it to the advantage of our own industries and to the disadvantage of American industries. The United States had 72 per cent of our total free list with the entire world last year—rather favourable treatment of a nation that has treated us as the United States has done for a generation past.

Now, a word or two with regard to the import of manufactures. The question may be raised—it was raised yesterday—of the classification of manufactures imported. In the tables I have referred to, whether the classification is entirely right or not, it is the same in the case of both countries, so that the comparison must be reliable as though something were taken from or something added to the list for each. The following figures show the amount of our imports of manufactures from Great Britain and from the United States for the years given :

IMPORTS OF MANUFACTURES.

	Great Britain.	United States.
1898..	$26,243,651	$41,510,312
1899..	31,187,387	49,362,776
1900..	37,328,311	60,473,221
1901..	36,469,135	62,643,640
1902..	41,675,602	69,536,613

Now, Sir, in the last year, 1902, the manufactures free of duty from Great Britain amounted to $7,988,819, while the manufactures free of duty from the United States amounted to $21,195,092. This latter sum goes to swell that enormous free list of $60,000,000. The increase in our imports of manufactures from Great Britain in the four years I have quoted, amounted to $15,432,000, or 51 per cent, while the increase from the United States was $28,026,000, or 67 per cent. And this increase has gone on, notwithstanding the operation of preferential duties, and the United States manufacturers are obtaining a stronger and stronger hold upon our market, their natural advantages enabling them to do so. And all this time the United States have refused to give us the consideration which our liberality towards them would naturally call for, liberality which they have availed themselves of to bring about the results I have shown.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Charlton's) argument, but I am not quite sure whether he proposes to reduce the amount of free goods coming into Canada by a system of protection or by a system of reciprocity.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not prepared to say what might be done with the free list under a system of reciprocity. But, under a system of protection, with a system under which we should have to meet the same condtions as now exist. I would cut that free list in two, and take off as much more as would be possible. I would be governed at all times, necessarily, by our own interest. If it were our own interest to admit a class of goods free, I would admit it free. We would look at this primarily from the standpoint of what is best for ourselves, and secondarily from the standpoint of how we could convince the American that he had better be ready to grant fair play.

Now, with regard to the rate of duties, in every respect the United States seems to have had advantageous conditions of trade. The duties paid last year upon United States goods amount to $15,155,136. This is 11·75 per cent upon the total import from the United States, or 12·54 per cent on the imports entered for consumption. The duties paid on the imports of British goods for the same year were 17·04 per cent. The duties on the goods from all other countries were 26·5 per cent. The rate on the goods from all countries, including Great Britain and the United States, was 15·26 per cent. The dutiable goods imported from the United States paid an average of 25·18 per cent; the dutiable imports from Great Britain paid an average of 24 per cent, and the dutiable imports from other countries paid an average of 37·79 per cent. This would make the duty on the dutiable imports from Great Britain slightly lower than on those from the United States. The hon. member for South Oxford reminded us last night—and his statement was a correct one—that not all the British imports that were dutiable were given a discrimination of 33⅓ per cent, but that this applied to only about $28,000,000, upon which the duty amounted to about 19 per cent. This is correct. I have only to say, in connection with that, that the reduction of duties under the operation of the thirty-three and one third per cent discrimination to 19 per cent, is about 8 per cent lower than it ought to be. If the discrimination were abolished the duty would go up 8 per cent and the cry we have from our woollen interests of insufficient protection would be ended. We have developed in our argument about this matter the fact that Canada is an excellent customer for the United States. The truth is she is the third largest customer for the general line of exports from the United States, and the largest customer for manufactured goods exported from that country. If we compare our standing in this respect with that of Latin America with its 60,000,000 inhabitants, we shall be somewhat surprised with the result of the scrutiny. Last year the United States exported to Mexico and Central America, with a population of 14,000,000, goods to the amount of $45,924,000. These are countries almost as closely allied to the United States by geography and nature as Canada is. Last year the United States exported to all South America $38,074,000 worth of goods; and to all the West India Islands, Spanish, Danish, Dutch, British, French—this excludes Cuba and Porto Rico—goods to the value of $17,020,000. That is to say, to all this enormous

region from the northern boundary line of Mexico to Cape Horn, embracing every island in the West India group, excepting Cuba and Porto Rico, the United States exported less than she exported to Canada, by no less than $19,796,000. And, excluding the West Indies and including all of Mexico and Central and South America, her exports to these countries were less by $36,814,000 than her exports to Canada. It is beginning to dawn upon the American mind that Canada is a market worth looking after, that it would be well to take into consideration whether they should not examine a little more closely into trade matters between the United States and this most excellent customer to the north of them. We have had a full generation in the life of man of repression, of bad feeling, of hostile tariff legislation—all upon one side nearly. We are now rounding out that period, and we have to see what the culmination of these conditions is.

If these conditions are to continue, what are we to do? First of all, as I imagine, we have to find out whether they are to continue. That is a question of so much importance that we need to make no mistake about it. We want to ascertain what we may settle down upon and rely upon as likely to be permanent conditions; and when we have ascertained that, then our line of conduct, so far as my opinion goes, would be clearly defined. We are either to get fair play from nations now treating us unfairly, or we are to meet them with their own weapons. That may not be profitable for the time being, it may inflict upon us a little inconvenience, it may raise the price of some things a little higher, but in my opinion that is the true policy to pursue. We want to look to ulterior results, and we want to apply ourselves to a line of conduct with something in view that we are aiming for, and that we can only get by asserting our rights.

Again I refer to the significant utterance of the Finance Minister where he states that notwithstanding and whatever his abstract principles may be, we have got to take note of what our customers and surrounding nations do, and have got to be governed to some extent by the course they pursue. Now, as I have said, we have dealt with Germany already. That question was closed up, we knew where we stood, we knew that we had received the most unfair and overbearing treatment from the overlord of that empire. We knew we had to assert ourselves, we have done it, and we have done it like men; and if the overlord wants to adopt a retaliatory policy and exclude our imports from Germany, I would look upon it with serene indifference; we would simply exclude his goods from Canada and inflict eight times as much injury upon that country as we receive in return.

Now, it is necessary to inquire in a discussion of reciprocity: Is reciprocity desirable? Why, if it is not desirable, we do not want to waste any time on it. If it is not desirable we would simply say to the United States when they make us overtures: We don't want to meet you, we don't want any reciprocity. We have decided what we want to do, you go your road and we will go ours; we don't care anything about reciprocity. Would that be a wise course to pursue? Mr. Speaker, this continent, with its seven odd million square miles under the domain of English speaking people, inhabited by 85,000,000 of people speaking the English tongue, this continent has before it vast, almost inconceivable resources of power and possibilities of development. This continent inhabited by English speaking people, will inevitably exercise a potent, if not a controlling, influence upon the affairs of the world. This great region is now in the possession of two branches of that great stock, with an interesting experiment in one branch of it in the fact that one state of its domain is inhabited by people of French extraction. We have most interesting problems before us. There is one thing that we can rely upon, and that is that in the interest of the world at large, in the interest of every man, woman and child, that lives upon this continent to-day, or will live upon this continent in the future, in the interest of all this, it is in the highest degree desirable that the relations between these two states should be amicable, friendly and intimate, and that the seeds of discord that have been sown for the last thirty years should not be allowed to produce their fruit, of disaster, and that influences should be interposed that will avert such result and will bring these two peoples together under conditions of harmony and good feeling.

So much for this continent. Then we have a wider scope of influence for the English speaking people. We have North America with its capabilities of supporting 500 millions of people, and in my opinion it will have that number speaking the English tongue, within the next 150 years. We have in addition the great empire of which we form a part, the empire with its colonies and its influences ramifying the world, the empire upon whose dominions the sun never sets, the empire that stands to-day almost isolated among the nations of Europe. We have the relations of that empire with the United States to take into consideration, a matter of transcendent importance. Sir, the relations existing between Canada and the United States will have an important, and may have a controlling influence upon the relations that will exist between these two great nations. And so when we stand here and say that this is a question of little moment, we don't care whether we have good relations or evil relations, why, we are taking a most shortsighted and purblind view of the great field of future operations. We are taking a view of our own responsibilities which is far beneath the importance that belongs to them. If we can in any way

institute and consummate any policy that will bring together these people, that will put an end to this bickering and animosity, the mutual disregard for each other, these mutual statements of a belittling and insulting character which we see in our press, which are even uttered by our public men, if we can put an end to all this, we shall have accomplished something for humanity, something for the liberty of the world. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I stand for reciprocity. I stand for it because I believe that there is something in it higher than the price of cod fish, than the price of wheat, than the balance of trade. I stand for reciprocity because I believe the infinite possibilities of the future will be promoted and developed by bringing together these two peoples. Well, now, what are the prospects ?

Mr. HEYD. Very poor.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very poor, my hon. friend says. My hon. friend from St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says that we have been working for reciprocity for twenty-five years. Well, I would remind him that he that waits long finally succeeds. You want to exercise patience in waiting. It is true that our applications for reciprocity have not been met with that degree of favour which we would desire. But I have reason to believe that times are changing ; and when our Conservative friends speak slightingly of this, and when they take a position opposed to reciprocity, when they say : You cannot get it, what is the use of trying—I do not sympathize with that position at all. The condition of public opinion in the United States as regards Canada is constantly improving. Those who know the developments of the Joint High Commission, which I am not at liberty to enter upon in detail, know that even then, there was substantial progress made towards the settlement of questions between these two countries, progress that would probably have given us a treaty that we would have considered at that time as satisfactory. That the intervening Alaska question and the indignation of the British commissioners at the course pursued by the United States, broke off those negotiations for the time being, I think was a very fortunate thing for Canada. I believe that when the commisison reassembles, as I assume it will, we shall reassemble under conditions much more favourable to the securing of a desirable treaty than existed when the commission dispersed. I believe that the condition of things has vastly improved, that the Americans have become disabused of their false impressions in regard to Canada, that they understood this country better, that they know that instead of dealing with a little offshoot of the British empire, with an obscure colony, they are dealing with a country possessing the resources of an empire, with a country that will become a vast and powerful state. They are realizing this now. They have seized upon the facts. They were ignorant of these matters because they had never been brought to their attention. The progress of the campaign of instruction instituted three years ago has been most satisfactory and instead of supposing Canada to be a narrow strip of frozen country stretching along their frontier they know now that it is a country of enormous resources, that the isothermal line stretches to Slave Lake and that there are 300,000,000 acres of fertile land, 3,000,000 of which now only are under cultivation. They understand the potentiality of its infinite resources, that this country is about to enter upon the race of progress and run that race not only with giant strides, but with great rapidity, and understanding this—perhaps I may be competent to judge to some extent of the changes in American public sentiment—in my opinion, the time is more propitious than it has been since the making of the treaty of 1854 for securing a treaty with the United States. My hon. friend from St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) thinks, as I read the report of his speech last night, that it is not best to wait for results. The principle of protection he says is too firmly rooted even among the farmers of the United States, to permit us to hope for reciprocity. I would remind him that the reciprocity sentiment has taken firm hold on the great west; that the Republicans of the great Republican state of Iowa, headed by their Governor Cummings, have taken strong ground in favour of radical tariff revision and reciprocity ; that a large share of the Republican votes in other western states share these sentiments, and that the entire Democratic party of the United States vigorously uphold them. Do not lose time, he tells us ; do not wait to see what may be the outcome of these negotiations that are approaching. Proceed at once to state your policy; assume that you know all about it, get your tariff fixed and go ahead ! He says that the right hon. leader of the government had promised to send no more reciprocity delegations to the United States. I do not understand that the Prime Minister has done that. Canada has maintained a most dignified attitude in this matter. When the commission left Washington in 1899 the assertion was made by the Canadian head of that commission, the premier of this country, that Canada was not going back to Washington asking for reciprocity again. He said : We have been seeking for improved trade relations, we know how desirable it is to have an improvement, we know how much these trade relations could be improved, we have exhausted our patience and our resources in the effort to improve them, and if you reach the point where you understand this question and realize that a treaty is desirable, you can intimate that

fact to us. Well, they have done that. My hon. friend from St. Mary's, Montreal, says that Senator Fairbank's letters came very conveniently at this season. What does he mean? Does he mean there is collusion between Senator Fairbanks and the Prime Minister of this country? Does he mean that Senator Fairbanks was employed to write letters to the Prime Minister which give colour to the supposition that the commission might sit again for the purpose of affording the premier and his government a pretext for deferring action on the tariff? Does he mean that? I do not think he does. I do not imagine that he does, but if he does mean that he is entirely mistaken. These advances have come from the American government; they have come from Senator Fairbanks at the instigation of and by the direction of the President of the United States—an intimation and an invitation to the Canadian government to meet the American commissioners again for the purpose of renewing the negotiations that were broken off in February, 1899. Now, shall the commission meet? Is it unnecessary to call this commission together again? Shall we proceed to fix our tariff and ignore the probability, nay, the certainty of this commission meeting when we shall respond to the invitation of the United States. I should say certainly the commission should meet. If the United States have made overtures to us, if they have given us an invitation to renew these negotiations, they have done it for a reason. They have done it because they desire a settlement, they have done it because they realize that the position of matters, as it exists to-day between Canada and the United States, is not desirable and realizing this they ask us to meet them for the purpose of entering upon negotiations looking to the possibility of settlement and adjustment of these questions. We are not warranted in assuming that it is not worth while to accept. The fact that the invitation is given, that it is given in good faith, the very fact that this advance is made by them with the full knowledge of the indignation that exists in this country in regard to their treatment of us, with the full knowledge that we have reason to complain, is a sufficient warrant, in fact an imperative reason, why we should accept the invitation.

Now, if we go down, what should be the proper basis of an arrangement? We might as well discuss this matter pretty fully. What should be the basis of the arrangement we should enter into, because I am sure that the premier would be glad to know something about public opinion as it relates to this matter. What should be the basis of the arrangement in regard to reciprocity between these two countries. I am accused, I have seen the accusation in Conservative papers time and time and again, I have heard the accusation, that in the course of some speeches I made before chambers of commerce, merchants exchanges and bankers' conventions, &c., in the United States, I have made propositions that were detrimental and inimical to the interests of Canada and that I have given away the case.

Mr. GOURLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) says hear, hear. I will tell the hon. gentleman how far I have gone. I have said that reciprocity in natural products, so far as my views go, is an essential feature of any arrangement we may make—no palliatives, no concession upon this thing and upon that but reciprocity in natural products all along the line.

Mr. GOURLEY. It would ruin us in 24 hours.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not at all. If we should get to that point the Americans would ask: What would you give us in return? We will say: We will abstain from changing our tariff so as to apply the process of the strangulation of the import trade in our country. If you give us free trade in natural products we may possibly, in addition to the retention of the moderate features of our tariff, now so favourable to you, abolish the British preference, and make your position under our tariff laws the same as that occupied by Great Britain. My hon. friend can judge as to whether I have given away our case and he can judge as to whether or not we can obtain reciprocity on that basis. It will be advantageous to us. I suppose I may be optimistic on this subject. I have mingled with American public men, with the leading American statesmen, I know the beat of the American pulse, I think the American people realize that they have pursued a fortuitous and absurd policy towards Canada for thirty-five years, they are prepared to adopt a new course, to bring about improved relations between the United States and Canada, and they are prepared to do what is fair to consummate that arrangement. My hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) says it would ruin us in twelve months.

An hon. MEMBER. In twenty-four hours.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, that is rather rapid.

Mr. GOURLEY. That is just a simile, you will understand.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, of course. We fortunately are not left in this matter without some criterion to go by, without some experience to guide us, without some developments in that same line, the results of which may be of service to us, may teach us pretty unerringly what the probable outcome of such a policy would be. When the American union was formed in 1787, it adopted the policy of free trade between the then thirteen states comprising the union and that has continued to be the policy of that nation from that date to this. From time to time new states were added; from

time to time new territory was acquired; finally the bounds of that nation stretched to the Pacific and to the gulf of Mexico and embraced the Mississipi valley; and yet, with all the diversity of climate, of production, of interests that existed in that country, and they are world-wide almost; with all the apparent reasons for protecting one section against another; protecting the farmer of New England where he had to struggle to produce crops, against the farmer of Illinois who had but to tickle the soil with a hoe and it laughed with the harvest; notwithstanding all these diversities of conditions which my hon. friend would say undoubtedly required the intervention of the tariff tinker and the protectionist; notwithstanding all this, that country has lived under free trade for a century and a quarter, has prospered under free trade; this great zollverein extending from ocean to ocean and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian boundary, has prospered as no nation has ever prospered. And to-day the domestic commerce of that country reaches the enormous sum of forty billion dollars, sinking into utter insignificance the foreign trade of any nation in Christendom. That is the result of free trade, of the free interchange of natural products; of all products between all the sections of that nation with all their diversities of climate and conditions.

Now, I would like to know why the same conditions that apply to the forty-five states of the American union cannot be extended to the seven provinces of the Dominion with the same result. Of course we cannot carry it so far; we cannot have absolute free trade—at present at least. We must have a tariff on certain things for revenue, but we can have absolute free trade in the productions of the soil, and to the extent that we reach out towards free trade, to that extent we will share the blessings that that country has derived from the practical operation of this principle.

Mr. CLANCY. That sounds like unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, it does, and unrestricted reciprocity would bring very good material results probably. We are not ready for it but we will go as far as it is prudent and take half of the loaf, and enjoy the prosperity and the blessings that will come from it.

And now with regard to the mutual interchange of natural products which my hon. friend says would ruin us in twenty-four hours, but which of course is a simile. The interchange of natural products in my opinion would produce only the most inconsiderable effect upon the prices in the United States. We want free admission to the American market for our farm products and our lumber and our ores, and for what reason? It is not that we may depress the American prices to the level of our own, but that we may secure the American prices and put the difference between the prices we get now with the duty taken from us and the price we would get then, into our own pockets. That is what we want it for. Our exportation of natural products to the United States is so insignificant and will be so insignificant in comparison with the great bulk of the products for consumption produced in this country, that very little effect can be produced by it. Take for instance the article of eggs. Last year we exported 11,590,000 dozen of eggs and 237,000 dozen of these went to the United States. One hundred and thirty-nine millions and eighty thousand eggs; quite a lot of eggs. We could not increase that export 50 per cent if we were to try. How much would that amount to in the United States. Why, Mr. Speaker, it would amount to less than two eggs per annum for each inhabitant of the United States; one omelette a year. That would have a very disastrous effect on American prices would it not. Why it never would be known; never. I have no time to go into the entire list, but you may go right through the list of farm products that may be exported to the United States for consumption in that country and their relative volume as compared with the production of the United States in the same line of articles would not be greater than in the case of eggs. The whole thing is a bug-bear. The American farmer is frightened about Canadian competition which he has no reason to fear at all. The Canadian farmer, he need not be frightened about American competition because he is a producer and an exporter.

Now with regard to the question we were discussing a moment ago; about the concessions we might make to the United States in return for free trade in natural products. As I said then I repeat now: That I should strenuously take the ground that we should make no more concessions; that we have made all the concessions that can be reasonably asked for. The only thing I would hold out as an inducement would be, not the promise of further concessions, but the assurance that we will withdraw what we have done if we do not get fair play; that in place of a free list of $60,000,000 we will make it $30,000,000; that in place of buying $69,000,000 of manufactures, we would manufacture $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 of them in our own country, and this would be the inducement that the American would need to convince him that he had better adopt the scheme that we propounded.

Mr. GOURLEY. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question?

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly.

Mr. GOURLEY. Why is it necessary for us in this Canadian parliament to be for ever disgracing ourselves by appealing to these people across the way, who have treated us like a lot of desperadoes for the last twenty years?

Mr. CHARLTON. We are not appealing to these people; these people have appealed to us. They have sent us an invitation to meet them; we are talking that over; we are arriving at a decision as to what we shall say when we meet them; how far we shall go and where we will stop.

Mr. GOURLEY. They would kick us from the continent to-day if they could.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have reached that point where they are appealing to us; where they have realized that they are sacrificing their opportunities and have pursued a policy which has not been a just policy, and that the day has come when our own action will deprive them of the advantages they might enjoy unless they give in fair neighbourly treatment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we talk about protection. I am opposed to the sacrificing of any existing interests in Canada. I want to see our manufacturing interests prosperous, and I will go just as far as my hon. friend from Nova Scotia if I cannot get fair play.

Mr. GOURLEY. No you won't.

Mr. CHARLTON. But, I have a broad enough view of this case to realize, that in the United States since 1861 that nation has been constantly and consistently pursuing a policy for building up a home market, and that the result of that policy is that they have created a home market which bears a proportion to their population greater than we could create by the most stringent system of protection in fifty years. Now, Sir, if we could with one stroke of the pens of the commissioners appointed by this country and by the United States, if we could secure access to that market which for fifty years has cost the people of the United States untold millions, would it not be to our advantage to get it. I think it would. I think it would be just as good a scheme as to go through, with all the pain, and sweat, and toil, and blood letting that that nation has gone through since 1861 in creating that market.

And now, Mr. Speaker, a few words about the transportation question and the market situation. We have some very productive wheat fields in the North-west, and a crop of sixty million bushels was garnered last year from less than one hundredth part of the area of that country adapted to the growth of that grain.

Now, we are confronted with the problem, how we are to afford that country an outlet to the markets of the world, and whether we shall throw any impediments in the way of the producers of that country reaching any market they may desire. The western farmer will raise wheat for sale, and, like a shrewd business man, he will want to sell that wheat wherever he can find a customer. He will be able shortly to raise all the wheat that he can find customers for; so that it would be the height of folly to interfere with his efforts to reach any market he desires to reach. We want to secure the carrying trade of that country, but it is incumbent upon us to endeavour to do so by fair competition. We do not want to resort to export duties or other unjustifiable repressive measures, in order to force the volume of the productions of the North-west through particular channels. There are going to be hundreds of thousands of settlers from the United States in that country, and they will naturally resent the idea that they cannot sell wheat wherever they can find a sale for it. They will not have the prejudice which my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) entertains against dealing with Americans. They will know that the friends they left across the line are of the same blood as the people of the country they inhabit, and they will want to trade with them, because it will be to their advantage to do so.

Now, Sir, there are several reasons why we had better let them do so. In fact, we cannot prevent it, unless we impose arbitrary restrictions of some kind, such as export duties. The Americans have the game in their own hand. They can remove the duty on grain, and in my opinion they will shortly do it. The western miller desires access to our sources of supply. I am told that the millers at Minneapolis can handle forty million bushels of Manitoba and western wheat.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you aware that the mills at Minneapolis have stopped grinding ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am aware of that, but the little difficulty about freight rates will be adjusted before long, and if not, they can send the wheat down to Buffalo. This wheat will be wanted by the millers at Minneapolis, or wherever they may be, first, to mix it with the softer grades grown in the United States, because it will be necessary to have a certain percentage of Manitoba hard wheat for that purpose. Then, the American milling interest want access to that market for the purpose of stiffening prices—for the purpose of introducing there the system that is in force in the United States. American millers tell me that wheat from Canada and Argentina, when it goes to market must be sold, as there are no facilities for holding it. They are constantly met by competition of this kind, which lowers prices ; and they want to get into this market with their hundreds of millions of capital for the purpose of competing with the Canadian buyer, for the purpose of buying the grain at higher prices than it would otherwise command, in order that they may hold that grain or the flour into which it is ground until they are ready to sell it ; in that way controlling the market, and preventing repressive bear operations, which tend to bring about lower prices. In both of these cases it is the interest of the North-west and in the interest of Canada that they should get into that market. For

these reasons, free trade in wheat and the introduction of American competition in the purchase of wheat in the North-west, would be worth more to the producers in that country than the removal of the British preference of four per cent in their favour.

The present value of the American market, aside from wheat, is relatively small; but its prospective value is almost limitless. Changing conditions in the United States are worthy of consideration. First of all, there is the gradual failure of their wheat lands. I can remember the time when the chief crop of Illinois was wheat, when enormous shipments were made, when the elevators of Chicago were bursting with the products of the Illinois wheat fields. To-day there is not enough wheat raised in Illinois to provide bread for one-half the inhabitants of the state. The farmers have gone out of the business; their wheat fields have become exhausted; their crops are of another kind. The same holds good with regard to Iowa, with its two and a half millions of inhabitants. The same will soon hold true of Minnesota, of the two Dakotas, of Kansas. The wheat production of these states is diminishing, the soil is becoming exhausted; and while the wheat production of the United States is growing less and less, the population of the country is rapidly increasing, and the urban population out of all proportion to the rural population. Take, for instance, the North Atlantic division, as it is called—comprising the states of New England, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, with a total population, according to the last census, of twenty-one millions. Of this population 13,600,000 are in towns of 4,000 inhabitants and over. In the state of New York, out of a population of 7,268,000, 5,176,000 live in towns of 4,000 inhabitants or over. Here, Mr. Speaker, are these vast centres of population, five millions and more in the single state of New York, thirteen and one-half millions in the North Atlantic division, living in towns of 4,000 and upwards, and the population rapidly increasing, and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec nearer to those centres of population than any other producing region on the continent. To reach these centres the farmers of Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa, have either to cross our territory or to go past it on the south side of the lake; and our North-western farmers will have just as good facilities for reaching those centres as the American farmers of the far west. This is a question the importance of which we only begin to realize when we come to study it carefully, in the light of all the facts; not taking the superficial view that some take, or the prejudiced view of those who think it is beneath the dignity of a Canadian to deal with an American at all; but looking at the facts from a common sense standpoint, with a realization of the great possibilities that lie before us in the near future. The United States will soon become a food importing nation, its vast manufacturing interests are being developed with wonderful rapidity, its urban population is increasing out of all proportion to its rural population, and the time is near at hand when that country will require from Canada or other countries, a portion of its food supply. These two countries are geographically one. Our North-west is geographically a portion of the Mississippi valley.

Mr. GOURLEY. I deny that.

Mr. CHARLTON. The province of Quebec is geographically as nearly allied to the New England states as to the mouth of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. GOURLEY. The United States is geographically an annex of Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. The province of Ontario has its nearest route to the sea across American territory.

Mr. GOURLEY. No man who studies the map would make such a statement. Study the map of North America, and you will find that the United States is geographically an annex of Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then the annex has got a little ahead of the main body. The two countries, I repeat, are geographically one.

Mr. GOURLEY. Never.

Mr. CHARLTON. The very boundaries between the two countries for a part of the distance which separate them, by the impediment of physical nature, serve to bind them together as a great highway of commerce from the point where the St. Lawrence reaches the American territory, to Duluth. Our North-west is geographically a part of the Mississippi valley, a part of the same country that sweeps up from the Mississippi to the Arctic ocean, a great continental slope to the north without interruption of mountain range, and which can be reached most conveniently and economically by railway communication from the head of Lake Superior at Duluth and from St. Paul and Chicago. This being the case there are these great natural resources which invite communication, which invite trade, and which invite the breaking down of the barriers that exist between the two countries, and the absurd prejudices, such as are entertained by my hon. friend who interrupted me a few minutes ago. There is in progress at present a great movement for interesting American capital in industrial and financial operations in the Dominion. I have friends in the west. I hear from them frequently, and I learn that the movement which is set on foot for removal to the Canadian North-west promises to become an exodus. I hear that the banks of Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota and the Dakotas are being depleted of their deposits by men who

are investing this money in the Canadian North-west. Those who can sell their Illinois farms for $100 an acre, their Iowa farms for $70 an acre, and their Kansas and Nebraska farms for $40 or $50 an acre, and invest this money in the Canadian North-west in land equally as good or better at $5 or $10 an acre, are appreciating the advantages of that exchange. They are selling their lands and flocking to our North-west by the thousands. They are a class of settlers who understand the conditions and are familiar with the work they have to perform. They have gone through the experience once and can go through it again. And a farmer with a half a dozen sons, can sell his farm in the United States, and with the proceeds give each of his sons just as large a farm in Canada as the one he left. I tell you, Sir, we are having a movement in the investment of American capital in our country of which we do not realize the magnitude. And we want to place ourselves in a position to promote and avail ourselves of the results of this movement, and nothing will promote it more rapidly than the adoption of reciprocity between the two countries. Our vast resources are attracting attention. The period of narrowness and exclusiveness and bitterness and ignorance, which characterized certain portions of the public in both of these countries is passing away, and in place of it is coming a broader spirit, a Catholic spirit, a spirit of toleration, a spirit of mutual conciliation which will bear excellent results in the interests of both countries. New conditions, vast possibilities confront us. We hardly stop to realize their magnitude. When this North-west, where hundreds of thousands are to settle in the near future, with its three hundred millions acres of arable land, of which three millions are now under cultivation, this North-west that can increase its production a hundred-fold—when the resources of this country are developed, when its fields wave with harvests, when its surface is covered by farms and towns and cities, then we will see the fruition of the promise we have to-day, and those who have the prescience to look into the future with a comprehension of what is coming, will see their dreams realized, and a great nation established on the northern portion of this continent. We will then look back to the past—if we live to see that day—and wonder at the narrowness and littleness and bitterness displayed by people in the old days before the broad horizon had opened before them. Nevertheless, so long as the present American tariff conditions continue, this rosy picture will not be realized as soon as it otherwise would. If we cannot get a treaty such as I think we can, we have simply to do what I said would be the alternative. We have simply to mould into shape our own resources, work out our own destiny, and build up as we best may the superstructure of our own nation. And whatever may be the outcome, whether we get that mitigation of trade conditions which we hope for, or whether we find that these trade conditions are to be perpetuated, I do not apprehend that we will find Liberals in this House seriously disagreeing. There is a good deal of latitude of opinion allowed here, and the government, while it permits this, will in my opinion, be confronted by a condition of things that will result in popular demand of such volume and potency in connection with this question of trade relations as will lead the government to bow to the wishes of the people. We will mould our course by the developments that are confronting us, that are near at hand, and I repeat, I approve most highly the course of the government in waiting the development of events, in waiting the few months that will enable us to judge definitely and absolutely what is the proper course to be taken. Canada desires to participate in the commercial activities of this continent. If we can obtain this privilege we shall have to shape a destiny of our own. The parting of the ways is just ahead. Providence will decide the matter. We cannot tell what the decision will be, or upon which of the paths we shall enter, whether upon the path of participation of the benefits of free and liberal trade relations covering Anglo-Saxon America, or the path of exclusion, imitation of the policy of the other country, and retaliation upon them for what they have perpetuated and imposed upon us. Let us await the future calmly, resolutely, if you will, without fear or care as to what the result shall be, determined that we will be governed by those conditions and developments, and will view from a patriotic standpoint whatever, in our belief, the necessity of our country requires from us in the line of action.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, it is now half past five o'clock, and I must ask the right hon. leader of the House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to allow me to move the adjournment of the debate, in order that I may be first on Thursday.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 23, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) presented the fourth report of the select committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the Debates of the House, as follows :—

Your Committee recommends that Mr. Leon Gerin be appointed to the position on the staff of translators in the official reports of Debates rendered vacant by the death of the late N. H. Beaulieu, and that his appointment and remuneration of $1,500 per annum date from the 23rd instant. Also that Mr. Sylva Clapin who has been employed in a temporary capacity on the staff of the translators from the 16th to the 23rd instant, be paid at the rate of $4 per day.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 121) to incorporate the Consolidated Trust Corporation.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 122) respecting the Rathbun Company.—Mr. Heyd.

QUESTIONS.

SADDLES AND BRIDLES FOR LAST CONTINGENT.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who had the contract for furnishing saddles and bridles to the last Canadian contingent for South Africa ?
2. What was the price stipulated in the said contract ?
3. What is the total amount paid to the contractors ?
4. Were any complaints made as to the quality of said saddles and bridles ?
5. Were said saddles and bridles used by the contingent ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) :

1. There was no contract. The saddles were furnished from store, and drawn from the units of cavalry throughout the country.

2 and 3. Answered by answer to question 1.

4. I am not aware of any complaints as to the quality of the saddles.

5. So far as I know, the saddles and bridles were used by the contingents.

MEDALS FOR THIRD CANADIAN MOUNTED RIFLES.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

Is it the intention of the government to award medals to the members of the Third Canadian Mounted Rifles, in recognition of their services of loyalty to the empire, in going to Cape Town, S.A., and there received orders to proceed to Durban, where they arrived too late to disembark by the 31st of May, the time set as the medal limit ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). The government has no power to award medals ; medals are awarded by the King. With reference to this particular case, I may say that all the Canadian soldiers who served in South Africa will be treated precisely as the soldiers from the British Islands and from the other colonies are treated.

LOWER AND UPPER GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

Who is the contractor for carrying the mail between Lower and Upper Gagetown, N.B. ? What is the amount paid the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). In the absence of the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) I beg to answer the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Wilmot's) question as follows : There is no special contract for mail service between lower and upper Gagetown. Upper Gagetown and Gagetown along with other offices are served during the season of navigation by the Star Line Steamship Company plying between Fredericton and St. John. During the winter season upper Gagetown is served tri-weekly from Gagetown, J. W. Dickie, contractor ; also tri-weekly from Oromocto by an extension of the Oromocto and Sheffield route, J. W. Malone, contractor. Lower Gagetown is served daily on the route between Gagetown and Westfield, W. H. Bulyea, contractor.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. C. E. SAUNDERS.

Mr. TALBOT—by Mr. Calvert—asked :

1. Has Mr. C. E. Saunders been appointed to the position of experimentalist at the Central Experimental Farm ?
2. Is he a son of Mr. Saunders, director of the Central Experimental Farm ?
3. When was the appointment made ; and what salary does Mr. C. E. Saunders receive ?
4. Who recommended him, and who appointed him ?
5. What was Mr. C. E. Saunders' occupation up to the time of his appointment as experimentalist ?
6. Has Mr. Saunders given any evidence of his qualifications as a scientific and experienced agriculturist ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) I beg to answer the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Talbot's) question as follows :

1. The Minister of Agriculture authorized the employment of Dr. C. E. Saunders to take charge of the work of cereal breeding and other branches of experimental work in agriculture at the Central Experimental Farm.

2. He is a son of Dr. William Saunders, Director of Dominion Experimental Farms.

3. His regular employment in his present capacity dates from January 1st, 1903, and his salary is $100 per month.

4. His employment was authorized by the Minister of Agriculture, who was personally familiar with the work he had already done in the cross-breeding of cereals and fruits.

5. He was transferred to this work from the exhibition branch of the Department of Agriculture, where he had been engaged in preparing a series of agricultural photographs for the Japanese and St. Louis exhibitions.

6. Dr. C. E. Saunders is an honour graduate and silver medalist of Toronto University in the department of natural science, and a doctor of philosophy of the science department of Johns Hopkins University. For some years past he has been employed at intervals at the Central Experimental Farm to carry on the work of cross-breeding in cereals and in hardy fruits for the Northwest, and during this period most of the new varieties originated at the farm have been the result of his efforts.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. SCOTT—by Mr. McCreary—asked :

1. What is the particular mileage of railways (a) in the North-west Territories ; (b) in Manitoba, which has been aided (c) by land grants; (d) by money grants, and the particular mileage which has been constructed without public aid ?

2. What is the total mileage of railways in Canada, excepting Manitoba and the Territories, which has been aided (a) by land grants ; (b) by money grants, and the total mileage which has been constructed without public aid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Mileage of railways in North-west Territories :

Constructed by aid of land grants.... ..	1,921.21
Constructed by aid of money grants...	1,336.70
Constructed without public aid..	57.97

Mileage of railways in Manitoba :

Constructed by aid of land grants.... ..	1,576.30
Constructed by aid of money grants....	1,624.81
Constructed without public aid..	35.07

2. Mileage of railways in Canada, excepting Manitoba and North-west Territories :

Constructed by aid of land grants.. ..	2,421.00
Constructed by aid of money grants..	13,685.00
Constructed without public aid..	777.00

LANDS GRANTS TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. SCOTT—by Mr. McCreary—asked :

1. What are the names of all railway companies to which grants of land have been voted by parliament ?

2. What is the area voted to each ?

3. What is the railway mileage so aided by land grants, constructed by each company (a) in Manitoba ; (b) in the North-west Territories; (c) in other portions of Canada ?

4. What is the area earned by each company?

5. What is the area reserved for each (a) in Manitoba ; (b) in the North-west Territories ?

6. What is the area patented to each (a) in Manitoba ; (b) in the North-west Territories?

7. With respect to lands reserved for, earned and selected by each company, what is the area remaining unpatented in each case (a) in Manitoba ; (b) in the North-west Territories ; (c) the date on which it is intended in each case that these lands shall be patented ?

8. With respect to the lands voted, but not earned, what is the area in each case which may yet, under existing legislation, be earned ; and the area in each case, respecting which the time specified for the earning of the land has elapsed ?

9. With respect of lands voted and earned, but not reserved for selection, if any, what is the area in each case ?

10. With respect of lands voted and not earned, but which may, under existing legislation, be earned, what is the area reserved in each case, if any, (a) in Manitoba ; (b) in the North-west Territories ; (c) description of the same, if any, by township, range, &c.?

11. With respect of lands earned and reserved, but not selected, what steps, if any, have been, or are to be, taken by the government to expedite selection ?

12. What is the area now reserved in each case, if any, for companies that have failed to earn their grants within the time specified, under existing legislation ; and the intention of the government regarding such cases ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I shall have to ask my hon. friend to move for a return.

IMPORTATIONS OF BAUXITE.

Mr. ROBINSON (Northumberland)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

How many tons of bauxite were imported into Canada for the fiscal year ending June, 1902 ? What country, or countries, was it imported from ? What port, or ports, was it entered at ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). The quantity of bauxite imported into Canada during the fiscal year 1902 amounted to 1,524 tons. The countries from which imported, were Great Britain 234 tons, Germany 639 tons and United States 651 tons. One thousand and thirty-five tons of bauxite were imported at Montreal and 489 tons at Quebec.

SOUTH AFRICA AND THE PREFERENCE.

Mr. McCREARY asked :

1. Has the government received from the Winnipeg Board of Trade a copy of the following resolution, passed by that body, in reference to trade with the South African Colonies ?

'Whereas it has been stated in the public press that a proposal for preferential treatment in the customs tariff of the British South African colonies, in favour of the mother country, was favourably received at the conference lately held at Bloemfontein ; and whereas the Dominion of Canada accords such preference, not only to the mother country, but also to such of the colonies as will accede such preferential treatment to the products of Canada. Therefore, be it resolved, that the Winnipeg Board of Trade desires to impress upon the government of the Dominion the importance of at once opening negotiations with the government of the British South African colonies, with the object of obtaining the benefit of a like preferential treatment for Canada, as may be accorded to the mother country.'

2. Has the government sent any reply to said Board of Trade in reference to said resolution; and what was the tenor of such reply ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes ; the communication has been received and acknowledged.

IMPORTATION OF RAILWAY TIES.

Mr. EMMERSON—by Mr. Calvert—asked :

1. Is the government now importing, or intending to import, hard pine, or southern pine (so-called) railway ties, for use on government railway ? Have any such importations already been made, and when ?
2. If so, what quantity of such ties, and from what country, or countries, have such importations been made, or are being made ?
3. What is the cost of such ties, delivered to the railway, on board cars ?
4. What are the sizes of such ties, either already imported, or intended to be imported ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The government is not now importing, nor has it arranged to import or decided to import, hard pine or southern pine (so called) railway ties for use on the government railways.

COST OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. JAMES J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say a word or two in reference to a question answered in this House on the 8th instant, concerning which, perhaps, the Minister of Railways will make an explanation. On the day referred to the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) asked the following question :

What is the total cost (capital account) of the Intercolonial and other government railways ? What is the total amount of money paid by the federal government as subsidies to railways in each of the following provinces :— Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, North-west Territories, and British Columbia, since confederation ?

To this the hon. Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) answered :

The total cost (capital account) of the Intercolonial and other government railways to February 28th, 1903, is as follows : Intercolonial Railway, $69,418,275.54 ; Prince Edward Island Railway, $5,112,435,27.

The question having been asked in the form it was, I think the Minister of Railways could not answer it in any other way than as he did. But it should be understood that the amounts given here include the amounts spent by the provinces as well as the amounts spent by the government of the Dominion of Canada. Without that explanation, the answer as it stands might give an incorrect impression to the House and the country, and also to the hon. member for Saskatchewan. There was a large amount of money spent by the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia on the Intercolonial Railway before confederation, and this was charged to these provinces at the time of confederation. The Prince Edward Island Railway was built by the people of the island, and paid for by them before confederation, the cost being $3,114,-735.11, and that amount is included in the amount given by the minister in the answer I have quoted. The actual money paid by the Dominion government for the Prince Edward Island Railway was $1,997,700.16. I wish to ask the Minister of Railways to make that explanation, because, as I have said, the form in which the question was asked brought out an answer which, unexplained, might be misleading.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, P.E.I.), is entirely correct in the statement he has made with reference to the amount of money which was expended by the respective provinces through which the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway ran at the time of confederation. I think that must explain why those answers were given in reply to the question. The statement which was read by me was handed to me by the officer of the department in the usual way, and was entirely in keeping with the published capital statements that have been put forward from time to time. This has been the uniform method in which the accounts of what is called the capital expenditure upon the road have been tabulated and have been published in the report of the Department of Railways and Canals from the beginning. It is true, as the hon. member has said, that there was expended upon the Prince Edward Island Railway prior to confederation the sum of $3,114,000. This amount was a portion of the indebtedness of the province at the time it entered confederation. It was allowed to enter confederation with an admitted debt of a certain sum, and whatever might be the difference between its acknowledged existing obligations and the sum which was allowed it by way of credit in debt account, was applied either to new capital expenditure by provinces, or would entitle the province to be paid interest on such difference at the rate authorized in the account, viz., 5 per cent. Practically, I think, the statement as given then and the capital account as published now are correct. It shows just what the total capital expenditure was upon these two different roads. It would be misleading to conceal the fact that there had been this large capital expenditure made before confederation. I do not know how it could be very well stated in a more explicit way than it appears in the published report, because the inference is clear, when you read that the government expenditure prior to confederation was so much, it manifestly could not have been an expenditure made by the Dominion government in a

direct way. It was already made by the provinces, and if made by the provinces, of course it would be an account to be adjusted between the provinces and the Dominion subsequently to that date.

THE BRITISH CORN DUTIES.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. the First Minister, if he can give the House any information as to the abolition of the corn duties in the imperial parliament, if the abolition applies to all corn and grain imported into the United Kingdom, or only to grain imported from the colonies. I believe a cable has been received to the effect that some action has been taken in the imperial parliament respecting such duties.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We have received no information up to this moment.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance.

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. J. CLANCY (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I do not imagine that it will be necessary for any hon. gentleman on either side of the House to offer any apology for making some criticism upon the budget speech delivered by the Minister of Finance, nor upon the speeches that have followed by hon. gentlemen opposite in support of the position taken by the Minister of Finance. I confess, Sir, as I am sure almost every hon. gentleman in this House must confess, that the speech of the hon. Finance Minister was somewhat disappointing. True, it was not disappointing in that part of it which relates to successful tax gathering, it was not disappointing in regard to enormous and barren expenditures, it was not at all disappointing with regard to the increasing public debt; nor was it wanting in those respects which drew from hon. gentlemen opposite lusty cheers over the inconsistencies of their leaders.

Before I proceed further, I wish to make some remarks about the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He made a very able speech from his standpoint. The hon. gentleman is well known in this House as an old parliamentarian, a gentleman of admitted ability—I am not quite sure that it has always been well directed. But no one can deny that the hon. gentleman is possessed of great ability. I wish in the outset to congratulate the hon. gentleman on maintaining his splendid record of inconsistency, of facing every way that is known, and in fact of facing ways in advance that no person knows anything of. I am not sure but that the hon. gentleman was selected to make that speech ; I am informed he was selected by the First Minister to speak just at that juncture. I am not certain but that the hon. gentleman was selected on account of his inconsistency. Under the conditions that now obtain in this House it was desirable that an hon. gentleman should speak just then so that no matter what he said members on that side of the House could at least quote him against himself, even if he had said something quite the opposite. But the hon. gentleman occupies a very important position in this country. Next to being a minister of the Crown, the hon. gentleman probably occupies the most important position of any man in this House in that he was selected by his leader as one of the Canadian delegates to take part in the international commission who had to deal with grave and important affairs affecting Canada. The hon. gentleman served on that commission, I have no doubt, with his usual ability. Now, Sir, I repeat that I have the best reasons for knowing, in fact I do know, that that hon. gentleman was selected to speak at that particular juncture at the special request of the Prime Minister. Whatever may be said of the hon. gentleman's inconsistencies, it must be admitted that the hon. member for North Norfolk, who had been a member of that commission, was not speaking his own mind alone when he addressed this House, the statements he made were not merely his own inventions ; and the country will understand that he spoke the mind of those hon. gentlemen who are his associates, including the mind of the right hon. the First Minister.

I shall now, with the permission of the House, have something to say with regard to the hon. gentleman's attitude upon that and some other questions. He started out with a renewal of the old campaign of unrestricted reciprocity. There is absolutely no mistake as to the position he has taken. He has taken the position that will at least appeal to one section of Canada, whether it appeals to another section or not. In order that I may make no mistake, I will quote some of his words. He declared that when the delegates went to Washington on the reassembling of that commission, their object was to secure, if possible, reciprocity with the United States. The hon. gentleman pointed to the advantages of reciprocity with the United States. What was the very first prominent advantage which he held out to the people of Canada ? It was that the province of British Columbia should look to Oregon and Washington as the places where they could get their supplies. Then, the hon. gentleman turned to the east and told the people of the maritime provinces to look to the state of New York, or to the state of Maine, in order to get their supplies. It is not difficult to translate that language into

plain English and the true translation is that those two sections of Canada were to look to the United States for a market. The hon. gentleman seems to have two schemes. I have no doubt both of his schemes have been thought out and discussed with his leaders, and I am perfectly sure, from the trend of his speech, that they were well and intimately discussed with hon. gentlemen representing the North-west Territoris. One was that the hon. gentleman was to ask for reciprocity with the United States, and failing in that the next course was to be the adoption of a retaliatory tariff. The House, I am sure, is somewhat at a loss as to which of these the hon. gentleman thought would be the more successful, but the one that seemed to please the hon. gentleman most, himself, was that we were to adopt a system of reciprocity. What else did he hold out to these hon. gentlemen from the west? Let me say here that I have no doubt that of all the speeches delivered in this House during the session, copies of the hon. gentleman's speeches will be printed and distributed amongst hon. members from the North-west and Manitoba and among the western people more than the speeches of any hon. member.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. I hope my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) from down by the sea who says 'hear, hear' and gives his approval to the ideas of the hon. gentleman will go down and apologize for the opinions of his colleague who sits beside him. I am not going to say that all of the members from the North-west are going to take the course which I have suggested, but these speeches are delivered for the purpose of appealing to those who are coming into Canada today. We are told that what the farmers of the west want is access to the American market because they could get the best price for their wheat.

Mr. COCHRANE. Nonsense.

Mr. CLANCY. True, it is nonsense, but nonsense sometimes has an effect. Very often nonsense is more serious than truth because it is more difficult to meet nonsense than truth. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has, nevertheless, made use of such language. He has told the farmers that if they could get reciprocity with the United States the wheat market of the United States would be infinitely better for them than the British market. The hon. gentleman tells us that if we had reciprocity with the United States the question of a market for the farmers of the North-west is solved. He knows perfectly well that that country is rapidly settling and that the greater number of settlers who are going in there now are Americans, a class of men whom we all welcome to this country, a class of men who have been brought up and who have lived under institutions similar to our own, but a class of men who are Americans and not Canadians. Does the hon. gentleman wish to cultivate a Canadian spirit or an American spirit? Does he mean to say that the people of western Canada are to turn their faces towards the United States? He went so far as to say that geographically the west was part of the United States, that it was part of the great Mississippi valley, and he told the people of that country that insofar as they were geographically concerned they did not belong to Canada, but that they belonged to the United States and that they must look to the United States for their supplies, that their wants must not be supplied by Ontario and the maritime provinces, but by the Americans who live adjacent. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, when he is making that appeal to a false and un-Canadian sentiment in this country, when he is endeavouring to tell the people that they are infinitely better off in the United States commercially and politically, perhaps, for all I know, because that is the trend of his argument, what we are improving our waterways for, what are we improving our railways for, what are we spending large sums of money to improve Canadian transportation for, if the great stream of Canadian wheat produced in Manitoba and the North-west Territories is to be diverted to the United States? Is that expenditure to be of any use if the plans of the hon. gentleman are carried out? I have very grave doubts if hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to go so far as to say that we are to have one Canada west of Lake Superior, and another east of Lake Superior. I think no more dangerous doctrine could be enunicated in this country. No man is less affected, perhaps, than I am, by what may be called false sentiment, but, this is no false sentiment; it is a danger to Canada and the hon. gentleman who is giving utterance to such ideas takes upon himself a grave responsibility.

This leads me now to the position of the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in regard to the re-assembling of the International Commission. The right hon. gentleman has given us, in clear and distinct language, what he thinks should be, and what I should judge he very well knows, will be the position of the Canadian delegates when the commission meets. But, is there not a question whether the commission should meet at all? Is the government in a position now to retrace its steps, to violate the pledge which was solemnly given more than once by the right hon. gentleman to this House? What was the pledge which the hon. gentleman gave to this House? Why, Sir, when that commission met and they were unable to agree the House and the country approved of the position which the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues took upon that occasion. These hon. gentlemen took a course that every true Canadian supported and applauded. What was the position which they took? The Americans laid down such

conditions for the settlement of the Alaska boundary question and in regard to other questions at issue, and which were discussed by the commission, as to make it utterly impossible for any self-respecting ministry in Canada or elsewhere to accept these conditions. What were the conditions? There were two important and distinct conditions laid down. In one instance the American commissioners insisted that if it were found that by friendly negotiation they were unable to come to a conclusion in regard to the Alaska boundary question, and it was left to arbitration there should be six commissioners, three upon each side, and that there should be no umpire. To that the right hon. gentleman stated in this House more than once that he objected, that he thought, and he gave several reasons for his opinion, that it would be impossible to arrive at any decision or to secure a settlement of the question upon that basis. Another condition laid down by the American commissioners was that in the event of the Lynn canal and the establishments being found by the arbitration to be in Canadian territory they were still to remain a part of the United States notwithstanding any such finding. The right hon. gentleman and his colleagues very properly rejected that proposition. Well, Sir, that condition was so absurd, so absolutely at variance with reason and common sense that no man could entertain it for a single moment on any ground whatever, but we are told by the right hon. gentleman that the Americans have receded from that position and that therefore the question, at least so far as that is concerned, has been somewhat solved. I ask the right hon. gentleman if the recession of the American people from the most absurd proposition that was ever made in regard to any international arbitration is one that will be thought of advantage to Canada in any sense whatever or one that the British government should take advantage of? Such a contention was absolutely at variance with any idea of settling such an international question, and there is no thanks to the American government for having abandoned it, because there was never any rhyme nor reason for setting it up. We are to have an Alaskan boundary commission, and I venture to say in advance that there is no possibility of any decision being arrived at. I believe that the American people are simply temporizing in order to find out what the mind of the Canadian people is. And, as to reciprocity with the United States, what was the position of the right hon. the First Minister upon that question in its earlier stages. In 1899 ('Hansard,' page 1061), he said:

> My mouth is closed on the subject and I cannot speak but there has been a statement made officially by the foreign office coming from the commission itself which has given to the public why we could not agree. The American commissioners did not want to have an umpire. They wanted to have three commissioners on one side and three on the other side. To this we could not agree because such an arrangement would not give us a definite settlement of the question. They also wanted it agreed that if the establishments they made at the head of the Lynn canal were found to be in Canadian territory they would continue to remain part of their own territory. We could not agree to that.

Well, every Canadian will agree in that sentiment. And speaking further the right hon. gentleman said:

> We came to the conclusion after giving the matter our best thought that the only rule which could be adopted in the position of things which existed in that distant part of the country were the rules so recently adopted for the settlement of the Venezuelan question.

The right hon. gentleman was firm in his decision at that date. He went on to say:

> I have only to say this, however, that the attitude which we have taken has the approbation of the people of Canada generally and it is an attitude which must and will be maintained to the end.

I ask the right hon. gentleman now, if he proposes to give away the case of Canada. Does he propose to maintain to the end the policy he announced here. Does he not think that it is giving away the case of Canada when he consents to an international commission on which there is to be no umpire, and which in all human probability cannot come to a just decision. I ask the right hon. gentleman if he and his friends are prepared to go to Washington now to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States when he has already declined in expressed terms to do any such thing. In the face of his declaration, I ask the right hon. gentleman if he thinks there is now any use whatever in going to Washington to try and negotiate a reciprocity treaty. I was going to say that the right hon. gentleman is in a humiliating position. Perhaps there is some truth in the statement made by a member in this House a few nights ago when he said that the letters that have passed between the Prime Minister and Mr. Fairbanks are a mere piece of theatricals, and that the whole thing was arranged for the purpose of impressing this country with the view that the Americans were seeking to have the commission reassemble to discuss reciprocity. Read that statement of the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in connection with the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and in connection with the position of the First Minister when he came back from Washington disappointed as every Canadian was disappointed—not disappointed with the efforts of our Canadian delegates but disappointed with the barren results which must follow any discussion with a set of gentlemen who seem to have no reason on

their side. Let me point to what the right hon. gentleman said about the commission when he came back in 1899. Here are his words :

I have no right to speak of what took place in the commission, but I have a right to refer to what is now in the minds of the Canadian people, and if we know the hearts and minds of our people at present I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity.

I ask the right hon. gentleman now if he has changed his mind upon that subject. I ask him what he thinks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who has two policies up his sleeve, one for a hostile tariff against the United States and the other for reciprocity, and he is quite indifferent which he gets so long as he gets one of them. Then we have the Minister of Finance facing in another direction and holding out some comfort to the people who are looking for a revision of the tariff. In view of all this, is it not quite apparent to every man who reads between the lines that the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was quite right when he said : That this is all a piece of by play to deceive the public. It is quite evident that the government wants to run an election under two flags. They will go to the people of the west and say : We will give you reciprocity with the United States and you can sell your wheat in the United States so that you need not be troubled about the congestion of the railways which prevents your products from being carried to the market. And then they will make another appeal to the people this side of Lake Superior and they will say to them : There will be no further concessions made to the United States; England will remove the tax upon breadstuffs in our favour and you will get your goods into the British market on better terms than the people of other countries. Is that not a fair reading of the whole subject, that hon. gentlemen stand in the position to-day of refusing to go either forward or backward, but are simply asking the people to wait for a revision of the tariff ? But there is danger of the people of this country being deceived on that subject now as they have been deceived in the past. When we have hon. gentlemen opposite supporting the government in all their contradictory positions, may we not conclude that that will be continued ? We have ministers of the Crown charged in this House by one who was but recently their colleague, with having deliberately gone to the manufacturers in Montreal in 1896, with the consent of the First Minister and his colleagues, and telling them in unmistakable terms that they need not fear any tariff revision that would injure them, but that they would have such a tariff revision as would give them greater advantages than they had at that time. That charge was made by a gentleman who holds not an inconsequential position in this country, but by one who knows the hearts and minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, the late Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). He did not mention names, though he said that some of them were in the House when he spoke, but the names are well known. When that charge of duplicity was made against ministers, what did we find ? We found the right hon. First Minister, instead of rising in his place and repudiating the charge, asking my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to get up and make a speech on reciprocity. Do hon. gentlemen pretend to ignore a charge of so serious a kind ? The hon. member for St. Mary's Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said : There are gentlemen sitting on this side of the House (meaning the ministerial side) who have written me letters, who have discussed the matter with me, who have stated to me that they are in favour of my views. And the hon. gentleman even went farther, and alluded to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson). I am glad to see my hon. friend in his place to-day, and I ask him if he repudiates the charge made by an hon. gentleman who was a few days ago a colleague of his, that he was in league with those who went to the city of Montreal for the purpose of pacifying the manufacturers, and that he was a protectionist and had done everything in his power to maintain the protection which existed when he came into office. I ask the hon. gentleman if he now repudiates that statement, or is willing to stand convicted of having committed himself along with his colleagues to a position which is scarcely creditable to any set of men in this country.

I now wish to direct my remarks to some of the hon. members from the North-west Territories, and I ask what was the position of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) ? Why, Sir, his position was that after these hon. gentlemen had made the bargain that I have referred to with the manufacturers in the city of Montreal, after they had, as it were, secretly sold out the people of this country, he told his people that he loyally accepted the position taken by the government on the tariff. He said they had had a revision of the tariff, but had not lowered it ; on the contrary, they had left it generally where it was before. Yet we find some of these hon. gentlemen from the North-west Territories, like the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) crying out against a possible revision of the tariff, feeling and knowing that it is higher in some respects than it was before. Notwithstanding this these hon. gentlemen have no word to say in denunciation of the present tariff as they did of the tariff of 1896. I ask these hon. gentlemen what they have been doing all the time they have been in this House. Has there been one honest or courageous enough to rise in his

place and show that he was earnest or serious on the subject by moving a resolution that the tariff should be reduced ? Not one of them has made any attempt to put himself on record in this way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose, with the permission of the House, to deal shortly with the tariff.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend from West York who says 'hear, hear,' not many years ago thought it would be better to blow up the bridges at Niagara and the tunnel crossing from Sarnia to Port Huron, and to stop all the possible means of comunication between this country and the United States, than to continue the state of affairs that existed when he wanted unrestricted reciprocity. The same hon. gentleman, who is a worthy colleague of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), made an eloquent speech only a few days ago, with tears in his heart and in his voice for the market gardeners and their sufferings under the tariff ; yet we find that hon. gentleman voting religiously against what he had said, and declaring by that vote that he was humbugging the market gardeners, and was just as earnest in that speech as he has ever been. He turned his back on them without any regard for his professions or his utterances.

Now, we are told that Canada is very prosperous. Well, I am sure nobody will marvel at that. Would it not be an astonishing thing if Canada were not prosperous, if Canada were not caught in the whirlpool of expansion which has spread all over the world. Would it not be a wonderful thing if even the evil position taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite could be the means of preventing that ? Hon. gentlemen have taken to themselves credit for having borne some part in bringing about that prosperity; but the fact is that they have been no factor in the case at all ; they have been lost sight of ; they have been as powerless to do good as to do harm. The hon. gentlemen were no factors in it. No matter what position they took, it did not make any difference. But we are told that they have changed the times in this country. We are told by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that we have a new state of affairs and that all the circumstances that once justified his extreme utterances in this House have ceased to exist. There was a time when the hon. gentlemen opposite, who now applaud an expenditure of $64,000,000, cried out against an expenditure of $40,000,000. It is only six years ago, in 1896, when these same gentlemen denounced a Conservative government, which took from the people in round numbers $36,000,000, and to-day they laud to the skies a government which is taking from the people $65,000,000. We find those same hon. gentlemen who, in 1896, bewailed the sad position of Canada, labouring under a debt of $158,000,000, which they described as a national mortgage, now wildly cheering a debt of $271,000,000.

But we are told that our trade has vastly increased. True, Mr. Speaker, it has. But why has our trade increased ? Both sides will concede that Canada is in a prosperous condition. The Conservative party has never put itself in a false position and will never, for the sake of a momentary or paltry party gain, seek to decry the condition of the country. But in discussing the increase of trade, let us compare the record of the two parties. We fortunately are in a position to do so. We had a Liberal government in power from 1873 to 1878 and a Conservative government from 1878 to 1896, and we have had a Liberal government in office in the last six years. And I may preface this comparison by remarking that we should not attach too much importance to the policy of a government—whether Liberal or Conservative—when considering the progress or otherwise of the country in matters of trade. Our aggregate trade—and I want to call the attention of the hon. member for North Norfolk to this—in 1873 was $217,000,000, and in 1878, after the Liberal government had been five years in office, it was only $170,000,000. In other words, our aggregate trade decreased under the Liberal regime, $47,000,000 during five years. Perhaps the hon. member from North Norfolk will find some means of explaining this decrease to the advantage of Liberal administration.

We then had the Conservative party coming into office in 1878 with an aggregate trade of $170,400,000, and we find that at the end of the next five years, that aggregate trade has increased to $221,000,0000, showing an increase of $51,000,000, which I consider was a very fair showing. In 1897, the Liberal party came into office with an aggregate trade of $249,000,000, which in five years was increased to $414,000,000, being an increase of $165,000,000. There have been of course in Canada, as everywhere else, periods of depression. The Conservative party had to pass through two periods of depression during their regime of eighteen years. The Liberal party had but one period while it was in office. If we are to attribute anything to the policies of political parties, we have the record of the Liberal party, which was in power five years, from 1873 to 1878, during which the aggregate trade of Canada decreased to the extent of $45,000,000, and immediately following that we had five years of Conservative policy and administration, during which our aggregate trade increased $51,000,000. We must bear in mind that our aggregate trade is one which does not depend entirely on the policy of the government. The trade within our own country, our domestic trade, is dependent in a great measure on that policy, but our aggregate trade is one over which, save as regards the offering of facilities for transportation—the government has

absolutely no control. Let me now take up the question of expenditure. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Customs, who is an authority on the trade question, if he will, before this debate is through, point to us any great public work in Canada resulting from that expenditure ? We have had immense expenditures in this country and great public works constructed, but not by any Liberal administration. We have nothing to look forward to and nothing to look back upon, to put to the credit of this enormous increase in our public expenditure which has been the result of the present administration. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they can point to any compensation for that immense expenditure ? I have no doubt that these hon. gentlemen will endeavour to evade the point by replying to my challenge in vague and airy generalities. Let me go more into detail. A good deal has been said with regard to receipts and expenditures of the Post Office Department. Our hon. friend the Postmaster General—who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place—has shown an extreme anxiety to convince the country that he is going to balance the two sides of the ledger. His chief ambition sems to be to wipe out a deficit, without any regard to the efficiency of the service. The efficiency of the service seems to be with him a very secondary consideration. Well, I do not think that in a sparsely settled country such as this, where new territories are being continually opened up, there need be any necessity for any Postmaster General to apologize for having a deficit in the management of his department. If he does not show a large deficit, he is not giving the people an efficient service. Let me point out in detail how the hon. gentleman has managed his department. Take the number of post offices, which existed in 1890, just six years before the Conservative party went out of power. In order to be frank and fair, I shall compare the six years' period of Conservative administration with six years under the present government. First let me give the increase under the Conservative government. The number of post offices existing in 1890 was 7,913 ; six years later, in 1896, it had increased to 9,103, an increase within those six years of 1,190. Now, the increase under the present government is paraded as a proof of the splendid administration of this economical minister, this hon. gentleman who wants to balance the ledger. But what is he able to show at the end of six years, in a period of great expansion, when Canada was making greater strides than ever before in her history, when the need for post office expansion was most keenly felt ? Surely, if the hon. gentleman had thought of anything except having eulogiums pronounced upon himself through his own mediums, the labour journals, the percentage of increase should have been infinitely greater than before. But we find that the number of post offices under his administration increased from 9,103 in 1896 to 9,958 in 1902, an increase of 855 post offices. This is all that the hon. Postmaster General can show in a period of unexampled development—an increase of 855 post offices against an increase of 1,190 in the previous six years. The hon. gentleman speaks of having wiped out the deficit. I am ashamed to think that the hon. gentleman was so anxious to wipe off this deficit that he resorted to methods that were neither more nor less than a shameless repudiation of the country's obligations. Taking advantage of the outbust of patriotism which marked the great Victorian Jubilee, the hon. gentleman issued jubilee stamps of large denominations. Under the influence of the prevailing patriotic fervour, men instantly bought these stamps, supposing that they were as good as the bills issued by the Treasury department, believing that they represented so much money and that Canada would redeem them. But the hon. gentleman refused to redeem these stamps, and so wiped out nearly half a million of dollars and came nearer to balancing the ledger than he ever did before. A great deal is made of the pretension that the hon. gentleman has reduced the postage. The Postmaster General tells us that he has given the people great concessions by the reduction of the domestic letter postage from three cents to two cents, and of the imperial postage also to two cents. Now, in the first place, I may tell the hon. gentleman and his friends that this move is not in the interest of the general taxpayer of Canada. There may be a time when the government which happens to be in power, whether Conservative or Liberal, can make the reduction of the postage to the advantage of the mass of the common people. But this reduction which the hon. gentleman has made, as I say, is no benefit to the ordinary taxpayer. It is idle for the hon. gentleman to say that all who choose to do so can avail themselves of this reduction. But to put upon the statute-book a law, or to make any move on the part of the government, is no benefit to the people if the people are not in a position to take advantage of it. Besides, it must not be forgotten that, while the hon. gentleman has made his spectacular reduction in the rate of letter postage, he has made very substantial increases in the rates on other postal matter. The newspapers are a very important element in the life of our people, for Canadians are careful readers. To enable the people to keep abreast of public questions they should have their newspapers furnished them as cheaply as possible. Formerly newspapers mailed from the office of publication were carried free. Under the changed rates brought into force under the present Postmaster General, newspapers sent outside a radius of twenty miles are charged one-half cent per pound. Of course, the publisher of a newspaper cannot afford to pay this, he must add it to

his subscription rate. For instance, if my hon. friend from Nova Scotia (Hon. Mr. Ross) receives a paper from Ontario he must pay postage on it. But he is so loyal a party man that, I venture to say, he will applaud the Postmaster General for this addition to the postal rates.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Not a bit of it.

Mr. CLANCY. I am glad that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross) takes that position. What does the hon. gentleman think of the other increases that have been made ? For instance, newspapers and periodicals posted elsewhere than at the place of publication were formerly sent for one cent for four ounces. That rate has been doubled, and now the charge is one cent for two ounces. Newspapers, single copies weighing not more than one ounce, were one-half cent, now they are one cent. Books, printed books of instruction, music and drawing books were one cent per four ounces, now they are one cent for two ounces. Pamphlets, circulars, hand-bills, packages of seeds, plants, grafts, &c., were one cent for four ounces, now one cent for two ounces. Maps, drawings, lithographs, photographs, sheet music, deeds, wills, mortgages, chattel mortgages, insurance policies, voters' lists, assessment rolls, municipal returns, patterns, samples of merchandise, and all that class of matter, which goes through the mails in large quantities, were formerly one cent for two ounces, now they are two cents for four ounces, four ounces being the minimum, a doubling of the rates. What do these increases represent ? We find, for instance, that the increase in the number of newspapers and periodicals posted elsewhere than at the place of publication was from 24,000,000 in 1896 to 34,000,000 in 1901. Circulars, samples, patterns, &c., increased from 3,672,000 in 1896 to 7,364,000 in 1901. The effect of all this is that the ordinary taxpayer in Canada pays more for the postal service to-day than he did in 1896. This is proved by the fact that, whereas the total expenditure on the post office represented an average of 93 cents per head for the people of Canada in 1896, the expenditure in 1901 amounted to an average of 96 cents per head. Notwithstanding the withholding from the people of a proper postal service, notwithstanding that the service is starved in every direction, notwithstanding these professions of reduction in the rates, we find that the people actually pay more for the postal service to-day than they did in 1896. But that is not all. The hon. gentleman is guilty of concealment in the making up of his accounts. He is so anxious to have the ledger balance, so anxious to be able to declare that he has for once wiped out a deficit and gained a surplus, that he has resorted to what I believe to be discreditable tactics and has deceived the public by his manner of keeping his accounts. The hon Minister of Finance told us that there was a surplus, he believed, in the Post Office department. But he felt called upon to make apology and to make known the truth that there was, after all, a deficit. The expenditure for the whole Post Office department, according to the Public Accounts for 1902, was $4,023,000, while the revenue was $3,918,000, a deficit in round figures of $105,000. Why did not the Postmaster General, why did not the Minister of Finance tell the House the truth with no concealment ? But the hon. gentleman says : We had a service in the Yukon which cost us $117,000, and we only received $30,000. There was a deficit there of nearly $100,000, or, to be quite accurate, $87,485. Does the hon. gentleman think the Yukon is no part of Canada ? Why should he make an exception in that case, unless he wished to deceive the House and the country ? I repeat, Sir, such arguments are scarcely worthy a minister of the Crown, and are scarcely such as might be expected by the people of this country.

Now there is another matter, that with regard to the Intercolonial Railway. I do not see the Minister of Railways in his place. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it has been your painful experience to notice that we have no ministers of the Crown in their places in the House upon occasions of this kind when they ought to be here to defend the charges that are made against them. These are not merely empty charges, they are charges sufficiently serious to require that those hon. gentlemen should be present to defend themselves. But they show an utter disregard of these matters, and exhibit a most unedifying complacency when they happen to be in their places and are confronted with most damaging facts. Still, they sit there speechless, and receive the plaudits of their friends sitting behind them.

The Minister of Finance made a reference to the record of the Intercolonial Railway. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I propose with your permission to deal with this question. I want to bring to the attention of the House the records of the two parties in managing that railway. That has always been a difficult business to administer; and I am prepared to admit that it always will be a difficult business to manage, and to manage with success. But the hon. gentleman tried to make the country believe that at last they had found a solution of all the difficulties in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. Now, Sir, I will show you the results of the administration of that road during two periods of equal length, one under the Conservative government and one under the Liberal government. Take the six years from 1891 to 1896 inclusive, and what do we find ? The Minister of Railways in the Conservative government expended $20,651,000 on what is called working expenses; on capital account he expended

$2,698,000, or in all for those six years he expended $23,350,000, in round numbers. Now, what was the revenue that came back to the people of Canada during that period? The revenue during those six years amounted to $19,020,000, in round numbers, or a deficit taken out of the pockets of the people—for I am prepared to admit that it had to be taken out of the pockets of the people—of $4,320,000. That was the result during the six years preceding the advent of the Liberal government. Now the expenditure from 1897 to 1902 inclusive under the Liberal regime, was, for working expenses, $26,648,000, and for capital expenditure $13,485,000, or a total expenditure of $40,133,000. The revenue during the six years period was $26,071,000, leaving a deficit that Canada must lose of $14,422,000 as against a deficit of $4,000,000 during the Conservative period. Is that, Mr. Speaker, a record to be boasted of by hon. gentlemen opposite? During a period of great depression in Canada, when business was stagnant, not only in Canada but throughout the whole world, our friends administered that railway at a loss of only $4,000,000; but as soon as hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, during a period of the greatest expansion Canada has ever known, when the Intercolonial Railway and every other road should have been making money, and most of them did make money, we have the spectacle presented by these hon. gentlemen of sinking $14,000,000 of the people's money in the Intercolonial Railway. I ask hon. gentlemen who sit opposite if they approve of a record of that kind?

Now let me go a little further into details. Hon. gentlemen may say: Well, we have something to show for our expenditure, the public are getting a benefit from it, we have made that a paying institution, and the people are going to get their money back. Well, let us see what foundation they have upon which to base such a statement. There must be something radically wrong with the management of that institution. In the first place, we have a gentleman taken from the ranks of the Liberal party, a very able lawyer in the province from which he came, but a gentleman who has not shown any ability as a railway manager, a gentleman who has sunk millions of public money, who has made of the Intercolonial Railway a dismal failure, who has made for himself a record as a railway manager that no man in this country will envy. Now, I want to make a fair comparison, and I think it will be fair to make a comparison between the Intercolonial Railway on the one hand and the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway on the other. What do we find in 1896? In 1896 the earnings per train mile on the Canadian Pacific Railway were $1.40, and in 1901, five years later, the earnings were a little over $1.71 per train mile. On the Grand Trunk Railway in 1896, the earnings per train mile were $1, and this was a time, bear in mind, of great depression. In 1901 the earnings of the Grand Trunk Railway per train mile increased to $1.26. The average earnings per train mile on all the railroads in Canada for 1896 were $1.17; in 1901 they were $1.44. Now, Sir, what do you suppose were the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway in 1896? Why they were 76 cents per train mile, and in 1901 they were 79 cents, as against $1.71 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, $1.26 on the Grand Trunk Railway, and $1.44 on all the railways in Canada.

That is a splendid showing of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that is the return the people are getting for this loss of $14,000,000 to which I have referred. But, there are other tests that I desire to refer to. The proportion of expenses to receipts is another test. The Canadian Pacific Railway, in 1896, had to pay out 60·05 per cent of its earnings for the purpose of carrying on its affairs and in 1901 it paid out 60·08 per cent. The Grand Trunk Railway paid out in 1896, 69·09 per cent of its earnings, while in 1901 it paid out 63·71 per cent of its earnings, or of its revenue. All the railways in Canada except the Intercolonial Railway, paid out 67 per cent of their earnings in 1896, and 65·92 per cent, or 66 cents practically, in 1901. What is the position of the Intercolonial Railway? In this period of great expansion, when railways have had earnings per train mile, in 1896, of $1.40, and in 1901 of $1.71, what is the record which we find in regard to the Intercolonial Railway? Why, Sir, instead of comparing with the Canadian Pacific Railway system, with 60 per cent of its earnings being paid out, or with the Grand Trunk Railway system, with 63 per cent of its earnings being paid out, or with all the railways of Canada, except the Intercolonial Railway, with 65 per cent of its earnings being paid out, we find that the Intercolonial paid out, in 1896, 104·03 per cent, or 4 cents more than it earned, and that in 1901 it paid 110·76 per cent, or 11 cents more than it earned. That is the record of the Intercolonial Railway. Some hon. gentlemen say: Well, the Intercolonial Railway was built in the interest of the people of Canada. We have carried freight at reduced rates, we have given the money back to the people, they have it in their pockets and if there is a disparity between the two sides of the ledger it has arisen by reason of the fact of giving the people special freights and other special advantages. Let me call the attention of the House to this point for a moment, and then I shall conclude: The revenue per ton per mile in 1896 for all freight carried over the Intercolonial Railway, was 1·297 cents, nearly 2 cents, as you will see, and in 1901 it was 1·478 cents. Therefore, the people have not had any compensation for the increased taxation; they have paid higher rates of freight than before and we have the lamentable spectacle of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals having sunk large sums of money

and having the credit of having managed the Intercolonial Railway worse than any other railway in Canada has been managed, and I venture to say, worse than any other railway on the continent of America.

Now, we come to the canals. These hon. gentlemen are telling us what they have done for the country. I shall only detain the House for a moment to call attention to the period in which the Conservatives were in power and in which they spent nearly as much upon the canals as did hon. gentlemen after they came into office. During the period from 1892 to 1896 the Conservatives spent $14,828,981. The Liberal government, during the period from 1897 to 1901, spent $17,635,377, or a yearly increase of something like half a million—actually $561,000. We are told of the splendid results, and of the great expansion that has taken place since they came into power. They try to account for their magnificent expenditures, as they call them, by saying: We have gone to work and completed the canals, we have given facilities for transportation, we have aided Canada in every manner possible. What do we find has been the result of the completion of these canals of which these hon. gentlemen speak so much? The revenue from these canals in 1896 was $339,539, and in 1901, $315,426, a decrease in that period of great expansion of $24,113. In that period, when we were all looking forward to our canal system as one which would be of great assistance in the transportation of commodities, when so much was being said about our waterways, we find that instead of our expectation being realized the very reverse was the fact. Let us take the traffic passing through these canals. In the period during which these hon. gentlemen expended this large amount of money, the period which they hold up to our view, we find the traffic returns to be as follows: In 1896 the total number of tons that passed through the canals was 5,033,869. In 1901, 2,408,985 tons passed through, or a decrease of more than one-half, a decrease of 2,624,884 tons. How have these hon. gentlemen compensated the people for these expenditures? I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Finance is not in his place but I shall ask the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) to be kind enough to tell him about the Yukon. When that hon. gentleman was addressing this House and displaying the splendid achievements of the Liberal party in 1901, he had this to say about the Yukon, as given in 'Hansard' of 1901, page 1455:

> Now, it is the policy of the government at the beginning, to use an expression which has become current, to make the Yukon pay for the Yukon, and that has been carried out.

Well, nothing was said about the Yukon paying for the Yukon this year. What have we instead? I will tell the hon. gentleman the secret. I am sure he has been let into it before, because it was so very palpable. However I will tell him again. The total expenditure for 1902 was $2,474,419, and the revenue was $1,559,259, so that there was a deficit of $914,960. That is the reason nothing was said about the Yukon. Some hon. gentlemen will perhaps say: Well, it has gone back but the Yukon has paid for the Yukon. The Yukon has not paid for the Yukon. The total expenditure for the whole period during which these hon. gentlemen have been in office has been $8,437,597, and the total revenue $8,267,826, so that there has been a deficit on the whole transaction of $169,771.

Mr. TAYLOR. Some of them made more than that out of it.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not including the pickings. I wish to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to what will be put forward as the reason for that. We will be told, no doubt, by hon. gentlemen who are to address this House in future that the royalties have been reduced and that therefore by reason of the reduction of royalties the people in that country have had some benefit from the reduction and that if the Yukon did not really pay for the Yukon, at least, the people, have the money in their pockets. Well there was a reduction. The whole revenue from that source in 1901 was $1,237,000, and in 1902 it was $849,720, or a decrease of $387,000. I admit that was a reduction in the right direction. It was a reduction wrung from the government by the efforts of the miners backed up by the strong effort made by the Conservative party in this House, and though the government at first refused to make the reduction they were forced to go back on their policy in that respect, as in many other respects. But although the reduction was $387,000, the deficit was $520,000, so that when the Finance Minister makes his next budget speech he will have to revise his statement that the Yukon pays for the Yukon.

I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is not here, because I have something to say to him. We hear that he is attending banquets and wearing pig tails, and having degrees conferred upon him, and hobnobbing with their Oriental Majesties, and that he will leave for home on the first of May. That will prevent him arriving in time to hear what I have to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, perhaps the Minister of Agriculture may be excused under the circumstances. We have been told often what the Liberals have done for the farmers in this country in the matter of cold storage, and how when the Liberals came into power they gave life to this system which was allowed to die for want of energy on the part of their predecessors in office. And when the First Minister was recently telling the people what his party had done for Canada, he mentioned this amongst other things:

We have established a complete system of cold storage for the transportation of perishable goods, and in this alone we have rendered people of Canada a singular service. The trade with Great Britain last year in eggs alone reached almost the sum of two million dollars and it is yet only in its infancy.

Last year when the Minister of Agriculture was defending his estimates he was put the following question by a member of this House.

I am sure it would be interesting to the House and the country if the hon. gentleman were able to state approximately what proportion of the Canadian products have gone in cold storage. I will also ask him to state the ordinary rates and the cold storage rates to London, to Liverpool, to Glasgow, to Manchester, and to the West Indies in the twenty-four ships that were equipped last year. And if he can, the quantities of Canadian perishable products which went by cold storage in each ship.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Who asked that question ?

Mr. CLANCY. I asked the question myself and this is what the Minister of Agriculture replied, and this is the discussion that resulted from that question:

Mr. FISHER. In a general way the products which have gone forward in cold storage have been butter of which practically the whole export of Canada goes in that way, and poultry meat of which practically the whole export of Canada to Great Britain, not to the United States, goes in cold storage.

Mr. CLANCY. What are the quantities ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not got the quantities. About two hundred tons of poultry meat went last fall to Great Britain by cold storage. Tender fruits, such as pears, peaches and grapes went forward in mechanical cold storage chambers (but these are about all). Cheese has not gone forward to any great extent in cold storage chambers. Some shipments of apples had gone in cold storage, but as a general rule the shippers of apples say, in the first place, that too large quantities go at one time to get the accommodation. And in the second place they do not think it will be worth while to pay the extra storage accommodation.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the value of the small fruits, and the value of the poultry sent forward in cold storage ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not got the figures of the exact quantities or the values of the fruit or the poultry.

The Minister of Agriculture was not able to answer the question as to the value of the fruit or the poultry, but I will answer it for him, and I take my figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns published by the government. For the year 1900, the total exports of poultry dressed and undressed amounted to $210,822 including all in cold storage or not. In 1901 that had dropped to $145,158, and in 1902 it only reached the comparatively small sum of $238,047. Now, let us take the small fruits to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I include what was sent in cold storage and otherwise and I find that in 1900 we exported a total of $59,412 ; in 1901 that fell to $38,326, and in 1902 it had diminished to $26,311. That is the story from commencement to end of the success of cold storage for which so much credit is claimed by this Liberal government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the expenditures and I take the controllable expenditure for which the ministers are accountable. I have made a comparison between the expenditures of the different departments as between 1896 and 1902 and here is the result :

COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURE AS BETWEEN 1896 AND 1902.

	1896.	1902.
Administration of justice	$ 758,270	$ 949,229
Civil Government	1,396,628	1,497,369
Fisheries	427,250	548,894
Geological Survey, &c.	134,368	224,015
Immigration	120,199	494,841
Quarantine	95,247	264,737
Indians	880,408	1,057,130
Marine Hospitals	36,683	51,827
Militia and Defence	1,137,717	2,060,978
Miscellaneous	172,363	1,146,120
Mounted Police	533,014	948,215
Penitentiaries	385,227	438,072
Police	22,703	60,241
Superannuation	311,231	338,764
Customs	896,332	1,176,024
Dominion Lands	119,908	158,843
	$7,427,548	$11,415,299

Here we have an increase in the controllable expenditure of 54 per cent, and mind you these are all expenditures that are under the control of the different ministers, and for which they can and ought to render an account. Where has the money gone, let me ask ? Why this increase of 54 per cent ? What is there to show for it ?

I now come to another question, Mr. Speaker which interests the people of Canada to a very great extent, and that is as to whether the system of bookkeeping adopted by this government is an honest system of bookkeeping under which the people of Canada can really tell what is going on in the service of the government. I address myself particularly now to the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) who is an authority on finances. He has referred to this question more than once in his speeches, and I shall probably have to quote some of his utterances as to what constitutes a surplus in Canada. When it is stated in this House that the Liberal party from 1897 to 1902 inclusive, have had continuous surpluses, aggregating over $27,000,000, I say that that statement is absolutely destitute of a single particle of truth. Now, that is a broad statement, and when I make it I realize the serious responsibility I take as a member of this House, especially one occuping so humble a position as I do. Now, our total receipts and total expenditures for each year since 1897 have been as follows :

Year.	Total Receipts.	Total Expenditures.	Deficits.
1897	$ 37,829,778	$ 42,972,755	$ 5,142,977
1898	40,556,510	45,334,281	4,777,771
1899	46,743,102	51,542,635	4,799,533
1900	51,031,466	52,717,466	1,686,000
1901	52,516,332	57,982,866	5,466,534
1902	58,052,333	63,970,799	5,918,466
	$286,729,521	$314,520,802	
Aggregate deficits..			$27,791,281

Every dollar of these deficits which have occurred since hon. gentlemen opposite have been in power, has been added to the public debt. I challenge any hon. gentleman who may reply to me to deny that statement if he can. Hon. gentlemen may apologize for this by saying what about the sinking fund? The sinking fund, as every hon. gentleman knows, is a statutory expenditure which we are obliged to make each year to provide for our loans; and if the sums which we have had to put aside for that purpose are deducted, the result will show that the net debt has been increased by these annual deficits in the last six years by $13,331,657. When I say that the bookkeeping of hon. gentlemen opposite is not right, they will probably say, just as the hon. Finance Minister said, that he has followed the practice of his predecessor. But that does not alter the matter in the least. If a false position was taken by his predecessor or if his predecessor followed a system he found in vogue the hon. gentleman's plain duty, if he wanted to be as fair as he professes to be, was to keep the public accounts in such a way that the people of this country would understand them to be accurate. In this respect the hon. gentleman keeps his books differently from every other civilized country in the world. What is the case in England? Do we find consolidated expenditures and capital expenditures there? No. All the accounts are kept in one ledger and under one classification, so that when they show a surplus, it is an actual and not a visionary one. Then, take the people to the south of us. I am not as fond of taking them as an example as some hon. gentlemen in this House; but what do we find there? I challenge the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), a gentleman who is well versed in these matters, to rise in his place and tell the House and the country that in the United States they have such mixed expenditures as we have; but their ledger contains on one side the whole of the expenditures, and on the other side the total revenues, and the balance of $69,000,000 which was shown last year was no fiction, but an absolute surplus which they could show in dollars and cents. What does the honest taxpayer believe when he is told by the Minister of Finance that for the coming year we shall have a surplus of over $13,000,000? He concludes, as every honest man would conclude, that there will be $13,000,000 in the treasury. He would conclude, from the hon. minister's statement, that it was not a fiction, but a fact, that, as a result of this government's administration for the past six years, there were $27,000,000 in the treasury. I ask if there is one hon. gentleman who can rise and say that there was any such thing in existence, that there was at the end of any of those years a single dollar there. The result is that though we are charging millions up to the public debt, we have had the amusing spectacle of a gentleman, of high standing in this country—I refer to the Minister of Trade and Commerce—telling the House what he would do with surpluses. He said, referring to the leader of the opposition:

> My hon. friend wants to know what I think about surpluses. I have no objection to tell him. There are three excellent uses to which a surplus may be applied. In the first place it may be applied to a reduction of taxation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, have these surpluses, which the right hon. gentleman boasts of, been applied to the reduction of taxation? No, and for the very good reason that they have never existed. Our taxation has, on the contrary, been increased. The next purpose to which a surplus might be applied, was the paying off the debt. But our public debt, instead of being reduced, has been increased. And the third purpose for which a surplus could be utilized, he informs us, was the construction of useful and productive public works. But where are these public works? I defy any hon. gentleman opposite to point to any productive public work of any magnitude which they have given the country. The system of bookkeeping adopted by this government is a most wonderful one. I have pointed out that you will find no such system of bookkeeping in any other country under any responsible government. You will certainly not find in the mother country any such deception practiced in the public accounts, and in no other country will you find the people presented with a statement showing fictitious and false surpluses.

On the question of the tariff, Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer a few remarks. You will remember, Sir, that the hon. Finance Minister read into his budget speech the platform adopted by the Liberal party in 1893. This is what he said:—

> Now, as to the manner in which this tariff revision should be brought about, I want to read to you—not because it is any element of novelty, but because it properly fits in at this stage of my speech—the platform adopted by the Liberal party at the great convention held at Ottawa in 1893.

After reading the whole platform he said:—

> Mr. Speaker, the electors of Canada in due course gave their verdict upon that and upon other issues and subject to such changes as changing circumstances may require and as to which I shall have something to say as I pro-

ceed. We accept the Liberal platform of Ottawa as the declaration of principle which we are bound to follow on our tariff reform.

The hon. gentleman, in his speech, laid down this principle with regard to the tariff :

That it should be so adjusted as to make free or bear as lightly as possible upon the necessaries of life and should be so arranged as to promote free trade with the whole world more particularly with Great Britain and the United States. We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

This is what the hon. gentleman read into his speech, and later on, addressing himself to the case of the manufacturers, he said :—

Every man who invested a dollar in the National Policy did so with his eyes wide open to certain important facts. He was well aware that from the beginning down to the end the National Policy was condemned by one of the great political parties in Canada. He was well aware that every effort had to be put forth by governmental influences and such influences as the manufacturers themselves are well aware of in order to obtain from the public an apparent endorsement of that policy. . . . . Now the manufacturers knew of this, and they must have known that when they put their money into these factories they were taking their risk. There was a speculative element in this whole national policy business and the men who play the game and gather in the winnings ought to be prepared when the turn of the tide comes to pay the losses and try to look pleasant. . . . .

Mr. GOURLEY. He was familiar with the game.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes. That speech was made after a conference with the manufacturers had been held prior to the elections of 1896. There was in it an implied threat to the manufacturers, but he did not proceed much further before he sang another tune. He said :—

However, I wish to say and emphasize the fact that it has never been the policy of the Liberal party as declared by any member of the Liberal party occupying a responsible position if they came into power to destroy at one movement all the manufacturing industries or to so change the policy as to place them in peril.

What do you think of a Finance Minister who tells the manufacturers that they are playing a game, that their business is in the nature of a gamble, and they might look out and be prepared for what might happen, and then immediately after declares that it was not the policy of the Liberal party to so change the tariff policy of this country so as to injure the manufacturing interests. He went on further to say :—

I hesitate not to say that if we should to-day by some rash step do that which some hon. gentlemen say that we are bound to do but which intelligent men know that we are not bound to do and would not do, we should not only break down the manufacturing interests of the country, but deal a blow to other interests of a wider and more serious character.

The hon. gentleman has always had the faculty of making startling and alarming declarations with regard to the policy he was going to adopt and then explaining away those threats, so that his friends might go to the country and put any construction on his utterances that would best suit the party exigencies of the moment. Hon. gentlemen have always been in a position—and, no doubt, will try to keep themselves in a position—to use these two sides of the speeches of their leaders, one in favour of protection, and the other in favour of the policy adopted by the Liberal party in 1893, of revising the tariff with a view to destroying every vestige of the national policy. But we have now in the House an hon. gentleman—I refer to the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson)—who, according to the statement of his former colleague, the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has tried within the cabinet to maintain the protectionist policy. I have referred to the hon. member for St. Mary's division. If any man has earned the gratitude of the people of Canada for maintaining in the tariff of 1897 a large measure of protection, that hon. gentleman has earned it. If that hon. gentleman told the truth about the hon. Minister of Customs, of which there seems no doubt, it would seem that the hon. Minister of Customs also was performing his part in the cabinet, under the influence of that strong man, to maintain the protectionist policy as this government found it in 1896. If that is the case, the Minister of Customs also deserves credit for the fact that the tariff was left in the form in which we find it to-day. But the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) cannot accept openly the praise that is said to be due to him, because he has put himself under pledge before the country in a different way. He tells the people that he despises the protection, he tells them that protection is an evil. But he tells the people also that the government is obliged to maintain a revenue tariff, a tax gathering tariff—and that it is a tax gathering tariff is proven by the enormous sums it wrings from the pockets of the people—and that, while he would abolish if he could the protection element, yet it is unavoidable that there must be in the tariff some measure of protection. The hon. gentleman has explained more than once the difference of the two parties on this point. He has told us that it is the cardinal principle of the Conservative party to give full protection to the country's industries, while it is the policy

of the Liberal party to give barely and beggarly the protection that cannot be withheld. But we are told now by the hon. gentleman's former colleague that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) is in favour of protection, and we are left to infer that he fought for that principle in council. Will the hon. Minister of Customs rise before this debate closes and say that that statement is not true? Will he repudiate the utterance of his late colleague? Will he say that he bore no part in the retention of protection in the present tariff? If so, will he be able to reconcile that with his declarations that the government did not want protection, but only wanted a tariff to collect taxes? That was his declaration, and that was what he relied upon for commercial defence against a commercially hostile country alongside which is constantly invading our territory. If the hon. gentleman denies that this was his position I will give him the words of his own utterances. But I know that he will not deny it, and I do not put that as an offensive challenge.

Now, what is the position of the hon. Minister of Finance in asking for delay in the revision of the tariff? He says that the manufacturers are more perplexed to find space and workmen than to find reasons for increases in the tariff, that what they fear is the fierce competition from outside from a period of depression, in the narrowing of our trade that, as everybody knows, must follow the present great expansion—that they are more frightened of what is to come than of what is here now. He tells us that what the manufacturers are frightened of is a condition of things that does not now exist. He tells us that they look to the future and seek to provide against the possible evils of the future. In effect the hon. Minister of Finance tells us that the time to lock the door is not when we are secure, but when the burglar comes and rifles our money boxes, and when he stands there armed and ready to defend himself against attack. We have now a tax gathering tariff. That is the design of the tariff in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite; if it affords protection, according to their cardinal tariff doctrine, that is an evil feature of it. But what of the future? The overflow of American markets is coming into Canada. I am within the mark when I say that the overflow of production of the United States is greater than the whole of our production in Canada. The hon. gentleman tells us that our manufactories are expanding and that the difficulty is anything but lack of orders. But our own manufacturers are not filling more than half our orders. If we had protection, we should find the space and the workmen, and should supply all the wants of our own people. But we have this evil of an invasion from the outside growing steadily, an evil which it may be impossible for us to eradicate by hostile tariffs if we do not act in time. We have immense quantities of American goods coming into Canada; our people are being trained and educated to buy American goods and use them; we have the agents of American concerns in Canada, camping here by the score; we have even Canadians being enlisted in selling American goods who ought to be enlisted in selling Canadian goods. And when the evil ripens under the influence of reaction from the present good times, we shall be without a single weapon of defence against the invaders. The waiting game is the one that the Minister of Finance recommends to us—to wait for possible reciprocity; to wait for something to come in relation to the preferential tariff.

I do not wish to detain the House over this preferential tariff business. If I were to read from the speech of the Minister of Finance, I could only show that he faces both ways upon this question as he does upon the tariff. He tells us that, if the British people do not give some concessions in their market, he is prepared to repeal the preferential tariff. But then he asks, notwithstanding that, whether it would be in the interest of the people of Canada to repeal it. The hon. gentleman always shows the faint heart. He stands at the cross roads and does not know which way to go. He tells us that, if the British government do not take a certain course, he will take the other. But then his heart fails him, and he asks the hesitating question: But would it be in the interest of Canada? He tells us that it is well to use their own tariff weapon against the United States. But when he thinks of our great North-west he asks: But what would such a course cost us? He lays down the principle that in every case, a protective duty is paid by the consumer in the enhanced price of the article. I deny that experience has ever shown anything of that kind, I deny that in Canada, at least, beyond a mere momentary spurt, protection has ever raised the prices of goods. Take machinery with regard to which a mean appeal is made to the people of the North-west Territories, made upon such small things as binder twine, barbed wire and farm implements. Is there an hon. gentleman representing a constituency in the North-west who will say that even if a duty of $10 were put upon farm implements, a farmer in the North-west would find it any serious handicap, such does not follow as a result of the duty. Yet the Minister of the Interior tells us that the tax upon farm implements is a great burden to the people of the North-west. Well, to-day we have the Minister of Finance undoing every particle of the legislation that he put upon the statute-book in 1897, retracing his steps, showing his own blunders regarding binder twine, probably making the proposal of giving a bounty of three-eights of a cent per pound on importations of the raw material, and he thinks that will cause the

binder twine to be made in Canada after it has been made free and tax our own people for it. But by whom was it made free? It was made free by a blunder of the hon. gentleman opposite, made free in vain. The people of Canada have never profited by it. We have lost that much revenue, and the American people came into Canada and took possession of our market, and made our manufacturers join the combine. To-day the manufacturers of Canada are in a combine with those of the United States, and we are importing 14,000,000 pounds of binder twine out of the eighteen million pounds we consume in Canada. We are importing 14,000,000 pounds that ought to be made in Canada by Canadian workmen.

What was the position of the Minister of Finance upon that question? Why, it was the most extraordinary declaration ever made in this House, that a minister of the Crown should come down and say, I have not found a remedy for the evil, but I propose, before this session closes, to find a remedy—in other words, giving us to understand that he was going to change the tariff in some way. But what is the shift the hon. gentleman proposes to make? He proposes to take out of the pockets of the people by means of a bounty the sum that is charged by the United States, to take it out of the pockets of Canadians in order to make good that loss that he inflicted upon them by taking away the protection. They not only take away the protection from the industry, but they have made binder twine higher, and they have deprived Canadian workmen of the opportunity of making binder twine that is now made in the United States. There is no mistake about who pays the money that goes in bounties. It comes directly out of our pockets. They take away protection largely from a large class of iron goods. The Minister of Customs declared, when the tariff was being revised, that they gave these bounties in lieu of the protection that they took away from the manufacturers in that class of goods. In other words, money that ought to have been paid by foreign countries, is now placed upon the heads of Canadians to be paid out in the shape of bounties in order to sustain that industy. It is just another one of their procession of blunders. It is the same with binder twine. But who pays the duty? We are told the consumer pays the duty. Why should we seek for reciprocity with the United States, I ask hon. gentlemen, if the American consumer pays the duty? I appeal to the hon. member for North Norfolk, who now wants reciprocity with the United States to sell our wheat there? According to the Liberal doctrine it is the people of the United States who pay that duty. If they do pay that duty, what is the difference between that and a duty on a binder coming from the United States? Why should we seek to get a preference in the British market? Let the British taxpayer pay the duty, we are not paying it, according to hon. gentlemen opposite. How do hon. gentlemen reconcile the two positions? Do they mean to say that every dollar that is put on by customs duties to defend our interests, and for the purpose of giving protection to our own Canadian people has the effect of raising the price?

I ask hon. gentlemen who represent the North-west Territories what compensation they have for the taxes put upon them. In 1896, we collected per head in taxes, $7.57, and in 1902 we collected $10.81. We are collecting $3.24 a head more than we collected in 1896. I ask hon. members who represent western constituencies what they have to compensate them for that. Do they still maintain that the old tariff taxed them to the extent of the duty upon the goods they consumed in this country? If they do, then let them make their peace with their leaders. But not only are we paying an excess of $3.24 a head in taxes in 1902, but we have a prospect of paying $4.23 a head for the year coming.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to consider this reform tariff. The hon. Minister of Customs, who pays great attention to this matter, says the tariff has been reformed. Well, this is the way it has been reformed. We imported in 1902 $118,000,000 of dutiable goods, and of that amount, just $16,615,000 came in under the reform tariff of 1897. That is the extent of the burden lifted from the people, when the taxes went all into the treasury, when it was no longer the case that two dollars out of three went into the pockets of the manufacturers and the favoured few, and the other dollar went into the treasury. We have the tariff reformed to the extent of $16,615,000 out of $118,000,000, or about 14 per cent of the whole tariff was reformed. That has been a splendid reduction. That has been the new policy, if I may call it so, of a revenue tariff, of lifting the burdens, of changing the currents of trade; that has been the new Liberal tariff policy. But it has another side to it, Mr. Speaker. Out of that $118,000,000 that came in last year coming under the general tariff of 1897 of dutiable goods, there were $34,542,000 raised. Is that a reformation of the tariff? I do not think hon. gentlemen will say so. I do not speak at all in regard to the preferential tariff, because I have no hesitation in saying from my place in this House and in the presence of hon. gentlemen who are merchants and who know, that the people never derived one farthing of benefit as consumers from the preferential tariff. We, therefore, speak of the reformation where it existed. if it did exist, of the decreases by that reformed tariff of 14 per cent and the increases of that reformed tariff of no less than 29 per cent. Who got the benefit of the reductions? Was it the general consumer? No, these reductions were made in the interest of the

manufacturers generally. The manufacturers got the benefit. I do not object to the manufacturers getting the benefit of the reductions if the amount was not taxed back upon the people in the form of bounties to make it up. The value of the goods on which reductions were made to help the manufacturers, and I do not object to that, was $7,222,632. I shall not enumerate the goods, but if the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) is sufficiently interested and curious, I will read it over for him.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Read the list and it will be on record.

Mr. CLANCY. The list is a very considerable one.

An hon. MEMBER. Read it.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman want it read ?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. I shall read it, but I shall ask the indulgence of the House if I do not conclude at six o'clock. I see the hon. Minister of Customs smiling. The first item is one in his interest and it is labels of all kinds.

IMPORTATIONS in 1902 of Goods on which the Duty was decreased in the Interests of the Manufacturer.

	Great Britain.	United States.	Other Countries.
	$	$	$
Labels, fruit and vegetable	10,807	55,735	13,538
Straw-board	191	7,571	17
Sulphuric acid	101	4,525	.....
Acid sulphate	135	15,771	.....
Lubricating oil	.....	52,282	.....
Crude oil	.....	40,568	.....
Olive oil	9,638	10,578	18,058
Shoe tacks	2	3,880	.....
Iron or steel nuts and washers	1,188	90,839	4
Files and rasps	10,617	76,657	6,394
Steam engines and boilers	34,998	347,024	.....
Iron and steel goods	1,404,912	2,983,020	583,460
Electrotypes and stereotypes	455	9,386	.....
Lead pipe	4,929	3,087	.....
Watch cases	996	97,711	.....
Cases for watches, jewels, &c	2,457	4,315	755
Cane, reed, rattan	517	38,044	30
Glucose or grape sugar	.....	103,437	8
Jeans and sateens	4,111	84,268	159
Rove	19,441	176,428	49,646
Wool yarns	217,735	4,208	64,908
Enamelled oil cloth	352,697	22,944	1,276
Window shades in pieces	2,040	971	.....
Nitro-glycerine	8	.....	.....
Slate for mantels, roofs, &c	59	49,981	10,201
	2,078,304	4,395,876	748,454

Great Britain	$ 2,078,304
United States	4,395,876
Other countries	748,454
	$ 7,222,632

Then, when we take the goods on which the duties were reduced we will find that these reductions were concessions to the United States. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen opposite want to know what these concessions were. The articles on which the duty was reduced in 1897 were Indian corn, Indian corn meal, wheat and wheat flour.

Mr. COCHRANE. For the benefit of the farmer ?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, for the benefit of the farmer. These hon. gentlemen claimed that the duty was taken off corn for the benefit of our farmer. The duty was lowered on wheat for the benefit of the men in the large centres like Ottawa, Montreal and Toronto, and other industrial centres which buy enormous quantities of wheat and while hon. gentlemen opposite were pretending that they were lifting the burden off the consumer they were placing a heavier

burden on the Canadian farmers. The value of the Indian corn, corn meal, wheat and wheat flour imported under the reduced duty and which duty was reduced for the benefit also of the people of the United States was $1,898,318. There was another concession made to the people of the United States from which the people of Canada derived no benefit of $878,087 on coal oil. Will any hon. gentleman say that the reduction of one cent a gallon on coal oil inured in the slightest to the benefit of the consumers of Canada ? It resulted in bringing in the Standard Oil Company with which the oil producers of Canada have been forced to join hands, an institution which they dreaded ; but with which they have been forced to join and now we have the oil producers of Canada acting in concert with that foreign combine and putting up the price of oil. Then, there was another concession to the United States in the matter of barbed wire to the amount of $826,846. We have brought in that amount of barbed wire under this reduced duty. The barbed wire factories in Canada are practically all closed up. The workmen who should look to Canada for a day's labour and a means of earning a livelihood have been sent to make barbed wire in the United States. We are not only sending our Canadian workmen to the United States, but we are sending our Canadian money to buy the barbed wire which is now made in the United States. As I have said we gave a concession to the United States in the matter of barbed wire of $826,846. But, we gave still another concession of $1,507,344 in the matter of binder twine. I shall not discuss that again ; I have only to say that this concession was made in the interest of the United States workmen and it was one of those stupendous blunders that hon. gentlemen have made and the country are now paying for this blunder.

Mr. COCHRANE. The people have been paying more for binder twine ever since.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes. I wish now to point out what has been the result of the raising of duties on goods imported into Canada. I appeal again to the hon. Minister of Customs. He does not seem to suffer in this and I shall not have his sympathy so much. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to give the House the list of goods on which the duties were raised under this reformed tariff. They were raised mainly upon the necessaries of life notwithstanding the declaration of the hon. Minister of Finance that he made in this House that he proposed to adopt the policy, or the platform, enunciated at the Liberal convention of 1893 that the duties on the necessaries of life should not only be reduced but that these goods should be made free. Well, this is how they have been made free. The list is as follows :

IMPORTATION IN 1902 OF GOODS FORMING THE NECESSARIES OF LIFE UPON WHICH THE DUTIES WERE INCREASED BY THE TARIFF OF 1897.

		Con. tariff.	Lib. tariff.
Rice, uncleaned (per lb.)		3/10	1/2
Fruit in packages and jars..	$ 88,901	2	2½
Jams and jellies..	63,814	3	3½
Hats and caps..	110,982	25	30
Clothes wringers	16,916		
Cutlery, n.o.p...	212,076	25	30
Cotton balls and batting..	8,517	22½	25
Cotton, gray and unbleached..	152,119	22½	25
Cotton, printed....	3,523,912	30	35
Braids, laces, &c..	1,357,055	25	30
Sewing thread..	601,674	32½	35
Damask of linen doylies, &...	477,300	25	30
Towels, all kinds..	193,366	25	30
Wool fabrics..	3,374,062	30	35
Wool manufactures..	3,780,177	32½	35
Shawls..	90,974	25	30
Women and children's dress goods..	64,436	32½	35
Embroideries..	391,629	30	35
Handkerchiefs..	254,762	30	35
Curtains and shams..	477,762	30	35
Ribbons, all kinds....	799,976	25	30
Sugar candy and confectionery (½ cent per lb.)....	82,580	35	35
Molasses (1½c. & 1¾c. p. gal.)	984,889	1½	1¾
Sugar..	7,652,808	½	66
Total....	$24,901,551	114	125

Hon. gentlemen will see that this list comprises all those little things that make up the outfit of any comfortably furnished house, and are to be found in the homes of the most humble citizens of Canada. Let me give the rates of duty. They were increased all along the line from 25 to 30 per cent, and from 22 to 25 per cent. I do not object to the increase on woollen goods, but while they gave a protection of 35 per cent on woollens they took it away on the other hand by the British preference in order to ruin our woollen manufacturers in Canada. I object in no sense to the 35 per cent, nor would I object to 40 per cent or to 50 per cent if such were necessary to protect our Canadian industries. But the government made a blunder here as elsewhere. They made a blunder by taking off the specific duty. We gave a rate of duty that with the specific and ad valorem combined amounted to 32½ per cent only, and we had an infinitely better protection under that than we have under the higher duty of the Liberal party, which is now 35 per cent. The reason for that is that we have constantly unloaded on this country shoddy goods, and the consumer in Canada unfortunately uses these goods, and to that extent they displace our Canadian goods that ought to be made by Canadian labour in Canada. Out of the $34,000,000 on which the duty was

increased, this government has placed that increase upon $24,000,000 of these things that enter into general consumption and upon the necessaries of life.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Who pays the increased duty on woollens ?

Mr. CLANCY. On woollens ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman says that the consumers do not pay it.

Mr. CLANCY. The increased duty on woollen goods has had the effect on the one hand to give the British manufacturer and the British exporter the advantage of the increase, but the increased duty to the people is because the duty has been raised to the people of Canada, who are paying the tax and receive absolutely not one farthing reduction from the retail dealers in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. That is where it is. We were told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the leader of the opposition did not point out one case where there was an oppressive duty. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that all duties and all taxes are oppressive, and the most oppressive taxes are those that we pay without receiving compensation in return, and these are the kind of taxes we are paying to-day in Canada. I am not prepared to say we ought to reduce our duties, but I say that under a better arrangement of the duties we would take less taxes from the people and we would give more labour to the people of Canada. These gentlemen opposite talk of being friendly to a protective tariff. Why they would not know how to administer a protective tariff. They do not understand the aims of a protective tariff ; they understand no tariff but a tax collecting tariff.

In conclusion, Sir, I wish to say a few words in reference to the conditions in western Canada. That country is rapidly being settled, and if properly directed that immigration will be of immense benefit to Canada. But in this connection, I know of nothing so dangerous as the position taken by the Liberal leaders in this country. Unfortunately they are preaching, not Canadian but American sentiment. They are telling the people of the west that they are not to look upon Canada as their home. They are placing such literature as the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) before them, which counsels them to look to American institutions and to trade with the American people. What do the people of the older provinces think of that state of affairs ? We have done what was our duty in voting millions of dollars to advance the west, and I trust this House will not be beggarly in voting generously sums of money to promote the welfare of that country. But I ask the patriotic Canadians who are ready to bear this taxation, what the outlook is to be if we are to adopt the policy propounded by hon. gentlemen opposite. Our railways will cease to be an advantage to the west ; our waterways will fall into disuse ; we will find ourselves a part of the American republic without our consent, and we will find the great west which ultimately will be a controlling factor in this Dominion ; we will find it not a part of British North America, but a part of the United States, if the Liberal government succeed in their policy. These gentlemen have a shifting policy for every occasion. They commenced with a reciprocal tariff, and they end with a preferential tariff, that they now threaten to abandon. They commenced with what they called a reform tariff, and now they are ending with increased taxation. Every policy they have adopted they have abandoned in turn, and their latest policy is unrestricted policy. Let us not conceal it from ourselves that we are on the dangerous ground we were in 1891. We are to be Americanized by this Liberal government. I see gentlemen upon the other side of the House who will go back and appeal to the people of the North-west on the ground set forth by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and sanctioned by the ministers, including the first minister, who asked him to make that speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How do yon know ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will tell my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas) because he intends to repeat that speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I intend to do nothing of the kind.

Mr. CLANCY. I would be the last to disclose a thing that comes to me in the way of confidence, but I will gratify my hon. friend's curiosity by telling him that the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) told me so himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What did he tell you ?

Mr. CLANCY. I will tell what he told me. I wish the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) was in the House, so that he might hear my words. I met him in the corridor and I said : 'When are you going to speak.' He said : 'I am very sorry that I am taking your place, but at the request of the first minister I was asked to follow the Hon. Mr. Tarte.' That is what he told me. Is that specific enough to satisfy the curiosity of my hon. friends opposite, who intend to use that speech in the North-west ?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that we cannot have two Canadas; one east of Lake Superior and the other west. If we are not to lose our identity; if we are to be saved from another campaign such as that of 1891, which was frustrated by the good sense and patriotism of the Canadian people, then we must be on our guard. This government on the eve of an election, intends to make such another campaign with the hope of being returned to power on it. But, Sir, our first duty is to cultivate a Canadian sentiment; our first duty is to show to the people of Canada that it makes a great deal of difference whether an article is manufactured by Canadian labour or by foreign labour, and our first duty is to provide home labour for the people of our own country. Well, Sir, how are we to do that? We must do it by cultivating a Canadian sentiment, by giving the first opportunity to Canadian enterprise and Canadian industry. If we prefer our Canadian home trade for Canadians rather than giving it to foreigners, if we prefer, in a word, to remain Canadians rather than to become a part of the United States, we must above all cultivate the sentiment of Canada for Canadians. Hon. gentlemen who fail to do that, who, instead, discuss the question from the standpoint of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) seem to me to be enemies rather than friends of that part of the country. I doubt if they are not playing a false part. I am not sure but that they will be the principle sufferers themselves; but what compensation is that for the wrong done to Canada and the evil effects that will follow the proclaiming of such an evil policy? I indulge the hope, however, that these hon. gentlemen will retrace their steps and follow a course that will unite rather than separate the country, that they will come to advocate a policy for the good of Canada as a whole, instead of different policies for different parts, each contending for itself and against the others. That we should have a united Canada, and not one broken into parts by the principles proclaimed by hon. gentlemen opposite, is, I am sure, the devout wish of every loyal Canadian.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) who addressed the House this afternoon at some length, said that the budget speech was somewhat disappointing. I have not the least doubt that it was somewhat disappointing to members on the other side of the House; but so far as the members on this side are concerned, I want to say that it was not disappointing at all, but was a speech with which we are very much pleased. The hon. gentleman saw fit to read the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) a lecture on patriotism. He told the House that the hon. gentleman, in making a speech on reciprocity with the United States, was speaking to the new settlers who are going into the North-west Territories at the present time with the desire of influencing their votes. He also stated that the hon. member for North Norfolk had made that speech by arrangement with the government. He said further that the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) had made a protectionist speech the other night also by arrangement with the government. In fact, he asserted that members of the government had arranged with their supporters to speak to different parts of the country; that is, one section of the House was to speak to the manufacturers of the east, another section to the farmers of the west, and another section to the new settlers coming into the country, with the intention of influencing their votes. Now, surely the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has forgotten that in days gone by the party of which he is a member were guilty of what he is accusing the Liberals of at the present time. I suppose he has not forgotten that on a certain occasion a gentleman who was Minister of the Interior for a few days, the Hon. Hugh John Macdonald, came to the west and advocated a policy of free implements, while the Hon. Mr. Foster, the Finance Minister at the time, and the other leaders of the party, were advocating protection in all other parts of the country. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the candidates of the Conservative party in the North-west Territories previous to the last election went all over the country advocating free implements and everything of that kind; but we did not hear anything of that kind in this part of the country. With reference to the hon. member for St. Mary's, I presume he speaks for himself and himself alone. I presume that the hon. member for North Norfolk, in advocating the policy of reciprocity with the United States, a policy which I want to say I myself believe in, also spoke for himself. I fancy that the policy of the government is laid before the House by the Finance Minister in the budget speech. Every individual member of this House has a perfect right to advocate whatever policy he considers to be in the interest of the country or in the interest of his particular locality, without being read a lecture on patriotism by the hon. member for Bothwell. Of course, the hon. member for Bothwell and his political friends imagined at one time that they had a monopoly of all the patriotism in this country. They used to boast of being the only patriotic party. They kept themselves in power for several years by waving the old flag; but in 1896 their hand seemed to lose its cunning. They

lost power, and in the last parliament, although they began by waving the old flag as before, they found that the people did not take any stock in it any longer and they dropped it. The speech made by the hon. member for Bothwell this afternoon was the same old speech that we have heard from him on several occasions during the last seven years. It was an old friend with a new face. It is true, he rubbed some of the corners off it, and put a little varnish on it, and tried to pass it off as a new article; but every member of this House who listened to it knows that it was the same old speech which has been replied to in this House half a dozen times. But I suppose the hon. member had nothing new, and in order to have something to say he had to refurbish the old speech and deliver it once more to the House. The leader of the party opposite, the hon. member for Halifax, dwelt at some length on ancient history. He told us what the Finance Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce had said and written some fifteen or sixteen years ago. We have heard that time and time again in this House for the last seven years. There has not been a budget under discussion when those same gentlemen did not resurrect something which the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Trade and Commerce had said some fifteen years ago. Let me tell them that the people of this country do not care tuppense ha'penny what the views of these or any other hon. gentlemen might have been long ago. Conditions change, and any statesman who cannot change with them, would be a very poor specimen. A policy that might have been good fifteen years ago might be anything but good at present. Why, in private life, a speculation which might have been a very good one a year ago might be just the reverse to-day. I have seen a gentleman in my town want to swap horses one day, but the next day changed his mind because he thought he could do better by keeping his own. And so with the government. They must keep up with the times and suit their policy to the changing conditions of the country. What our hon. friends opposite did was just the reverse. They stuck to the one policy until they practically drove half the people out of the country and had the whole country in a state of stagnation. The hon. leader of the opposition and also the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) had to admit that the country was highly prosperous, but they made desperate efforts to show that none of that prosperity was due to the administration and policy of this government. Well, Mr. Speaker, while we do not claim that governments make the rain to fall and the sun to shine or the little birds to sing, we do claim that by adopting business methods and applying these methods to the administration of public affairs and by adopting a fiscal policy suited to the needs of the times, this government has brought about a certain measure of prosperity. It is astonishing how, as times change, these hon. gentlemen sing a different tune. In days gone by they claimed every dollar of prosperity was due to their national policy. That policy, they said, made the hens lay more eggs, and they argued that the government which could not bring about prosperity should be turned down. To-day, however, they refuse all credit to the present government for the prosperity which they are forced to admit our country is enjoying. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that these hon. gentlemen protest too much. To ordinary people, the business of the country is governed by the same general principles as those of a private individual. If you want to do business to the best advantage you must advertise, you must let people know what you have to sell. If you have lands to sell, you must let the whole world know it. That is what this government has done and what the other government did not do. We have advertised our wares in the British markets and the other markets of the world. We have let the people of the other countries know what we have to dispose of and we have in this way brought about a prosperous condition of affairs. We have taken a leaf from the book of the United States. We have adopted up-to-date methods and applied them to our immigration policy, and in this way we have started a stream of immigration into our unoccupied lands, which is bound to produce the happiest results.

I do not intend to follow the example of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and weary the House with an abundance of figures. If those given by my hon. friend were analysed, it would be found that he was considerably astray in his conclusions. I have, however, here a couple of statements to show the progress this country has made in the way of business during the last few years. Take the foreign trade of Canada and that of the United States and compare the two. I am taking this trade on a basis of merchandise only. In the United States the increase was 38 per cent and in the Dominion it was 81 per cent. Then, take the domestic trade, on the basis of merchandise only. In the United States the increase was 51 per cent, while in Canada it was 84 per cent.

Then, take the per capita of the foreign trade of the United States, on a basis of merchandise only, and compare with that of Canada :

	United States.	Canada.
In 1890..	26·30	44·38
" 1896..	23·66	45·16
" 1902..	28·92	76·47

That, I think, is a pretty fair showing, and you will notice that most of the increase took place under the administration of this government. Let me now give the per capita trade, in domestic imports of merchandise only, in the United States and Canada :

	United States.	Canada.
In 1890..	13·50	17·18
" 1896..	12·29	20·97
" 1902..	17·49	36·04

I submit that the statement made the other evening by the hon. leader of the opposition was misleading, because he gave the amounts en bloc in comparing the trade of Canada with that of the United States. The only proper way to make a comparison is to take the per capita basis.

My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) dwelt at some length on the tariff, which is a question that interests particularly the people of our western country. He is kind enough to tell us that we are going to get the support of the people out there by circulating the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Well, Mr. Speaker, I know something about the people in the west, and judging by the sentiment out there, I should say that there is no necessity whatever to circulate the speeches of the hon. member for North Norfolk—although they certainly are good ones—or of anybody else, in order to get support for this government. The people in that part of the country know that they are prosperous. They can put their hands down into their pockets and feel that they have some money. But in 1896, they would feel in their pockets a long time before they could find a six-pence. It does not require speeches by my hon. friend from Bothwell or my hon. friend from Norfolk to convince them that the country is prosperous. With reference to the tariff, I submit, with all due respect to the hon. member for St. Mary's division of Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte), that the tariff should remain as it is. We in the west, as I have said, expect that we must pay our share of taxes to run the affairs of the country. We are not selfish; we know that the government of this country is a matter of compromise, and that we are not to be exempt from taxation while our brothers in the east are taxed. But the conditions in the west are different from those in the east. Practically everything that we in the west produce must be exported, and our products must be sold in the open markets in the face of the worlds' competition. Even products of ours that are sold within the Dominion are sold on the basis of the English price, so that we get no benefit from any home market whatever and thus we get nothing in return for the taxes we are called upon to pay in customs or excise. There are no industries as in the east and we are not building up a home market. As I have already said, we are contented with the tariff. We got reductions in certain lines, such as in woollen goods that were beneficial to the people, and we are willing to accept the present status. But we do not want to have an increase in the tariff at the present time or at any other time. That is the feeling of the people west of the lakes, and I submit that that feeling will have to be taken into consideration now and in the future in carrying out a fiscal policy for this country. Our hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in discussing this question the other afternoon told us that what we wanted was to have industries started west of the lakes. That may be very true. If gentlemen interested in manufacturing enterprises use some of their capital to set up establishments west of the great lakes to manufacture agricultural machinery, woollen goods or other commodities that we have to use, the creation of a home market will be begun, and we might take into consideration the fact that we are getting some benefit. But at the present time we feel that we are paying enough.

Now, as to the propaganda for an increase in the tariff, as I understand it, those who are most strongly in favour of an increase in our taxes, who have been the prime movers in the manufacturers' association to have petitions signed and delegations sent to wait on the government, are those interested in the manufacture of woollen goods and those interested in the manufacture of cotton goods. I venture to say there are no two industries in this country so well off at present as the woollen industry and the cotton industry. The great point is that they have a raw material on the free list. The class of wool used by the woollen manufacturers comes in absolutely free. The cotton people are in a similar position, for they get their raw cotton free. Contrast this with any other line of manufacture. Take, for instance, the furniture manufacturing interest. They certainly get their rough lumber free, but every other commodity that goes into the manufacture of furniture is taxed. What is raw material to the manufacture of furniture is the finished produce of other lines of manufacture. For instance, varnish, bolts and screws—everything that enters into the manufacture of furniture except rough lumber is subject to customs duty. It does not make any difference for my present argument whether the commodities are imported and pay the customs duty or whether they are manufactured in Canada, the price is increased to the extent of the duty, for the men who manufacture the varnish or the bolts or any of these other things take advantage of the duty and sell up to the limit that it allows. The manufacture of shirts is another illustration. Cambric and cottons of all sorts are the raw material of those who make shirts, and these are the manufactured products of the cotton people. It is true that the shirt manufacturer has the benefit of the duty upon the shirts brought into the country. I have not at hand at the moment a copy of the customs law, but we will say, for the sake of argument that the duty on these shirts is thirty per cent. If, then, the duty on raw material is thirty per cent,

the men who manufacture shirts have very little to protect them. All they have is the duty on the value of the labour put into the manufacture of the shirts which must be a small rate of protection. The same thing applies all along the line. It applies even in the case of agricultural implements. Unless the manufacturers in that line have their own paint factory, they must buy their paint, and, whether it is imported or whether it is manufactured in this country, the price is higher to the extent of the duty. And so in all classes of goods used in the manufacture of agricultural implements. When we consider these things, we see what an advantage the manufacturers of woollens have in being able to import their raw material absolutely free. Therefore, it seems to me, that these are the last people who should put up a propaganda in favour of increasing the tariff. The country is fairly prosperous. I know, as a matter of fact that the manufacturers of woollen goods in this country cannot fill their orders. I happen to be in business and know all about it. They are three, four, five or six months behind with their orders. They employ all the men they have room for and are increasing the size of their plants and working over time. We have a right to believe that they are working at a profit—they would not work at a loss, for they are not in this business in a philanthropic basis. In view of the prosperity they now enjoy I think they might very well leave the tariff alone. But they tell us: That is all very well, but the hard times will come. Well, there is an old saying it is time enough to bid the old gentleman good day when you meet him. When the hard times come, if there is necessity for the revision of the tariff, I suppose the Finance Minister will take it into his consideration and will arrange the duties to suit the affairs of the country. For my part, I am in favour of no tariff at all. But, as we must have revenue, I admit that we must have customs duties. But those duties should be imposed so as to bear as lightly upon the poorer classes of the community as possible. My hon. friend from Bothwell, speaking of the woollen trade this afternoon found fault with the government for taking the specific duty off woollens. It appears to me, on the contrary, that taking off the specific duties was a great boon to the poorer class of the community. The hon. gentleman talks about shoddy, I suppose he was alluding to blankets. I might illustrate the point with a case which I have given before, but which will bear repetition. Take a blanket weighing eight pounds and costing say $1.50. There is specific duty of forty cents. Add to this the ad valorum duty, and you make a duty of about fifty-five per cent on the blanket that is bought by the poor man. On the other hand, the better blanket that would be bought by the rich man pays a duty of only thirty per cent. The same point is illustrated by the case of shirts. A dozen shirts of the coarser quality costs $3.05—say $3 for the sake of the argument. There is a specific duty of $1 per dozen or thirty-three and one-third per cent, and an ad valorem duty of twenty-five per cent. That is a duty altogether of about fifty-eight per cent.

Now, if you take the other line of shirts worn by the rich man, which costs $36 a dozen, and spread a dollar a dozen over that, you have five per cent; add to that, 25 per cent, and you have 30 per cent that the rich man will pay on a shirt, while the poor man has to pay 55 per cent. That is the way of raising a revenue that appeals to the hon. member for Bothwell. He says the government should never have done away with the duty. I say the government in doing away with it, did something that is in the interests of the people of Canada.

Hon. gentlemen opposite would like to make the tariff of this country prohibitive, so far as I can gather. I am not sure what they do want. The leader of the opposition has talked about adequate protection. In the west we never can get a statement of what is meant by that; but from the drift of their speeches we must come to the conclusion that they are all in favour of raising the duties right along. Now, if you make a prohibitory tariff what will the effect be? You will enrich a few individuals at the expense of the great majority of the people; you will divert taxation from the treasury where it is going at the present time, into the pockets of a few individuals who will get rich; because if there are no goods coming into the country, if you raise the tariff high enough, so that you will have no importations into the country, of course there is no duty to be paid and nothing to go into the treasury, and men who sell goods to the people are going to get the benefit, and the majority of the people who use goods, although paying high prices, will have to pay taxes in some other way in order to run the affairs of the country, so they will pay taxes twice over.

Now, there is another thing, Mr. Speaker, If you impose a high tariff of any kind you are going to reduce the value of lands all over the country, because a high tariff will increase the cost of the production of every bushel of wheat, and every bushel of oats that a farmer raises, or of every animal or anything else that the farmer of this country has to raise; because he will have to pay so much more for his mowing machine and his rake, so much more for his plough, so much more for anything else he uses on his farm. That is going to increase the cost of the production of his grain and his animals. If you do that, you are lowering the earning power of that farm, and if you lower the earning power of the farm, you are lowering the value of the farm and lowering the value of the land. That is one of the results that would follow from increasing the duties.

Now, what would we get by adopting the

policy advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite ? If you put the duties up sufficiently high—and I have heard some hon. gentlemen opposite—I think the member for Bothwell himself advocated putting them up forty or fifty per cent—you would immediately close out all the importations coming into this country and you would leave us without sufficient revenue to develop this country. It is admitted by all classes of people that this country will require money for public works. If we are to keep pace with other countries we must have money to do it with. Now, the only way to have money coming into the treasury is by way of duties, otherwise you will have to borrow the money and pay interest on it. Now, Sir, under the scale of duties existing at the present time our revenue is increasing, it has doubled in seven years. Existing duties already give us sufficient money to run the country with, and this year we have a surplus. But if you were to adopt a high tariff you would simply shut off revenue and leave us without any money. You would build up a few millionaires, a few Rockefellers, you would build up a few trusts and combines such as the hon. member for Bothwell was talking about this afternoon. That has been the effect of high tariff in the United States, and that is the effect a high tariff would have in this country if it was enacted, there is no doubt at all about that. Talk to any hon. gentleman you please from the other side of the line, I don't care if he is a Republican or a Democrat, I don't care how high a protectionist he may be, he will not deny that the outcome of a high protective tariff in the United States has been to build up the trusts and combines they have there at the present time. These trusts and combines have got so strong that they are able to take the people by the throat. There is no legislature that the people can elect in the United States that is able to cope with the trusts at the present time. The trusts have got so strong there that they would simply turn out any government that would interfere with them. If the people were to elect a president of the United States to-morrow who was in favour of reducing the duties, who was in favour of regulating the trusts and combines, they would simply shut up their factories and turn hundreds of thousands of people on to the streets to starve. That would create a panic, and the consequences would be of the most alarming character. Now, we do not need to go to the United States for any patent of that kind. I think the people of this country have sufficient intelligence to frame a tariff to suit themselves, and if they are sensible they will frame a tariff to suit themselves without reference to what their neighbours are doing around them. It does not make any difference to us whether the people of the United States put a dollar a ton on iron going from this country to the United States. We have got to have iron, we have got to have raw material for our manufacturers. If it is a benefit to this country to get that iron in here, we will simply put it on the free list without reference to what the people of the United States may think or may do.

Now, an argument that has been used a good deal in this country, by gentlemen on this side of the House as well as gentlemen on the other side, is in regard to the balance of trade. They tell us that because we buy from the Americans some forty or fifty million dollars worth more than we sell to them, it is a ruinous policy for us to pursue, because the balance of trade is against us. I don't look at it in that way, I don't think there is anything in the balance-of-trade argument at all. We buy from the United States such commodities as we require, we buy raw material from them if we want it. If we want iron we buy it from the United States, simply because we want it in our own interest. If we buy certain other commodities from the United States we buy them because we want them, and if we put up a duty on these articles merely for the purpose of retaliation, we are simply, as the old saying is, cutting off our nose to spite our face. If the manufacturers of agricultural implements in this country, for example, had to pay a higher duty on the raw material which must come from the United States, they would have to increase the price of their commodities, and the people of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific would have to pay that increased price. So I say there is nothing in the balance-of-trade argument at all. I myself as a business man have bought goods for years from a firm, and paid them thousands and thousands of dollars, but they never bought anything of me in return. Still I did not lose any money by it, I made a little money as I went along. When we do buy more from the United States than they buy from us, we sell more to other countries than we buy from other countries, so on the whole the balance-of-trade is pretty nearly even, at the present time I think it is exactly even. Therefore, so far as the balance-of-trade argument is concerned, there is nothing in it.

Now I have something to say of the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on reciprocity. That seemed to trouble my hon. friend from Bothwell a good deal this afternoon. He seemed to think that if that speech was circulated it would have the effect of turning the votes of the newcomers in the west in favour of the Liberal party. Well, setting aside the political question entirely, as a member from the west, as one who has lived in the west for many years, and studied the conditions, and knows something about the feeling of the people there, I would like to see reciprocity brought about. We have a great field in the west for raising sheep. If we can get the markets of the United States for our wool, sheep raising will become a profitable

enterprise and millions of acres of very valuable land that is not used very much at the present time because it cannot be used for anything else, would be utilized for the purpose of pasturing sheep. Sheep can be raised profitably in the west and the people would make money out of it. We would also be able to get more for our cattle. We sell a great many young store cattle to the people of the United States. We would also get more for our wheat. I want to say a word in reference to wheat. To those who are acquainted with affairs in the west it is a well known fact that the hard wheat belt is moving northward all the time. Thirty years ago the state of Minnesota could not grow wheat on account of frost. To-day the state of Minnesota is turned into a corn state. They cannot produce hard wheat at all, the climate has changed entirely and they are producing scarcely anything but corn. In South Dakota, where they were affected by frost a few years ago, they are to-day going into the raising of corn. It has been figured down by scientific men that the wheat belt is moving northward at the rate of about five miles per year. The millers of the United States have found that it is impossible for them to run their mills at a profit without getting more hard wheat. They have managed to get permission from their government to mill our wheat in bond, and to-day we find that the Americans are building elevators all over the western country and entering into competition with the local buyers, thus increasing the price that the farmers are getting for their wheat. The Americans must have our wheat, and if we get reciprocity the demand will be greater and we will get a larger price. I claim that reciprocity with the United States would be one of the best things that could happen the people of the North-west. We must take into consideration, in speaking of the west, that the west and the east are practically one. We cannot be prosperous out there without the people of the east feeling it; you cannot be prosperous here without the people of the west feeling it. We are talking about reciprocity in natural products; we are not talking about reciprocity in manufactured articles. You will always have your market for manufactured articles in the west. The more we get for our wheat the more you will get for your manufactured articles. It is to the advantage of the people of eastern Canada to see the people of the west in a state of prosperity. The first step to take in bringing about that condition of prosperity is to secure reciprocity in the products which we raise in the west. I feel confident that we are going to get it. The feeling in the western states is growing strongly in favour of reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada. Anybody who studies the times knows that. There have been meetings held all over the United States to consider the question. We have had pronouncements made by several of the most prominent men of the middle and western states upon that question. The feeling, as I have said, is strong and reciprocity is going to be brought about. One of the reasons for this change of feeling is the fact that the government have advertised this country in the United States and the Americans now know what we have. Eight or nine years ago they did not know what we had. They imagined we had nothing but a country where everything froze up. To-day they know we have the finest agricultural lands in the world and they are anxious to come over and get some of these lands, and notwithstanding the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) I am of the impression that they will make first-class Canadians. In my own district as soon as they put in the three years which enables them to become Canadian citizens, they become Canadians. In one case a state senator from Minnesota in my district, who will have completed his three years next year, is going to take out his papers and become a Canadian citizen, so well satisfied is he with the institutions of the country, and I may say that these people are better satisfied with our institutions than with those which they had in their old homes. The sentiment is growing in favour of reciprocity and we should not do anything to hamper it. If you adopt a policy of retaliation you are merely going to strengthen the hands of those people who are opposed to freer trade between the two countries in the New England states. The proper policy to pursue is to arrange our own tariff to suit our own people and never mind what our neighbours are doing and in a very short time we will find that this feeling has grown so strong that reciprocity will be brought about and when it is brought about it will confer a great benefit upon the people.

Mr. Speaker, I have never looked upon the British preference, from the sentimental standpoint from which a great many people claim to have looked upon it. I have looked upon the British preference as a reduction in the taxation that the people of our part of the country have benefited by. With that preference we have been enabled to buy goods more cheaply, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell. I think I am in about as good a position, having been in business for over twenty years, being in business at the present time and handling woollen goods, to speak with authority on that question as the hon. member for Bothwell, and I say that the British preference has reduced the price of woollen goods and other commodities of all kinds to the people of the whole Dominion. Not only has it had the effect of reducing the price on all kinds of goods that come from Great Britain, whether they be great or small, but it has had the effect of reducing the price of all commodities that we import from the United States. It has also had the effect in reducing the cost of all commodities that are

produced by the Canadian manufacturers, because, if any person who is doing a business can go to a Canadian manufacturer, if he wants to buy a bale of blankets, or a bale of tweeds, make him an offer, saying: Under the preferential tariff of 33⅓ per cent I can lay these goods down at such a price, you are a Canadian I would like to deal with you and if you can supply the goods at that price I will give you the order, but if you cannot, I will get the goods from Great Britain. If the business man can do that, the Canadian manufacturer in order to hold the market, comes down to the price which has been mentioned, the merchant obtains the goods at a lesser cost and the people who consume those goods get the benefit of the reduction in price. Therefore, not only does the British preference apply to what we import from Great Britain, but it applies to what we import from the United States and all other countries, and also to goods manufactured in the country. I noticed this evening, and I have no doubt other hon. gentlemen have noticed, that Mr. Ritchie, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, announced to-day that the tax will be taken off wheat. I have observed that for some time the opposition have tried to make a point of that. I think it was generally understood by the majority of people that the tax was a war measure, and I think most people were under the impression in this House, as well as in Great Britain, that it would only last so long as they required to have it, for the purpose of getting revenue, that it would be taken off again and we see that it has been taken off. That will exclude some of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite and some hon. gentlemen no doubt will have to change the speeches that they have written up in view of the statement that has come over the wire to-day. Now, the people in my part of the country, as well as the people in all other parts of the country, are very much interested in the amount of taxes they have to pay. The people in the west are not as partisan as those in the east. The people out there are more independent.

In the west a man may vote one way to-day and another to-morrow, for he is always on the lookout for the best government he can get, and naturally to pay as little taxes as he can. They will vote for the platform that will best suit their views, but they want to know what that platform is. The leader of the opposition accompanied by some of his leading supporters, toured through the west last summer, and I think he must have come to the conclusion that the people whom he counted as Conservatives would not be favourable to his policy; that is if they could find out what it was. Personally I am at sea as to what 'adequate protection' means. It may mean anything, and it may mean nothing. It is like the American pedlar who had but one suit of clothes in his bag, and it was big enough for any man and small enough for any boy. The policy of the opposition at present is intended to suit every body, like the pedlar's clothes. When the Conservatives try to convert us to their way of thinking we have a right to know what their policy is before we take a plunge in the dark. Does the leader of the opposition think that the present duty on agricultural machinery is adequate? He was asked in Manitoba if he thought 20 per cent was adequate protection on mowing machines, and he said it was. We have his policy as to that particular item, but what is his opinion about the duty on threshing mills, fanning mills, disc harows, ploughs, and all that class of machinery? Is it adequate or does he want to raise it. The manufacturer might think that 40 per cent would be about adequate protection, while the farmer might think that 10 per cent is adequate enough. Now, the hon. gentleman from Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) did not give as much consolation to gentlemen on the other side of the House as they expected, but nevertheless he is a high priest of protection, and he says that about 49 per cent would be about a fair rate of duty, and I suppose he voiced the sentiments of the Conservatives in this House when he said that. The people of the west would like to know if the Conservatives think that 49 per cent on farm machinery is adequate protection. What would they consider adequate protection on blankets and shirts and course tweeds and woollens, which the farmers of the North-west use a great deal of, it being a cold country, and all of which they have to import. A farmer does not want to pay 35 per cent more for a piece of tweed than he would otherwise pay, in order that there should be adequate protection. These gentlemen opposite, if they hope to make any headway in the west, will have to come out of the woods and state exactly what they mean by adequate protection. They cannot play fast and loose with the people as they are trying to do. I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) who is leading the opposition to-night, that in the west his party cannot run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. He will find that his own supporters in the west, and there may be a few left, are in favour of a lower rate of duty, or at least that they are in favour of leaving the duty as it is to-day. It is certain that they do not want any increase of duty. Now, the leader of the opposition told us that from our standpoint we should have no surpluses at all, but that we should reduce the taxes. That may be true, but does not the hon. gentleman know that it is desirable to have stability of tariff and that it would be a very foolish thing to tinker with the tariff in the middle of a session just for the purpose of dissipating a surplus. A surplus is a good thing in its way. This is a great

and growing country, and we must have money to develop our resources, and if gentlemen in the east do not know what to do with a surplus of $13,000,000, I can tell them how they can spend it in a way that will redound to the interests of Canada at large. We are getting a hundred thousand immigrants or more into our North-west this year, and you can with great advantage devote your surplus so as to improve the condition of the people who are flocking into that country. You can equip a winter port in the beautiful harbour of St. John, and you can go to the St. Lawrence and expend money there in improving your transportation facilities. That will get rid of your surplus and it will confer great benefits on the people of Canada as a whole. I am afraid that most hon. gentlemen do not realize what the immense immigration into the west means to Canada. It means that each immigrant, man, woman and child, whom we bring in is assuming $50 of the national debt, and for 100,000 people, that means $5,000,000 a year. These 100,000 immigrants will bring $10,000,000 in wealth in the shape of merchandise and cash, and there you have $15,000,000 to figure on immediately. I submit that in a young and growing country like this, each immigrant is worth at least not less than $1,000, and therefore, if the government would spend $1,000,000 out of the surplus in bringing in say 150,000 people, we would be getting $5 back for every dollar we would expend in that way. Is not that a very profitable way in which to get rid of your surplus ? The leader of the opposition presented a statement to the House which purported to show the money taken out of the pockets of the people when the Conservatives were in power and the money taken out of the pockets of the people as he alleged since the Liberals came into power. He went on to say that when the Conservatives were in power in 1896 the taxation of the people amounted to $27,759,285, and that it had increased in 1902 to $43,389,122, which he said meant that in seven years the Liberal government had practically doubled the taxation of the people. The hon. member for Bothwell said this afternoon that when the Conservatives left office the taxation was something like $7 per head, and that this government had increased it to over $11 per head. I never heard, and no hon. member on the other side of the House ever heard, of this or any other government going to any man's door to collect taxes. Perhaps the hon. leader of the opposition has heard of it, but I never have. The government do not go to collect taxes from any person. The people tax themselves, because they are able to pay taxes. The hon. leader of the opposition the other day undertook to show that the Conservative government in 1891 collected $30,000,000 from the people and in 1894 brought it down to $27,000,000. I suppose he wanted to make out that that meant economy; but what does it show ? It shows that the people in those days of deficits were so hard up that they could not import many commodities. If a farmer buys a binder, and is is imported, he pays a certain amount of taxes. If he buys a plough, and it is imported, he has to pay more taxes. If he buys a suit of clothes made of tweed which is imported, he has to pay more taxes. When hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, he could not afford to buy a binder or a plough; perhaps he could not buy clothes; and then of course he did not pay taxes. If he is able to-day to dress his family or has luxuries which he could not afford when the Conservatives were in power, and a certain portion of these commodities are imported, he pays more taxes. If he lives more as a human being ought to live at the present time, he of course pays more taxes. The people were not able to pay as much taxes when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. The farmers could not buy binders, mowing machines and ploughs; they were so poor that they could hardly buy a suit of clothes. Now that prosperity has come, and is rolling over the country, they have more money; they can buy the machinery they require on their farms, they can dress their families in a proper manner, and have ten cents to put on the collection plate on Sunday, which they did not have when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. The greatest evidence of the prosperity which is rolling over the country at the present time, is the fact that the revenues of the country have increased by leaps and bounds. This shows that the people are able to buy largely of everything they need, and are consequently paying more taxes. If hon. gentlemen opposite had their way they would put up a high tariff wall, so that this money, instead of going into the public treasury, would dribble into the pockets of some individuals, and the people would get no advantage. That is the policy they want to adopt, but I think it will be a great many years before they have a chance to put into force a policy of adequate protection.

We have a great deal of money in the treasury of the Dominion at the present time; we are told that this year we shall have over $60,000,000. How is this money being spent ? Have hon. gentlemen opposite been able to put their finger upon a single dollar of improper expenditure ? I notice that when the estimates are going through, every member on the other side of the House wants more money spent. One wants a dock, another a post office, another a public building, another a harbour, another a dredge; and after they have all clamoured for more expenditures of every kind, they come down with a mock motion at the end in favour of retrenchment, and claiming that the government have spent too much money. How many of these votes

have they challenged ? Perhaps one or two out of millions and millions in a whole session of parliament. Yet they will talk about the increased expenditures. If the money that is coming into the treasury is properly expended—and it is, because hon. gentlemen opposite have not been able to show any wrong expenditure, although they have had their microscope on it right along—the people of the country will be perfectly satisfied. We require a good deal of money to-day. When the Finance Minister took over the financial affairs of this country, he found a pretty serious state of affairs. Mr. Foster, the Finance Minister, under the Conservative government, did not leave very much behind. It reminds me of a story I heard about an Irish undertaker, who was called in to bury a man who belonged to a peculiar sect. After he had prepared the corpse for burial, an elder of the sect to which he belonged gave him a five dollar bill to put into the box along with the corpse. The undertaker asked him what that was for. The elder told him it was to pay the passage of the corpse across the river Styx. After the elder left, instead of putting it in the coffin, the undertaker put it in his pocket, saying to himself, 'Begorra, times is hard, and I need that in my business, so I will let this fellow schwim.' That is exactly what the late Minister of Finance did with the present Minister of Finance ; he took everything in the treasury, and when the present Minister of Finance came in, he had to swim, and in his first year or two he had a good deal of swimming in order to pay off the debts left by his predecessor.

The hon. member for Bothwell referred to the expenditure of the Post Office Department. I was surprised that the hon. gentleman had the audacity to attack the Post Office Department of all the departments in the government. He said that the Postmaster General in the late government had opened about 1,000 post offices while in the same length of time the present Postmaster General had only opened 556—to show that the other Postmaster General had spent more money. But, when the present Postmaster General took over the Post Office Department, he found a deficit in the finances of about $700,000. He took over those thousand post offices, a great many of which I suppose had been opened for political purposes; he had to provide funds to run them, and, according to the hon. gentleman's own argument, he has run them and 556 more, and run them successfully. And with all that he has wiped out the deficit, and given the people penny postage. Then the hon. gentleman said that he had cut off a lot of mail contracts, and had dismissed a lot of people who should not have been dismissed. Any person who will take the time to look into the affairs of the Post Office Department and who knows anything about the inside history of that department, must come to the conclusion that the pruning knife was badly needed when the change of government took place. Look at what was going on all over the country. In my own riding a man was getting $7,000 for carrying the mails ninety miles. He had that contract year after year, but when the present Postmaster General took office, he cancelled it and called for tenders. What was the result ? The same work is now done for $1,000. Six thousand dollars per year have thus been saved to the people and we are getting a better mail service. This man had the contract some ten years, so that $60,000 were squandered of the people's money on this one contract, or sufficient to build a bridge for the people at Saskatoon. Hon. gentlemen opposite can surely not have forgotten the case at Brockville, where a man was paid a certain sum of money for transferring the mails from one platform to another and paid the same amount for watching himself while he did it. Nor can they have forgotten what took place in Nova Scotia, where a relative of the late leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), was getting some $600 per year for carrying the mails from the railway station at Amherst to the Amherst post office. And this man farmed the contract to another, who did the work for the sum of $200. So that this friend of the former leader of the opposition put $400 of the people's money into his pocket as long as he lived and did nothing for it. And when he was about to shuffle off this mortal coil, he bequeathed his contract to another relative of Sir Charles Tupper, who in his turn sub-let it for $200 and pocketed the $400. And when this man was about to die, he transferred it to another relative of the Tupper family, who also farmed it out for $200, and pocketed the $400. When the present Postmaster General came in, he applied the pruning knife to this transaction and let the contract for less than $200. Is it any wonder that with leakages of this kind, there should have been a deficit of some $700,000 which our Postmaster General is now succeeding in wiping out. My hon. friend from Bothwell can talk as much as he pleases about the Post Office Department, it will take a long while for him to convince the people that any change is necessary.

I wish now to crave the attention of the House for a few moments while I discuss a subject which more particularly interests that part of the country I come from, but which of course closely interests every part of the Dominion. We all belong to the same country, and what benefits the one is bound to be of advantage to the others. We have to work together, and our proper policy, as the hon. Minister of Finance has told us, is to build up our western country. Every producer you put on the soil is bound to consume manufactured products. Every one who grows wheat must buy manufactured articles. Let us fill up that country, and the

big industries down east will reap the benefit. It is well known that railway construction in the west is not keeping pace with the development of that country. Very little has been done in the past few years outside of the province of Manitoba in the way of constructing railways. We are getting people in there very fast, and if we do not do something at once towards building railways in that country, we may have a reaction and find people going out perhaps faster than we are bringing them in. What are the facts of the case ? The congestion which has existed in that country in the way of accumulated freights during the past two years is well known. I am not going to blame the railway companies. Although I hold no brief from the Canadian Pacific Railway, as everybody knows, I do not blame that company. I believe that its intentions were good. I believe that the $9,000,000 which it was supposed to spend west of the lakes in improving its terminals and motive powers and rolling stock, it intended expending there. But if a man wants a horse and can find no one with a horse to sell, what can he do ? If the Canadian Pacific Railway wants locomotives and could find none to buy, it is difficult to blame that company for not getting any. But the situation is one which demands a remedy. We have spent money on our canal system, but I am sorry to say that it has not proved, as my hon. friend from Bothwell has shown, a success. My hon. friend from Bothwell shows that although a lot of money has been expended on our canals, the tonnage passing through them is decreasing, but he forgot that while business is decreasing on the canals it is growing up by leaps and bounds on our railways. This is a railway age. I have given some study to the subject, and I am convinced that any money spent on canals, except for the purpose of utilizing them as a safety valve to regulate freights, is money wasted. I shall not take into account the people who came into our western country last year and who are coming in this year, because they are not yet producers, but the people who were there up to two years ago have produced about 125,000,000 bushels of grain in round figures. Up to two years, there were not more in that western country than 500,000 people. If 500,000 people produced over 125,000,000 bushels of grain, and if we put people into that country at the rate of 100,000 per year, we will double our production in five years. To-day we are suffering from a congestion of traffic; we cannot get our grain out. What we got to the lake ports we had not sufficient boats there to move, and, even if we had boats, we could not get it all to the lake ports in sufficient time for navigation. Consequently more than one-half of our crop is in the terminals or elevators throughout the country and will have to be kept there a year. Every bushel of wheat which has to be kept over at the close of navigation costs six cents to the farmer. The storage insurance, interest on money and other charges, amounts in round figures to about six cents per bushel. We have 50,000,000 bushels lying on our hands, and if you figure out how much this comes to at six cents a bushel, you will find that our 500,000 people in the North-west have lost enough money to pay the interest on the bonds of railways which would carry that grain out during the winter months. What we absolutely require is some way of marketing our grain every year. We cannot store our grain at the head of the lakes. We have a surplus of fifty million bushels this year, and it is quite within the range of possibility that in ten years we shall have a surplus of one hundred and fifty millions requiring to be stored there. Suppose you throw one hundred and fifty millions of bushels on the market in the spring of the year, you would certainly depreciate the market very seriously. This would be an addition to cost of five or six cents per bushel for keeping it in store and depreciation while there. The only safety for the people is to have a railway built with proper grades, with large locomotives and cars of great capacity such as we have now. We could then market our grain twelve months in the year. This must be done some time, and the sooner it is taken up the better. It will unite the two parts of the country, it will bring the people of the east and the people of the west together and there will be a better feeling. It will make it possible to carry out cheaply the products of the west and to bring in at proportionately low rates the commodities that the people of the west require. You would have no trouble then about bringing in goods from the outside. You would build up a solid country, and this is the only way you could do it. In the meantime, with conditions as they are in the west, something must be done immediately. If some action is not taken in the present session to provide a railway along the Saskatchewan Valley up towards Edmonton to afford railway facilities for the people in that country, some of whom are fifty or sixty miles from a railway, it is within the range of possibility that you may have people going out of the country faster than you can bring them in. We know that a great many of the people going in there are people from the United States, from a country where they have railway facilities—

Mr. MACLEAN. Who built the railways?

Mr. DAVIS. It is the money of the people that builds everything. These people from the United States are accustomed to having railways close at hand, and to everything moving quick. If they stay there two years and find that the government is taking no action towards giving them relief, it is, as I say, quite within the range of possibility that they may pack up and leave the country. What would that mean ? That would

mean a depreciation in the value of farm lands from one end of the country to the other. The condition of things is serious, and it is absolutely necessary that this matter should be dealt with at once—the sooner the better for all parties interested. Now, I notice that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) is very much interested in the railway problem. Judging from the speeches he has made on the question, he is always in favour of government ownership of railways. I may tell him and other gentlemen who are troubled with the disease of government ownership of railways that if he had been in this House this afternoon and had heard the criticism of his friend from Bothwell, he would have come to the conclusion that government ownership of railways is not a paying proposition. But, I am not very particular about how the roads are built. Some people are opposed to giving subsidies to railways. If any person can get capitalists to go in there and build a road in the Saskatchewan Valley, with the necessary branches and do it without subsidies, I shall be quite in favour of it. But before capitalists will enter upon an enterprise of that kind, they must see where the interest on their money is coming from. Except for the business of taking the people into the country you are not going to get any revenue for the first two years, I do not suppose my hon. friend from East York would propose taxing immigrants enough to pay the interest on the cost of the road for those first two years. How, then, is the interest to be provided ? Of course, if you can get the roads built without subsidies, I am with you. But we must have railways, whether the companies build them or whether the government build them. There are people in the west who are in favour of government ownership of railways. But, it seems to me, from the study I have given to it, that it would not work very well with the system of government we have here. Put the railways under control of the government, I do not care whether it is a Liberal or Conservative government, and the result, it seems to me, would be dangerous. In place of government ownership of railways, I think it would be government ownership of people. I think my hon. friend from East York and the people of his way of thinking will find, that if the railways were in the hands of the government, it would be difficult to move the government from power, whatever the occasion for doing so might be.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) to the fact that there is an amendment before the Chair moved by the leader of the opposition concerning the tariff. According to the rules of parliamentary procedure, when an amendment has been moved the discussion would be confined to that amendment. I find that the hon. gentleman is now discussing the question of government ownership of railways. The amendment as he is aware, deals with the tariff question.

Mr. DAVIS. I have not read the amendment. I did not think it worth my while.

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment reads as follows :

> This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians ;
>
> And that the financial policy of the government should include a measure for the thorough and judicious readjustment of the tariff at the present session.

I would invite the hon. member to confine his remarks as much as possible to the question of the tariff.

Mr. DAVIS. I am glad to hear the amendment. I had not taken much notice of the wording of it, but I understood that it was generally in favour of adequate protection. It seems to me, that the discussion of railways is quite germain to the subject. A vigorous railway policy is necessary for the welfare of the agriculturists as well as for the healthy development of trade. I do not see how the railway question is to be omitted from a consideration of the financial affairs of the country. The hon. member for Bothwell, this afternoon, discussed the Intercolonial railway and every other question from Dan to Beersheba and if there had been anything outside of that that he could have got after, he would have brought it in too. I am under the impression that the subject I was trying to discuss is as important as those covered by the hon. member for Bothwell, and it has a direct bearing upon the welfare of the country and on the question of the tariff, for, as I have shown, if you build up railways between the east and the west you are going to keep trade within ourselves, and it will not be necessary to go outside the country to buy the commodities we require.

Mr. SPEAKER. I thought the hon. gentleman was discussing the question of ownership of railways, which was, perhaps, going a little outside the question.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I am in the wilderness, I was led there by the hon. member for Bothwell. He was in the wilderness all afternoon. He gave us the track mileage of I don't know how many railways and all sorts of details on railway questions. I was going on to say that we need railways from the east to the west. I was not going to discuss the question of government ownership of railways—I leave that to my hon. friend from East York who appears to have a patent on that kind of thing for this country. I keep well within the lines of the trade question when I say that if we are going to build up the

country and keep the trade of the west for our home industries, whether the tariff is high or low, we must build railways so that the people may be contented with their lot, and so that the people of the west and the people of the east may exchange ideas and everything else.

Now we must have railroads built. As I said before, it does not make much difference to the people of the west in what way they are built. We have some people up there in favour of government ownership. But how is the government going to construct those railroads ? For my part I believe that the time for giving subsidies to railways has passed. I think there is a better way than by giving cash subsidies, and that the majority of the people of this country are coming to that opinion. We cannot at the present time have government ownership of railways because it would not be practicable under our system of government. It would not be practicable unless you took over all the railroads in the country, because you cannot run a government railway to compete with an independent line, the government railway has got to go to the wall. So I say it would not be wise for us to build government railroads at the present time. But there is another way of doing it, and that is by guaranteeing bonds.

Now I want to say a few words with reference to the state of feeling in the province of Ontario at the present time. I find that certain delegations of farmers have been waiting on the government protesting against giving bonuses to railways. I find that such papers as the 'Farmers' Sun,' and perhaps the Toronto 'World,' are also opposed to granting cash subsidies to railways at the present time. That feeling seems to have taken strong hold of the people of Ontario. But the people of Ontario seem to forget that every man in the province has a railway at least within five miles of his own door, and they seem to forget that those railways were built with money out of the public treasury of this country, and if it did not come out of the treasury it was money borrowed on the credit of the whole people, who have to pay interest on that money. The other day I asked a question about how much public money had been given for building railways. I find that $69,418,275.54 have been spent on the Intercolonial Railway ; I find that $5,000,000 odd were spent on the Prince Edward Island Railway. I find that subsidies have been granted to railways to the extent of $1,872,000 in Nova Scotia, and $1,292,000 to New Brunswick. I am not complaining of anything that has been given to these provinces, I think they are entitled to it. I find that Quebec got $10,000,000 and over by way of railway subsidies, and I find that Ontario got $18,750,000, money that was borrowed on the credit of the whole people of Canada towards constructing her railways. And to-day, after every man has got a road at his own door, he says : Well, it is time to stop giving subsidies. It is like a man sitting down to a free dinner, and after eating a good hearty meal himself he pushes the dishes away and says : No more meals to be given away. This money that has been spent on railways all over this country, has been borrowed on the credit of the people. Now let me go a little further. I find that $3,000,000 odd were spent on railroads in Manitoba, principally on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway ; in the North-west provinces, $7,000,000, on main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway ; British Columbia, $9,000,000 odd on main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now it is often said that the Canadian Pacific Railway was built for the people of the west. I take issue with that statement. Where did the $25,000,000 given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the west, come from ? It was not paid out of consolidated revenue, it was borrowed on the credit of the people of Canada. The people of the west have got to help pay the interest on it, and it is within the range of probability that in the near future, judging by the development up there, we may be called upon to pay the greater part of the principal. When they tell us that they are building railroads for us in the west—it is nothing of the kind. Every railroad in the west has been built out of our own land, granted without stint. More than 80,000,000 acres of the most fertile lands in the world have been given away for railroad construction ; in my own district, 10,000,000 acres of land, have been given away to subsidize railways. How many miles of railway do you think we have in Saskatchewan ? About one hundred miles. We have given $50,000,000 worth of land and have got one hundred miles of road. We are not complaining about that, because after all I do not think it will matter much to the people of this country in thirty years from now whether that land is given away to railroads or to settlers. The land is of no value until you get some person to buy it and begin producing, then it becomes valuable. But the argument still remains that we in the west, who have contributed to build all the railroads in the east for the last eighteen years, think it is not unreasonable now to ask the people of the east to assist us in opening up and developing that country.

I was going on to say that there was a better way of building railroads than by granting cash subsidies, because I think the age of cash subsidies is past. Now a railroad should not be built at all unless it is built in a section of country that will support a population. If a tract of country will not support a population, there should be no railroad built there. If you build a railroad through a fertile tract of country that has passed the experimental stage, and where the people are coming in and settling, there can be no risk at all in the govern-

ment guaranteeing bonds to the railway under certain conditions. I claim that the government would do well to guarantee the bonds of a railway company to build that road through to Edmonton, or further if it is found necessary, at a certain figure, and take a first mortgage on that road, so that we may have something to show, and that we may get interest on the money. And in order to satisfy the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) and gentlemen of that school, let us insert a clause in the agreement that the government will have a right to purchase. If you do that the gentlemen who build that road will be able to go into the money markets of the world and borrow money for 3 per cent and less, on a government guarantee. That being the case, if you put $13,000 or $14,000 a mile into a railroad at 3 per cent, it must necessarily follow that the fixed charges and the interest on that money every year are going to be less than if it was built with 6 per cent money that a corporation would have to pay if they had to borrow money without a guarantee. You would have double the amount of interest to pay every year if you built the road by a private corporation without a government guarantee. If the government guarantee the bonds, they should also take the right of supervising the rates to be charged on the road. As soon as the country settles up thickly, as soon as development takes place, as soon as production takes place, the road becomes more valuable. If the government do not wish to purchase the road in the meantime, the company can get other parties to take bonds without a government guarantee. After the country is settled, the government can release the mortgage and the railroad will not cost the people of the country a cent. Bonds were guaranteed on railways in Manitoba eight or ten years ago, and the government of Manitoba have never been called on to pay a dollar, because the profits after the opening up of the road were sufficient to meet all the charges on the road.

I think, if the government takes this question up, and there is an urgent necessity that it should be taken up at once, by guaranteeing the bonds and taking a first mortgage on the road, inserting a clause to suit the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) if it is necessary, we will get the road built this year, and we will be enabled to hold not only the people we have, but we will be enabled to get hundreds and thousands of more people to come into that country. We have a boom on now, we are bound to get the people, we have the land, the climate is all right, but we must be alive, we must act quickly, we must show that we are alive, because, if we do not, people are not going to stay here and let the moss grow upon them. Now, I think I have taken up, perhaps, too much of the time of the House. I may be transgressing the rules of the House in bringing this question of railway construction in the west to the attention of the government, but in doing so I am only doing what I feel is right, not only in the interests of the people of the west, but in the interests of the people of the east. I know what the conditions up there are. I know people forty and fifty miles away from a railway, and I know that a man cannot farm with profit fifty miles away from a railway. If a man has to haul his wheat a thousand miles by railway and fifty miles by land, it will cost him more to haul it fifty miles by land than to pay the freight for 1,000 miles by rail. We must secure cheaper freight rates for the people in that country. These people who are waiting year in and year out for railways will get tired and leave the country. I know people in my district who have been for twenty years fifty or sixty miles away from a railway, and if they do not get some relief they will feel like moving out. If the newcomers see old settlers going out, they will not look with favour upon the country. I hope the government will take this question up and deal with it. We have a large surplus and we will have large surpluses in the future, because, having a government which carries on the affairs of the country on business principles, we are bound to have surpluses. I do not claim that this government have made all this prosperity, that they have made the rain to fall or the sun to shine, but they have done something in the way of building up the country by adopting business methods in the conduct of public affairs. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that while prosperity exists in Canada today all the world is prosperous, and that we are only getting our share. I will say however, that there is a possibility that if the government had not risen to the occasion while other countries were carrying on an increased business and enjoying a large measure of prosperity this country might not have been prosperous. If a man is running a business in a town and he does not advertise his business, look after it and apply modern methods to it, he might set on his counter and do nothing, while every other merchant of the town was doing a rushing business. I claim that this government are a first-class business government, that they are conducting the affairs of the country upon business principles, and I am certain that when the appeal is made to the country again, the people will think twice before they return to what they had seven or eight years ago—periods of depression, stagnation, and people going out of the country faster than we could bring them in.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, in continuing this debate, I may refer for a very few moments to some of the points taken up by the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Davis) who has just resumed his seat. The notes which I have taken of them are something like the following, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not do as they often do on that side of the House—get up and run out of the House as soon as they deliver themselves of their speeches. First, he says: 'surpluses are a good thing.' I may have something to say in regard to that later on. 'The government never collect taxes.' I will refer to that as well, because I am able to refer him to very good authorities on that side of the House—the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding). 'The Postmaster General, when he came to power found a deficit of $700,000. He wiped out the deficit by saving on contracts for carrying the mails.' I will refer to that as well. 'The railway problem of the west; we must have some way to market our grain. If the railway is not built this year, people will move out.' I imagine the influx of settlers to that country will be the best market the people will have for their surplus products for a year or two whether they have railways or not. Therefore, I do not think there is any great danger in that respect. It is said in the section of the country from which the hon. gentleman comes, that they have occasionally what they call chinook winds that come through the crevices of the mountains. They are dry, they are higher in temperature than the average temperature of the atmosphere, and out of that condition has grown the saying whenever a scheme is floated upon nothing, that it is a hot air scheme. I must confess that the logic that the hon. gentleman presented to this House to back up his convictions was largely of the hot air character, and I do not wonder at it because he comes from a section of the country where they know something about hot air.

The hon. Minister of Finance made his statement in this House a few days ago in regard to the condition of the country financially, commercially, and industrially. Its treasury, he said, was overflowing with wealth. The incoming revenues of the country were not only ample for its needs, but there was a large surplus every year, the largest, expected at the end of the present year, would reach about $13,000,000. The expenditure, he said it was true, had been heavy, but we had the money, the country required the expenditure, and if the expenditure was wisely made no one could object. The people, he said, are industrially employed to their fullest extent at good wages, and the country is becoming wealthy, so the banking and financial operations up to the present indicate. The financial statement in the line of bookkeeping which he gave us showed that the country was in a prosperous condition so far as its revenue went, and that the government were expending lavishly so far as their expenditures went. He said the revenue was overflowing and going up every year. In round figures we find that it is something like the following:

Year.	Revenue.
1897	$37,000,000
1898	40,000,000
1899	46,000,000
1900	51,000,000
1901	52,000,000
1902	58,000,000

Well, this was a large revenue, very much larger than Canada had ever been accustomed to before these last few years. But, while the revenue was large the expenditure also was large. The statement is as follows:

Year.	Revenue.	Expenditure.
1897	$37,000,000	$42,000,000
1898	40,000,000	45,000,000
1899	46,000,000	51,000,000
1900	51,000,000	52,000,000
1901	52,000,000	57,000,000
1902	68,000,000	63,900,000

The people of Canada cannot complain of the parsimony of the government in expenditure, nor of their slowness to collect heavy taxes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) told us that the government does not collect taxes, but it is quite plain that they get a very large amount of money from one source or another, including customs and inland revenue. The Minister of Finance told us that from 1897-8 to the present he had had, not only enough money to expend for the requirements of the country (not including capital expenditure) but that he had $40,900,000 of surpluses besides. Does it not seem passing strange that if the government could collect a surplus of $41,000,000 in six years, they did not succeed in reducing the national debt by more than $6,000,000. If a farmer has a mortgage on his farm and he has seven years of prosperity and a surplus of $2,000, what kind of a farmer would he be if he did not pay his mortgage. If he spent his money extravagantly and recklessly and neglected the mortgage would not any sensible man say that that farmer was a poor financier, and that he was not acting in the interests of himself and his family. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) told us that a surplus was a good thing, and I asked him why should this extra money be taken out of the pockets of the people—

Mr. SPEAKER. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to the rule that when an amendment to the motion for ways and means has been moved the debate should be confined to the subject matter of the amendment. The hon. gentleman is now discussing the question of the expenditure of the country. Does the hon. gentlemen think that is relevant to the amendment?

Mr. SPROULE. I respectfully submit that it is relevant to the amendment. I am

endeavouring to show that by their system of taxation the government is taking more money out of the people than is needed for the requirements of the country, and that what we want is adequate protection and a fair revenue. But while I bow to your ruling Mr. Speaker, I will give another reason. I hold in my hand extracts from the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce who spoke after the amendment was moved and he dealt with exactly the same question as I am dealing with now. I respectfully submit that since he was allowed that latitude I should not be refused the right of a reply. I would point out also Mr. Speaker that for the last two years the amendment has been moved at the commencement of this debate, and therefore if you confine yourself closely to the rule and not permit a reply to the budget speech, it will lead to a great deal of inconvenience.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Speaker, while I recognize that your ruling is absolutely correct and that the amendment being moved at the beginning of the debate shuts off general discussion, still Sir, on behalf of the government I would desire that with the consent of the House you should allow debate on everything comprehended in the financial statement. Beyond that I do not think we should travel however. That is our desire Sir, if you can see your way clear to waive the rule.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is clear on the question but I am anxious to be guided by the feeling of the House and that is why I mention the matter. It is better that there should be some understanding on the question. Personally I have no feeling on the matter, and if the House wishes it I have no objection.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The rule has been already departed from and it is only fair that we should have the same rule applied to us all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I believe Sir, that if we are allowed to discuss the question treated of in the financial statement generally, it may have the effect of shortening the discussion rather than that there should be a new debate on the financial question and on the trade question as well.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair and there is an amendment to that motion, and the rule is that the debate should be confined to the amendment. It would not be in order to speak on the expenditure of the country or on the railway policy as was done by the last speaker (Mr. Davis), I call attention to the rule and it is for the House to come to an understanding upon the matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The rule is a very proper one but if it were applied here it would lead to a double debate upon the same question, and I think we might all agree to avoid that.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite satisfied Mr. Speaker that your only desire is to preserve the rules of the House, but when you intimated to me some time ago that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) was travelling outside of the rule I said that if the rule were insisted upon it would be very inconvenient. I believe that it would be an economy of time to permit a general debate now. Let me Sir, direct the attention of the House and particularly of the last speaker (Mr. Davis) to what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said with reference to surpluses a few years ago. Here it is

> If the surpluses were created by government in some magic way there might be in them a cause for thankfulness, but they are not. But when it is considered that every dollar of a surplus is money taken out of the pockets of the people without a shadow of excuse ; money not even required by the reckless expenditure of the government, there is not as much cause for rejoicing.

I commend that language of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the attention of hon. gentlemen on the other side as peculiarly appropriate to the condition of things now existing. Even under a reckless system of expenditures, the Minister of Finance tells us that at the end of the present year he will have for the number of years the Liberals have been in power aggregate surpluses amounting to about $41,000,0000. Then I say apply to the present system the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce's own logic of a few years ago, and it is the strongest proof that that system is burdening the country, is taking money out of the people that is not needed, and is indicative of very bad government. He went on to say :

> That millions of dollars should be taken yearly from the consuming classes of the country, and this without being absolutely necessary, is a cardinal principle of the Finance Minister to which even his best friends could not unreservedly assent.

I wonder how that applies to the present Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman said :

> A surplus of so many millions is so much money drawn from the trade of the country. How long can the Dominion stand the drain ? Certainly not many years longer.

This was said at a time when the aggregate surpluses of eighteen years amounted to $9,800,000. How much stronger will the application of this language be to-day, when in seven years the government have taken $41,000,000 from the people more than they required ? Do I require to comment on it ? I say comment is unnecessary. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is noted for his direct reasoning, his strong adjectives and his logic; and if these ever applied with special force to a party in power, they apply to the party in power at the present time. Why was this extra money taken out of the people ? Not because it was de-

manded by the needs of the country, because hon. gentlemen admit that they do not require to spend that much. Then, why not do as the Conservative party did when in power ? When we found that there was a surplus of revenue over expenditure, we threw off that amount of taxation. In 1894, when the surplus was going to be largely increased, we threw off $3,500,000 of that taxation, so as not to take more out of the pockets of the people than was absolutely necessary for the needs of the country as economically governed.

We are told that we have good times to-day. We have not attempted to deny that. No people in the country are more grateful and thankful for it than we are. But what wonder is it that we have good times ? Before 1896 we had a cycle of hard times, the hardest times that we had for many years. Then a cycle of good times started up all over the world, and Canada shared in those good times as well as every other country. But look at the expenditures of the government during the last seven years. How much have they spent in that time ? They have spent $314,500,000, while in the seven years previous, the party that was declared by these same hon. gentlemen to be reckless spendthrifts only spent $251,000,000. Is it to be wondered at that this large expenditure helped to make good times for Canada ? They were spending all that their predecessors spent each year, and over $10,000,000 a year more. In these seven years they have spent $63,000,000 more than their predecessors did in the same time. That expenditure helped to make good times, there is no doubt whatever. Add $10,000,000 to our expenditure every year, and think what it means to the people of Canada. Now, with this heavy revenue, this large collection of taxes, and this heavy expenditure, I ask, what great national undertaking has been accomplished by the present government ? What national highway have they built ? What great national good have they secured for the people of Canada ? I answer none. There is not to-day a living monument to their management of the country during the last seven years. The Minister of Finance says that every department of the government has been wisely and economically managed, from a business and financial standpoint. He referred to the Post Office Department as an illustration, claiming that the present Postmaster General found a deficit of $700,000 when he took charge of the business, which he reduced from year to year, until last year there was a deficit of only $105,221. But the hon. Postmaster General stated in Toronto a few months ago that there was no deficit at all. Which statement is correct ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but he knows that the hon. Postmaster General did not say that. He said, omitting the Yukon and the Atlin districts, there was no deficit.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to explain that. Omitting the Yukon district, there was no deficit; but the unfairness of omitting the Yukon must be clear to any one, because it is part and parcel of the post office system. If you deal with the whole post office system under the late government, you must do the same under the present government, otherwise the comparison is no comparison at all. You cannot compare things that are not comparable. You must compare things that are comparable. The hon. Minister of Finance said that there was a deficit of $105,000, including the Yukon. The hon. gentleman who took his seat a few moments ago said that the hon. Postmaster General had wiped out that deficit by saving on the contracts for carrying mails. What has the Minister of Finance to say of that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He did effect large savings.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked the hon. Minister of Finance :

Is that deficit reduced out of the revenue of the post office ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as I am aware, it was. I do not quite see the point of my hon. friend's question.

Mr. SPROULE. Simply this, if I may be allowed to explain. I understand that the old deficit of $700,000 was wiped out by an item put in the estimates for that purpose, but it was not revenue from the post office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not quite see the difference ; the fact remains that at the close of the year 1896 there was a deficiency of some $700,000, just how it was paid is of little consequence ; and if under the circumstances which I have described, my hon. friend has reduced that to $105,000, I think that is a record which even my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) should receive with satisfaction.

Now, was that the way the deficit was wiped out ? I say it was not.

Mr. COWAN. Well, you are wrong.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) is to the fore again. He is usually noisy when any one else is speaking.

Mr. COWAN. I have been pretty patient to-night.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do I say it was not wiped out in that way ? For this reason :

At the close of the fiscal year of 1895-1896, the parliamentary appropriation for that year had been exhausted and large sums were still owing by the department. With the view of ascertaining the true financial position of the department, two accountants, Messieurs Cross and Munro, were appointed to make certain inquiries, the result of their investigations being set forth in the aunual report of 1897.

What were they to inquire into ? One of their inquiries was to ascertain the exact

amount of the unpaid debts or liabiliaties of the department on the first of July, 1896, over and above the appropriation made to parliament for the fiscal year 1895-6 and classify the same. They were to inquire about several other things as well. They then made this report. They said that at the close of the fiscal year 1895-6 the liabilities of the department, in excess of all parliamentary appropriations applicable thereto amounted to the sum of $685,449, increase of these liabilities during the year 1895-96 made it $68,734 more, which made in all $781,152. That was the actual deficit the auditors found.

I asked whether that was wiped out by the savings, and I understood from the reply and the process of reasoning of the Finance Minister that it was. But what do the estimates of 1897 show? An item was proposed for the Post Office Department of $685,447, or just what the auditors found was the deficit and for which there was no appropriation. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was then looking after the estimates of the Postmaster General, said in explanation of that item:

> The Postmaster General is not here at the moment. But I can state briefly what this is. They are the accumulated deficits of the post office for the last twenty years. It appears that they have always been out running the constable in that department, and that they have been constantly paying out of one years appropriations, sums which were due in the last year and adding thereto from time to time. They have finally run up to this large sum and the Postmaster General thinks that it is time that should stop.

And he proposed an item of $685,447 for that purpose. And we voted that amount. Was it by any saving in the department that this amount was wiped out? Not at all. That should for ever set at rest the contention that the Postmaster General, by any exercise of economy, wiped out this deficit. What more did the hon. Postmaster General do? He sold that year $444,000 worth of Jubilee stamps, which were not redeemable by the post office except you used them by way of postage. A large portion of them were never used at all. I sent two sets to Kansas and had an application for more, but could not get them. It was a disgrace, I contend, to this government to take that money out of the people and give them nothing in return. Ordinary stamps were redeemable in cash, but not these stamps. When we find this item of $685,447 voted to wipe out part of the deficit and when we find the Postmaster General realizing $444,000 out of Jubilee stamps, are we to conclude that he is entitled to any great credit? I do not think it. And I do not think that any gentleman on that side should be inclined to give him credit for great economy in the administration of this department. I am not saying a word against the hon. gentleman for what he has done. Many of the things he has done I approve of. I approve of the reduction in the postage, but while he reduced the postage on letters he increased it on papers. While he reduced on the one hand he raised on the other. But what I find fault with is that he should take credit to himself for good management and for wiping out the deficit and making the department self-sustaining. Whereas, as a matter of fact, as I have shown, he did nothing of the kind. What did Mr. Foster say in reply to the explanation I have cited of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce? He said:

> We will accept that explanation. We knew that the hon. gentlemen opposite were going to bring down enormous appropriations, and we suppose that we will have to let them pass.

It passed off at that. That is the history of how the post office deficit was wiped out.

We are told that there is economy in every department. We are told that the Intercolonial Railway has been economically managed, but that question has been already dealt with and will be dealt with at greater length by hon. gentlemen on this side in the future.

I would ask: Has the Department of Public Works been wisely and economically administered? I could readily give a dozen items as illustrating the very reverse. Take that vote which was given last year for a public work, the Grand Vallée pier, which will be found in last year's 'Hansard,' page 1585. A public work was started there which is going to cost the country $63,000. It was started in a place where there were not a dozen people, where no boat heretofore ever called, where no trade was done, which was nothing but a wilderness. And for what purpose was it started? Simply to benefit a member of this House who had invested in a timber limit there a short time before. The place, as the hon. member described it the other night, was when this work was begun, a perfect 'terra incognita'—no boats at all, no population, no village, no post office. That wharf, when finished will cost the country, according to the Minister of Public Works, $63,357. If time permitted I could give a dozen examples which would show just as effectively as this does the lack of wisdom and economy which characterizes the administration of this important department. There is no extravagance, we are told; every department is managed wisely and well. Let me take one example from the Department of Agriculture, and it is quite as striking as the other I have given. The present government had a work to do that their predecessors did several times—the taking of the census. This government took the census in 1901. The census was taken by their predecessors in 1891, in 1881 and in 1871. The first time the census was taken in 1871, the cost was $511,330. In 1881, the cost of taking the census was $456,904. In 1891, the expense of this service $570,000, only once under the Conservative regime did the

expense of taking the census go above half a million. What did it cost this government to take the census in 1901 ? So far they have spent $1,130,000, double what it cost in 1891. This is the record of this government which we are told is a government of economy and ability. But they tell us that there was much more work in taking the last census. Well, they had nine schedules in the census of 1891 and eleven schedules in the last census. But the expense has already been doubled, all but $10,000, and that amount and more will be spent this year. Will the people of the country regard this as wise expenditure ? Will they regard it as an example of strict economy ? I do not think they will.

What has the government accomplished in the way of national statesmanship since they came into power ? What great thing have they accomplished for the benefit of the people ? Before coming into power they said they would negotiate a trade treaty with the United States. Have they done so ? No ! They tried to negotiate a treaty with France to establish better trade relations between the two countries, but so far they have not succeeded. They tried to improve our trade relations with Germany, and they have brought about a trade war with that country, so that we are shut out of its markets. They tried to negotiate a treaty with the United States, but it was a failure. They tried to negotiate a treaty with the little island of Trinidad but failed. They told us that at the late intercolonial conference we would get a treaty with the Australian colonies. They told us that the granting of the preferential trade with England was a great achievement. We have had that system a few years and what is the effect of it ? Taking up to-day's paper, I find the following :

London, April 23.—Mr. Harold Cox, secretary of the Cobden Club has written to the Westminster 'Gazette' with regard to the Canadian tariff policy as follows : 'The main tariff of Canada was deliberately framed to shut out English manufacturers and English goods. It gives greater encouragement to the manufacturers from the United States than from Great Britain. There is no reason commercially, for British gratitude to Canada. The boot is on the other leg.'

That is what the secretary of the Cobden Club says.

Mr. HEYD. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) believe that ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying now, what I believe, but I am telling the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) what the great free trade Cobden Club of England thinks. This is written by the gentleman who pinned the medal on the premier's breast a few years ago because of the granting of the preferential tariff, which, they thought, was a move in the direction of free trade. I am afraid the premier will be humiliated by being compelled to send the medal back to the Codben Club to be kept for some future free trader.

Mr. GOURLEY. I heard he had sent it back after the surtax was put on German goods.

Mr. SPROULE. No doubt he would feel very uncomfortable in keeping it. We have preferential trade, and what has it given us ? Members of this government were at the interimperial conference last year, and they went there saying they were going to establish better trade relations with the Australian colonies and New Zealand. Moreover they were going to try and get some consideration in the British market over the foreigner. But they gained nothing. But, while they gained nothing in the way of better markets, they humiliated Canada by declaring that Canada would not consider the question of imperial defence. And Canada stands as the laughing stock of the world, because, notwithstanding our wealth and position and loyalty and everything else, our premier, who was in the band wagon of the great jubilee of our late beloved Queen in 1897, refused to even discuss, on the lines desired, the question of imperial defence. They said Canada was not prepared to pay her share for the defence of the empire. I say this is a humiliation to Canada. We are doing less than we ought to do and are the laughing stock of the world.

Have hon. gentlemen opposite materially cheapened the transportation ? They are always talking of the transportation problem ; have they actually done anything in connection with it ? If so, I do not know where to look for the record of it. The fast Atlantic service question was really settled when they came into office, the contract having been practically made. But they cancelled it, saying they could get a better one at less cost. But they have made no contract yet. A few years ago we were going to have the bottle-necked ships that would accomplish so much. But it was only hot air from the west. Then, we were to have had a contract at very much less than the old one. They worked away at that for years. At last they declared that they had failed, and nothing has been ever accomplished. But the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) says : Oh, we have done a great deal for the people of Canada ; we have changed the system of taxation, giving them a revenue tariff instead of a protective tariff. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, in commencing his address, twitted the leader of the opposition with being inclined to resort to scrap-book literature—with dealing with history of the past. If there was one member of this House who ought to be afraid of scrap-books, it is the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He seems like Banquo in the play of Macbeth. When he hears of a scrap-book, his previous record will not down. Like Banquo's ghost it will come up to confront him. That was why he displayed

so much dread of scrap-book literature, because he is confronted by his utterances of the past. In dealing with the system of taxation, he said :

Under our system the great bulk of the taxes goes into the treasury, under the old regime the great bulk of it went into the pockets of the manufacturers.

Now I ask the people of this country if that is so ? He says :

If we have to-day an exceedingly unfair and oppressive system of taxation under which we were practically putting two dollars into the private pockets for every one that went into the public treasury, I might see my way to deliver myself of some public criticism. There are the strongest possible grounds for believing that since we came into office the exodus is stopped and the tide of immigration has been flowing into our country to the tune of 125,000 to 200,000 a year.

Where are they now ? Referring to the leader of the opposition he said :

He has paid no attention whatever to the difference between the real taxation inflicted on the people under a protective tariff, and the actual taxation inflicted on the people under a revenue tariff, even if it be a high one. The difference is this, that substantially the great bulk of the taxes go into the treasury under the present tariff, whereas, under the administration which preceded ours, an enormous percentage of the taxes which the people of Canada had to pay did not go into the treasury but went to swell the profits of private individuals.

Is that so ? Now, I take up the Trade and Navigation returns, and let me give one illustration of the working of the tariff called protective under the old government under which, as he says, for every dollar that went into the treasury two dollars went into the pockets of the manufacturers. Now I take the importations of those lines in which the farmers are interested : Cultivators, drills, seed drills, harrows, harvesters, horse rakes, mowing machines, ploughs, reapers and such like. These are manufactured in Canada. Under the old system, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce is right, for every dollar of revenue that went into the treasury, and that was collected by customs duties, two dollars went into the manufacturers pockets. Now, take the last year the Conservative government were in power, I find that 9,321 articles were imported on which a duty of $70,000 was paid. In 1902, under a tariff exactly the same in every particular, the same duty as in 1896 on every article, this government took out of the people of Canada $417,000 in duties as against $70,000 by the Conservative government—the same system, the same duty, the only difference being that one was called protective, while the other is called a revenue tariff. And yet the Minister of Trade and Commerce says that under the Conservative government for ever dollar that went into the treasury two dollars went into the manufacturers' pocket, whereas in 1902 nothing goes into the manufacturers' pocket but all goes into the treasury. How can any one believe that ? If a duty of 20 per cent and 25 per cent in 1896 was a protective duty, is it not a protective duty to-day ? If it enabled the manufacturer to put two dollars into his pocket for every dollar that went into the treasury, does it not enable him to do the same thing to-day ? Does the Minister of Trade and Commerce think the people of Canada are so stupid or so gullible as to believe such a statement ? Is that logic or is it not ? I need not deal with corn and other items. I merely give this as an illustration, as an example, of the hon. gentleman's style of reasoning.

Now he says : We have stopped the exodus from the country by our system, and we have done a great good in that respect. Is it true that they have stopped the exodus ? How do we know whether the exodus is stopped or not ? We know it by the Trade and Navigation returns of the United States, which show the value of settlers' effects going into that country every year from Canada. Now, if the exodus was stopped there would be no settlers' effects going in there, because it is only goods taken in by men who actually settle there that are taken account of by the Trade and Navigation returns of the United States. I find by those returns that in 1897, $1,275,000 worth of settlers' effects went into the United States accompanied by people who went there from Canada to settle. In 1898 there were $964,000; in 1899, $1,037,000; in 1900, $1,144,000; in 1901, $1,042,000; in 1902, the very last year, at a time when the exodus has all been stopped, according to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, there were $1,278,000 worth of settlers' effects crossing the frontier from Canada to the United States, accompanied by Canadian citizens who went over there and settled in that country.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). Would that not include effects of settlers who come to our ports from England and other places ?

Mr. SPROULE. They say not. Only from Canada. Now I find that this very year there is a considerable exodus going on, largely to the New England States, where manufactures are plentiful. Very naturally they go to a country that has varied industries and which offers employment in so many lines. If our protective tariff was accomplishing for Canada what we think it ought to accomplish, provided it was high enough, it would build up our own industries and keep our operatives at home.

I want to ask, what helped the exodus. We are told that we have 125,000 to 150,000 immigrants coming into Canada, and that we had a very heavy exodus when the Conservative party were in power. What helped to make that exodus ? The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said that

the loss of Canada in those eighteen years during which the Conservative party were in power amounted to millions. Every train going to the United States was crowded with settlers and their effects. Why was every train crowded with settlers and their effects ?—because every Reformer in Canada became an immigration agent for the United States, with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce at the head of the bureau. Am I justified in saying so ? I think I am. Why do I say so ? When I look at the 'Economist' and read that letter written by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce years ago, to tell the people of Europe what a bad country Canada was, how heavily it was taxed, how the people were bled white by taxation, that it offered no inducements for people to come and settle, that it was the place above all others in the world for them to avoid, is it any wonder that people were deterred from coming ? At that time the Conservative party had eleven principal agents at work to get immigrants to come to this country and they spent $120,000 during the last year they were in power on immigration. To-day the government have no less than forty-four principal agents drawing from $1,000 to $4,000 a year, most of them receiving large amounts for expenses in addition and they have also 275 agents in the United States on commission working in the interests of Canada. When we were endeavouring to get immigrants to come to this country we had every Reform member of this House acting as an immigration agent for the United States, saying that the people of that country were happy and prosperous and that they were getting rich while we were getting poorer and poorer. It was not enough to confine their operations to the continent of America, but the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had to write about the condition of Canada to the 'Economist,' so as to prevent immigrants coming to us from Europe ; and what did he say :

But it is not equally well known on your side of the Atlantic that it has become painfully apparent for some time back to every one who has been at pains to examine the evidence which has accumulated on the subject, that, even in that comparatively short space of time, this most ill advised policy has resulted in a tremendous exodus of the very choicest portion of the population of Canada.

Talking to the people that we were trying to get to come here, he told them that the people were leaving the country because of the policy of the Conservative party.

And in a very grave depreciation in the selling values of farm lands and of town and village property throughout all the older sections of the Dominion, including Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

This has been accompanied, as is usual in such cases, by an immense increase in the aggregate indebtedness of the Dominion in the shape of large additions to its federal, provincial and municipal debts, and also to the mortgage debts incurred by private individuals and liabilities incurred for the construction of railways—by far the greater part of all which obligations are held abroad.

Briefly, in these thirteen years, there has been a great displacement of wealth, caused mainly by artificial legislation, but (as regards the older provinces) absolutely no increase at all in the collective wealth of the community. Two or three cities, and perhaps a score of towns, have increased considerably, and a few hundred individuals (who have been privileged to tax their fellows for their private advantage) have grown rich by this system of legalized robbery ; but the great mass of the population, and notably the agricultural class, are distinctly poorer and less prosperous than they were twelve years ago.

This he was saying to the farmers, mechanics and labourers of England, that we were trying to get to come here, and whom we were telling that there were greater advantages here than those which they enjoyed in the old country. Is it any wonder we did not get immigrants to come to our country ? I think not.

In one word, if the assertions and official statements of the present government are to be relied on, and these 900,000 immigrants, did really come to Canada as they assert, what between immigrants who came to Canada and who have quitted it chiefly for the United States, and the loss of its own natural increase which has disappeared in the same direction, the Dominion has lost not less than one million and a half of people in the last ten years.

As to the amount of taxation, the agricultural class has been simply bled white.

This is told to the farmers of England whom we were asking to come over here that they might better their condition.

Over and above the taxes actually paid into the Dominion treasury to be expended for so-called federal purposes they have been mulcted during all these years under the proctective system of at least an equal amount which is either totally wasted or goes into the pockets of a very small number of protected manufacturers.

The exact amount levied, or to speak more accurately, pilaged, in this way can hardly be estimated ; but it is known not to be less than a sum fully equal to the entire amount credited to the treasury.

Such an amount of taxation levied for thirteen years is a very formidable burthen for a country like Canada to bear.

It would be well if this were all, but unfortunately, the economic results of protective system adopted by Canada in 1879, grevious as they are fade almost into insignificance compared with the moral and political pollution it has brought in its train.

No moral or political pollution to-day—not at all. Then, to continue this article :

It is not merely the policy but the fixed determination of the Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada to overthrow this system at all hazards ; and, after very full deliberation, they have come to the conclusion that the best and probably the only really available method which presents itself for the purpose lies in introducing the system of perfect continental free trade

or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States.

Compare that with their statement lately, giving the reasons why they made a reduction in the duty on British goods.

That is what they were asking for then. Look at their loyalty to England to-day. Out of goodness of our heart and out of generosity we give that preference to England in recognition of the splendid freedom she has given to us. We did it out of the generosity of our heart and because of our overflowing loyalty. Then, they wanted unrestricted reciprocity that Hon. Mr. Blake said if adopted, would lead to annexation. It goes on to say :

> One thing, I think ought to be clear to all intelligent Englishmen, and that is, that it is utterly impossible that Canada can prosper under her present conditions—isolated and in danger of being still more completely isolated, from trade and commerce with the entire continent to which she belongs geographically, losing her population at the rate of one million and a half in ten years (if the official statements of the present government are to be relied on) and subject, at the same time to a system of taxation and of organized political corruption such as you have happily been strangers to since the days of Walpole or Charles II.
>
> The Liberal party of Canada and, indeed, the great bulk of the people of the Dominion, wish well to the mother country, and it is very far from their desire to do anything which in the long run can injure her interests ; but their duty in the premises is plain. As Canadians they must consult the advantages of Canada first.

And he declared for a policy of unrestricted reciprocity or continental free trade with the people of the United States. That was written to the 'Economist' by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, written to a country where we were trying our level best, with a very small expenditure of money, to get immigrants to come out to this country, when we were endeavouring to show them that we had a better country, and that it offered better opportunities for battling with the conditions of life than any other country. Yet, the hon. gentleman, in this article, declares that such is not the case. Is it any wonder that we did not get immigrants to come to this country ? Now, I take up the writings of the hon. gentleman to the 'North American Review' declaring that the country is so burdened with taxation and debt that no man can succeed in Canada and that the United States is the only place where people can succeed. What was the situation during the time that the Conservative party were in power ? I say that at least there were seventy-five immigration agents in this House who were immigration agents always for the United States and never for Canada. They went about preaching the same doctrine and they had thousands of their friends outside. The bureau was here headed by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Hon. Mr. Blake, whose portrait adorned an immigration pamphlet that was distributed in the state of Kansas with his speech in the House of Commons added to show the people of that country that Canada was the last place in the world to go to. This pamphlet contained speeches of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce decrying Canada, saying that Canadians were bled white and that Canadians were kept in bondage worse than any slavery they ever had in that country. It was then said that there was an exodus, and that the people were fleeing from the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why are immigrants coming to Canada to-day. It is because every member of this House is an immigration agent in the interest of Canada. There never was a Conservative, who in power or in opposition, would decry his country. In power or out of power, the Conservatives stand up for Canada, and you will not find in the 'Economist' or the 'North American Review' or in any other publication, an article from a Conservative decrying his own country and telling the people to go to the American republic where they could amass wealth, rather than to Canada where the farmers were bled white and the inhabitants kept down by heavy taxation. It was left for the Minister of Trade and Commerce and for other Liberals to denounce their country in that way. I repeat, Sir, that every member of parliament to-day has a good word to say for his country, and that amongst the people of Europe and amongst the people of the United States their object is to create the impression that Canada is a happy country to live in. I know it to be a fact that in many Reform constituencies in this country the Reformers believed their member when he told them that Canada was the last place in the world to live in, and taking him at his word they left in such large numbers that many of these Reform members got defeated when they returned for election. That was notably so in South Grey, which was a Reform constituency, but which at the last two elections went Conservative for the reason that the Liberals, believing their member that Canada was a bad place to live in, cleared out to the states and left the Conservatives who had faith in their country, in the majority. Every Canadian member of the parliament, I repeat, is to-day an immigration agent for Canada, whereas before 1896, every Reform member of parliament was an immigration agent for the United States, with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) at the head of the bureau.

We were told, Sir, when the Liberals came into power that their fiscal policy was going to be that of a revenue tariff. But what is their policy to-day. It is a very peculiar policy indeed. In the budget speech of 1897 ('Hansard,' page 1,111) the Minister of Finance said :

I shall have something to say which will show that in respect of our relations with Great Britain, and in respect of our relations with any other country, that is willing to meet us on equal terms, we shall be prepared to offer a measure of tariff reform, of the most substantial character, which is not contained in this tariff I am going to read.

He told us here that he would read two tariffs, one not much different from the tariff of the Conservatives, but as they were pledged to tariff reform they would give a substantial measure of tariff reform in relation to those countries that would trade freely with us. Further, in answer to a question by Sir Charles Tupper, the Minister of Finance said :

I stated that the tariff I am about to read to you is the general tariff, but that before I conclude, I shall be prepared to make a statement in relation to a special tariff that will apply to Great Britain, and any other country which is prepared to accept the conditions that that tariff imposes.

There are men, well meaning men in Canada—Liberals, some of them, let us admit—who say that we should meet the Dingley Bill on the principle of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and a dollar for a dollar. Such is the demand of many men in Canada to-day, but we submit it would not be wise to adopt that policy. We submit that it is a wiser policy to wait and see what shall be the outcome of the present uncertainty in the United States in relation to their trade policy and of the negotiations which we are willing to enter into with respect to reciprocity. We submit, that pending such negotiations, and pending the settlement of the American tariff question, and a clear understanding of what will be the effect which their policy may have upon the affairs of Canada, it is the part of prudence that we should to-day hold our hands and not extend to that country the measure of tariff reform which we would be anxious to extend if they would meet us on liberal terms.

But there are those who say that if we do not care to deal with the tariff in its relations with the United States to-day, we ought not to disturb our existing tariff at all. I have heard it argued that what we should do is to let our own tariff stand as it is to-day. I cannot subscribe to that doctrine. The Liberal party has pledged itself to give tariff reform and the country expects the Liberal party to fulfil that pledge. And if the events across the border have taken such a course as to justify us in withholding action in relation to our trade with that country, that is no reason why we should not proceed to deal with tariff reform in its relation to those countries which are prepared to deal with us. . . . . I have to tell the House that it is not the intention of the government—speaking of the question generally, and not, with reference to any particular article—to propose any great reduction in the tariff as applied to those countries which are not disposed to trade with us. We propose, therefore, to have a general tariff, and that general tariff will be, to a large extent, the tariff of to-day—but the tariff of to-day freed from some of its enormities.

His tariff reform or the reform part of his tariff was the preference clause, and he offered it to every country in the world who would accept it. He told us afterwards that it only applied to England and to-day he threatens to take it away from England. He tells us that his general tariff was to a large extent the then existing tariff of the Conservative party, and if that be the case, it is the tariff of to-day because there have been practically no changes made in it since. If, as the Liberals claimed before 1896, the tariff policy of the Conservative government put $2 into the manufacturers' pocket for every dollar it put into the treasury, how can our fiscal policy of to-day be a revenue tariff, when as the Minister of Finance has told us it is practically the same tariff as that in force during the Conservative regime. In 1902, the Minister of Finance said :

There are several reasons which operate in our minds against entering a policy of tariff changes to-day.

That is what the Minister of Finance said two years ago. This government gave us the preferential tariff and that was the only substantial change they made in the tariff, and let me ask what has been the result of that, England says it has done her no good; Canada finds it has done her no good and to-day the Minister of Finance threatens to repeal that great measure of tariff reform. As a reason for not changing the tariff in 1902, the Minister of Finance said : That the census was not taken; that he hoped to get a better treaty with France, and that he thought Germany would change her mind and give us better treatment in her markets. Well, Sir, we have seen that Germany has not changed her mind. Another is the present position of our trade relations with the mother country and her colonies. Two important conferences are to take place ; one on the question of trade and commerce, affecting the empire ; and, second, a conference with New Zealand, Australia and Canada. For these reasons we postpone for the present the question of tariff revision. That was in 1902. We come down to 1903, and he still does not propose to give any more tariff reform. What reason does he give to-day ?

Coming now to the question of the tariff. I have two clauses to propose which will affect the tariff in certain directions, and I shall ask for some amendments to the free list. Of these I shall speak presently. With these exceptions —and they are important exceptions as respects the clauses referred to—we do not propose any change in the schedule rates of dutiable goods. We are not unmindful of the fact that there has been some agitation for a general revision of the tariff, but we think there is nothing in the present circumstances of the country which calls for this, and there are some strong reasons why any extensive changes in the tariff schedules would be inopportune.

That is what he says to-day. Now, what has been the tariff policy of hon. gentlemen opposite ? The only substantial change they made was in giving the preference to England. But that has resulted in a commercial war with Germany, which may

extend beyond Canada and even to England. It has resulted in our being shut out of the German market and our trade with Germany being circumscribed. It has done England no good, it has done Canada no good, and now hon. gentlemen opposite threaten to repeal it. That is their trade policy for the present. What is it for the future? The Finance Minister has stated it: no change. What has it been all along? It has been procrastination, and it is procrastination to-day. They know that some of the industries of the country are waning for want of encouragement, but they are doing nothing.

The great beet-root sugar industry, which is rapidly springing up in Canada, wants more protection, wants a little bounty. That is an industry above all others for the farmer—why? Because $60 out of every $100 spent in that industry goes direct to the farmer. But those who are engaged in that industry want an increase in the tariff on sugars coming into the country, and for the want of this they are handicapped in carrying on their business. We are told that unless they get some consideration in the tariff their industry is likely to go down instead of becoming one of the great established industries of the country. There is a large amount of money invested in it to-day, and there is going to be much more in the future if it is given the assistance it requires. Canada is admirably adapted to that industry. There are hundreds employed in it to-day, and there will be tens of thousands in the future if it is granted proper encouragement. But procrastination is the thief of time, and the present Minister of Finance will give that industry no consideration beyond allowing its machinery to come in free for another year.

Then, look at the lead industry of British Columbia, in which there were over 1,000 people employed last summer. The men engaged in that industry declare that unless something is done for them, it must be closed down. I was in British Columbia last fall, and I saw there some of the most valuable lead mines, I suppose, in the world, one with over 300 men employed; but they had to shut down because there was no profit in the business. If the government would put a duty on lead and give them a small bounty, that industry would go on and flourish. The 1,000 men and more indirectly employed in that industry must be thrown out of employment, or turn to some other occupation, or go across the line to find employment in the lead mines of the United States which they ought to find at home.

We are told that the government are going to put a duty of $7 a ton on steel rails, but I think they are going to do it in such a way that it will not do any good. I think that duty is right, and I commend the Finance Minister for it. I was up through the factory at Sault Ste. Marie last fall. It is a most valuable factory, and I for one would go farther than the Finance Minister. He says:

> We will give this duty if the quantity is sufficient to supply the demand and the quality is as good as can be got from other countries.

Even if the quality were not quite as good, I would give the duty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who would buy the rails if the quality were not as good?

Mr. SPROULE. The Canadian people would buy them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They will not. They have refused to buy them.

Mr. SPROULE. Who?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is within my knowledge that the quality of rails made has not given satisfaction, and the railway companies have objected to them on that ground.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the price was pretty high, but I saw that they got a contract for the Temiscamingue Railway only a few weeks ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope they will do better, and I think they will.

Mr. SPROULE. The rails I saw them turning out at Sault Ste. Marie last fall seemed good; but, I am no judge of rails.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Lest I might be misunderstood, I believe they are taking steps to improve the quality of the rails, and I have no doubt they will make good rails in the immediate future.

Mr. SPROULE. I hope they will, and I commend the Minister of Finance for offering to give them this assistance. That is what we like to see. That is what will build up Canada; and this is a suffering industry that cannot continue unless it gets some support.

Then, the hon. Minister of Finance says he is going to assist the binder twine industry, he has not told us how. I hope that whatever means he advises will be effective. A few years ago, he took the duty off and helped to kill the industry without doing any good to the Canadian farmer.

Then, he proposes to license foreign-built vessels. I do not object to that.

With regard to certain lines of industries the government are not giving the relief they should give. We are told that the woollen industry is suffering very much to-day. I believe it is, and a change in the tariff would tend to build up that industry, and enable it to employ hundreds and thousands of operators which it cannot employ to-day. Procrastination is killing it.

But the Minister of Trade and Commerce says: You cannot do anything with your tariff to help the farmer. He says, speaking to the leader of the opposition:

We sell about $20,000,000 worth of cheese, chiefly in the English market. I suppose we consume about two million dollars worth in Canada. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman would protect us in that. We sell nearly as much bacon and hams. I would like to know how he will protect us in that.

Let me tell the hon. gentleman how we could protect the Canadian farmer. The late government protected him by passing a tariff law which shut out the spurious cheese of the United States. This cheese was coming into our country and being shipped over to England as Canadian cheese, and in this way it was destroying the reputation of our product, but the late government put on a high tariff.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You could not do it by putting on a tariff, because it came through Canada in bond.

Mr. SPROULE. We put on a tariff which was prohibitive.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It was done by regulation. No matter how high you make your tariff you could not prevent American cheese passing through Canada in bond, without paying any duty.

Mr. SPROULE. We charged a duty on the cheese that came in, and if we did not put the tariff high enough to keep out the ordinary cheese and pass regulations to prevent spurious cheese being branded as Canadian, our cheese would not enjoy the reputation it does in England. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce says we cannot add any value by our tariff to what our farmers raise. Is that a fact?

Mr. HEYD. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for South Brant says yes. Let me tell him that in 1890, we found that the Americans were supplying Canada with fresh meats. They sold in 1890 in Canada 33,062,979 pounds of fresh meat, or $1,729,603 worth. Have we not farmers enough in Canada to raise meat and pork to feed Canadians? The late government believed that we had, and raised the duty to two cents a pound on fresh meats. What was the result? In two years we reduced the importation by 20,000,000 pounds of those meats. Did not that benefit the Canadian farmers? Will the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce say that that was of no use to our farmers? If not, why does he not take the duty off to-day? I defy him to do it. If he should attempt anything of the kind, our farmers would soon send this government to the right about. What was the result of our giving our Canadian farmers the control of our own markets? In 1890, we only exported $895,817 worth of meats. That was before our Canadian farmers had control of their own market. But when we raised the tariff so high as to shut out Armour and Company and Swift and Company, and the other Americans who were dumping their meats into Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston and Montreal, every week in the year, our exports of meats increased. In 1902 we exported meats to the extent of $41,122,071, and at the same time supplied our own markets, whereas in 1890 we only exported $895,000 worth and our markets were in the hands of the Chicago men. As soon as our Canadian farmers were given control of their own market, they at once began to raise a greater quantity of meat, and they sent out in 1902, after two year's experience of the higher tariff, $41,122,071 worth of meats, and at the same time supplied their own market with 20,000,000 lbs. a year which had been formerly supplied by Armour and Company and Swift and Company, of Chicago. Would any man, in face of these figures say that you cannot help the farmer and enhance the value of his products? But I find that we are beginning to import meats again, and if I were Minister of Finance, I would again raise the duty. Last year we imported $1,787,920 worth. Changed values have given the Americans an opportunity to place their meats in our market again. But whenever changed conditions and value give foreigners the advantage of our markets, I would put the duty up and keep them out. If the hon. Minister of Finance were doing his duty to the farmer, he would raise the tariff again, keep out the Americans, and reserve the Canadian market for our Canadian farmers.

But we can not expect much from the present government. The only real act of statesmanship they ever attempted was the preferential tariff, and that is a rank failure. They admit themselves to-day that it is a failure. The Cobden Club, through its secretary says that it is a failure. England says that it is a failure. Every one condemns it. It has brought about a commercial war with Germany. It has shut Canada out of the German market. It has got England into trouble. The government have not succeeded in getting any treaty with the United States. They have not succeeded in getting any improved trade relations with France, Trinidad, Australia or New Zealand. And our Canadian farmers have no other markets than they had before this government came into power. Every act of statesmanship they have attempted is stamped as a failure, and now they have decided to rest on their laurels, and be thankful so long as the Canadian electorates will allow them to remain in power, and enjoy themselves travelling over the country. They will not make any material changes in the tariff but remain in power and draw their salaries and take their excursions all over the world. Let me refer to what has become a growing evil ever since this government has taken office, and that is the absence of the heads of departments. When-

ever parliament is called together we find two or three ministers absent. Not only have we had four or five absent all summer, enjoying themselves in Europe—France, Italy and elsewhere, but we have two important ministers absent to-day. One of them is in Japan. I see that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has been visiting the college where they train the Geisha girls over in Japan, no doubt with a view of ascertaining whether it would not be wise to introduce such colleges here in connection with our experimental farms to train girls in this country. He is feasting and enjoying himself with the Mikado. But he is not here to answer the questions we require him to answer. The hon Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) is away. It is sometimes said that these ministers are purposely and conveniently away for fear embarrassing questions may be asked, questions that they would not like to be called upon to answer. So, I say this has been a government of pleasure trips, a government by deputies. It has been so for years, and it is so to-day. Five or six ministers are away every summer, and two or three are away every session of parliament. touring over the world for pleasure. They might as well allow the government to go on by deputies, for it will do just as well as when they are present. This government have done nothing. Procrastination is their only policy. They dare not touch the tariff, for fear that in revising it they might offend their free trade friends on the one side or the manufacturers, whom they have promised not to injure, on the other. So long as they can travel over the country on pleasure, so long as Providence is kind enough to give them good health and enjoyment, they will hold their offices and draw their salaries.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Would not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) do the same ?

Mr. SPROULE. If I did, I would want to get out as soon as possible. If I were in office with no other purpose than that, I should consider myself the most mercenary creature in the country. I hope we shall never see the day when there will be a Conservative government that will have no higher aim than to draw salaries, to 'rest and be thankful' as long as the people of Canada allow them to remain in office. There are things to be done for the country. We have heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) from the west telling us that there is a crying demand for railways in the west. We must have transportation equal to the requirements of the people. Is the government giving it ? They have done nothing and are doing nothing. They give us no outlook for the future, any more than they have given us achievement in the past. We can come to no conclusion but that their only policy is a policy of procrastination, to remain where they are, to draw their salaries, so long as the people will allow. They have not reformed the Senate, though they promised to do so; they have not reduced the number of cabinet ministers, though they promised to do so. They will remain in office, draw their salaries, travel over the world for pleasure, and enjoy themselves as long as the people are willing to allow them to remain in office.

Mr. HEYD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 24, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 123) to incorporate the Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) moved :

That the third report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official Report of the Debates of the House during the present session ; which recommends a gratuity to the widow of the late N. H. Beaulieu be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). Mr. Speaker, I rejoiced, in common, I presume with most citizens of Canada, when I heard the speech of the Finance Minister setting forth the financial affairs of this country. The satisfaction I experienced was doubtless felt by all on this side of the House as

well as by our friends on the other side, though perhaps their satisfaction was dampened a little by the fact that such magnificent progress had taken place in our country during the term of a Liberal administration, and that it had never obtained while they had control of our affairs. It was also a matter of satisfaction to learn that the government had discharged their duties while they were lately in Great Britain in endeavouring to obtain a preference in the British market. That they were unsuccessful was not their fault. They evidently did all they could to obtain what our friends on the other side, at least, want for Canada, but were unsuccessful. It was also a matter of satisfaction for us on this side of the House to learn that the government did not fail to do their duty, when it was forced upon them by the action of the German government, by retaliating in adopting a surtax on German goods. There is a misconception as to how far this surtax will operate; but if it prevents, as I believe it will, the importation of German goods made in England,which has been going on for a long time past, it will go far to remove the difficulties under which some of the manufacturers of this country labour at the present time. As I understand it, if 51 per cent of the price of a finished product represents the German portion of the work, the article comes under the operation of the surtax, and is placed on the general list to which an addition of 33⅓ per cent is added. Therefore, if that surtax is applied as it should be applied, it will prohibit from entering into this country the German goods that are made in England, and almost prohibit the importation into this country of goods that are made in Germany.

Now, I am quite willing to admit that our hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) may feel hopeful of some reciprocity arrangements being entered into with the people of the United States. That, apparently, has been the one object of his life. Personally, I am not so hopeful as he appears to be, because in my own mind I have not the slightest idea that anything will ever come of our attempt to have reciprocal arrangements with the people of the United States. From their public men, who have a right to speak with authority because they know the opinions of the people for whom they speak, we have never yet heard one utterance which would justify us in believing that they would concede to Canada any reciprocal arrangements that it would be in our interest to accept. President Roosevelt, for instance, has distinctly laid down the conditions upon which a foreign country can have reciprocity with the United States. This reciprocity must not interfere with their manufacturing, their industrial, and their commercial interests. The late Mr. McKinley also laid down the same doctrine in a clear and emphatic manner. He said that if by lowering the duties that are at present of no use to the people of the United States as a protection, they could increase their trade, by all means let them reduce the duty. But, Sir, a preference of that kind offered to us that will not interfere with any of the protected industries of the United States, would be of such limited value to us that it would be impossible for us to accept it. The idea that the United States will ever allow us reciprocity in natural products, for a right to sell their manufactured goods in Canada under the present tariff, is expecting entirely too much. I am therefore confident that there will be no reciprocity arrangement made with the United States, believing that they will never offer reciprocity on such terms as it would be our interest to accept.

Nor do I believe that what has recently taken place in the House of Commons of Great Britain gives us any reason to expect that we will get a preference in Great Britain for many years to come. We did hope that the imposition of the duty upon flour and wheat would give the British people an opportunity to grant us a preference without putting a tax on the British people, but I understand that that duty has been wiped out, so hostile was it to the feelings of our friends across the ocean. I see no prospect in the immediate future, either for a reciprocity treaty with the United States, or for a preferential treaty with Great Britain; and now that the grain duties have been removed, I see no reason why this government should not be able, when the necessity present itself to rearrange the tariff of this country in such a way as will be in the best interests of all classes of the people. It may be that under present circumstances courtesy demands us to wait, because Mr. Chamberlain has not had an opportunity of exerting his influence in favour of the preference. It may be judicious as well as courteous to our American friends also not to anticipate the deliberations of the commission that has been appointed, seeing that the first move towards reciprocity has emanated from our friends across the line. But after we shall have found that our hopes in obtaining reciprocity with the United States, or a preference in Great Britain, are in vain, one of the principal reasons will be removed which have made us unwilling to interfere with the preference that has existed in the past; and the government has promised us that they will exercise a free hand in that matter, and that they will abolish the preference if it is seen to be needed in the interests of Canada.

I am also gratified to learn, from the papers that were brought down, that the efforts of the government to prevent the scheduling of Canadian cattle in the British market, were put forth with force, with skill, and with earnestness, and their failure to get that embargo removed was due, as I believe, and as all the members of this

House believe, to a desire on the part of the British people to protect the raising of animals in that country. With all these facts before us, we have a right to assume that we will be able in the near future to rearrange our own tariff, if it is necessary, entirely in the interests of our own people. I can assure the Minister of Finance and the government that their desire to build up in this country the industry of the manufacture of steel rails, and for that purpose to give a substantial bonus, meets with the enthusiastic support, not only of their supporters on this side of the House, but also of our friends on the other side.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been treated to a few addresses on the budget speech, and on what I will call for courtesy's sake, the amendment that is before the House. I regret to say that the hon. gentlemen who have spoken so far have not even alluded to that amendment, although it is one of considerable importance; but they have criticised the financial administration of our affairs, which, as was clearly pointed out last night by Mr. Speaker, is contrary to the rules of the House, but which, by the courtesy of the Minister of Finance, we are to continue to-day.

Our hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was the last speaker last night, and he was terribly exercised over the fact that we have had a surplus amounting to some $40,000,000 during the period of our administration. He asked: What did we do with it? What would he expect a wise and judicious administration to do with a surplus of some $40,000,000, but to invest it prudently in the interest of the people of Canada? He instanced as a parallel case the farmer, who, after seven years of plenty had not succeeded in paying off the mortgage on his house, and he asked what would be thought of such a person. He went on to say that this would be a very foolish farmer, but that would depend upon conditions. If the farmer had taken the surplus of his labour and invested it building new barns, in draining his ground and in improving the productive power of his farm, he would have done much more wisely than to have applied it towards paying off the mortgage, which, in the case of the Dominion of Canada, only costs about 3 per cent. The government were wise in not reducing the debt, but in judiciously expending that money. But, he goes on to ask: How long can the people stand this tremendous expenditure? He predicted that the day of reckoning is soon to come. Let us look and see how the people have stood it during past years, and if the present conditions obtain, how long they are likely to stand it. The best evidence of that is to ascertain what effect this large expenditure and these large surpluses of ours have had upon the welfare of our people. I presume it would be fair to direct the attention of the hon. gentleman to the amount of deposits the people have in the large chartered banks of this country. In 1890 they amounted to $128,000,000. Six years after the time they were not so profusely bled as they say we are bleeding people now, the deposits had increased to $183,000,000, or in six years, only $55,000,000 had been added, while, during the last six years, while they have been paying such a tremendous tribute to the country, the deposits of the people increased from $183,000,000 to $382,000,000, or an increase of $199,000,000. It strikes me that the people are standing it, and at the same time improving their own condition very perceptibly. I am quite content, myself, to believe that they are quite willing to continue such a state of affairs. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to think that a surplus is an insuperable obstacle to the country's progress. They must remember that they also have had surpluses in times past. In 1882 and in 1883 they had a surplus amounting to $14,000,000. We have to go a long time back in order to get a surplus of that kind. After seventeen years experience, we do not find any more, but in these two years they had a surplus of $14,000,000. But, compare the conditions of the country then with the conditions of the country to-day. While they had a surplus of $14,000,000, the savings of the people in the banks of the country diminished from $97,000,000 to $95,000,000, so that the people were $2,000,000 poorer during their period of surpluses, while they were $199,000,000 richer during our period of surpluses. I think the country need have no special anxiety about these surpluses of ours. I owe my hon. friend from East Grey a slight apology for last night stating that the duty upon meat was of no benefit to the farmers of this country. I understood him to say wheat, but he was talking about meat, and I am quite willing to confess that it was of great benefit to the people of this country.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Mr. HEYD. There is another thing I would like to draw your attention to, Mr. Speaker, and it is the few remarks that were made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), that were not replied to by my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). The hon. member for Bothwell alluded to the period of deficits. He appeared to feel proud that there had been deficits amounting to $5,694,758 in the three years ending the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, and he made it a charge against us that we had $20,994,445 to our credit at the end of the last three years, and in order to get over that difficulty he condemned the system of bookkeeping. He said our system of bookkeeping was all wrong. Well, it is the system we have inherited from the old government, the system that has been carried down since the period of confederation, and though the hon.

gentleman has been a member of this House he never before raised his voice to find fault with our system of keeping our books. But, I can readily understand why he should find fault with our system when it shows quite clearly that our surpluses amounted to $20,994,445 in the last three years, while hon. gentlemen opposite had three years of deficits. In order to get over the difficulty, he takes the expenditure, both consolidated and capital, and says: See, they had no surplus because they were behind at the end of their period of time and actually increased the net debt of the people of this country. Well, that is true, but I claim still that the present system of keeping our accounts is correct, that it has always been correct and it never has been objected to except by the hon. member for Bothwell and the late Minister of Finance, who also found fault with it when it continued to show surpluses as a result of the good management of the Liberal party. But, if this contention is true to-day, where would the Conservative party be a few years ago? Their receipts in 1884 were $31,000,000, their expenditure $57,000,000, showing a deficit of $26,000,000. Where would they have been in 1885 with a deficit of $16,000,000, where would they have been in 1886 with a deficit of $28,000,000, or a deficit of $70,000,000 in three years, and with an increase in the national debt of the people of $64,691,000? No system of bookkeeping can get over that. We are obliged to keep our books that way, but if the hon. gentleman is right now, they must have been wrong then, and these expenditures must be explained. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they are easily explained. The old government were building the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it was necessary to exceed the income of the country. This has been the case and this is our excuse to-day, that notwithstanding that we have been in receipt of large revenues we have engaged in large capital expenditures. But, our hon. friend goes on to say that the national debt is the true balance of the account when the final summing up takes place. I say that too. I say it is quite immaterial whether you charge the expenditure to consolidated account or capital account except for certain purposes, and that in the end it all comes to the increase in the national debt. Let us look at that for a short period of time. Our friends opposite increased the national debt in the three years ending 1896 by $17,000,000. We increased the national debt in the three years ending 1902 by $5,556,000. If we take the debt as it stood in 1897 at $261,538,596, which was the time when we got absolute control of our affairs, and take the actual debt on the 31st March, 1903, which was $261,620,000, we find that it was only $82,000 more than it was when we got control of the affairs of this country. That is the position to-day in connection with the national debt. Our hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) had a great deal of fault to find with the tariff duties, and he tried hard to convince the country that the people of Canada were not paying the duty, and that the raising of the tariff would not increase the burdens on the people. If that be true, then all our efforts to remove the preference are absolutely of no use. But we have been told time and again, and we know it is true, that the preference in favour of Great Britain has reduced the price of goods in Canada, has brought disaster upon the woollen mills, and that the manufacturers want the preference removed and the full duty restored. Do they want that in order to still further increase their tariff; no, they want it to stiffen prices and to remove the tremendous competition that they are subject to because of this preference. It is of no use at this late date to try to make people believe that by increasing the tariff you do not increase the price of goods.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HEYD. The gentlemen who spoke on the other side have kept a long way off from the amendment that is before the House. I desire Sir, to confine my attention particularly to that amendment and to see just what it means. But let me say Sir, that the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) owes an apology to the leader of the House as well to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) for the statement he made last night to the effect that Mr. Charlton was inspired by the Prime Minister to make his speech and that the sentiments entertained by Mr. Charlton are those entertained by the leader of the government. The member for Bothwell told us that he got this information from Mr. Charlton himself. I deny that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) was told by the member for North Norfolk that he would speak at a certain time at the request of the premier, but to hold the premier responsible for the utterances of Mr. Charlton and then to say that Mr. Charlton himself was the author of the story, is something that we on this side will not believe.

Mr. GOURLEY. I thought it was the devil and not the Prime Minister that inspired the speech of Mr. Charlton.

Mr. HEYD. Well, you will admit at all events that the Prime Minister is not the devil. Now the amendment which has been presented to the House is couched in very ambiguous terms as are all the statements with reference to the tariff which are formulated by gentlemen on the other side. I have taken considerable trouble to ascertain what the meaning of the word 'adequate' is. I find in the dictionaries that the words 'sufficient' or 'enough' are very fair equivalents, but when you begin to apply words to a thing of vast importance like the tariff of Canada, it is well to be definite. In

order to find out just what the Conservative party means by the word 'adequate' we have to go to a little town in Manitoba to illustrate it in a practical way. The leader of the opposition and his friends were in Manitoba last summer and a poet in that country hearing what they said, although he might have applied himself with much better advantage to something else, got off this version of adequate protection.

> Through a western town called Morden
> Passed a famous man called Borden
> Who, in a tone articulate
> The problem tried to demonstrate
> That duties, that were adequate
> Would be a boon, as sure as fate,
> To the merry men of Morden
> If they'd only bear the burden.
>
> But the men in Western Morden
> With contempt refused the burden,
> Though he did his best to stimulate,
> They thought he did but simulate,
> So they more and more do hesitate
> To believe that duties adequate
> Would relieve the men of Morden
> Of the heavy useless burden.

That is an interpretation of the word 'adequate' as used by the leader of the opposition. We all know that Mr. Hugh John Macdonald had promised the people of Manitoba that if the Conservative party were returned to power they would have free agricultural implements and while the leader of the opposition was delivering his speech in the town of Morden some one asked: What about free agricultural implements. The Winnipeg 'Telegram' which I presume gives a fair report has the following account of what happened. The leader of the opposition replied as follows to the question:—

Question: What about free agricultural implements promised by Mr. Macdonald?

Mr. BORDEN. I will answer my friend's question before I sit down so definitely that there will be no question about it. I will answer on behalf of the Liberal-Conservative party which has no Sifton at one end and Tarte at the other.

Question: Will you raise the duty?

Mr. BORDEN. We will make the duty adequate and if it is now high enough, 'as I believe it is,' to enable manufacturers to make implements in Canada, we will not increase it. I am informed that implements are as cheap in Canada as in the United States. So the duty seems high enough.

The leader of the opposition tells us that 'adequate' means to enable manufacturers to make goods in Canada. It is to that interpretation of the word that I shall address my remarks. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) tells us that 'adequate' means to enable manufacturers of cotton or wool or steam engines or anything else to make them in Canada if the duty is high enough to secure that, and that there is no Tarte at one end and no Sifton at the other end to preach a high tariff or a low tariff as the case may be. He told us that the word 'adequate' meant a duty high enough to enable manufacturers to make implements in Canada, and that he believed the duty on agricultural implements is high enough. Do the Conservatives intend that the plough makers and the binder makers and the agricultural implement makers of Canada should believe that 'adequate' means the ability to manufacture in this country. Is it for that that the manufacturers' associations are giving banquets and inducing the Hon. Mr. Tarte to make speeches. Do they not mean something else by the word 'adequate.' That word 'adequate' is the crux of the whole question.

If the leader of the opposition is right that the word 'adequate' means a tariff that would enable the manufacturer to make goods in Canada reserving to himself a reasonable and a fair profit; then we are all adequate protectionists. I do not think you will find on this side of the House even the most pronounced free trader who would object to that kind of adequate protection. But concealed behind that word 'adequate' is something that we do not understand. The manufacturer believes it means high tariff, so high as to secure Canada for the Canadian manufacturers. That is what we think is meant by that word 'adequate,' and with that catch phrase, hon. gentlemen opposite will not raise the duty on agricultural implements; they say that is high enough. They go from one end of the country to the other, and, with such an amendment as is presented to this House, vague and meaningless, they fool the people, as they attempted to fool the people away up in that western town of Morden.

Now, let us see what that resolution means in its practical application. It reads as follows:

> This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians;

The hon. gentleman's first proposition is to protect labour. Well, I want somebody who has more ability than I have to devise some plan whereby labour can be protected. Labour is as free as air, and gravitates to the points where wages are most remunerative. It leaves the points where wages become less than is necessary for the maintenance of the labourers; it is constantly shifting; and it cannot be protected or, if it can be, then, what I hold in my hand is absolutely meaningless. I have here the proceedings of the Trades and Labour Council of the Dominion of Canada at their annual meeting held in the city of Berlin and attended by the representatives of one hundred and two organizations. Are these men entitled to speak for labour, or is our friend who leads the opposition? That meeting passed the following resolution:

Whereas the Manufacturers' Association has declared its intention to seek an increase in the tariff, and, whereas, the injury and oppression of industry comes not from the various industries offering to exchange riches for riches, but from the extortions to which labour is subjected by the holders of the land, the forests, the mines and other natural opportunities, therefore this congress would condemn any increase in the tariff, and would urge that taxes be removed as soon as possible to those values which now enable non-production to impoverish industry.

That is the opinion of one hundred and two labour organizations, met for the purpose of considering how they could advance their own interests. That resolution passed unanimously, and I say that these representative labour men in convention assembled are more entitled to say what will conduce to the interests of labour than even the hon. leader of the opposition, and this whole House along with him. I, therefore, say that the hon. gentleman's resolution, in its application to the first part of the population whom it proposes to protect, is absolutely ineffective, but, on the contrary, is injurious.

Now, let us see to what other classes it applies. In our trade returns we divide the interests of Canada into about six classes: Mining, fishing, forests, animals, agriculture and manufactures. Let us take the miners first. The exports of our mines last year amounted to $34,947,575. The resolution proposes by adequate protection to benefit them. How can the miners out in the Yukon, who have everything to buy, and who have to take their returns out of the soil, be protected by increasing the prices of their tools and their food, while in no way providing them with a market? They are a class who cannot be protected no matter how much we try. It is true, the lead miners in British Columbia are just now subjected to a terrible inconvenience; but this is not particularly for the want of protection. It is because an organized trust in the United States will not buy their ore. If they could secure a market for their ore, they would not ask for protection; but they are asking for protection for lead ore, because they have no foreign market for it; and so far as I am personally concerned, I will endorse the action of the Minister of Finance if he will put such a duty on everything into which lead enters as will enable these men to live, in the particular circumstances in which they are placed. At the same time, do not let us try to persuade ourselves that we can, by a policy of adequate protection, advance the interests of the miners of this country.

Can we do it with our fisheries? They exported last year $14,143,294 worth of fish, besides supplying nearly the entire requirements of the country, and they were subjected to a competition of how much? Six hundred and twenty thousand seven hundred and six dollars, consisting of: Oysters, $240,000; fish bait, $101,688; anchovies and sardines, $107,000; and forty-three other items, amounting to $172,018. Therefore, it is impossible for adequate protection to advance the interests of our great fishing industries.

Let us now turn to the lumbering industry, which is sufficiently large to warrant us in devoting a little time to its consideration. Our exports of forest products last year, amounted to $32,119,420, and our imports to $4,242,358, including $941,000 of oak and $665,000 of logs and round timber. Add the imports of fancy woods, such as we have not got in this country, amounting to $1,000,000 or $1,500,000, and the lumber required for the people of the North-west who are many miles from a lumber yard, and you have all the foreign lumber brought into Canada. Have we had any delegations from the labour interests, the mining industry, except the lead miners, the fishing industry or the lumber interest, asking us by means of a protective tariff to better their conditions? Not at all.

The greatest industry which we have in this country is that of animals and animal products. That has taken on a wonderful development during the last few years. Our exports of animals and their products last year amounted to $59,161,209. Let us look at this question in an honest, candid way, and ask ourselves if we can improve the condition of the farmers by giving them adequate protection. The leader of the opposition tried the other day to show that they are subjected to a tremendous competition. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce showed that out of the $28,000,000 of agricultural products that were imported, not more than $6,000,000 came into competition with the products of our farmers. Of the actual imports of last year which our cattle-growers had to face, amounting to $3,000,000, there were $1,064,988 of animals, $1,716,747 of food products and $375,515 of stock for breeding purposes, while we exported $59,000,000 worth of our surplus product, after supplying the requirements of our own people. How can you protect that great industry by increasing the protection of the farmers. They have no competition now. You might raise the duty to 100 per cent, and it would be of no benefit to the farmers, except that in an indirect sense it would produce a home market for some of their surplus products.

Take our agricultural returns, take last year we exported $37,000,000 of our surplus products and our exports of these products are likely to increase in much greater ratio than they have done in the past. But what competition were our agriculturists subjected to? We must not forget that it is not the amount we import into this country which comes into competition with our own products, but the amount consumed in this country. It is the quantity imported for

home consumption which competes with our own products, and the hon. leader of the opposition seeks to create a false impression when he says we imported some $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 worth of wheat last year. What we imported from the west went out of this country by the east. It merely passed through this country, yet the hon. gentleman would have us believe that that importation of wheat came into competition with what was raised by our own farmers. Out of $489,000 worth of grain which came into this country, the actual amount that did enter into competition with our own products was $89,000 worth. If we included corn, which we imported at the request and for the benefit of our farmers, the whole amount of agricultural products that came into competition with the products of our own farmers was but $5,700,000. When we consider these facts, must we not conclude that the resolution of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition goes a good deal further than the circumstances justify, when it calls on us to declare that our agricultural industry requires to be stimulated by an adequate tariff. It seems to me perfectly clear that, with the exception of a few manufacturing industries, there is no industry in this country that could be stimulated by an increased tariff, and during the past six years the output of our manufacturing industries has increased from $9,365,000 in 1896 to $18,462,000 last year. Even with regard to our manufacturing industries, the word adequate production has no significance, because, with the exception of a few, they are in a fairly prosperous condition, and when such a condition obtains they evidently enjoy what the hon. leader of the opposition calls an adequate protective tariff.

The hon. gentleman read an extract from an interview with certain miners, in which the miners contended that the duty on wheat of twelve cents, on oats of ten cents, on hay of $2 a ton, and on eggs, three cents a dozen, bore very heavily upon them. The hon. gentleman was not suggesting that the protection given the farmers was too high. On the contrary, he thought it was not high enough. He believed that on certain agricultural products the duty should be increased so that a country like Canada, possessing agricultural capabilities second to none in the world, should not be obliged to import from the United States nearly $28,000,000 of agricultural products and produce of animals. But, if he had said that out of this $28,000,000 of imports from the United States, $22,000,000 consisted of bananas and oranges and other articles in which our farmers are not interested, he would have presented a truthful statement. In declaring, however, that our imports of agricultural products amounted to $28,000,000 and then proceeding to base the argument he did on that statement, he produced a false impression. In order to obtain an accurate idea of the facts, I have looked into the Trade and Navigation Returns and I find that our imports were as follows :

Animals..	$1,064,000
Grain..	489,000

And so on down, giving them the benefit of free corn and every conceivable thing that could possibly come into competition with the products of our Canadian farmers. The total importation amounts as the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, to about $6,290,000. How does this compare with the total products of the Canadian farm ? It is estimated by the Bureau of Industries of Ontario that our agricultural products last year amounted to $214,000,000. It was estimated years ago by the Dominion statistician that the agricultural products of the Dominion amounted to over $500,000,000. I believe he was over the mark but now we have probably reached that stage. I put the question. If we raise $500,000,000 worth of agricultural products, how can an importation of only $5,000,000 worth affect our market—an importation of only about one per cent of our whole product ? To say that such a small percentage of imports could affect the prices of our gross production seems to me a patent absurdity.

Let me see how this thing works out when we apply the figures. The hon. gentleman says that we allowed wheat in subject to a duty of 12 cents per bushel, well, last year we imported $89,000 worth and this country raised $100,000,000 worth. How much benefit would accrue to the farmers by increasing the duty on wheat ? On oats the duty is 10 cents per bushel and the hon. gentleman wants that duty raised. But, I find that the total quantity of oats we imported was but $71,000 worth and that the province of Ontario alone raised $28,000,000 worth. What proportion does our importation of oats bear to the quantity we raise ? It is almost infinitesimal and microscopic. We might almost call it a specimen of bacteria which we are called on to consider in connection with this question. On hay, the duty is $2 per ton, and we imported $121,000 worth, the bulk of which I presume went into British Columbia or some of those distant territories which our Ontario farmers cannot reach. Our production of hay in Ontario alone last year amounted to $37,000,000, and we are asked to believe that this importation of $121,000 worth of hay comes into competition with the entire production of hay of this Dominion, and that to keep it out of this country would be a great service to our agriculturists. Then take potatoes, we imported last year $102,000 worth. But Ontario alone raised $7,000,000 worth. and included in that importation of $102,000 worth are sweet potatoes and yams. Are we to believe that by raising the duty from 15 to 45 cents a bushel, our people would be enabled to raise

sweet potatoes and yams, and that we would thereby introduce a new industry into Canada ? My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, even spoke of the advantage which increased protection would give our milk and cheese. Well, we imported milk to the extent of $55,000 worth, and cheese to the extent of $42,000 worth, and we are asked seriously to believe that this importation is a danger and a menace to the dairy industries of this country, which last year fed our own population of five and a half millions, and exported $19,000,000 worth of cheese and $6,000,000 worth of butter.

I do not see anything in that resolution which throws out much encouragement to any of our industries. But I agree with the hon. the leader of the opposition on the importance of the home market to the people of Canada. I am of the opinion that that is a market which may be cultivated and developed, and which the government can cultivate and develop by—I will not call it a protective tariff for that term might be offensive to some of my friends—but by a tariff for revenue. I believe that a tariff of revenue to a greater extent would be useful to the people of this country, and I shall try briefly to show by the trend of our trade during the past few years, that an absolute necessity for successful farming in Canada is the establishment of a home market. If we take the two great branches of the farming industry—agricultural products and animals—we will find that we have got two countries in the world to sell to and almost three to buy from. Of our entire exports, no less than 90 per cent goes to Great Britain and the United States; and of our entire imports we get 85 per cent from Great Britain and the United States. Germany supplies, of our imports, something over $10,000,000 and takes of our exports about $1,300,000. So, we cannot get hurt very much if they put a prohibitive tariff on our goods. We can eliminate the world in considering what the future has in store for us. With only 15 per cent of our imports coming from countries other than Great Britain and the United States, and only 10 per cent of our exports going to the other countries, the proportion is so small as to have practically no effect. I have here a short summary showing some features of our export trade to Great Britain and to the United States in 1896 and 1902. I take these years because they are a little more convenient :

COMPARISON OF EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES, 1896 AND 1902.

Agricultural Products.

	Great Britain.	United States.
1896	$ 9,551,316	$3,232,729
1902	27,973,503	2,555,216
	$18,422,187*	$ 677,513†

* Increase. † Decrease.

Animals and Their Products.

	Great Britain.	United States.
1896	$32,523,070	$3,341,275
1902	52,687,998	5,139,262
	$20,164,928*	$1,797,987†

* Increase. † Increase.

TOTAL EXPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND ANIMALS AND THEIR PRODUCTS.

	Great Britain.	United States.
1896	$42,074,387	$6,573,004
1902	80,661,501	7,694,478
	$38,587,114*	$1,121,474†

* Increase. † Increase.

After seven years, we find that we have increased our exports to Great Britain by over $38,000,000, while our exports to the United States have increased only a little over $1,000,000. Now, let us look the facts in the case from the farmers standpoint, and consider, in view of the limited market in the world at large and in the United States, what chance we have in the British market and in the market we can create for our own products among our own people. That is the proposition the farmers have to meet. It is no use for them to say to themselves : We want to sell in the dearest market and buy in the cheapest market. That would be an ideal condition, and may come when the millennium comes; but it is not here just now. The nations of the world simply say : We will not buy from you. That is what the United States tell us. It tells our farmers, with their surplus of $100,000,000 : We will only take five or six millions of certain qualities of your goods and the rest you can do what you like with. The question naturally arises, a question of considerable importance —is the market of Great Britain an unlimited market; can we continue for all time to send our export products to Great Britain ? Is there a time likely to come in the near future when we shall reach the limit of the demand for consumption in that country ? With the United States markets closed against us, with Germany, France and all the nations of the world with highly protective tariffs, our outlook as farmers is simply the outlook upon the British market and the home market—and the local market is of even more importance than the British market. Now you will bear in mind that Canada, at the present time is an agricultural country. The proportion of farmers to the rest of the community is as three to two. It has been changing, and changing rapidly, during the past ten years. Owing to the influx that has taken place of people going to our North-west, the present condition of affairs may continue and we may remain an agricultural community. But it is changing in the United States. That has ceased to be an agricultural country and has become a manufacturing country,

for the proportion of farmers to others there is ten to twenty-one. Now, we are in the peculiar position still of being an agricultural country, capable for years to come of supplying far in excess of our wants, with the markets of the world, except Great Britain, barred against us. Therefore I say the development of a home market is a matter of great importance to the people of Canada. And the only way it can be done is by the application of a tariff for revenue purposes. The productive power of our farms last year was $500,000,000. We exported $100,000,000 worth, leaving $400,000,000 worth at home, of which, I presume, the rural population consumed at least one-half. It must not be forgotten that during the past year the rural population in old Canada has decreased by 112,000, while the urban population has increased by 364,000. In the province of Ontario, the farmers have decreased by 48,000, while the inhabitants of the cities, towns and villages have increased by 116,000. How much of our prosperity must be attributed to this change of population it is hard to say. It is commonly said that our prosperity is due to our export of farm products. But then, we consume in old Canada twice as much as we export. There are two or three ways open to us to enlarge the home market. Hon. gentlemen on the other side would say: If you have a highly protective tariff, that will cause all the goods required in this country to be manufactured in the country, and so you will increase the urban population to such an extent that the farmers will have a population for their surplus products. Is that likely to be the case? The United States tariff of 50 per cent meets us when we seek to enter their market. In relation to grain, there is an unlimited market for many years in Great Britain. The imports of grain and flour into Britian last year, was $150,000,000. We have a long time to develop even the North-west before we can overtake that market, so that my present remarks do not apply to Manitoba and the North-west. But the old Dominion of Canada has ceased to be an exporter of grain. We hardly raise more than we ourselves consume. So, we are compelled to build up a different system of production in order to have an export trade. We have developed in a wonderful degree during the past few years the cheese industry, the bacon industry and the cattle industry. These are the three largest. Are we likely to overtake the consuming capacity of the British market in these lines? Of cheese last year we exported to Great Britain $20,000,000 worth. The entire import into Great Britain in that year was $31,000,000. We have reached 65 per cent of the cheese trade of the British market, and it is the opinion now of men engaged in this business that we are exporting as much cheese as we are likely to do, unless, by improving the quality of the cheese, we may improve the desire to consume our cheese by the English people, in which case that increase will be held by the Canadian makers of cheese. Take bacon, the next in importance of our exports last year, amounting to $12,400,000, whereas the consuming capacity of hog products in Great Britain was represented by an importation of $68,000,000 last year. There appears to be a big margin between $12,000,000 and $68,000,000, and people assume that all we have to do is to go in and capture that market. But that is a delusion. Mr. Flavelle, the head of the Davies Pork Packing Company, in an address that he recently made before the Pig Breeders' Association of Canada, says that that is an entirely erroneous impression; that we have already reached the extent of our bacon producing capacity; that while the English people import some $68,000,000 worth of hog products, a large proportion of that is of the heavy, coarse hogs in which we cannot compete with the people of the United States, who can sell that class of hogs cheaper than we can; so in that market the United States is supreme. With Denmark, England and Ireland as competitors, we may hold our own, will hold our own, and may capture any further increase that may be developed for Wiltshire bacon. In cattle we exported $9,000,000 worth out of a possible $44,000,000 worth. I am not a cattle man, I do not know what prospects there are for further developing that trade. We have competitors in the United States who can produce cattle as good as we can, and a little cheaper, because their corn is cheaper. We have competitors in Argentina and other places, where food is cheap and labour is cheap, and I have grave doubts whether we can materially increase even our exports of cattle. Therefore, the question presents itself with force to the farming community. Are these things true, and if true, wherein is the remedy?

Mr. GOURLEY. The hon. gentleman says that hogs cannot be raised in this country as cheaply as in the United States. Would he state the reason why?

Mr. HEYD. Mr. Flavelle says that more than one-half of the entire imports of Great Britain are composed of heavy, fat meat that can be produced cheaper in the United States than we can produce it in Canada, and that we cannot hope to be competitors with them.

Mr. GOURLEY. Does the hon. gentleman know the reason why they can be produced cheaper there?

Mr. HEYD. I am not in the hog business; but Mr. Flavelle, who is the manager of the Davies Pork Packing Company, the largest house in this country, and being himself the best informed man in this country on that question, says so, and I am willing to take his statement.

Mr. GOURLEY. Where can I get that information ?

Mr. HEYD. Any farmer in the House can tell you. I am not a farmer.

Mr. GOURLEY. I can understand that they would have some advantage over us.

Mr. HEYD. There are two or three theories, but I do not know. Now what alternatives have our farmers got ? First, they have the important one of developing the home market. Every additional consumer in Canada is a benefit to the farming community. If, by a rearrangement of our tariff, our industries were injured so that the urban population that is now the principal consumers for our farmers were compelled to leave this country, at once the farming industry would be depressed. But if, by a judicious and wise system of tariff reduction, this urban population can be increased, the manufactured goods that we get abroad in many lines would be made in this country, and that would help to build up our home industries. The only other alternative is for the farmer not to produce his stuff. He has got to face one of two propositions, either our own people must buy more of his surplus products, which will be the case if we increase the consuming capacity of the home market, or he must stop growing those products.

Now then the question for him to consider is, how much will it cost to secure that home market. The farmers recognize that the protective tariff now in force in this country is in their interest. We have no farmers' deputations down here asking for a reduction of the tariff. They are willing to submit to the present tariff in order to develop the home market. But they have a right to ask themselves, recognizing the benefit of the home market: How much is it going to cost to secure immediately that home market ? That is the crux of this whole question. Now the opposition say : Put on a prohibitive tariff, that will do the business. It will also reduce the great revenue enjoyed by the government. They will no longer have occasion to quarrel with the Finance Minister if they introduce a prohibitory tariff as a remedy for our present ills. The Finance Minister will no longer be able to say that he has a surplus of $13,000,000. That evil, if it is one, will certainly be done away with. The present tariff, while it encourages the home market, also provides a revenue for the government and secures a paying market for home manufactures, and general prosperity for all. That is the stand taken by the government, and the farmers accept these conditions.

Some manufacturers are content with the present conditions, while some want more protection than they now get. While I am not prepared to say which class is entitled to an increase in the tariff, I do believe that there are industries in this country that are being injured by the preferential, that have been injured in the past from the want of a surtax on German goods ; and there are industries that are being injured by under-valuation from the United States. Those industries that are being made a slaughter market for American goods should be considered, and their welfare should be looked after by the government of this country. I believe that the government is now alive to the situation, and recognize that under-valuation has been taking place for a number of years. They are appointing more officials on the customs staff in order to prevent that evil, and they are getting the machinery into good working order. I know some industries that are likely to be closed up from this very evil of under-valuation. Still, we must admit that the manufacturers as a whole, with the exception of a few, are in a highly prosperous condition, there is no question of that. I believe that the government will be alert, and will be able to meet any changed conditions that present themselves. I believe they will have to be on the alert for that slump which the manufacturers fear on the other side. We do not fear it in this country, because we have not got our money all invested in the business. But we have to realize the tremendous development that is taking place in manufacturing interests in the United States, the terrible trusts and combines that have been formed there, which are more powerful even than the Senate and House of Representatives. It behooves us to realize that one company controls $140,000,000 worth of capital ; that there are nearly two hundred trusts controlling over $3,500,000,000 of capital, and producing nearly $1,661,000,000 worth of goods ; that the manufacturers of the United States produce about $7,000,000,000 worth, nearly $8,000,000,000 worth of manufactured goods properly so-called, or $13,000,000,000 worth if you include the products of the hand trades and reduplications. If you take the hand trades alone they amount to $8,500,000,000, of which not 3½ per cent, but 12 per cent, is exported to the markets of the world. We find that the product amounts now to $800,000,000 more than the people of the United States consume: They have agents the world over selling goods at less than it costs to produce them, recouping themselves in the highly protected markets at home in order that they may make sacrifices in the markets of the world. Our manufacturers say there is a danger. As soon as the consumption in the United States for these manufactured goods cease, the productive power, which will not cease, will go on producing, they must immediately find markets and the question which presents itself to their minds is this : Is the Canadian tariff high enough, under the conditions which are sure to obtain in a short period of time to preserve for us what we

have spent years in accumulating and in developing—the manufactories over which we have control ? No wonder that they are asking for an increase in the tariff. If I were a manufacturer and had the same interests at stake, I think I, myself, would shout for higher protection, louder than I am doing to-day, but, I have faith that the government that in 1896 assumed the helm of affairs and directed the ship of state to the haven of prosperity, are still able and willing when the conditions change, once more to listen to the voice of reason and to continue to guide that ship in the future as in the past along prosperous lines.

Now, there is one industry in particular that we ought to feel thankful the government have done something for, though they have done very little for it. The binder twine industry is a peculiar industry, separate from all others and it bears a peculiar relation to the other industries of the country. It has to compete for trade in Canada alone against an organized body of twine manufacturers, which controls 90 per cent of the entire output of the United States. The International Harvester Company is the octopus that they have to fight against and against their onslaught they are absolutely powerless. Many people have been induced to go into the manufacture of binder twine. The hon. Minister of Finance stated the other day that many have gone into it, but they have gone into it under a false impression. They were under the impression that because the Brantford Binder Twine Company in three years earned dividends amounting to 200 per cent, all they had to do was to get a company of farmers to put their money into the binder twine business and they would likewise be able to declare dividends of 40 per cent, 60 per cent and 100 per cent. It is not always that we have manilla wars. It is not always that raw manilla jumps from 3½ cents a pound to 13 cents a pound. A company has to have on hand a large quantity of raw material in order to enable it to make a profit of nearly $150,000 on the increase in the value of its raw material alone. That accounts for the 200 per cent dividends declared by the Brantford Binder Twine Company, but last year, in the face of a first class consuming demand in the North-west Territories it made 8 per cent, the Ontario Farmers Company made 5 per cent, the Consumers Cordage Company, which did not happen to have on hand $150,000 worth of raw product, has made 2½ per cent per annum during the last seven years. The Chatham Binder Twine factory is closed up, and the Richelieu Cordage Company has closed its factory. Nearly all the binder twine factories in this country are owned by farmers who have gone into the business to prevent monopoly and that is the reason why the Farmers Binder Twine Company of Brantford was started. It has been successful because some 8,000 farmers became the agents and distributing centres for the institution. It costs the company nothing to sell its goods and it is able to keep on making binder twine. But the others are in dread. They do not know where they stand to-day. The United States market is closed against them by a duty of 45 per cent upon all binder twine of which manilla is a component part. With an octopus there controlling 90 per cent of the entire output, with the ability to begin in Texas and follow the markets up and when they reach the latter part of the season with a remnant of their supplies on hand, Canada is the dumping ground. The menace is not to the binder twine companies alone, but it is to the farmers of this country. The independent binder twine companies which we have in Canada are absolutely at the mercy of this foreign corporation which can charge what they like and when they like. The farmers of Canada are absolutely at their mercy if they have a glut of grain, as they are likely to have this year, that may reach to the producing power of the binder twine companies, and when they come to take the crop from the golden wheat fields they may find themselves left in the lurch for want of binder twine. The binder twine manufacturers met members of the government. They said : If you will give us a protection of 12½ per cent on binder twine we will undertake to produce all the people of Canada want. We have producing power sufficient to meet the requirements of the Canadian consumers. We will agree to fix our price at the price quoted by the International Harvester Company to the people of the United States and if we exceed their price you shall have the power by Order in Council to wipe out the duty so as to prevent us from getting a monopoly or extorting money from the consumers of the country. A proposition of that kind may be very difficult to deal with. Our farmer friends do not realize the importance of this question. We have the ability to make binder twine in Canada to-day. We have the factories, we have the labour to make all this country demands and we will make it and sell it to the consuming public as cheaply as the International Harvester Company sell it to the people of the United States, if we have a certain amount of tariff for revenue applied to the binder twine industry. It is these industries which are being injured that I have the greatest solicitude for. It is not the establishments that are developing and increasing beyond all reason. It is those that are being injured and which do not know what to do. They do not know what to do because the price of manilla had not until recently even been fixed. If it should turn out that they have too much binder twine in the United States there is nothing to prevent the International Harvester Company from saying that the price in Canada shall be 12 cents per pound. Our price is 13 cents. The price

of pure manilla is 13 cents. But, to suit their own purposes the price of the International Harvester Company can be put down to 10 cents per pound for the purpose of wiping out every binder twine industry we have in this country. They are at the mercy of the trust. I would make it a little harder for the International Harvester Company to sell their goods in Canada. I would like binder twine to contribute by a revenue duty to the coffers of this country. Why should they have been singled out. If a revenue duty is the policy of the government it should apply to binder twine as well as to reapers and to mowers.

Now, Sir, I hear already that some industries that have been subjected to the preference; some that have been subjected to the slaughter, are being hard hit. I have letters from some which say that it may force them to close up. I have one letter from the Cutlery Company, who think they will not be able to wait until the government finds out whether Great Britain is going to give us a preference or the United States reciprocity. They cannot wait another year and fight against the present conditions. There are many industries in that position, and I do hope, and I hope with confidence, that the present condition will not last much longer; and that those people who have been hoping against hope as the binder twine people have been for five or six years, will be relieved from the tension to which they have been subjected, and at least put upon the plane that is occupied by the ordinary manufacturers of this country. I trust, Sir, that when this slump which is sure to come, manifests itself, the government will be on the alert, and if specific duties are needed or if anything else is needed to secure the manufacturers of this country from that invasion, they should be so secured. It is my opinion, Sir, that cheap goods to the consumer for a year or two, will never pay Canada for the loss of these magnificent manufacturing industries that have developed so wondrously during the last few years and are to-day the pride of this great Dominion of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker. I wish to join with the other members of the House in the expression of gratitude for the splendid prosperity that reigns throughout Canada at the present time. I will, however, have to differ from my hon. friends on the other side of the House, as to the cause of that prosperity, because I believe that a very large measure of our prosperity at the present day is due to the splendid national policy that was inaugurated by the Liberal-Conservative party in 1879.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. I listened to the lengthy speech of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and I was not surprised that the Speaker had to draw his attention to the fact that he was not keeping to the amendment before the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) said in answer to Mr. Speaker, that he had not read the amendment, but even that ignorance of the subject did not deter the hon. gentleman from criticising the leader of the opposition for promulgating a policy which he (Mr. Davis) had to admit he knew nothing about. Well, Sir, the policy of the Conservative party is adequate protection for home industries. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) told us that he could not understand the term 'adequate protection,' because it was not definite enough. As to that, it may not be amiss for me to give him the authority of a gentleman of high standing in this House; a gentleman whom he has supported for the last few years; a gentleman who stood so high in the estimation of the Reform party that he was selected by the Prime Minister to take the most responsible portfolio in his government when he came to power in 1896. I refer to the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). Let me in the first place read the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition. It is :

> This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians ;
>
> And that the financial policy of the government should include a measure for the thorough and judicious readjustment of the tariff at the present session

Now, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) does not understand that, let me read to him what the Hon. Mr. Tarte said about it the other evening, and perhaps that may illuminate the mind of the member for Saskatchewan. The Hon. Mr. Tarte said :

> Let me compliment the hon. the leader of the opposition on the speech he has delivered: On both sides of the House it is admitted to be one of the ablest utterances that have been made on the question of a tariff in this parliament. It is delightful to hear questions of that importance discussed in such an able manner. His motion has the right ring.

That illustrates the difference between the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and the member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte). Let me say further, Mr. Speaker, that there is a demand from the people of the North-west for local self-government as we have it in the other provinces of the Dominion. Travelling through the territories last fall, I found that Liberals and Conservatives were agreed that the time had come when they should have local self-government. And, is it not a surprise that a gentleman coming from the territories as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) does, should have addressed the House for two long hours and make no reference whatever to this all-

important question to the people of his constituency. On this subject let me quote what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said in 1895—not since the Liberals came into power but before they came into power, and that makes a great deal of difference with these gentlemen. Referring to the $277,000 that the Conservative government was voting in 1895 for the North-west Territories Mr. Charlton said :

> We could save the whole of that expense by allowing the North-west Territory people to manage their own concerns. Give them self-government, do not lead them around as infants with a string, but let them manage their own business like free British subjects.

What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) think about the condition of things now ? Does he think that because the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) advocated free trade on agricultural implements and now favours a revenue tariff of 20 per cent on them, that this same hon. gentleman will give his adhesion to anything which the government proposes ?

I listened with some pleasure to the speech of the member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd), but I am unable yet to determine whether he is a protectionist or a free trader. I could not make out whether he was advocating a revenue tariff or protection; probably he was arguing for both. But for the information of the House let me quote something the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) said last year and which is to be found in 'Hansard,' page 299. He said :

> I am in favour of increasing the protection on the woollen industry of this country.

Notwithstanding that he held this opinion last year, he is ready to stand up in the House to-day and to support the existing tariff, and to say that he is in favour of a revenue tariff, and to say further that the present tariff is all right. Why did he not tell his leader this year that he was in favour of increasing the protection of the woollen industries of this country. Again, he said last year :

> I am willing to protect even to the extent of extreme protection.

What has changed his mind since. Further he said :

> I am opposed to any kind of reciprocity with the people of the United States.

This is what he said last year, but to-day he stood on the floor of the House to tell us, that he warned the government that the day is coming when the British market will in some measure be closed to us and that we will not be able to supply it to the extent that we are supplying it at the present moment. What does he ask ? He says the government is called upon to provide a home market for the farmers. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, or the government themselves, how it is possible to have an increased home market without having increased manufacturing establishments ? Every man knows that it is an utter impossibility.

The hon. Finance Minister, in his budget speech in the session of 1901, stated that he believed in a policy of stability of tariffs. The right hon. Prime Minister has made the same statement on several occasions. That is their policy as a government and a party. I think it is a very good text for the people of any country, so far as it can be lived up to. Would it not be well for us to look into this government's record to see if they have lived up to that splendid text ? The Liberal-Conservative party were defeated in 1896 ; the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier came into power and formed his government ; and at the session of 1897 that government introduced what they called the Fielding tariff, and announced to the world : We present this to the people of Canada as a stable tariff ; stability of tariffs is our watchword. That tariff was adopted in 1897 ; but how long did these hon. gentlemen live up to their doctrine of stability of tariffs ? Not very long, for in the following session, that of 1898, the hon. Finance Minister stood up in his place in the House and said to the manufacturing industries and to the people of Canada : We are going to alter the tariff and make a radical change. What was the change ? He announced a preferential reduction to British goods of 12½ per cent ; nay, it was supposed to be world-wide. How long did that last ? Not very long. In the next session, in 1899, the hon. Finance Minister again stood up in his place and announced another reduction. I suppose he said, discussing it in the Cabinet: This tariff is not satisfactory yet ; we will have to forget that stable tariff doctrine, and put away the 12½ per cent preference to goods coming to this country from England, and adopt a 25 per cent preference. And he announced that change in the House. Stability of tariff, do you say ? In the meantime, the manufacturers came to the government and said : We cannot continue our manufacturing if you continue this reduction of the tariff. Yet in the next session they came along with another sweeping change. They said : We will put away that 25 per cent preference and adopt a 33⅓ per cent preference on goods coming from England. Would you call that a stable tariff ? Would it be called a stable tariff by men intending coming to this country to engage in agricultural or manufacturing pursuits ? Not a bit of it. In 1897 the government looked for something further. They said : There is to be a large development in the railways of Canada, and we will adopt some legislation to enable steel rails to be manufactured in this country. In November, 1900, just before the general election, the government sat down in Council and entered into a contract with the Clergue Company of Sault Ste. Marie, not by open Act of parliament, but by a special secret contract, given without competition,

to supply the government with 125,000 tons of steel rails. The contract was to extend over a period of five years. I heard the Finance Minister stand up in his place in the House and say: We are having a splendid steel rail industry established in the province from which I come, and it will soon be in operation. But that contract was not lived up to—why? Because it was made in secret. Every man in this country should have had an opportunity of tendering for those steel rails. Speaking for myself, I am opposed to this kind of class legislation. Coming to the session of 1902 and keeping before our minds that promise to the people of Canada of a stable tariff, we had a discussion of the tariff in this House. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) the other evening, referring to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance on that occasion, said:

Last year my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in his budget speech said that he would not revise the tariff that session, because there were reasons why he should not do so—the census returns of manufactures were not available, and the London conference was on; but the words of the hon. Minister of Finance, which I read in the House on another occasion, conveyed to the country the impression that the tariff would be revised this year. The business men of the country took those words as a pledge for a revision of the tariff at this present session. The words of the Finance Minister of last year were a great deal more definite on that point than his words of this year. Last year my hon. friend did not argue on principle against a revision of the tariff, but we realize that conditions have arisen in the world that will make it necessary for us to revise the tariff at some future day. These words, I say, were understood to mean a revision this year. I can appeal to the business men of the country—they took the words of the hon. gentleman as a promise. I know that there are in Ontario and the province of Quebec several industries which cannot live under the present tariff, and there is one thing that surprises me. This Liberal side of the House is empty to-night. I would like to see it full. But what surprises me is that there are so many members of parliament on this side who have told us that they share my views, who have written me and told me repeatedly that they share my views, and who have not been able to impress their views on the Liberal party. I say it openly, I say it from the bottom of my heart, that I fully expected that the Liberal party, with which I have been connected during the last ten years, would carry out the policy it was understood in 1896 they would carry out. I am weighing my words. I know what arrangement, what understanding took place between some public men. I know what took place. I do not divulge any secrets. I know what we did in the election of 1896 in Montreal. I see within the radius of my eye public men who, at our request, came to the city of Montreal, went to the manufacturers, with the knowledge of the leaders of their party, and told them not only would the tariff not be disturbed, but it would be changed in the right direction when the proper time came. There was no secret about that. I shall not give names. There are men who hear me—I am sorry there are not more on those benches—who know that I am perfectly right. I am out of office because I could not stay in office under the present circumstances.

What do hon. gentlemen think of that kind of a statement? Is that a statement which should be made on behalf of a government that advocates stability of tariff? What are we to think of hon. gentlemen, who advocate a policy of tariff stability, going secretly to the manufacturers, prior to the general elections, and saying to them: 'You need not be disturbed about our utterances. True, we have advocated reciprocity; true we have promised free trade; but do not be alarmed, we tell you in secret—because we do many things in secret—that if the tariff be changed at all, it will be changed in the interest of the manufacturer.' Is it a matter for surprise that when we find a government, which pronounced itself in favour of stability of tariff, making important changes in that tariff every session, so that no one can tell exactly what may happen next, our capitalists and manufacturers should refuse to invest in manufacturing industries. This session the government have introduced a new feature into their so-called policy of tariff stability. They have inposed a surtax on goods from Germany. Well, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion such legislation is anything but wise and prudent statesmanship. I do not wish to be misunderstood. In saying this, I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to increased protection? On the contrary, I am in favour of increasing protection to all our Canadian industries which require it. But at the same time, I do not think that it is wise or politic to single out any special country and say to that country: 'You shall not bring in your goods under the ordinary tariff, but you shall pay one-third more than the rates charged other countries.' If for no other such a policy is impolitic and inadvisable for this reason. We have in this country a large German settlement. We have particularly in the central part of Ontario—in Waterloo and in the surrounding district—many German settlers who are among the most prosperous and enterprising citizens to be found in this Dominion. We are inviting the surplus population of Germany to come in and settle on our unoccupied lands. We are holding out great inducements to good citizens from every part of the world to cast their lot in with us. But when a German immigrant takes up a location in our Northwest, what will happen? He may find beside him a Russian and along side the Russian a settler from some other foreign country, and when he takes up our tariff he will be confronted by this fact; that goods from every foreign country in the world except Germany are admitted on the same basis, but on German goods a special tax is imposed, and that is a condition of affairs which will naturally excite his resentment and prejudice him against the

laws and institutions of his newly adopted country. That is why I am opposed to this policy of discrimination against the goods of any particular country. What I maintain is that the government should look carefully into the subject of imports from Germany, and if it came to the conclusion that the goods we import from that country could be and should be manufactured in Canada, then it would be perfectly justified, in the interests of this country, in making its tariff sufficiently high to keep out such imports and similar imports from every country in the world. But I do not think that it is wise to apply any special tariff to any one foreign country which is not equally applicable to every other.

My hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) spoke a good deal about the farmers. He pleaded both for and against them. He argued that it was in the interests of the people that we should have protection, but he immediately proceeded to warn the people against too high protection. He at first said that our imports from the United States did not hurt us and then he dwelt on the necessity of our imposing a higher tariff on some American products, especially barb wire and binder twine. Let me refer to that binder twine question. When we had a Liberal-Conservative government in power, that government put a duty of 12½ per cent on binder twine imported into Canada, no matter from what country. The Reform party took issue with the Liberal-Conservatives in that tariff and claimed that, in the interests of the Canadian farmer, binder twine should be admitted free. If that were done, they said that our farmers would purchase their binder twine at cheaper rates. They applied the same argument to barbwire, which was protected by the Liberal-Conservative government. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Reform party came into power and took the duty off binder twine and barb-wire. This gave the Canadian people an opportunity to compare the results of the two policies. What has been the result of taking off the duty? Why, the result has been that every year since then we have had a large quantity of binder twine and barbwire manufactured by foreigners coming into this country and sold to our Canadian farmers at higher rates than formerly were the rule, when these two industries enjoyed the advantage of protection. And we have today that devoted Liberal, my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd), lifting up his hand and appealing to have the tariff raised again because at this moment our binder twine factories are closed down.

Which of the two great parties, Mr. Speaker, are entitled to the support and confidence of the farmers of Canada? Both sides are in accord on this point, that our farming community is the most important in this country. I am one of those who believe that the farmers of Canada can be protected.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. GOURLEY. Most of all.

Mr. BLAIN. Most of all, as my hon. friend says. Let me go back to 1878, when the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was in power as First Minister of the Liberal administration. Taking up the tariff of the Reform government of that day, what do I find? I find that wheat was admitted into this country free of duty. Let me give a list of the farm products admitted free of duty into this country under the Reform government. That list was composed of wheat, barley, peas, oats, rye, eggs, wheat flour, oatmeal and cornmeal. There was at that time a great political issue between the two great bodies contending for the mastery. The Liberal-Conservative opposition, headed by that distinguished statesman, the late Sir John Macdonald, said that if returned to power they would inaugurate a national policy, not for the benefit of the manufacturers alone, but for every class of people, including farmers. They were elected in 1878, and in their tariff of 1879 they showed how they looked after the interests of the farmers. In that tariff the following duties were imposed on agricultural products:

Wheat	15	cents per bushel.
Barley	15	" "
Peas	10	" "
Rye	10	" "
Eggs	5	" per dozen.
Wheat flour	50	" per barrel.
Rye flour	50	" "
Oat meal	½	a cent per pound.
Corn meal	40	cents per bushel.

There were some changes made by the Liberal-Conservatives from 1879 down to the time they went out of office in 1896.

Some slight reductions were made in these duties, reductions that, speaking for myself, I do not approve of. If I may be permitted to say so, I think the Liberal-Conservative party made a mistake on that question. The Liberal party came into power and found this tariff on farm products—a duty on everything the farmer sells, showing the belief on the part of the Liberal-Conservative party that all classes of people should have protection. And are those duties still in existence under this free trade government that used to declare that the farmers could not be protected? That is what they told us in this House and what many of them still tell us in the country. They promised the country free trade. Why did they not carry out that promise and strike off this list of duties? Why does not my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) or my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) advocate such a course? Why does not the government, if it believes that protection does not protect the farmer, strike off these duties when revising the tariff? This should be made a test question between the parties, so that the people of Canada may understand it.

I have a list here of farm and market-garden produce imported last year into this country, all of which, in my opinion should have been grown in Canada :—

Wheat	$7,217,137
Rye	239,404
Pease	20,748
Oats	131,818
Wheat flour	155,544
Beans	21,333
Tomatoes, fresh	54,047
Apples	90,307
Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries	94,192
Potatoes	88,017
Horses	570,651

A very large part of these goods came from the United States. And, if hon. gentlemen opposite would like to know my opinion of 'adequate protection' and the opinion of my honoured leader and the Conservative party, I may tell him that 'adequate protection' applied to that list would mean such protection as to cause these goods to be grown in this country. But, is there any difference now between the two parties on this question. There was a motion moved in this House last session by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard), as follows :—

That it is greatly in the interest of the market gardeners and the farmers, that the duties on our Canadian garden products be so adjusted as to guarantee the Canadian farmer an effective protection against foreign competition.

That is 'adequate protection' put into a resolution. And how did this resolution fare with this government and with this House ? Where were these hon. gentlemen who are now seeking for the farmers' votes ? I take up the list, and I find that the right hon. leader of the government himself, every member of the government and every supporter of it recorded his vote against it.

Mr. CLANCY. How about the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) ?

Mr. BLAIN. He voted with his party of course, and made a speech on the subject.

Mr. GOURLEY. That must have been a mistake.

Mr. BLAIN. Not at all. What the hon. gentleman said was : Wait till you see us next year. And this year the opportunity has gone by and nothing is done.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What was the motion we voted on ?

Mr. BLAIN. I read it; was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) asleep ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. We did not vote against that motion.

Mr. BLAIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, we didn't.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is the record :—

House divided on motion for adjournment——

And among those who voted was the hon. member for West York.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is a very different thing.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman stand up in this House and say that he did not vote against it ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIN. Of course he would. I could not expect anything different, for the hon. gentleman promised the electors of West York when he was seeking their votes, that he would represent them before this government and said he was the man to do it. He said : What is the use of sending an opposition supporter if you want protection on the farmers products ? They voted for him, and the first thing he did when he got to the House was to stand up and speak against this motion. And not only did he speak against it, but he voted against it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Read my speech, and you will find it in favour of the motion.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman spoke one way and voted the other.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Read my speech.

Mr. BLAIN. What does the hon. gentleman say about it now ?

An hon. MEMBER. He will tell you next year.

Mr. BLAIN. As the hon. gentleman says he spoke for it last year, would it be unreasonable to expect, if he is an honourable representative, that he would vote for it now ? But I will not pursue that further.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Better not; you won't make anything out of it.

Mr. BLAIN. Of course, I could not make anything out of the hon. member (Mr. Campbell).

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) will have to reckon with the electors of Peel.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not at all afraid of that reckoning. I will be able to invite my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) over to give us a few speeches in favour of protection and vote for free trade, or in favour of free trade and vote for protection. No doubt he will be generally welcome, because he will be a useful man on either side of the question. But I was speaking of the farm products imported into this country that should have been produced by our own farmers, and I read the resolution which shows the distinction between the two great political parties in this House. One thing at least will be plain—that the Liberal-Conservative party has spoken in favour of a protection and voted for it. Throughout the country, whether east or west, it stands for adequate

protection in every province. That is the record of our leader, and behind him he has an ardent following who, though few in numbers, are all in favour of adequate protection to the farmers of this country. Not quite so much can be said for hon. gentlemen on the other side. During last year they lost a member of the government who, on the floor of this House gave us his reasons for leaving that he could not concur with the government in their trade policy.

Now, I wish to give a list of certain articles and duties imposed under the Canadian tariff and under the American tariff, and to ask the House how they can expect that a people of five and a half millions can compete with a people of eighty millions, when there is such a tariff advantage in favour of the American farmer. Here are the figures of the Canadian tariff :—

Canadian Tariff.—Butter, 4 cents a pound ; cheese, 3 cents a pound ; eggs, 3 cents a dozen; barley, 30 per cent equals 12 cents a bushel ; wheat, 12 cents a bushel ; oats, 10 cents a bushel ; pease, 10 cents a bushel ; hay, $2 a ton ; potatoes, 15 cents a bushel.

American tariff.—Butter, 6 cents a pound ; cheese, 6 cents a pound ; eggs, 5 cents a pound; barley, 30 cents a bushel ; wheat, 25 cents a bushel ; oats, 15 cents a bushel ; hay, $4 a ton. potatoes, 25 cents a bushel.

Now then, I have another partial list which I wish to present to the House, showing the manufactured goods that were imported into this country last year, every dollar's worth of which should have been manufactured in Canada :

Boots and shoes	$701,383
Barb wire	826,846
Farm wagons	95,512
Buggies	71,192
Portland cement	861,751
Wheel barrows, trucks and hand carts	44,894
Box and flat cars	443,931
Harness and saddlery	82,137
Furniture	489,306
Gloves	653,234
Scales	103,592

Now, Mr. Speaker, applying to this list of goods the resolution of the hon. the leader of the opposition, demanding adequate protection, every dollar's worth of these goods would be manufactured in this country by Canadian workingmen. That is the difference between the tariff policies of the two parties at the present time.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What was the importation of agricultural implements that had adequate protection, according to the leader of the opposition ?

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman may deal with that himself when he comes to speak. But I would remind him that when he was in opposition he went up and down this country stating that agricultural implements ought to be admitted in this country free. Now he comes forward as one of the leading spirits in retaining a tariff of 20 per cent on agricultural implements, the very tariff the Liberal-Conservative party put on when they were in power. If I were permitted a reference to his own business, I would ask him to look up the tariff and find out to what extent the business in which he is engaged is now protected, whether he is not enjoying protection as well.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that I advocated free agricultural implements ?

Mr. BLAIN. I say that the hon. gentleman spoke to the farmers of Ontario condemning the Liberal-Conservative government for keeping a protective duty on agricultural implements. Does the hon. gentleman deny that ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend say that he did not support a party in the country and on the floor of this House which opposed the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party in imposing a duty on agricultural implements, as being against the interests of the farmers of this country ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Stick to what you said.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, the hon. gentleman is a little worried, and I will leave him alone. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is stated by some supporters of the government that protection increases the price of agricultural implements to the farmers. That statement has been made in western Canada, and it is made on the floor of this House. Now, it would be fair to inquire from people in the United States, the highest protective country in the world, how the farmers fare in that country in that regard, whether they are paying more for their agricultural implements by reason of living under a highly protective tariff. I made it my business to write a few letters to gentlemen, entire strangers to myself, inquiring the price of binders in the United States. Here is one of the letters that I received in answer, dated Milton, North Dakota, February 28, 1903 :

Richard Blain, Esq.,
Brampton, Ont.

Dear Sir,—At the request of Mr. John McCowan, we give you herewith the retail cash price of McCormick and Deering binders for 1902.

McCormick, 6-foot	$125
" 7-foot	130
Deering, 6-foot	125
" 7-foot	130

I have another letter from Horton & Co., of Mayville, North Dakota, dated March 14, 1903 :

Richard Blain, Esq.,
Brampton, Ont.

Dear Sir,—McCormick six-foot, right or left hand binders, were sold by us in 1901-2 for $115 ; seven-foot, $5 more or $130 cash.

That is what farmers are paying for their binders in the greatest protective country in the world. Contrary to statements that we have heard on the floor of this House, I affirm that farmers in the United States are paying as low a price for their binders as the farmers of any other country in the world. Now, what are they paying in Canada? This morning I telephoned to the Massey-Harris Co., Ottawa, asking the manager the prices at which he sold his binders to the farmers in the vicinity of Ottawa in 1902, and this is his reply: Six-foot Massey-Harris binder, $120 cash; seven-foot Massey-Harris binder, $125 cash. So you will see, Mr. Speaker, that there is very little difference in the prices of agricultural implements in Canada and in the highest protective country in the world. The farmers in both countries are buying their agricultural implements very cheap. I also wrote to Senator Jones, a well-known gentleman recently appointed to the Senate, asking him to name the three countries in which farmers could purchase their binders the cheapest. The first country he named was the United States, the most highly protected country in the world, in which farmers purchase agricultural implements cheaper than in any other country. In his letter he said there was very little difference between the two countries, that the farmers of the United States and the farmers of the Dominion of Canada purchased their binders at about the same price. So, I will submit that to the House, and I will submit Senator Jones' name who wrote me a letter saying that the farmers purchased their binders in the United States and Canada cheaper than in any other two countries in the world, both of these countries being under something of a protective tariff. Now, I wish to say just a word or two in conclusion. I am informed that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) is to follow me, and I want to refer him to the matter about which I am now going to speak.

Mr. HOLMES. I might inform the hon. member (Mr. Blain) that the arrangement has been changed, and that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) will speak.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for West Huron will speak at some time, and when he does speak he will be good enough to answer this, I am quite sure. I have a letter from the town where he lives addressed to the Hon. W. S. Fielding, M.P., Minister of Finance. It bears date Clinton, Ontario, 30th March, 1903, and it is written by Mr. John Ransford, of the firm of R. and J. Ransford, manufacturers and dealers in salt, Clinton, Ontario. I shall read just one or two paragraphs from this letter. He says:

> The salt industry is a most important one. It gives employment to a large number of workmen, and is a direct benefit to the farming class, in that large sums are paid annually for all barrel material.
>
> Many works are shut down and capital unproductive owing to the present conditions of the tariff. There is ample capacity to supply the requirements of the Dominion if Canadian salt makers were permitted to have possession of their own rightful market.
>
> The quality of salt produced in Canada compares favourably with the production of any other country
>
> There is a duty on salt imported from the United States of 5 cents per 100 pounds in bulk and 7½ cents per 100 pounds in packages.
>
> There is a duty imposed on salt going into the United States of 8 cents per 100 pounds in bulk and 12 cents per 100 pounds in packages.
>
> There is no duty on salt imported into this country from any other source than the United States.
>
> The imports of salt from Mediterranean ports and Great Britain amount approximately to an average of 100,000 tons or 700,000 barrels per annum.
>
> The annual consumption of salt in Canada may be calculated at 1,000,000 barrels or 150,000 tons.
>
> Practically two-thirds of the market is therefore filled with foreign made salt admitted with the package entirely free of duty.

He says in conclusion:

> In view of the foregoing it is asked that a duty similar to that existing in the United States be imposed on all salt coming into Canada, viz.: 8 cents per 100 pounds in bulk and 12 cents per 100 pounds in packages.

That illustrates the condition of a large number of manufacturing establishments in this country that are suffering under the present tariff. The woollen industry is suffering. My hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) has stated that the binder twine industry is suffering. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the cotton industry is suffering. The farmers are suffering in many instances because there is not a higher protective tariff on their produce. I should like to make one further statement on the farming question. There were in 1879, duties placed on butter, cheese and eggs coming into this country. These items have been protected continuously whether the Liberal Conservative party were in office or the Reform party were in office. These three industries that are entirely farming industries have been protected ever since 1879, and I wish to say, and I make this statement on high authority, that there is no animal in this country considering its value, that produces so much profit for the farmers as the hen. The egg producing industry, the cheese industry and the butter industry that have been protected continuously by both political parties all these long years are in a prosperous condition. The farmers of Canada are supplying the butter that is used by the people of Canada. The farmers of Canada are supplying the cheese that is used by the people of Canada, and the farmers of Canada are supplying the eggs that are consumed by the people of Canada. Now, a considerable quantity of these commodities come in un-

der the present tariff, from the United States, and I submit that adequate protection should be applied to these articles, that in accordance with the principles enunciated in the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) the tariff should be placed sufficiently high so that the United States farmers could not send to this country one dollar's worth of these goods in competition with the product of our own farmers. In conclusion I wish to say that I am in favour of the amendment submitted by the hon. leader of the opposition, that I believe in a higher protective tariff for the industries of this country, that I think the market gardeners and the farmers of Canada should have received better treatment at the hands of this government than a promise, that I am in favour of and will support legitimate and adequate protection for the farming industry, for the manufacturing industry, on every article that can be grown on Canadian farms and on every article that can be manufactured by the Canadian people. That is the policy I am prepared to support. I will support it if it comes from the Liberal side of the House, and I will support it if it comes from this side of the House. So soon as a resolution is introduced into this House adopting protection that will measure up to the standard I have laid down, I will stand up in my place and support that resolution, because I think it is in the best interests of the farmers of the county I have the honour to represent, and in the best interests of the people of Canada from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the discussion on the amendment, and on the budget propositions that have been presented, I would like to state my position in regard to the amendment by congratulating the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) on the fact that his budget, as presented, turned down fairly and squarely the insolent and absurd demand made a few days before the session opened by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association for the application of a prohibitive tariff to Canada. I may say when the campaign on behalf of this demand was in progress during the past year, the result was looked to with some degree of doubt. It may be said that those who doubted had not proper confidence in the minister, or in the ministry. But there are many sides to the question and when it is remembered that the minister has always been careful not to take an extreme position on the tariff; that he has always held that the tariff is rather a compromise than a finality; that it does not, as did the tariff of the preceding government, represent the acme of human wisdom; and when besides and beyond that it is remembered that this association was actively organized for the express purpose of forcing tariff concessions, backed as they claim by some $400,000,000 of capital, and being in a position to enforce their demand if such demands could be enforced, it was not wonderful if we should look for some changes and some effort to satisfy these gentlemen to a degree. I say, Sir, that it is with extreme satisfaction the country has heard that these demands have not been acceded to in any degree; and that the tariff stands to-day, without concession, as it did a year ago. I do not claim, nor is it claimed by any one, that the tariff is perfect, that any tariff can be perfect; or that changed conditions do not necessitate from time to time changes in the tariff. We all agree to that, but when a straight demand, a bulldozing demand was made upon the government for concessions which in my humble estimation at any rate, and I believe in the estimation of the large majority of the people of this country were absolutely unreasonable, it is a satisfaction that they simply were not acceded to in any part. It was the only answer that could properly be given; it was the answer that was given, and the government is to be congratulated upon that answer. I believe that had there been any tampering with the general tariff at this session—I say this for the information of the government—I believe that had there been any tampering with the tariff at this session looking towards increases, it would have been taken by the country at large as a surrender on the part of the government to those demands of the manufacturing association, and that there would have been created a lack of confidence on the part of their friends towards the government that would have had serious if not actually disastrous results.

While we have to congratulate the minister upon the stand taken in regard to these demands, it appears to me, however, that throughout the course of this debate, there has been a lack of appreciation of the respective magnitude of the various interests involved. I do not know whether the government is in danger of being finally stampeded into a policy of protection by the continual outcry that is made from, not only the other side of the House but also from this side of the House. But it may not be out of order in any case for me at this stage of the debate to present in some degree the case for the Canadian consumer, who seems to have been entirely forgotten up to the present moment.

We have heard of this, and that, and the other industry which is suffering for more protection. Now, for my part, I am a protectionist; I believe thoroughly in protection. I am no theoretical free trader. I believe that it is the business of the government of the country to take any means that may be necessary to advance the interests of the country whether it be by tariff adjustment or by any other means. The dif-

ference between myself and the gentlemen who have already spoken here on this subject seems to be, that they recognize a high tariff as the only method of protection, and they recognize the manufacturing industry as the only interest that is worthy of protection. I decline to accept the proposition that high tariff is the only method of protection, and I much more strongly deny the proposition that the manufacturing industry is the only one worthy of protective consideration. What proportion does the manufacturing industry of Canada bear to the other industries of Canada ? If we take the exports of Canada we find : That the mines export $16,000,000; the fisheries, $10,000,000; the forests, $21,000,000 ; agriculture, $93,000,000; and manufactures, $18,000,000. We find that by the last census the population of Canada was in the neighbourhood of 5,000,000, and the number of people actually employed in what are generally considered to be manufactures, amounted to about 100,000. Now, as a large number of those who are employed in manufactures are not adults, it would not be fair to give the usual count of five persons dependent upon each operative ; but allowing four, it would appear that there were about 400,000, people out of our population of 5,000,000 who are directly interested in manufactures, or practically one individual as compared with nine individuals interested in the other industries of the country. I say that any legislation which looks to the protection or the advantage of the interests in which only one-tenth of the people are concerned, ignoring the interests and advantage of the nine-tenths, is not properly a policy of protection. It will be conceded by all, that those industries of the country which are the exporting industries, the price of whose product is necessarily regulated by the export market are not susceptible of benefit from a protective tariff to anything like the same degree that is an industry whose prices are regulated by the home demand rather than by the export price. You can, by raising the duty, raise the price of a manufactured article, so long as that article depends chiefly on the home market for its consumption. You cannot raise the price by increasing the duty on an article whose price chiefly depends upon the export market. That is the position as it exists as between the manufacturing industry and those other creative industries of the country, and the policy which undertakes to advantage the one-tenth at the expense of the nine-tenths is a policy which cannot be recognized as a protective tariff, and which I do not think this country at this time and in its present condition will recognize as a protective policy. We have no quarrel with the manufacturers of Canada ; we have no wish other than they should prosper. Our objection is that the manufacturers of Canada desire to prosper by reason of tariff adjustment rather than by reason of their own exertions, energy and ability. We who depend on agriculture are left to our own resources. We must necessarily maintain our position in the markets of the world, let those markets be high or low, and all we ask is that the manufacturing industries be left in the same position approximately. It was said by the preceding speaker that the agricultural industry is protected. I think the hon. leader of the opposition said the same thing. They both want it to be more protected, and they argue that those who do not believe in a high tariff should declare for no tariff at all on agricultural products. Would they please remember that, in the first place, the tariff does not exist for the puprose of protecting any industry.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend will pardon me, I think he expressed himself on one occasion in favour of a duty on oats, saying that it had a good effect in protecting the western farmer. I remember seeing an article of that kind in the very able journal over which he presides.

Mr. OLIVER. I intend to come to that. These hon. gentlemen argue that as we are not in favour of a high tariff, we should therefore hold that there should be no tariff on agricultural products. Now, the tariff is imposed for the purpose of raising a revenue by customs taxes, and there is no reason why that revenue should not be raised by a tariff on agricultural products as well as on anything else. There is no reason why the farmers should not have the benefit of the incidental protection which results from a revenue tariff. That is all the protection the farming industry has, and we certainly demand our share of that incidental protection. But while that is true as regards agricultural products in isolated cases, it does not apply to the general output of agriculture. On the great export products of wheat, cattle, butter, eggs and poultry, a protective tariff is practically of no use at all in the way of increasing prices. Do my hon. friends deny that ? Do they say that the agricultural duties do increase the general prices of these products to the farmers ?

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman permit me ? I think that may be answered by the course of the government in making a reduction in the duties on corn and wheat and corn meal.

Mr. OLIVER. I was not asking about the policy of the government. I was asking the question of the opposition.

Mr. CLANCY. That answers the hon. gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not want that answer. I want the answer from the opposition, not from the government. If they could advance the prices of agricultural products by increasing the duties, why did they not, during the agricultural depression which existed

previous to 1896, increase those duties and thereby increase the prices of the farmers' products ? Either they were not able to increase the prices by increasing the duties, or they were not willing to. They can adopt which inference they like. If they were able to and did not, they were not friends of the farmers; and if they were not able to, they should not stand before this House and claim that it is possible to increase the prices of agricultural products by increasing the duties.

Our position, then, as representing agriculture, is this : We accept the position as to raising the duties by means of a revenue tariff. Having accepted that position, we are entitled to such a measure of incidental protection as is afforded by a revenue tariff, and we demand that every other industry in the country shall be put on the same footing. That is where we take issue with our friends of the Manufacturers' Association.

Just what does the demand of this Manufacturers Association amount to ? There may be people who imagine that it is simply a demand to revert to the so-called national policy tariff of 1878. But there was all the difference in the world between the so-called national policy of 1878, and the demand of the Manufacturers' Association. The national policy of 1878 was placed before the country on the plea that the manufacturers needed assistance—that if they were given assistance, it would benefit the country at large, and that in the end the prices of manufactured goods would come down. The demand of the Manufacturers' Association is that the tariff shall be raised for the purpose of preventing goods from coming in. It is not the demand of an industry that wants assistance; it is the demand of an industry which, having grown and become strong, demands to be relieved from competition. In 1878 it was a request to help the manufacturers, in order that the country might be helped; but the demand of to-day is that the manufacturers shall be protected so that, no matter what happens to the country, they will be all right. That is the position put before the House by hon. gentlemen opposite during this debate. I think it was the hon. leader of the opposition who argued that, as we see hard times ahead of us, when Canada may become a slaughter market for imported manufactured goods, we want a prohibitive tariff against those times. On what grounds of justice do the manufacturers make this demand ? When the hard times come, the purchasing power of the people is decreased. Are they then to be compelled, under stress of a tariff law, to pay more for the goods they shall have to buy, in order that our friends the manufacturers shal be lifted above the general depression ? I hope not. I do not agree with any such contention. I think that of all the unreasonable demands that have been made on behalf of the manufacturers, that is the most unreasonable. We are willing that they should share with us in the general prosperity, but we ask that they should also share with us in the general adversity when it comes. When we have only 50 cents to buy a dollars worth of the goods we require, we do not want them to be placed in a position to charge us a dollar for only 50 cents worth of goods.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ATLANTIC QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé) moved that the House go into Committee on Bill (No. 28) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company (amended).

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier asked that that Bill do be allowed to stand over until next week.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am sorry to say that I cannot allow it to stand over until next week, because the promoters of this railway are already hard at work in the interests of the company. There is a survey going on and the works will be started shortly during this session and besides I may inform my hon. friend that this afternoon I was told by the hon. member from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) who takes a deep interest in this Bill that he did not intend to make any objection to its being reported and read the third time.

Mr. C. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I wish to explain why I do not raise any objection to this Bill as now framed. My instructions were first to oppose the Bill because the promoters intended constructing the road through the interior of Gaspé, some sixty or seventy miles from the shore, which would not suit the people of that country, who live almost exclusively along the shore. Both the Quebec and Dominion governments have expended a million and a half dollars to help in the construction of the Baie de Chaleurs railway, which extends 100 miles from Metapedia down to Paspebiac. Public interest requires that this road should be completed before another road is undertaken through the interior of the peninsula, where as yet there is no population. It was my intention to oppose the Bill before the House if the company had not bound itself to build the shore line concurrently with their line in the interior. The Quebec legislature granted a charter two years ago and revived it this month, so that the company could proceed with its work, in the interior regardless of any legislation here. But in view of the fact that it is willing to build the shore line at the same time as the line through the interior, I have concluded that there

is no objection to the measure. The conditions are most reasonable. The company has to build ten miles of its road from the terminus of the Atlantic and the Lake Superior railway within one year, or else its charter will lapse for both the shore line and the line through the interior. It is a fair compromise in the interest of both Bonaventure and Gaspé counties. The peninsula has been sadly in need of railways for many years. The change in the policy of the government about 1884 prevented the people there having the railway which they might have had if the original Baie de Chaleurs road had been constructed as part and parcel of the Intercolonial Railway instead of being handed over to a private railway company, and we would have been spared the long series of scandals connected with the Baie de Chaleurs road. At present the English bondholders are in possession of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, the company having transferred to them the road on account of its inability to pay the interest on the bonds. Had the trustees of that company come forward with a reasonable proposition and undertaken to continue the Shore line, I would have given them the preference. But, in the absence of any such proposition, and in view of the fact that there are $300,000 owing by the company to the farmers and labourers in the county of Bonaventure, the only option left me was to give the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company a fair chance.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I concur in the remarks of my hon. friend from Bonaventure. If the promoters of this company had agreed to build only the line through the interior, I myself, as representing the county of Gaspé, would not have supported the Bill. But I induced the company to add to its Bill a clause in the nature of a compromise, by which the company is obliged to extend its railway from Gaspé Basin at the extremity of the peninsula as far as the terminus of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company. This company has given further evidence of its bona fides. During the last two months it has made a complete survey of the interior and the reports so far are most favourable. The survey of the interior line is now completed and Mr. O'Sullivan, a well known surveyor from the province of Quebec is now en route to survey the coast line from Gaspé Basin to Paspebiac. I am pleased to say that within one year from the sanction of this Act we will have at least ten miles and perhaps more, constructed along the shores of Gaspé and the county of Bonaventure. This Bill, has given rise to some discussion in the press and I am sorry to say that those who wrote in the newspapers were far from being well informed. This Bill represents public opinion in the county of Gaspé and Bonaventure and I shall not attempt to inflict on the House a reading of the numerous petitions which I hold in my hand. But, I may say that, with the amendment suggested by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), to which I have agreed, and which I seconded with pleasure in the Railway Committee, a new era has dawned on the county of Gaspé and the county of Bonaventure.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on the Bill.

On section 3,

Mr. SPROULE. That would shut out all other claims. As I understand it, as a matter of law, when you specify some claims, the others are excluded. There may or may not be other claims, but, if there are, this would prejudice them.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I may explain that this principle was adopted by the House last year on the Bill for the Gaspé and Western Railway. This section is to cover the claims of labourers, boarding house keepers, those who supplied material, and local merchants. Of course, the bondholders are guaranteed by the possession of the road and the bonds, and those having judgments are guaranteed by their judgments.

Mr. SPROULE. Of course, the bondholders can take care of themselves.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This section is put in only in case this company should buy or lease the other railway, which they do not intend to do. It is only a measure of precaution which my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) deems it proper to take.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that these are unusual proceedings. Judging from what you have read, Mr. Chairman, so much has been added to the Bill, or so many changes have been made, that, in all fairness to the House, the Bill should have been reprinted, so that we might have an opportunity of studying the changes proposed. I presume there are very few members, perhaps not more than two or three, who really have any intelligent knowledge of the character of this legislation. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who, no doubt, has more special knowledge on this subject than the rest of us on this side of the House, has made a request that the Bill should lie over. I think it is only reasonable that that request should be acceded to in order that we may have some person to speak for us with respect to these changes. I would not raise any objection to hurrying this Bill through the House were it not for the fact that no person is here to represent the government in this matter. I regard it as the duty of the Minister of Railways to be in his place when private Bills of this character are being passed through their various stages, so that we may appeal to him and ascertain whether he has pronounced upon the Bills and whether, in the opinion of his department they ought to pass. The minister is absent, and

there is no one here to represent him or to represent the Department of Railways and Canals. We are in utter ignorance as to the character of this legislation, and this is especially true since the Bill has been altered to such a very large extent as would appear from the amendments you have read. I think that, in the absence of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, we are entitled to express the desire that the Bill should be laid over. The delay will be very slight and no inconvenience, so far as I can see, will result. I understand the measure would come up again on Monday. I think it is only fair that this request should be acceded to that we may have an opportunity of studying the proposed amendments and dealing with the Bill on its merits. Otherwise we may regret that the Bill was allowed to go through in this hasty way. There may be wonderful revelations. We have heard a great deal about this railway. The old Baie des Chaleurs Railway once created a great sensation in this House. In fact we look with a great deal of suspicion on anything connected with railways down in Gaspé. I think it was well that the members of the House should have every opportunity of informing themselves before this legislation is allowed to go through. I again ask the leader of the House to consent to granting the request of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I want to say that the Minister of Railways and Canals has an urgent engagement for to-night, and in speaking to me concerning these Bills, he said that each one of them had been fully considered and dealt with in the Railway Committee, and there was no objection to any of them, otherwise he would have cancelled his engagement and would have been present to-night. But in view of the thorough discussion these matters had in the Railway Committee, he said they might go through, and he accepted his engagement. But it is only fair to him that I should make this statement on his behalf. I was not present at the meeting of the Railway Committee, though I am a member of it, and I have no personal knowledge of the matter. But I am quite willing to accept the assurance of the Minister of Railways and Canals that the matter was fully discussed in the committee, and I understand that the particular amendment to which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) refers was drafted by the Minister of Railways and Canals himself. Therefore, I think the House may reasonably accept the conclusion that the judgment of the Railway Committee was deliberately reached, and that we will probably make no mistake if we follow that opinion.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of the exceptional nature of the amendment that has been proposed, and of the fact that if there were other claimants, as there very often are, this would shut them out in the event of that railway being sold, and in view also of the fact that the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) expressed a desire to be present when this Bill was considered, I think it would be only right to let it stand over. It would not in the end delay the passage of the Bill, nor jeopardize its passage in any way. There is no doubt that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had some strong reason for making his request. It may be that he is representing some other interest, and his absence here to-night is a reason for asking for delay, not that we desire to interfere with the passing of the Bill, but for the purpose of enabling him to express his views on it. I think the hon. member who has this Bill in charge would consult his own interest by allowing it to stand until the member for Jacques Cartier is present.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). The member for Jacques Cartier attended the Railway Committee meeting, and merely pleaded for delay in the absence of the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). The member for Jacques Cartier admitted himself that he was not conversant with the matters dealt with in these Bills. The Minister of Railways and Canals declared that he had taken up the Bill and found no objection to it, that the principal of the payment of these claims had been recognized last year. In Bill (No. 102) concerning the Gaspé and Western Railway, in subsection 4 of section 9, the same principle is to be found, that is, the payment for labour, board and material. A vote was taken in the Railway Committee, and this present Bill was passed by a majority of 30 to 9. Now, when we come to the House we are met with the same objection, that the member for Jacques Cartier is absent. The member for Montmorency was here to-day and left at four o'clock, knowing that this Bill was on the Order paper. So far as the amendment is concerned, the Minister of Railways and Canals drafted it himself.

Mr. INGRAM. One of the objections that the member for Jacques Cartier took in committee was that he wanted a certain senator to be present as well as the member for Montmorency. The senator was not present.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier alluded to Senator Casgrain in the Railway Committee, and to the member for Montmorency. If the hon. gentleman will take my word, I saw Senator Casgrain this afternoon in the lobby, and the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) saw me, and I understood from them that the Bill would pass this evening.

On section 7,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This section is amended in the second line by inserting after the words 'telephone lines' the words 'upon and.' It will then read: 'The company may construct and operate telegraph and telephone lines upon and along.'

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that in bygone years we have taken strong exception to that provision permitting a union or connection with other telegraph lines. Practically we are giving authority to a new telegraph company to do business from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean. That will be the effect of it, because this company will have power to connect with lines of any other telegraph or telephone company. By such connection they can form a through system of telegraphing and telephoning across the continent. Exception was taken to words like these some two years ago, and several Bills were altered for that reason, so as to restrict the broad sense in which power is taken in this Bill. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this whole Bill requires a good deal of consideration yet. This clause which has been incorporated in the Bill, if I recollect aright, was disapproved of by the House some few years ago, and was altered in order to prevent a company from getting the extreme power that was not contemplated at all under the operation of a special charter. I think we had better let the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance make the explanation he did with reference to the absence of the Minister of Railways and Canals. No doubt he had sufficient reason for being absent, and I think we may also make the same plea on behalf of the member for Jacques Cartier, that he also has sufficient reason for being absent. If we allow the consideration in one case we should allow it in the other. I hope the promoters of the Bill will not press it further, but will wait until it can be discussed fully by the only gentleman on this side of the House whom we think has any knowledge of the facts.

On section 9,

Mr. SPROULE. What is the length of this line ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The line in the interior from Causapscal to Gaspé basin is 140 miles long, and from Gaspé basin to Paspebiac 80 miles.

On section 11,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 11 is amended by striking out the word 'five' in the third line and inserting the word 'seven.'

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it usual to say that 'one or more of whom may be paid directors ?' We might as well say that all should be paid directors.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no objection.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the committee rise and report the Bill ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I would suggest that before this Bill comes before the House for the third reading it should be reprinted.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be better to have it reprinted.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that about one-third has been added and two-thirds expunged and there is almost nothing of the original Bill left. I hope the House will consent to the reprinting of the Bill so that it will come before the House in an intelligible form.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Macdonald from the Committee of the Whole reports that they have considered Bill (No. 28) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company and have ordered him to report the same without any amendment. When shall this Bill be read the third time ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Now.

Mr. SPROULE. We do not want it read the third time now. It can be left to the next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Now ?

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) insists upon the third reading of the Bill now, all I can say is that we do not propose to allow it to go in that way. We have been very moderate in our requests and very reasonable and if it is going to be forced through in that way we will have to raise the objections that we think are necessary to the Bill and endeavour to have it delayed until we can have some better consideration of it than we can have to-night. The request made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) was a very reasonable and fair one. A large portion of this Bill is new matter that has never been considered by many hon. members of this House. The request to have the Bill reprinted before it is read the third time is something that should be generally conceded. Why is it not allowed in this case ? It is not going to interfere with the passage of the Bill and therefore I say it should be conceded at once. But, the disposition which hon. gentlemen have shown to force the Bill through against the will and the wishes of every person is rather strong presumptive evidence that there is something behind it unknown to the House and which the House ought to know before the Bill is pushed through in that way. I hope the hon. gentleman will allow the Bill to remain and let its third reading take place at another sitting of the House and in the meantime allow the Bill to be reprinted.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Speaker, in case an hon. gentleman takes exception to the third reading of a Bill is that objection not well taken ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is a question for the House to decide whether the Bill shall be put on the Order paper for the third reading now or at the next sitting of the House.

When a Bill is reported without amendment, as in this case, from the Committee of the Whole it is a question for the House to decide whether the Bill should be put on the Order paper to be read the third time now or at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. INGRAM. Do you hold, Mr. Speaker, that there have been no amendments to this Bill ?

Mr. SPEAKER. No amendments in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, it is only a quarter to nine now and—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do think in view of what has been stated the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill had better not press it now. Any hon. member can prevent it getting through and probably the Bill will make just as much progress if we let it stand until the next sitting of the House instead of attempting to press it to the third reading now.

Mr. SPROULE. Quite as much.

Mr. SPEAKER. At the next sitting of the House.

Order allowed to stand.

NIAGARA GRAND ISLAND BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 57) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

On section 1,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In line 23 the word 'three' is inserted in the blank so that it reads :

Provided, however, that if such consent is not obtained within three years after the passing of this Act, &c.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Mr. Chairman, I beg to move by way of amendment that the word 'three' which you have just read be struck out and that the word 'five' be inserted in lieu thereof. This matter came up before the Railway Committee the other day and the word 'three' was suggested and put in. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) in whose name the Bill stands was not present and the facts were not thoroughly well known, but I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that in three similar Bills which we passed last session, all of them dealing with the cases of International bridges, the term was made five years instead of three and it is merely desired to put them on an equality in that respect. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was seen since the Railway Committee reported and he has no objection to making the change.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Chairman, I beg to verify the statement of the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck (Mr. Thompson) that in these Bills the term was made five years so that we have a precedent.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

RED DEER VALLEY RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

Mr. COWAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 102) respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). This Bill looks like an old familiar friend that we disposed of twelve months ago, and has been resurrected again. I do not know whether the statements made by the Minister of Finance with reference to what the Minister of Railways had said about those Bills apply to this one as well as to the others. I would like to know whether the minister has taken into consideration the fact that this Bill carried with it a very large land grant. This Bill proposes to revive a charter that lapsed about the first of July, 1902, and before we accept the principle of the Bill it is important for us to consider whether or not we are going to adopt the principle of subsidizing railways by large land grants. If we revive this charter we adopt the principle of giving to this railway what has been refused to others, namely, a very large subsidy to a line through a section of the country where there ought to be very little trouble in constructing a railway. Possibly the Minister of Finance may be able to say that the Minister of Railways has had his special attention drawn to the fact that this land grant is associated with this Bill. If this charter is revived under this Bill, will the land grant also be revived ? If the land grant is not revived, I will offer no objection to the second reading, but if the Bill carries with it this large land grant which it is alleged would construct two railways, the House should be very careful indeed before accepting the principle of the Bill. I hope the Minister of Finance will be able to give us some information on that point.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The remarks I made on the part of the Minister of Railways had reference to Bills which had already been before the Railway Committee and had there been fully considered. This Bill is standing for its second reading; it has not yet been before the Railway Committee, and of course, the remarks which my hon. friend alluded to cannot have any reference to it. It is not usual to affirm any principle on the second reading of a private Bill. The almost invariable practice is to allow these Bills to pass their second reading and to go to the committee. I am informed that this Bill does not carry the land grant spoken of by my hon. friend.

However, that point can be considered in the committee, and I do not think we shall be prejudicing the public interest by allowing it to go to the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the Order in Council expired ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I could not say.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year the hon. Minister of Railways stated that the Conservative government were responsible for the land grant to this company. We would like to know whether this government intend to assume the responsibility of extending that principle ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will come up in due course, when we shall be prepared to answer.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill in question relates to a railway project in the constituency I represent, and while I have no intention of opposing it at this stage, I feel bound to say that the opposition which I felt compelled to give to the Bill last year I still feel compelled to give, and for the same reason. It is the avowed policy of the government in the North-west that no more land grants shall be given to railways. I understand that this Bill involves a large land grant to a railway, and I as a supporter of the government policy in the North-west cannot support it. I would mention one fact further, that the latest report which I have received from the North-west is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have increased the price of their lands to $6 per acre.

Mr. SPROULE. In this particular instance I have a distinct recollection that there is a very large interest involved. I do not know whether the second reading of this Bill involves an assent to the principle of the land grant; but if it does, I for one, am distinctly opposed to it.

Mr. COWAN. You supported it before.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not, and the hon. gentleman has no right to make that statement. I say most distinctly that I did not support the land grant connected with this railway. I opposed it, and for the same reason I am opposed to it to-day. It includes not only an ordinary land grant, but one of the important coal mines of the North-west, which is within a reasonable distance of Calgary, and it is for the purpose of getting control of that coal mine that this company are desirous of reviving this Bill, because if they did, they would get control of something twice or three times as valuable as the whole railway. It was got at a time when there was not the same value put on coal or on land in that country that there is at the present time. When an effort was made last year to revive this Bill, it was opposed, and strongly opposed, and the Committee was not disposed to grant it. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and other members from the North-west, strongly opposed it, and I opposed it as well. I take the same position to-night. If it in any way involves an assent to the principle of land grants to railways in the future, I am opposed to it. I think we have reached a time in the history of Canada when we should stop giving land grants to railways. In every portion of that country I found that where there was a demand for a railway, it was where a considerable settlement existed. The need of a railway was great because the produce to be handled was great, and therefore the earning powers of the railway ought to be sufficient to make it pay. When that is the case, there is no reason why we should give a land grant.

Mr. COWAN. Having made the statement that I did make when the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was addressing his few imperfect remarks to the House, I must just say that I made the statement that the land grant provided for in the charter was supported by the hon. member for East Grey.

Mr. SPROULE. Last year.

Mr. COWAN. I did not say last year. I reiterate that statement here and now. I say that not only was the charter supported by the hon. member for East Grey, but I would be very much surprised if the land grant and the charter were not both supported by his vote and his voice; because, so far as observation can be a teacher, I think hardly anything has ever passed in this House in which the voice of the hon. member for East Grey has not sounded loud and long. Last year this company asked for a renewal of the charter; but when the hon. member for East Grey sat on this side of the House, when the government which he supported was in power—and I may say that among its supporters he was a bright and shining ornament—he voted for that charter and he voted for that land grant. It was only last year and not before that the voice of the hon. member for East Grey was heard against it. I have not anything to say at this particular juncture with regard to this matter. It seems to me to be a little out of the ordinary. It is a question that ought to go to the Railway Committee I have no doubt the voice of the hon. member for East Grey will be heard in the Railway Committee on this question, as it is heard on everything, relevant and irrelevant, and if he has anything to say against the land grant or the charter, let him say it there.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I have a right to rise to an explanation. When I made the denial

I made it emphatically. When the Bill was before the committee last year—

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman did not say that last year.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that when this Bill was up before, that was last year, I opposed it, I referred to the fact that the hon. member for Alberta opposed it and I said I opposed it as well—

Mr. COWAN. What about the time when it was first granted ?

Mr. SPROULE. And I deny the statement made by the bleached Ethiopian that I supported it.

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, this Bill cannot pass its second reading to-night, because it is not printed in French.

Mr. COWAN. Mr. Speaker, in that case, I will not move the second reading, because I would like the hon. member for East Grey to have another opportunity to make a speech.

Order allowed to stand.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Champagne.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Ross (Ontario).

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the London Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. McGugan.

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Empire Accident and Surety Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 111) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 112) to incorporate the Canada Industrials Corporation, Limited.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 113) to incorporate the Sault Ste. Louis Light and Power Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 115) to incorporate the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Tobin.

Bill (No. 116) respecting the Restigouche Boom Company, and to change its name to 'The Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Company.'—Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Haggart.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance.

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). When the House rose at six o'clock, I was making a comparison between the requests made in 1878 and the demand made in 1903 by the manufacturers of Canada. That which was in 1878 a request, became in 1903 a demand. The plea that was then made for assistance to a struggling industry has now become a threat on behalf of a self styled dominant interest. What was asked in the general interest in 1878 is demanded in a special interest in 1903. The difference between the request of 1878 and the demand of 1903 is just as wide as the difference between the conditions prevailing then and now. And it is just as well that we should recognize the difference in those conditions, so that we may appreciate the injustice of the present demand. The promises that were made to justify the request for increased protection were the retaining of our population at home, the increase of our general wealth and prosperity, and the lowering of the price of manufactured products. At the end of eighteen years' experience of that policy, carried out by those who had every opportunity to put it to the test in its entirety, what has been the result ? Although during those eighteen years we had a national expenditure of six and a half million dollars per year over the national revenue, although we had the building up of a number of millionaires in the country, at the end of that period we found ourselves in a condition of commercial and industrial stagnation. Contrast that with our present position. To-day, after an experience of some seven years of a change of policy and a change of tariff, we have a prosperity in trade, commerce and finance such as this country never before dreamed of. In 1878 we were asked to give protection to the manufacturers because they and the country were not prosperous. Now these manufacturers are demanding more pro-

tection because they and the country are prosperous. In 1878 they asked for protection because they needed it. Now they demand protection because the country is rich enough to stand it. The moral of this is that the manufacturers have thriven because the country has prospered—that the manufacturers depend on the farmers, and not the farmers on the manufacturers. We had eighteen years of effort to make the country prosperous by protecting the manufacturers, and that experiment resulted in dismal failure. We have had since then seven years' endeavour to make the country prosperous by increasing the facilities for agriculture and trade generally, and we find both the country and manufacturers prosperous to a degree they never were before. All of which shows that the policy of restriction produced the result that should naturally have been expected. In 1878 we voted for restriction of trade. During eighteen years we carried out that policy, and at the end of the eighteen years we had the natural result. In 1896 we voted for expansion of trade, and, for seven years we have had an increase of commerce, an increase of industry and prosperity. And to-day we are asked, practically, as it appears to me, to commit commercial, industrial and financial suicide, by reverting to the conditions which failed in the period from 1878 to 1896, and which, I believe, will fail again if the attempt is made to revert to them. It is the highest tribute that can be paid to the policy of protection to manufacturers at the expense of the community, to the policy of building up tariff walls and restricting trade, to say that it was in the highest degree successful and that trade was restricted. The fact that the country was not prosperous was entirely another matter, and did not affect the theory or the success of the experiment. Just as with the surgeon who performs a very difficult operation, is able to announce that it was very successful; adding, as a mere detail that the patient died.

Now, as to the policy of a prohibitive tariff, there can be only one opinion from the standpoint of those who have to bear the burden of that tariff. I suppose there is only one opinion from the standpoint of those who get the benefit of it—that we take for granted. Among those who have to bear the burden of it there certainly should be, and reasonably can be, only one opinion. As those who are to have the benefit constitute only one-tenth of the community, and those who are to bear the burden constitute nine-tenths, it seems to me only one answer is to be given to such the demand for such a tariff from the standpoint of the welfare of the nation. The fact that the demand comes from both sides of the House, to a certain degree does not affect the condition at all. I would like to say to the Minister of Finance that, however, desirable it may be to please everybody, that is beyond the limit of success; but that the effort to please everybody generally results in pleasing nobody. If I understand what liberalism means, it stands for progress, but it stands for principle as much as it does for progress. Liberalism stands for principle, or it stands for nothing, and if it shall ever be that the impression goes abroad that Liberalism has become mere opportunism, then, no more can the Liberal party expect, and no more will it receive, the confidence of an intelligent and progressive country. I give all credit to the government for having withstood these demands, these united demands of the Manufacturers' Association—these dangerous demands, demands which, if acceded to, mean, as I contend, commercial and financial ruin to this country. And as these demands have not been acceded to, I take it for granted that the government must face the absolute, unquestioning and determined hostility of that same Manufacturers' Association and of every interest which they can bring to bear in their support. I take it for granted that the fight is on, as a matter of fact, between the present government and those interests which stand for a high tariff, whether they are in one province or the other and whether they call themselves Liberals or Conservatives. I, therefore, give the government all credit for the stand they have taken and for having accepted the challenge which was thrown down. But, for fear that there might be any misunderstanding with those of us who represent portions of the country the industries of which are not susceptible of successful and profitable protection, I will go a little further and will challenge some of the propositions laid down in the budget speech.

I said a while ago that I was a protectionist. Beyond that, I believe in retaliation. But, I believe in retaliation only as a measure of self-defence, and when you are sure of hurting the other fellow more than you hurt yourself. Now, I am not so sure, on looking into the matter a little carefully, that our proposed retaliation against Germany is altogether favourable to ourselves. I notice that that policy was applauded on both sides of the House, and particularly on the other side. Perhaps if we look into the matter a little carefully, we shall not see quite so much reason for applause. Looking over the Trade and Navigation Returns, to-day I found that we imported last year 371,000,000 pounds of sugar, at a value of about $7,500,000, upon which the duty would amount to about $2,750,000. The duty on the low grade sugar is 62½ cents per hundred pounds, and on the high grade it is $1.25 per hundred pounds. I found that we imported from Germany about 183,500,000 pounds of sugar, about half of our total import, of the value of about $35,000,000, the duty on which was about $1,750,000. If we import an equal

amount of sugar from Germany next year under that retaliatory system which was so strongly applauded on both sides, but particularly on the other side, we shall pay into our treasury an additional amount of $445,000 over the amount paid in last year. This, perhaps, will change a little our satisfaction with the idea of retaliation. Let me repeat that I do not object to retaliation —not at all ; I quite approve of it; but I do not like retaliation which costs us half a million of dollars a year in taxation on an article the taxation on which almost more than the taxation of any other article lays the burden chiefly upon the people least able to bear it. A tax on sugar is essentially a tax on the poor. A family of moderate income will use probably, about as much sugar in the year as will the family of a millionaire. This means that the family of small income will pay more towards the national revenue in proportion to their ability to pay than will the family of the millionaire. The same is true of the taxes on all articles which enter into general consumption. A tax on sugar when it goes beyond a reasonable point is essentially objectionable from the point of view of the agricultural and of the general population of the country, not excluding those who are employed in manufacturing industries. I take the liberty of saying that if it was desirable to retaliate against Germany—and I agree that under the circumstances it was desirable—I do not think it was desirable to retaliate by hitting ourselves to the amount of half a million dollars a year. It seems to me that if the cost of our sugar is likely to be increased by the amount of half a million dollars a year by the retaliatory duty against Germany, it would have been fair and right to follow the example that was instituted in the case of the preferential tariff, and to have reduced the general tax on sugar so as to even up to consumers generally the increased cost that results from this surtax upon German imports. At this time when we have a swelling revenue and a large surplus, we might very well have a reduction of the duty on sugar rather than an increase, for that is really what the German retaliation amounts to in respect to sugar.

In regard to the proposed duty upon steel rails, I also take issue with the proposition laid own. Of course that duty does not take effect immediately. It may never take effect. Possibly it was never intended to take effect. But if not intended to take effect, it should not appear upon the statute-book, because it commits the House to the principle of protection for protection's sake. Now, if there is one thing that is more necessary than another in the development of this great country of magnificent distances, it is railways, and the great part of their cost, at any rate on the prairies, is the rails, and a duty which increases the cost of rails in this country is to that extent a bar to development. I have read in the papers that we have an estimated consumption of 150,000 tons of steel rails per year, the duty upon which, at $7 per ton, would amount to $1,050,000. That is really a hindrance to the extent of $1,050,000 to the construction of railways at a time when we are voting from year to year millions of dollars of subsidies to aid in the construction of railways. Now, I am aware that the steel rail industry has its rights the same as any other industry ; but I claim that in this case, as in some other cases that I will mention, the general interest overrides the special interest. I believe that where the interest of this country from one ocean to the other is so largely bound up in railway construction, it is in the general interest that the steel rail industry should be sacrificed for the general interest of the country. I do not know any way yet to give everybody everything that they want, and it is not possible in all cases to do so. We have frequently to give in order to get, in fact, I think that is a rule of life. If we want cheap railways we have to buy rails at the lowest price that the world's market will afford. I would be glad to see the iron industries of Canada developed. At present we are paying considerable bonuses on the production of iron in order to aid in that development. It is, I believe, under the circumstances, a proper policy, a fair policy. For my own part, and speaking as I believe, for the people I represent, we have no objection to that. When we pay bonuses we know how much we are paying, what we are paying them for, and what we are getting for what we are paying. But in the case of a duty we do not know how much we are paying, and we do not know what we are getting for what we are paying. There is all the difference in the world between the two cases. Now, I think that in having bonused the iron industry to the extent that it has been bonused, we have gone quite far enough in that direction. One of the greatest reasons for the revival of manufactures under the present tariff has been that the protective duties on raw iron which prevailed up to 1896 have been reduced or abolished. Now I think it is universally admitted that these iron duties practically strangled Canadian manufactures which used iron. I would be sorry to see that policy reverted to in any degree, and particularly I would be sorry to see it reverted to in the case of such an actual necessity as steel rails.

I believe in giving all industries such incidental protection as a fair revenue tariff will afford them. I have no objection to the protection which is afforded to many of these industries, but there is one which belongs to the class of universal necessities, and which means a special tax on the poorer people and on the industrial classes which, under the tariff as it stands to-day, is anything but a revenue tariff. It stands there

absolutely as a protective tariff quite as much as the duty on steel rails—I allude to the duty on coal oil. That duty at the present time is 5 cents per gallon, which I think amounts to about 75 per cent protection. I claim that is absolutely an unreasonable duty. No industry in this country has a right to such a measure of protection. I would be willing to concede to the coal oil industry a fair measure of protection, a 2c. per gallon duty, if you like; although I consider that in the case of an article which enters so generally into consumption as coal oil, it should be under an absolutely minimum tariff instead of under a maximum. At a duty of 5 cents per gallon we are paying $50,000 in duty on every million gallons of oil that we import. I presume I am safe in saying that we are paying just as much in the extra price on every million gallons of oil produced in Canada. So that the trade returns do not show the amount of taxation that we are paying on coal oil, by any means. Admitting that 2 cents a gallon of a specific duty on coal oil would be a fair revenue tariff, the difference between what we are paying and what we would be paying under a revenue tariff, amounts to about $30,000 a year on every million gallons of oil consumed in this country. I say that is too much, it is not reasonable. It does not come under the lines of a revenue tariff, it is a burden laid especially upon the agricultural classes of this country, and it is one that I for my part shall vote against on every opportunity that I get.

I will take the liberty of alluding to another protective measure that has been accorded under the present tariff, a protection which can be justified on the grounds I have already mentioned. It was of special advantage to the agricultural industry that binder twine, barbed wire and cream separators were placed upon the free list. That is a measure of protection, I admit, to the agricultural industry. It is justifiable on the ground that that which is the farmer's raw material, a necessity of his occupation and calling, which enters so largely into his every day work, should be subjected to the least possible tax. It is only natural and right that the duties upon such articles should be reduced to the lowest possible point. In the case of binder twine and barbed wire, industries representing rather raw material than labour, in which the value of the material which goes into their production is so much greater than the amount of labour, the actual labour of the country is not seriously injured by the duty being taken off, it was an eminently proper thing that these articles should be made free of duty. The removal of the duties on these articles has been of special advantage to the agricultural classes, an advantage which they appreciate and one in which in all fairness they are entitled to, because, on many of the articles which they have to buy, for which they are the principal customers, they are paying, even yet, under this present tariff, the maximum duty of 35 per cent. If the farmer has to pay 35 per cent on what he has to buy, when he has only a protection of 20 per cent tariff on what he has to sell, it is only fair that he should have these great and recurring necessities absolutely free of duty.

I have said that there were points in the tariff propositions of the hon. Minister of Finance to which I took exception and to which I think the agricultural interests at any rate do take exception. They take exception to the increase in the duties on sugar, to the excessive duty on coal oil and to the proposed duty on steel rails. Now, there is only one way to make the dissatisfaction of a member against the government felt and that is by voting against the government; and if it were possible on this present occasion to express my disapprobation of those points of the policy of the government by my vote on the resolutions before the House I would have great pleasure—no, I would not have great pleasure, but I would feel that I was under the necessity of casting my vote in that way. But, unfortunately, this is not the case. We are here confronted with the proposition of the hon. Minister of Finance to consider his budget as brought down and with the appeal of the hon. leader of the opposition to support his amendment. The amendment offers no satisfactory alternative. Rather, if there is anything contained in the budget proposition of the hon. Minister of Finance which is objectionable to the agricultural interests, that objection is intensified tenfold by the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition. In the remarks that have been made from the other side of the House one note has run through them all and that is that the agricultural and other duties are not high enough. The protection on steel rails is not high enough, the retaliation against Germany was not begun soon enough. There is apparently a sentiment behind the amendment that even the demands of the Manufacturers' Association are not too much to be conceded. It will not answer for our hon. friends on the other side of the House to sneer at us who support the government, to some extent, under protest. It will not do for them to say to us: Vote with us because the government does not do as you wish, for if we voted with them we would be travelling much farther afield from the position which we desire to see maintained. They say: 'The government is a protectionist government, and has chastised you of the agricultural classes with whips; put us in power and we will chastise you with scorpions.'

We are in a somewhat unfortunate position in that we cannot approve in all particulars of the proposition of the government and at the same time we cannot approve in any particular of the proposals of the op-

position. There is, it seems to me, something lacking in both the propositions of the hon. Minister of Finance and of the hon. leader of the opposition. There is a new condition of affairs arising in this country in finance, in transportation, in commerce, and in manufactures, a condition which is not recognized, of which no note has been taken by either one or the other. I allude to the rise of combines in every line of life. There was a time when we thought that the abolition of duties would prevent the formation of combines. Unfortunately, that is not the fact. On the other hand we are fully of the opinion that the levying of an improper duty certainly tends to the formation of combines. I believe that what this country wants in the way of protection is protection against combines—combines of capital, combines of industry, combines of transportation, and the policy which is brought forward and which will deal successfully with these combines is the policy which this country needs and which this country calls for. It is not sufficient simply not to recognize that this condition of affairs exists. It is not sufficient that it did not exist ten years ago or twenty years ago; the fact is that it exists to-day and we are feeling the effects of it. To-day, as was said before, in the North-west Territories, we are paying $9 per thousand more for lumber than we were paying fourteen months ago as a result of the existence of a combine in lumber. That means $9,000 on each million feet of dressed lumber used in that country. It means an exorbitant tax upon the new settlers in the country, it means a check to immigration, it means a check to prosperity, it means that this government is in duty bound to take measures to break up that combine, and to bring things to their natural condition. The combines are not confined to lumber. A year ago the paper trade combine was tried in court and convicted and a reduction in the duty on paper followed. But that is not a sufficient remedy. The evil still exists. I am not able to say what the remedy is, but I say that a remedy is necessary against these combines in the interest of the people. The first step towards helping combines is a high tariff, and the first step towards breaking them up is a low tariff, or the removal of the duty altogether where a combine is proven to exist.

I wish to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the British preference. I have noticed that this preference is an object of serious attack from the other side of the House on nearly all occasions. Although sometimes it is covert, yet it is continuously made. I regretted very much to hear from the Finance Minister that there was a possibility if not even a probability, that the British preference would be abolished or reduced. Since the budget speech was made circumstances have altered so that the conditions which then existed do not exist now. The duties on grain imported into Britain have been abolished, and we have not now the same claim upon preferential treatment in their market as we had a few days ago. But I am not looking at the British preference from the standpoint of retaliation on Britain, or from the British standpoint at all. I am looking at it strictly from the standpoint of a Canadian consumer. I find that the most important imports from Great Britain are cottons and woollens, which are the wear of the masses of the people; and that which increases the cost of cotton and woollens to the masses of the people is an injury to the people; that which cheapens the cost of these articles is a benefit to the people. We imported last year $7,000,000 worth of cottons and $10,000,000 worth of woollens from Great Britain. Taking the average duties at 25 per cent, and that is rather below the mark, we find that the saving to the Canadian consumer by the preference on the goods actually imported from Great Britain, amounts to $580,000 on cottons, and $830,000 on woollens, or a total of $1,410,000 by reason of the British preference on these goods actually imported in one year. I say, Sir, that this is an advantage to the Canadian consumer which no government can afford to ignore. We cannot afford to tax our industrial classes to the extent that is demanded by the cotton and woollen manufacturers of Canada. We are benefiting nine-tenths of the people by the reduced duty on cottons and woollens imported from Great Britain, and if you like to put it in that way, we are injuring the cotton and woollen manufacturers in Canada. But what do these industries amount to. The last census shows that there were 4,000 woollen mill operatives and 6,000 cotton mill operatives in Canada. We are not interested so much in the capital invested in these mills, as we are interested in the operatives in these mills. Put the case in its worst light, and say if you wish that the continuation of the British preference will shut up every cotton and woollen mill in Canada, and even then I will say that Canada cannot afford to carry on the mills at the price demanded by the cotton and woollen manufacturers. But, Sir, this price which they demand is not founded on fact. The truth is that the cotton mills of Canada were never as prosperous as they are to-day, and never were turning out as much goods as they do to-day. As a matter of fact the mills at Valleyfield have doubled their capacity since this government came into power and the British preference was put in force. The cotton industry is one of the strongest evidences of the advantage resulting to manufacturers by reason of the increase in the general prosperity of the country. They have been hardest hit by the lowering of the tariff under the British preference, and still they have achieved that measure of prosperity.

In considering the demands made by these special interests, I would desire to impress upon the government now and henceforth that there are national interests, that there are universal interests to be considered which are entirely paramount to these special interests of the manufacturing concerns. We do not grudge the manufacturing industries all the protection that is coming to them under a fair revenue tariff. They are more than heartily welcome to it; we wish them all prosperity, but when they are singled out for special protection and advantage; when they are put in a position whereby they are to be protected from the stress of commercial depression, while every one else must in the nature of things suffer that to its extreme degree, then it is something that we cannot agree to and that we cannot support any government in agreeing to. It may be possible that on account of the widespread territory covered by agriculture, by the lumbering, by the mining and by the fishing interests, that it is impossible to secure that concentration of pressure which we see exercised in the case of the manufacturing industries. But it will be well for the government to remember that it is there, and that so long as right is right, so long the public interest should be maintained against the demand of any special interest no matter how strongly that demand may be worded or how strongly it is backed up by pressure. It should be remembered that the manufacturing industry has the ear of the press of the country. The manufacturers are in a position to make their voice heard all over the country as the voice of the farmers cannot be heard. They are organized, as the farmers and fishermen are not, but it will be a mistake for this Liberal government to forget the principles upon which they have obtained power and upon which they have been supported in power by yielding in any degree to the demands made upon them by special industries for special protection. If Liberalism means anything, it means that general interests shall prevail against special interests; it means the masses against the classes, and we look to the present government to maintain Liberalism in this sense.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the House is loosing interest in the budget debate. When Mr. Blain spoke this afternoon I counted just fifteen members on the government side of the House, and when Mr. Oliver rose to speak there were only sixteen. It seems to me that all interest is being lost in the debate, and that an adjournment would perhaps be in order. However, I understand there are a number of gentlemen who wish to speak and I would like to say a few words myself on the question. It is quite possible that I may not throw much light upon the subject, and that I will have to differ from the hon. members who have spoken before me. However, they cannot blame me if I do not thoroughly agree with them.

In the first place, I must congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance on his excellent showing in his budget speech. I am sure every man in Canada will be pleased that the government though not instrumental in bringing about the present prosperity, have been at the head of affairs while the country has been progressing so favourably. His showing is certainly a much better one than that of last year. Last year several millions of dollars were added to the national debt, while this year it seems that about $13,000,000 will go to pay off the national debt. Now, Sir, I wish to say a few words from a non-partisan point of view, neither Grit nor Tory, neither Liberal nor Conservative, but from an independent farmer's standpoint. We will try to hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may. I have always held the opinion that trade between all nations and all classes of people should be as free as possible, and with as little restriction as possible. Nearly all nations resort to the system of tariff, or duties on goods to raise the revenue required to support the government and to meet the expenditure of the country. Adequate protection we have had pretty well defined by nearly every hon. gentleman who has spoken. I understand it to mean a higher protective duty than we have at the present time, and that all classes and conditions of the people of Canada are to have a share of protection measured out to them. Now, Sir, I am at a loss to know how my hon. friend the mover of that amendment is going to protect the farmer. That is what I am here to learn. A high protective duty on such commodities as the people require, gives a few individuals an opportunity to tax the community without giving anything in return either to the government or to help the consumer. For many years past 'Hansard' has been loaded down with this question. We have heard the same ideas and about the same language that has been used in this debate, and the country has profited but little from the discussion. Men invest their capital to manufacture such things as the people want, and then expect the government to allow them to tax the people at their sweet will.

Mr. COWAN. While the lamp holds out to burn.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity; he is aching for it. For one, I do not object to the government giving a measure of protection when we have the facilities for the production of the raw material in our country; and when our friends and neighbours are anxious to work that raw material into manufactured goods, I think they should have an opportunity to try to produce the things we require. Therefore I think the

government would be justified in lending assistance to our infant industries.

Mr. COWAN. What particular industry is infant ?

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). You will have an opportunity, my friend.

Mr. COWAN. I know, but I would like to have your idea as to what industry is infantile ?

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). We want to put them well upon their feet, but after they are well upon their feet, they ought to be able to stand alone.

Mr. COWAN. Is eighteen years long enough ?

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). That chap is not very well ; you had better give him a job down cellar. The farmers and the working people are willing to pay their fair share of the taxation of this country, but they are not anxious to make millionaires of a few at the expense of all the rest. Canadian manufacturers are able to take care of themselves, and I think I can show you that by bringing in the best evidence we have in this country. 'Industrial Canada,' in its April number says :

> Slowly but surely, a Canadian export trade is being built up. Though confronted by many obstacles, the men who are establishing a demand for Canadian goods in foreign markets are gradually making headway amongst the competition of the world. Steamship lines are being acquired by Canadians. Other lines are being subsidized by the Dominion government. Agents are prospecting in distant lands, and manufacturers at home are directing their attention towards foreign conquests. . . . .
>
> Many of our firms to-day are self-satisfied. Recent years have been so prosperous that the majority of our manufacturers have been kept busy with Canadian orders. . . . .
>
> We believe that a number of Canadian firms do not even take the trouble to answer inquiries from the foreign field. One instance which has recently come under our notice is that of a large firm in Birmingham whose representative was about to visit Canada, and previous to his departure addressed an inquiry to more than thirty Canadian firms asking them to address him at Toronto, advising him whether they were prepared to undertake export trade and to what extent. To these thirty inquiries only eight answers were received, the firms favoured with the opportunity not having shown even the courtesy of a reply. Such an attitude injures the whole prospect of Canadian trade and our firms would do well, even if they cannot undertake the execution of orders at the present time, to look ahead and retain always the confidence of foreign buyers.

That proves most conclusively that the manufacturers of all classes of goods have no reason to complain. It is useless to attempt to build up industries without natural advantages. We have the raw materials, we must have coal and electric power or water power, otherwise we cannot compete successfully in manufacturing with other nations who have these advantages. But if we have these advantages and cheap food and money, our Canadian industries should be able to hold their own, even if not protected against foreign producers. Our farmers and other classes of Canada are willing to assist our manufacturers, but are not willing to pamper and pet them for ever. We are referred to the high protective system of the United States, and I might say that one half of the discussion on the present budget has been taken up with what has occurred in the United States. It seems to me that we have enough to do at home and would do better to confine our own attention to our own business and leave the United States alone. But since the United States are pointed to as an argument in favour of protection let me point out that the protective system in that country has been the means of making many millionaires and some multi-millionaires, but has not made the average people of that country any better off than the same people in other countries. It has certainly not done anything for the farmers because they are poor men. In Canada we do not want any tyrants, we do not want any one-man power, but we want wealth distributed fairly among all classes and conditions of men. A very large minority of the American people are opposed to a high protective tariff, and were it not for the fact that the United States enjoy free trade among fifty commonwealths, comprising 84,000,000 people, their system of high protection would have exploded long ago. The manufacturers of the United States and Canada are selling their goods cheaper abroad than to their own people. Take the manufacturers of machinery, in which every farmer is interested. Some time ago a number of binders were smashed up in a railway accident, and the manufacturers sued the railway company for damages. During the hearing, the evidence showed that the cost price of these binders was less than $40, and yet the retail price to the farmers was $110. If our manufacturers are making such immense profits, I do not think it reasonable for our government to entertain any proposition to raise the duties. When discussing this question with a friend of mine some time ago, I told him that every machine I had on my farm was made in Canada, I said that there was sufficient loyalty about me to buy everything in Canada. Well, he replied, I do not see where the loyalty comes in. Had you bought that machine in the United States, you would have had to pay $20 into the revenue of this country. Which is the most loyal—the man who pays $20 to the government, or the man who pays $20 to the manufacturers ? I leave that nut for my hon. friends around me to crack. We sometimes lay the flattering unction to our souls that we are very loyal, but when we hear the other side we begin to doubt whether our patriotism will stand washing.

We have heard considerable about this German treaty, and I felt rather pleased when the hon. Minister of Finance told us that he was about to retaliate on these people who had tried to injure us by refusing to give us the benefit of the favoured-nation clause. But when I come to think the whole matter over, it begins to dawn on me that I might be in the position in which I used to be when younger. I have read a good deal of Scripture and have tried to live up to it. One Scriptural advice is that when struck on the right cheek, we should turn the left. I have lived up to that as much as I could, but whenever I turned my left cheek and was struck on that, then my hand was ready to strike the aggressor down if possible. That is just the way I felt about this German treaty. But when we begin to question whether there is not too much muscular force on the other side and that we might suffer in consequence, another aspect of the case presents itself. We have to think before we act. However, whether we have sufficient muscular force or not, it is worth our while to test it and teach the nations of the world that Canada dare say her soul is her own.

Another strong point made by the hon. Finance Minister was concerning the question of preferential trade. We held the whip hand over those Britishers, and if they would not give us preferential trade in grain we might at some time consider the advisability of abrogating the preferential clause in our tariff. What about us poor Canadians ? Ain't we in it ? I think we are. Take the case of a widow with a family of little children. She has to clothe them—that is as necessary in this country as feeding them. She goes to a merchant tailor for a suit for her five year old boy. The merchant understands the case. He shows two suits, both the same price, $5, and both fitting for the boy's wear. Here, says the merchant, is one suit, which was made in England. Here is another, at the same price, but it may not be quite so good a class of cloth. If you buy the English suit, you pay a dollar into the Dominion treasury—if you buy the other one, you pay the dollar just the same, but it goes into the manufacturer's pocket. There is patriotism again. The poor widow says : Surely, I don't have to pay a dollar into either. But the clothier answers : Madam, remember that if we had not the preferential trade that Mr. Fielding gave us, you would have to pay sixty cents more. Then it begins to dawn upon her that preferential trade is a good thing for her as a Canadian. I am not sure that I have made the case clear to some of the obtuse-minded gentlemen I see about me. Some fifteen years ago, I was in North Britain. I do not care to tell all the little incidents that have happened in my life; some of them might be against me. I was in Glasgow, and as my business was done for the day, I went with a friend to the extensive Coatbridge iron works. Every one who knows anything about that section knows of this great industry. It was wonderful to go through the works at night with the furnaces in full blast. The foreman was very kind—a canny Scot. He learned that I came from Canada, and that may have made him all the more courteous to me. Since that time, we have had the King's coronation, and more Canadians have been seen in Great Britain of late. But, at that time we were quite a novelty. The foreman said : You come from Canada ? What business brought you over? I told him that I had come with some cattle. Have you sold them ? Yes, sold them on Glasgow market. He said : I was reading in the papers this morning that the Canadian government has raised the duty on bar iron—the stuff that they were rolling out there in immense quantities—to $13 per ton. I said I was sorry for that, and if I had been in the Canadian parliament I would not have voted for that. That made him think I was somebody of importance, I suppose. He said : Now, my friend, you brought some cattle from Canada ; did you have to pay any duty to bring them here ? No, sir. You don't know how badly I felt to think that we placed a duty on the product on their industry, while they allowed my finished product to go into their country free. I told him I would do all I could to remedy that when I got back—and I have been a long time trying to do it. I would commend this illustration to those who are harping on the idea that Great Britain does not give us a preference. Why is she not giving us a preference all the time ? Has she a duty on anything coming from Canada except tobacco—and we don't have much of that to sell—and whisky ? It is true, they have the embargo on the cattle, but I believe that will be removed when we can show a clean bill of health.

Another thing that we have heard for the last twelve months is 'Canada for the Canadians.' It sounds splendid at first—you would think everybody would throw up his hat and hurrah for it. But when you examine it and think the matter over, you will find, as in the other case, there is nothing in it. Suppose that the British people who are our best customers, were to say that as we are crying Canada for Johnny Canuck, so they would cry Britain for John Bull, and were to turn their deer parks and pheasant preserves into grazing lands and raise their own stock. I tell you, to-morrow we would be begging those people to take our stock. What would be the value of our lands if we had not a market there for our cheese, beef, apples and all our surplus products ? It is our duty as Canadians to try to keep that British market open, and to see that no foe shuts us out from it. That is where we get our income from. That is

the goose that lays the golden egg, and we must see to it that she is not killed. Do you think that when you sell your stock or your cheese to Great Britain, they are going to pay you gold. You need not expect it; Great Britain will not send gold either in bullion or in dust. She wants to sell you her products, and, if she cannot do it, she will buy stuff from the nations that will buy from her. You are handicapped if you do not trade with the nations that trade with you, because the law of trade is not goods for gold but goods for goods. It is our duty to trade with our best customers. Our country is progressing by leaps and bounds, and the government must move with it. It is the duty of the government to use every means in its power to help all those who are trying to help themselves. And they say that the best way to do that is to leave the farmers alone and not put a duty on what they need to buy and reduce their purchasing power. By helping the farmers you are helping every other class. So, be very careful what you do. Explore and exploit all our new domain where there is iron, pulpwood, nickel or anything else. Lend a helping hand to those who are willing to put money into these things. But do not pamper them for ever. Help them at the start, and they will soon be able to help themselves.

Now with regard to this steel rail question I feel somewhat like my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). These railway companies that are asking for subsidies from this government will need to double their request if you put a duty on steel rails. They will have to pay $7 a ton more duty. For myself, I am opposed to giving subsidies to railways. I believe the time has come when capitalists have got sufficient money to build their own railways. If we give them money, we should see that we have security, we should take first mortgage on the road, and have a voice in its management, and make it carry our mails and do our work for the money that we grant it. Now, Sir, it is a question to my mind, when we give them $7 duty and $6 in bounty, whether $13 a ton would not be too much to give for the purpose of starting a steel rail industry. However, if it is decided by the wisest men in this country that that would be the best plan, I am not going to object; let us try it for a while.

The next point I will touch upon is the question of binder twine, in which all the farmers are interested. That also is their raw material. It takes 45 cents worth of binder twine to bind an acre of good wheat, so that on every acre we have to spend 45 cents, whether we get anything back or not. Now it is the manufacturers of binder twine who are asking for protection, I understand. I was pleased when the duty was taken off binder twine, because I believed that our Canadian manufacturers were able to compete with the United States manufacturers. But if it is true, as has been stated, that the Americans get a rebate on their raw material, that there is a monopoly of manilla in that country, and that our people cannot get the sisal used in the manufacture of binder twine, then it will be a matter for consideration as to whether we should give them a duty or not. But, if we do, we must see that the duty is not so high as to prevent the Americans selling our farmers twine so that our manufacturers may not have a monopoly. The binder twine people are no better than others, and they will form a combination if they are able, and make the farmers pay higher prices. I do not believe in bonuses, but there are times, perhaps, when they are necessary. Now, Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House for having spoken so long, though the apology may not be so much needed, because there are so few here. But those who are absent will be sorry in the morning that they were not here.

Mr. A. E. VROOMAN (South Victoria, Ontario). Of all the questions mentioned in the budget speech, perhaps the financial question is the most important to this country. All other questions treated in the budget speech are more or less affected by the financial position. When the revenues of the country are buoyant, when the treasury is overflowing, it gives an impulse to all the departments of the government, and the public machinery moves on easily. I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that when times are good, people are satisfied, and are disinclined to a change, in fact they like to leave things as they are. There is a disinclination for experiments. I think this government have taken full advantage of these conditions, and have decided to leave things pretty much as they were before. In fact, when we look around and ask ourselves what they have done, we cannot find an answer; especially are we puzzled to find out what they have done after having made such large expenditures. Perhaps, after all, judging from the little things they have done, it is better that they should have not attempted great things, because if they had, they would probably have injured the country. I was pleased to listen for the third time to the story the Finance Minister had to tell us about prosperity and good times. I was ready to make some allowance for the ring of exultation in his voice when he announced that wonderful surplus, the largest surplus we have ever had in the Dominion of Canada. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the Conservative surpluses, though not as large, were more creditable to the government under the circumstances in which they were gathered.

I have always thought, Mr. Speaker, that this government was in many respects very fortunate. They came into power contemporaneously with good times. That statement does not need any proof. If we look

up the statistics of those days, we will find plenty of evidence to show that before they came into power good times had begun to revive. We all remember the times of depression from 1892 to 1896. The world over there was financial depression and stagnation. Under those circumstances, we were fortunate in having at the head of our financial affairs a very able man, who succeeded in conducting the ship of state through financial storms, while on the other side of the line, many monetary institutions tottered or went to the wall. In Canada our banks and corporate institutions all weathered the storm, with, I think, only one exception, a little bank up in the city of Winnipeg. But what was the course of the opposition in those days? The opposition thought it was a good time to make an onslaught on the government, they thought the time had come when they might possibly attain to power. They made various specious promises that I need not detail to this House They threw into the arena of public discussion, a very troublesome religious question, and owing to the discontent thus created, and the prevailing hard times, the Liberal party succeeded in attaining to power. But we have discovered, after looking back over the six years that they have been in power, that the Liberal party made a better opposition than they do a government. I do not say even then, very much for their opposition when they were on this side of the House. During their long occupation of seats on this side of the House they inculated to perfection the science of criticism and of faultfinding. They arrived at a perfection in that regard that we on this side of the House do not hope to emulate. But since they have been occupying the treasury benches, we have not discovered in them any evidence of constructive statesmanship. Now, while the Liberal party were in opposition, and especially during those hard times, they were wonderfully alarmed about the financial condition of the country, and in a resolution adopted at the Liberal convention in 1893, in this city, they expressed their alarm in this way. Mr. Speaker, you will indulge me if I recall a little ancient history. Perhaps the House has never heard of this resolution before:

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878; and we demand strict economy in the administration of the government of the country.

They really deserve our pity when we consider that during all these long years they lived in this constant state of alarm. As a practical professional man, I understand the wearing nature of that condition of the nervous system, that constant state of alarm. From 1893 to 1896 we had that party constantly affirming that position, and I will draw from ancient history the expressions of some of these hon. gentlemen. The present hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said:

> I say that it is a disgrace and a shame to the government that have been entrusted with our affairs that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of $38,300,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable.

The present Postmaster General (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) said in 1895:

> There is nothing to warrant this enormous expenditure of nearly $38,000,000 except the fact that we are burdened down with debt and with office-holders, great and small.

I have not heard that these office holders have been dismissed, or if they have been dismissed, deserving followers have been put in their places. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said:

> The Liberal party, if in power, could at once reduce the public expenditure and effect other savings to the extent of five million dollars per annum, without impairing the efficiency of the service.

The right hon. the present leader of the House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

> If we get into power we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie; and I say that, although we may not be able to bring the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three millions of dollars per year.

Well, they came into power and in six years we find an annual expenditure of $64,000,000 which is just $20,000,000 more than the expenditure when they came into power. We find that in the last six years of their rule they spent $101,417,000 more than was spent during the last six years of Conservative rule. This is an immense amount of money. We have been told that there have been great public works undertaken in this country. The hon. Minister of Finance said the other day that they had provided liberally for public works. I have been trying to think what has been done in this country with this large expenditure what great public works have they built, and I am not able to settle on anything of importance that has been done. They have a public debt of $271,000,000 as against a debt of $258,000,000 when they came into office. They levied taxes last year to the amount of $43,389,000, whereas, when they came into office they found taxation to the amount of $27,759,000. During six years of rule by these hon. gentlemen we do not find that they have manifested any particular alarm. The alarm subsided when these gentlemen achieved power and we now find that they have passed into a state of quiescence and rest. We do not hear any expressions from these hon. gentlemen now about the unjustifiable expenditure of the government; in fact, I sometimes think that members of the opposition are very lax in applying the proper epithets to that kind of

thing. I do not wish to burden the House with statistics, because, in this debate, we have had a good many statistics. But, I would like for my own purpose to refer to the taxation imposed upon the people of the country. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), gave us the particulars of the taxation for the last six years of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite and for the last six years of the administration of the previous government and he was answered in that regard by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. If hon. gentlemen will look at the record of taxation from 1891 to 1896 they will find that taxation was not increased but that it was actually decreased. During the period from 1891 to 1896 there was a falling off in taxation, but from 1896 to 1902 we find taxation rapidly increasing. The present government found the taxation at $27,759,000 when they came into office, while in the last report, we find that the taxation imposed upon the people has been increased to $43,000,000. In the last six years the government have taken out of the people in taxation $44,600,000 more than the taxation imposed upon the people during the previous six years. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce undertook to explain that away and this is the way that he did it. He said :

That is the hon. leader of the opposition—

Has paid no attention whatever to the difference between the real taxation inflicted on the people under a protective tariff, and the actual taxation inflicted on the people under a revenue tariff, even if it be a high one.

I have tried to understand what a revenue tariff was and what a protective tariff was, but I have never been right in my conclusion if the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is an authority upon the subject. We have the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) saying this in his speech :

The tariff of this country is practically the same that was adopted in 1897.

Now the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce further said :

The difference is this, that substantially the great bulk of the taxes go into the treasury under the present tariff, whereas under the administration which preceded ours an enormous percentage of the taxes which the people of Canada had to pay did not go into the treasury but went to swell the profits of private individuals. The people under our tariff have the satisfaction at any rate of knowing that what is taken out of them goes into the treasury, and can be used for the benefit of the whole people.

The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works said :

The revision of the tariff of 1897 has placed it about 2 per cent less high than it was before. We did not do more than that ; and when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was this afternoon denouncing the former tariff, the tariff that I supported myself, when he was telling us that the tariff enacted in 1879 and kept on the statute-book up to 1897 had simply allowed the manufacturers to pocket the money of the people, I was saying to myself, if it was so, I do not know what it is now, because there is not much difference in the two tariffs ; the present tariff is about the same thing. We even raised the tariff in 1897 as against the United States on many articles.

It seemed to me when I heard that sort of argument coming from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that it was a very fallacious argument. I could not help but believe that the hon ex-Minister of Public Works was right in this matter and that, as is practically admitted by the government supporters, the tariff is the same as that which has been in force since 1879 with some few slight exceptions and the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works says that the government even raised the tariff against the United States in some particulars. What is the principal reason why taxation fell off in the last six years of Conservative rule ? Here is what the ex-Minister of Finace (Mr. Foster) said in 1891 :

In 1891 we remitted taxation on sugar—it came into effect the latter part of that year—to the extent of $227,477, and we had a surplus of $155,977. In 1892, the remission of sugar taxation, calculated on an equal consumption, was $5,200,000, and still we had a surplus of $1,354,555. In 1893, calculated on the consumption, the remission of taxation on raw sugar and other sugar amounted to $4,000,000, and we had a deficit of $1,210,232. In 1894, the remission of sugar taxation was $4,821,000, and we had a deficit of $4,153,875. And in 1895, after which we placed again the duty on raw sugar, the remission of total taxation was $5,603,521, and the deficit had come down to $330,551. What is the summing of the matter ? It is that in that period there was taxation remitted to the tune of $19,800,000, but there was a net deficit of $4,184,227. So that consequently there was given back to the country, in the remission of taxation, over and above the deficit which had to be provided out of capital, the sum of $15,000,000.

That is the reason there was no increase in the taxation. But with all the large surpluses that this government has had we do not find that they remit any taxes to the people. On the contrary, they continue to take money out of the pockets of the people, and to take all that they decently can. Last year the expenditure for all purposes was $63,970,000 against an expenditure of $44,000,000 in 1896, when the Conservatives were in power, or an increase of $19,874,000 under Liberal rule, and on the top of all that the national debt has been increased as well. It was unfair for the Finance Minister to compare eighteen years of Conservative rule as to expenditure with the six years of Liberal rule, because we all know that during the eighteen years the Conservatives were in power vast public works were undertaken and completed. I shall take the liberty of reading from the 'Monetary Times' an article on the budget speech of last year, which applies equally

well to the conditions that prevail this year, and I assume that the 'Monetary Times' is not a party paper. It says:

The Finance Minister has been most fortunate in taking up his story at the beginning of a cycle of prosperity and expansion, which succeeded the world-wide depression of the previous five years, and drew to its close in 1895; and in having had five full and growing years for succeeding recitals. We may also say that he was fortunate in having had as his predecessors in the government, men who spent largely and builded wisely in preparing the ground, without which no such results as called forth his and our congratulations could have been possible.

The budget speech shows an almost dizzying progress to have been made in other respects than in trade, and throws into bold relief the striking change in faith and practice since 1896. Never in the history of Canada were such vast figures dealt with by a Finance Minister in point of revenue and expenditure. Receipts from taxes $38,743,000 in 1901, compared with $27,759,285 in 1896. Total revenues, which of course all come out of the people's pockets, $52,500,000, as against $36,600,000. Total expenditure $57,900,000, compared with $41,700,000, and a net public debt of $268,000,000, as compared with $258,000,000—mark the change in five years. For 1902 it is stated that the total to be gathered for the treasury will be $57,000,000, the total expenditure $65,000,000, and the addition to the debt will be $6,000,000.

This fairly takes away one's breath, the sums are so vast, and the increase so rapid. Yet it is not recorded that Sir Richard Cartwright either swooned or swore, or that any of the old advocates of economy and reduction did else than cheer the minister as he placidly made these announcements on the authority and with the sanction of a Liberal government. And yet, apart from the change of front indicated in the party, these figures challenge the serious attention of every thoughtful citizen. Granted that the country is prosperous, is it wise to set so rapid a pace, and raise to such a height the scale of expenditure, which once raised it will be found almost impossible to lower? It is well to remember that as the prices of staples rise—and there have been marked advances in price in many lines of recent years—the amount recived from customs taxation rises, for it is largely ad valorem. Then, when prices fall, the amount of customs revenue falls. In prosperous times, with a buoyant revenue, is it prudent to spend it all and add so many millions besides to a debt already too large? For $13 per head or $65 per family for one year's government is a tremendous charge. Giving all due force to the contention that we are a growing country, and must needs provide generously for the public service, this headlong rush forward in taxation and expenditure, seemingly unchecked by bit or bridle, invites reflection on the part of business men and thoughtful citizens. These piping times will not always continue, and the overdrain of to-day hastens the exhaustion of to-morrow. We cry a warning and a halt before the rush has become a rout in which moderation and prudence lose their meaning and their force. At this rate we know not where we shall end, for, though the minister hints at limits to the tide of prosperity, he apparently sets none to the volume of expenditure.

That article from this respectable journal speaks better than I can of the present financial condition of the country. We are well aware that in a new country like this, expenditure must increase and the people of Canada are perfectly willing to meet that increased expenditure, but there is a limit to everything. When our expenditure increases by leaps and bounds as it has done in the past few years, we naturally want to know what it is expended for, and when we come to inquire into the details we find that there is a wholesale waste of public money. Take the expenditure for the census as an example. We have had four censuses since confederation. The census of 1871 cost $511,000; the census of 1881, $552,000; the census of 1891, $549,000, an average for each of the three censuses taken by the Conservative government of $540,000. But in 1901, under a Liberal government, the census has cost $1,121,513, up to date. The Minister of Agriculture told us last year that the reason for this was because they asked so many more questions and elicited so much more information from the people. That may be true, for we all remember that the government issued a circular to their enumerators, instructing them that they were to get the ages of all the young men who were about to become twenty-one years old, and likely to support the government, so as to have them ready to put on the voters' list for the coming election. I asked the Minister of Agriculture what was the cost of taking the census in my own constituency, and that is a fair sample of what has occurred everywhere else. The fact of the matter is that they have uselessly spent double the money that the Conservatives did. The Minister of Agriculture told me that the population of my riding in 1891 was 20,455 and in 1901 it was 19,953, or about 500 less. But there were seventeen enumerators in 1891 and 39 enumerators in 1901. In 1891 the expense of taking the census in my riding was $1,253, and in 1901 it was $2,663. The Minister of Agriculture further told us that in 1891 the enumerators were allowed nothing for transportation but in 1901 they received $1.50 a day for horse hire. The cost of taking the census in that small riding in 1901 was just double what it was in 1891, and that increase can easily be explained when we find that every sorehead of the Liberal party and every party heeler in the constituency was appointed as an enumerator at the expense of the country, in order to get him back into the traces before the election. That is an illustration of where the money goes under this Liberal government. The fact is that this government, and to some extent they are justified in it, have not been disturbing the trend of things since they came into power. Times have been good and the revenue bouyant, and they have been allowing things to float along, as it were. But there is one thing which they have been very active about, and that is in looking after the party inter-

ests and placing their friends in good safe positions. As to the general interest of the country they are doing nothing. As a competent authority for that, I will quote from the speech of the right hon. Prime Minister, delivered at the Toronto Fair banquet on the 27th of August, 1901. He was replying to the toast of the parliament of Canada, and he said :

At the present time the government was in the happy position of having little to do. It had been said, 'Happy the man who has no history,' and it might with equal truth be asserted, 'Happy the nation that has no history.' He was in the peculiar position of a reformer who had nothing to reform. There had been a time when he had wanted to reform everything, but nowadays, added Sir Wilfrid, 'I find that I am very much of a Conservative.'

This, though somewhat of a confession, was part of the common history of mankind ; the young man is ardent for change and thinks the world is out of joint ; but as a man advances in life he feels as do the majority of men in parliament, that this is a good world to live in after all, and things run on very well if they are let alone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I had just occasion for saying what I did about this matter. The sentiments expressed there are quite praiseworthy ; I do not take any exception to them, though I doubt very much about his being a Conservative, and have they been lived up to ?

Now, looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns, we see that our total imports for home consumption last year amounted to $202,791,595, and our total exports to $211,640,286, which I take to include coin and bullion. As we analyse these figures, keeping in mind the preferential features of the tariff, they are somewhat interesting. We find that we imported from Great Britain $49,206,062 and from the United States $120,814,750. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) says these large imports from the United States are due to geography. I am ready to admit that geography has a good deal to do with them. We import a great deal from the United States that we would not perhaps import if the two countries were not in such close proximity ; but that fact does not account for the whole difference. We have this broad fact, that while a preference has been given to English goods in our market, we imported only $49,000,000 from Great Britain, while we imported $120,000,000 from the United States. We get a better idea when we consider the increases. Since 1898, the increase in the imports from England was $16,705,145, while the increase in the imports from the United States was $42,109,160. The history of the British preference must be a source of great humiliation to hon. members on the government side of the House. When that preference was granted to English goods in our market in 1898, we remember with what a blowing of horns and beating of drums it was ushered in. We could not hear the last of it ; it was one of the greatest triumphs of statesmanship. And I remember that when the Finance Minister was asked if he would dare to abolish it, his supporters cheered him to the echo, when he declined to answer the question directly, but simply said that there were some things which, when once granted to a nation, could not be taken back. Yet, in his budget speech of this year he intimates that the abolition of the preference is in contemplation. I take it that that is one of the results of the last colonial conference, because we have evidence that at that conference the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain did not show any great appreciation of the preference, and the members of our government who were there were probably put a little on their mettle, and almost threatened to take that preference away from England. Here is what the Finance Minister says in his budget :

But if, after further consideration, they come to the conclusion that our request is not a reasonable one. If, owing to their adherence to certain views they cannot grant us the preference, we shall be free to take our own course. Whether, in such a case it would be wise, in the interests of Canada, to modify or change the preferential tariff, would be a question to be considered. But, putting aside other considerations, if the British government and people do not show any appreciation of the value of the preference, then, so far as the British government and people are concerned, they cannot complain if we see fit to modify or change that preferential tariff.

He does not say positively that he will abolish the preference, but he intimates as much. The other night the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. John Charlton), who has been advancing the interests of reciprocity with the United States lately, said this about the preference :

I beg to differ with Mr. Chamberlain in this matter. This preference has had two effects.

Mr. Chamberlain had been saying that the preference was of no use to England. In fact, the imports of British goods into Canada under the preference had decreased in comparison with those under the general tariff. The hon. member for North Norfolk went on to say :

In the first place, it has arrested the decline in our trade with England, a decline which was making rapid progress when this preference was adopted. In the second place, it has led to an expansion of that trade, and a brief examination of the returns will prove this beyond peradventure, as the following figures of our imports from Great Britain will show.

And what figures do you suppose he quotes in support of his argument ? He begins with 1893 and he gives the figures for the ten years following, comparing these of the four or five years of great financial depression with the last five or six years, during which there has been the greatest boom, and he says :

These figures prove that the preference, or something else, arrested that decline, and that

there set in an expansion, which amounted to $19,794,000 in five years.

Yet, curious to say, while the hon. gentleman gives the preference the credit for increasing our expansion of trade, he is willing to give it away to the Americans. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says the preference has been of no value to us. I am not ready to take either position. I think it would be a mistake to abolish the preference. Here is what 'Industrial Canada,' the official organ of the Manufacturer's Association, says on that point:

It has been alleged that the government contemplates the abolition of the preferential tariff in favour of Britain. It has been stated that the attitude of the Canadian representatives at the last colonial conference was intended to prepare the way for this. It is hardly credible that the government intend to do anything of the kind. Whatever may be said about the wisdom or unwisdom of granting the preference in the first place without any compensation, to withdraw it now would create a very unfavourable impression in Britain. It is true that the present tariff hits some of our manufacturers very hard and will injuriously affect many others when hard times come, but the way to remedy the evil is not to abolish the preferential tariff, but to so increase the general tariff that even with a British preference of 33⅓ per cent the minimum tariff will be high enough to safeguard Canadian interests.

That is what the organ of the Manufacturers' Association says about the withdrawal of the preference, and I think myself that the preference having been once given, it would be a very ungracious thing to withdraw it. Last year we exported to Great Britain $117,320,221 and to the United States, $71,197,684. Since 1898 the increase of exports to Great Britain has been $12,321,403, and to the United States, $25,492,348. You will remember that the government, when they introduced the preference, told us that they did not want a British preference in return. They claimed that we had it already. According to their view, our preference was a free gift to the mother country; and the people of England, when they saw our goods on their market, would be tumbling over each other to get them. Canadian goods would be bought in preference to any others. Yet we find that during this great boom in business our exports to England have only increased $12,000,000 while those to the United States have increase $25,000,000.

The point I wish to make is that we import from the United States $65,000,000 worth of manufactured goods which we could make in our own country. We have the raw material, the skill, the capital and the intelligence. Why then should we not make these goods at home? We took from the United States $54,000,000 worth of goods last year more than they took from us, and $71,000,000 more than we purchased from Great Britain. We are told by the hon. Minister of Finance that there is to be no revision of the tariff, with a few slight exceptions, but surely there is no reason why the great bulk of these manufactured goods which we import from the United States should not be made in this country. The hon. Finance Minister has decided to put a small protection of about three-eights of a cent per pound on binder twine to neutralize the effect of the rebate given the American manufacturers. Well, Mr. Speaker, that little item of three-eights of a cent on binder twine illustrates to me very clearly the timid way in which this government deals with great questions. They are afraid to do what is right. This question of binder twine is an important one. Last year we imported from the United States 15,000,000 pounds of that article which was charged, at invoice price, about ten cents per pound. We imported more than we manufactured, and I find by an answer given to a question put by an hon. member the other day, that the price quoted of the imported article is about the same as what is charged at home by our manufacturers. We might as well make all this binder twine in this country, and then keep at home the $1,700,000 which went out of this country last year for its purchase.

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has resurrected an old question. In 1891 the party opposite went to the country on a policy of unrestriced reciprocity. It seems to me that after the last conference with the United States authorities, that question should have passed away into the limbo of the rejected and forgotten. But now the hon. member for North Norfolk is coquetting with it again, and it is said that this government intends going down to Washington and talking this matter over. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we recall a little bit of ancient history, we will see what some of those hon. gentlemen said about reciprocity a few years ago. Here is what was said by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce:

To say the least of it, enormous stores of raw material of great value to the United States are stored up in Canada, and it should be our pride and our work to get out our raw products as quickly as possible and send them down to be converted into manufactured products by the skilled labour of the United States.

Truly a wonderful policy. It should be our pride and work to become hewers of wood and drawers of water for our American friends. We were advised to use our labour and our skill in taking out the raw material and putting it into barges and railway trains and shipping it to the United States in order that our American neighbours might convert it into manufactured products and then sell these products to us. That was the policy of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce when in opposition. But what did he tell us the other day on this very question. He has another policy now. He said:

Sir, I will tell the hon. gentleman—he was replying to the leader of the opposition—what this government and the people of Canada have done in the past two years. They have shown the people of the United States, by the best of all lessons, that we can live without them, that we can grow in our trade and commerce in a much faster ratio than they, that we can successfully compete with them in the markets of the world.

Why, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is on this question twenty-five years behind. He is preaching the doctrine that we taught twenty-five years ago. He has only begun to realize now what he should have realized a quarter of a century ago. Here is something else which that hon. gentleman said :

One United States customer is worth to us in Canada, half a dozen customers of any other nationality.

Then we had the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) saying—

There is a market at our very door for 40,000,000 bushels of wheat. If we have free intercourse, Canada will be a market from which these states will draw the 10,000,000 barrels of flour they need per annum. They need every product our farmers have to sell.

And the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) said :

If my leader comes into power it would not be rash prediction to say that within six months of that day, by a scratch of the pen, a treaty of reciprocity would be put in force between the people of Canada and the United States.

There was an election in 1891, and hon. gentlemen opposite went to the country on a policy of unrestricted reciprocity, but the people turned them down. They do not seem, however, to have learned anything from the lesson, for we have the right hon. gentleman who leads that party saying :

And I say the only policy which would benefit this country is unrestricted reciprocity and continental freedom of trade. It is absurd to suppose that, situated as we are, the interests of Canada will always be identical with the interests of Great Britain. . . . . Some day must come when these interests will clash, and whatever the hon. gentleman may be, for my part whenever it comes to that, and however I may regret the necessity, I will stand by my native land. I, for one, when I made up my mind in favour of this policy of unrestricted reciprocity looked first and last to the interests of Canada and not to the interests of England. Let the British subject that sits in the British parliament look after the interests of England. I do not believe in the principles of the United Empire Trade League, for the reason that that scheme limits trade to allegiance. It proposes to make allegiance the basis of trade, whilst we desire to make trade interests alone the basis of trade. . . . . Our duty is to Canada and not to England. Just as the British government teaches this government that the first duty of the British government is to England and not to Canada, so I insist that in all these matters, it is for any self-governing colony to look to its own interests, first, last and always.

Just then we were not fighting for home rule. That was the attitude at that time of the party now in power, and to-day we have the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the apostle of reciprocity, bringing up this argument again :

We should approach the United States. The time is near at hand when, in my opinion, we will certainly get great material concessions. I am quite optimistic about the mater. I believe that we will get concessions that will be entirely satisfactory, and so I am thoroughly convinced that it would not be prudent in our interest to enter upon a course such as we might enter upon, in all probability such as we would be justified in entering upon if no concessions were made.

For my part, I agree with the statement of the leader of the opposition, that we should legislate for ourselves and not wait for any proceeding on the part of the United States. That is the dignified position to take. We ought not to legislate here with one eye always on Washington. It would appear that the government are going down to try and court favour with the United States. This government, it seems, will never have done with that kind of thing. But a singular thing in the hon. member for North Norfolk's position is the illogical nature of his utterances. He says :

Our importation of natural products into the United States is so insignificant and will be so insignificant in comparison with the great bulk of the products for consumption produced in this country, that very little effect can be produced by it. Take for instance the article of eggs. Last year we exported 11,590,000 dozen of eggs and 237,000 dozen of these went to the United States. One hundred and thirty-nine millions and eighty-thousand eggs ; quite a lot of eggs. We could not increase that export 50 per cent if we were to try. How much would that amount to in the United States. Why, Mr. Speaker, it would amount to less than two eggs per annum for each inhabitant of the United States ; one omelette a year. That would have a very disastrous effect on American prices would it not. Why it never would be known ; never.

He says also :

If we should get to that point the Americans would ask : What would you give us in return? We will say : We will abstain from punishing you as you deserve, we will abstain from changing our tariff so as to complete the process of the strangulation of the import trade into our country. If you give us free trade in natural products we may possibly abolish the British preference, a thing which in my private opinion we ought to do, anyway, and which will be such a concession as you ought to get.

When the American authorities read that speech, if the hon. member for North Norfolk is one of the commissioners, what sort of a bargain are they likely to make ? Why do the Americans wish to deal with us ? Do they wish to buy our products ? That this is not the case is proved out of the mouth of the hon. member for North Norfolk himself. It is our market they are after, and there cannot be any question

about that. The hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) says there is a growing feeling in the United States in favour of reciprocity. I believe there is. Not long ago, there was a convention at Detroit to discuss the subject, and some of our Canadians were there making speeches. But I have come to the conclusion it is our markets the Americans are after, and I agree with the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) when he says :

Reciprocity with the United States could not, in my humble opinion, benefit us in any way. We could not sell the Americans anything that they could not produce and if we open our gates to them they would flood us with their products.

That appeals to my judgment. I would be very careful about the kind of bargain made with the United States. If our commissioners go to Washington again, I am willing, as a representative of the people that they would make a bargain. But I am not willing that they should give away everything to the United States. What we want is a fair bargain. But we have it from the mouth of one of the commissioners that there is no intention on our part to give anything. In that case, the Americans must concede everything. That is the most absurd position that could be taken.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss briefly a question which has not been dealt with in this debate. Our discussion on this occasion has centered round the financial question and the trade question. These are very important subjects. But since I have been a member of this House, and for years before, the transportation question has received great attention from the members of this House, and from the people of the country. Long before I entered this House the matter had been discussed by the press and on the platform by the ministers and members of this House. And since I have had the honour to occupy a seat in this Chamber, I have listened to many instructive discussions on the subject and have received a great deal of information. But, hitherto, I have had nothing to say on the question. I have listened to the hon. ministers discussing this question. As on everything else, they have expressed a great variety of opinions, but they have done nothing. We are just where we were. In the session of 1900, the hon. member for East Simcoe formulated a resolution in this House like this :

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when a fixed and definite line of action should be undertaken on the question of the transportation of the grain and other commodities of the North-west Teritories, Manitoba and the Western States, with a view to centreing the same to the greatest possible extent in Canadian channels.

In the course of a learned discourse on this subject, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) of that time, speaking for the government said :

We all agree with the principle enunciated in this motion that the time has arrived when some definite line of action should be taken on this subject.

So, it would appear that, four years ago, the time had arrived when some definite action should be taken. And yet, nothing has been done up to this hour. It seems that the government have arrived at the sage conclusion that they are hardly able to grapple with the question, and they are going to hand it over to an irresponsible body of men. This is only a convenient way of shouldering aside a question of great importance. While I give a great deal of credit to the ex-Minister of Public Works for the energy he has shown, the information he has acquired, and the schemes he has promulgated in connection with this question, yet, in watching his course, I could not come to the conclusion that his judgment should be followed. His mind was burdened with the idea of constructing canals. Without speaking at length, I wish to put myself on record on this subject. I have come to the conclusion—and I see that the Minister of Finance expresses himself in much the same way—that our system of canals is completed. I take it that the hon. gentleman does not agree with any of these expensive schemes of the ex-Minister of Public Works. So far as the St. Lawrence system of canals is concerned, including the Welland Canal, and all the others, that system is equipped as perfectly as possible, and whatever expenditure is necessary to equip that waterway and fit it to carry the trade that may come to it should be undertaken. I would spend money enough on the lower St. Lawrence to make it safe and to lower the rates of insurance. But as for the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal, building a canal from Lake Nipissing to French river and North Bay, I am opposed to that scheme, it is utopian. I do not believe in it. While the St. Lawrence canal system has the effect of keeping down the rates, I think it is altogether too late in the day to start an enterprise of that kind. We know that it takes an immense amount of money to build canals in the first place, and then they are frozen up half the year. Transport over them is slow, and the canals are closed much of the time when the products of the farm are seeking a market. Therefore, I would not advocate spending any money on canals. It has been proved in the United States that with a good roadbed and large locomotives, the railways will transport freight at about the price of canals. Therefore, I would object to any utopian scheme like the Georgian Bay canal.

It is true that we may need another transcontinental railway. But I am satisfied that if the Canadian Pacific Railway were well equipped with plenty of rolling stock and locomotives, its carrying capacity could be increased two or three times over, and

we would not have these blockades that we have to-day. When blockades of freight take place I think the government should approach that great corporation and urge them to improve their equipment. Now this transportation question is to a great extent an agricultural question, because it is the agricultural products that have forced this question to the front. These products are increasing, and the farmers are becoming greatly interested in this question of transportation. But the farmer does not care very much how his goods get to market, whether they go through this route or that, so long as he gets them to market in good season, and gets good returns. A good deal of fault has been found with the Grand Trunk for making its terminus at Portland. We have the ex-Minister of Public Works declaring that there is no patriotism in money or business. He said he did not blame the Grand Trunk for making its terminus at Portland, because Portland was its natural port. The shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway have a right to expect the best possible dividends, and Portland being the natural port, the Grand Trunk carry a large quantity of grain to that port. It is the same with the farmer. He does not care which way his grain gets to the market so long as it gets there by the cheapest and safest route. His chief desire is to get his goods on the market in the best condition.

Another important question I wish to discuss is that of assisting the construction of railways by subsidies. Up to this time there has been an immense sum of money spent on the construction of railways. This country has spent $230,000,000 in money subsidies to railways, besides land grants and freedom from taxation. According to the last Statistical Year-book, we have now 18,140 miles of railway. The Dominion government has contributed toward their construction at the rate of $9,083 per mile; the provincial governments have contributed $1,771 per mile, and the municipalities have contributed $892 per mile. So our railways in Canada have been subsidized at the rate of $11,746 per mile. I think, Mr. Speaker, the day has arrived when this expenditure is becoming unnecessary. We certainly have reached a state of development when railway corporations should build their own roads. But as long as it remains the policy of this government to give subsidies, just so long will private enterprises refuse to put money into them. It seems inconsistent that we should talk about railway subsidies and freight blockades in the same breath. With freight waiting to be carried such as we hear about and we know to be the case, surely those ventures ought to pay. It ought to be considered a great concession to secure a charter to build a road in this country, and the government ought not to be asked to contribute. What is the history of railway building in the United States?

The people there have had to meet much the same conditions as those existing in Canada, and it is natural to inquire as to the policy they have pursued in reference to this question. So far as the United States government is concerned, it has never given a single cash bonus; all the aid it has ever given has been confined to assistance to transcontinental lines. The moneys advanced to them were secured by mortgage bonds which, with few exceptions, have been paid off, so that it has received back in interest and principal far more than the original amount advanced. In addition, the United States government has made large grants in public lands. The Western States, though, had a different policy, and gave so largely that several of them became practically bankrupt; but to-day no railway bonuses are given in the United States. In the Eastern States no bonuses in money or land were ever given. At the present time the railways constructed in Canada, with scarcely an exception, have been subsidized by the Dominion government to the extent of $3,200 per mile, but latterly the Dominion subsidy has been increased, so that if a road costs over $15,000 per mile it receives an additional subsidy of 50 per cent of the excess of the cost until the total Dominion subsidy reaches $6,400 per mile. The usual subsidy given by the provinces is $3,000 per mile, and is in addition to the Dominion subsidy.

The difference in the Canadian policy regarding railway construction and the United States policy, is well illustrated in the bridge built at or near the town of Cornwall, Ont. That part of the bridge lying in Canadian territory received subsidies from the Dominion and provincial governments to the extent of $125,000, and is practically free from taxes; while that part lying in American territory received no subsidy and contributes a substantial tax to the State of New York. The New York and Ottawa Railway was bonused on this side of the St. Lawrence, but received no bonus in the United States. Yet over the subsidized line in Ontario the fare is three cents per mile. And over its entire length on the other side the fare is two cents per mile. The passenger rate in New York is two cents per mile, and in the State of Michigan two cents. The Grand Trunk Railway has given a two-cent rate over all its lines in Michigan. If the subsidies that we give to railways had the effect of reducing rates, there might be a good deal to be said for them, for we would then receive back in the form of cheap rates at least a part of the outlay. But unfortunately the subsidies that we pay are not applied to any such purpose. They are realized on at once by those who receive them, and the road which is built is mortgaged and stocked to its limit.

Now, I would like to quote from a speech delivered by Mr. W. D. Gregory to the farm-

ers of North York, as reported in the 'Farmers Sun':

Let me quote you some of the rates which prevailed last year between the Western States and the seaboard, and between Ontario points and the seaboard, and the prices which at the same time the Ontario farmer and the farmer in the United States received. In May last year the Grand Trunk Railway carried grain arriving by lake at the town of Midland, from Midland to Montreal for 4½ cents per bushel, including terminal charges. At the same time it charged 8 4-10 cents per bushel for carrying from Midland to Montreal grain raised in the county of Simcoe and loaded on the cars from the local elevators. In October last, the rate on grain from Duluth to Montreal via the Canada Atlantic Railroad was 8⅓ cents per hundredweight, and the rate from Fort William to Montreal via the Midland Railroad 10 cents per hundredweight.

At the same time the rate from Markdale, Ontario, to Montreal, was 16½ cents per hundred-weight, or almost double the rate charged for the carriage of grain from Duluth to Montreal over a road heavily subsidized by you. At the same time the rate from Buffalo to Liverpool via New York was 11¾ cents per hundredweight, and the rate from Toronto to Liverpool 17½ cents per hundred-weight. Is it, therefore, surprising to find that at this time No. 2 red winter wheat was selling at Chicago for 69½ cents per bushel, and at Milwaukee from 68 to 69 cents per bushel, while in Western Ontario the price was from 65 cents to 65½ cents per bushel, and at Toronto 66 cents per bushel, the latter price being the highest then paid in the province?

It has often been wondered why wheat sells at a little higher price at Chicago than at Toronto, but the freight rates do the whole thing. It is explained easily in that way:

Another aggravating feature of the situation from the farmers standpoint is the frequent difficulty of securing sufficient cars for the local shipments. We all know the Midland railway; yet at one time not very long ago local grain buyers had to wait for weeks before getting a car to ship the produce of Ontario, while train load after train load of cars loaded with American grain rolled by the local station on their way to the seaboard. A large portion of this American grain had been accepted by the railroad subject to the condition that it should be delivered at the seaboard at a certain time, and in order that it might be delivered, Canadian shippers were deprived of the cars they might otherwise have received. The scheme of diverting American grain to Canadian routes did not work to your advantage on that occasion.

In my opinion it is not in the interests of the country that we should subsidize railways any more unless for colonization purposes and then there should be a lien taken on the road. I just want to give the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) the other day which was given by the hon. Postmaster General. The hon. member for West Elgin asked:

Has the government made any efforts to induce any of the immigrants coming to Canada to settle in Ontario?

I think the hon. Postmaster General made rather a curt reply to that hon. gentleman, and I do not consider that he gave a proper reply at all. This is the answer that he gave:

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The government in promoting immigration into Canada leaves it to the immigrants themselves to select the places in the Dominion where they desire to settle.

These poor immigrants are in the hands of an agent. If the agent were instructed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture as to the necessities of Ontario it would be an easy matter for him to switch off a number of these people and direct them to locate in Ontario. I want to bring this matter to the attention of the hon. acting Minister of Agriculture, because the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is not here. I regret he is not. I hope he may be at work where he is for the advantage of Canada. I understand he is cultivating very friendly relations with the Japanese. I am told that he is rapidly assuming the manner and even the appearance of these people and that he would be very easily mistaken for one of that nationality now. I hope the government will not risk losing permanently the services of that valuable minister. We have been spending half a million of dollars on immigration agents abroad, and we have coming into this country to-day an immense number of immigrants. It seems like the irony of fate that the government hardly know what to do with the immigrants now coming into this country when only a few years ago these hon. gentlemen were declaring that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not pay for the axle grease. I think under the circumstances that the money spent on agents in Europe might be brought home and used in providing accommodation for these immigrants here. I believe that the tide of immigration which has set in will continue and that the expenditure in foreign fields may be reduced, or that it may be brought to this country and used in looking after the comfort of these immigrants. I do not know that I would advocate the reduction of the expenditure, but there is no occasion for increasing it. The hon. Minister of Agriculture must know that this is an important question in the province of Ontario. It is becoming a matter of concern to the farmers in that province. The tenant farmers and labourers have gone to the west and a farmer cannot rent his farm, he cannot sell it and he cannot work it for want of labour. I have heard farmers in the province of Ontario make that statement again and again. They say: Are we to turn our farms into commons and allow the cattle to run over them? This condition is brought about by the fact that there is no labour to be had in the province of Ontario. I think it would be very easy for the immigration agents to

divert some of the stream of immigration into the province of Ontario. We have had deputations of farmers from the province waiting upon the local government and asking them to do something. There has been a promise made, but, owing to fortuitous circumstances, the government at Toronto has not had time to do anything. This is a matter that I desire to impress upon the attention of the government. This is the condition of affairs in the province of Ontario and I want to bring it before the government in the interest of the farming community because I represent a farming constituency and I am a farmer myself. I think I am a practical farmer because I was born on the farm, and in fact, I have lived off the proceeds of the farm all my life.

Now, I want to say something for the benefit of the hon. Postmaster General. I do not want to discuss that vexed question of his surplus at all. It seems clear that the reports are all askew in regard to this matter. They will not agree. The Auditor General's Report says one thing, the Public Accounts say another thing and the Postmaster General's Report, which would be expected to put the most favourable light upon it says another thing. There is one thing that I want to call to the attention of the House and it is the inferior postal service that is given in the province of Ontario. I know men engaged in mail carrying who are not getting as much as they should; yet, the hon. Postmaster General is supposed to look after the wages that labouring men get. There is another point that I want the hon. Postmaster General to take a note of. If this were not going down in 'Hansard' I might as well be talking to a vacuum, or to vacancy, because——

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Hear, hear.

Mr. VROOMAN. I hope the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Ross) is enjoying himself. I did not know he so considered himself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Surely you would not call 'Hansard' a vacuum.

Mr. VROOMAN. In Ontario the question of free mail delivery has become a real live issue. The farmers are asking for the free delivery of mails at their own homes. When you come to investigate this question you will find that it is a very important one. We know that farm life in Ontario, as elsewhere, is a hard life. I have no doubt there are many farmers who are well to do, who make a considerable amount of money and who have a good time, but the average farmer is not in that position. He works hard and his life is a monotonous one, so much so, that the boys and the girls leave home. The farmer, when his sons leave home cannot get help and anything that will make farm life more comfortable and enjoyable is going to do a great deal to improve the condition of the farmer. What I want to see is the adoption of a system of free mail delivery that will bring the farmer in contact with the outside world every day, so that, the boys insteads of going down to the village to hear the latest dirty stories and other trash in the evening he will have some inducement to remain at home. I want every farmer in Ontario who can afford it to have a telephone. That telephone question is coming to the front and I was glad to hear it discussed the other day at the Railway Committee. If the farm home has the telephone in it, if the farm home has the daily paper in it, then, the boys, when they come in from their work will be perfectly willing to stay there and if we can get them these comforts and other modern facilities such as the electric car, I am sure hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I say that the attractiveness of home life on the farm will be much enhanced.

There is no use arraying class against class as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis) did. We are enjoying prosperity and peace and plenty in Canada to-day, and what we want to do is to make the home happy. This is an agricultural country above all and it is my opinion that the interests of the farmers are kept too much in the back ground. It is true that the tariff is an important question, but the Minister of Finance told us that he was going to take the tariff out of politics and it occurred to me that if his supporters didn't talk tariff in this House they would have not much else to talk about. I know something of the condition of the farmer in Ontario and I take it that in other provinces his condition is about the same. I blame the educational system in Ontario that many of our young men are leaving the rural districts and seeking the cities, in many cases to their great loss. They are told too much about the advantages of professional life, and the advantages of agricultural life are neglected and ignored. Let us spend more money on agricultural colleges and experimental farms and send our boys and girls there to learn scientific farming and modern methods so that they can make farming pay. Sir, it seems strange that there should be such a discrepancy in the reports concerning the Postmaster General's account—the Postmaster General's Report, the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report all differ on this matter. I believe, Sir, that in the minister's endeavour to secure a surplus the service in some of its branches is being starved—the letter carriers and the mail carriers are in many instances not half paid. These cases have come under my own observation, and when we are in the estimates I intend to draw the minister's attention to it—I think this is a satire on the Minister of Labour. But, Sir, I wish to say that the farmers of this country are expecting an expression of opinion from the Post-

master General on the question of free mail delivery. This is a question that is growing in favour, and the people, the agriculturists, will soon demand it as a right. I believe, Sir, that the day is near at hand when we shall see the farmer have the daily paper delivered, when the farm house shall have its telephone, and when the electric car will be within easy reach—then home life on the farm will be enjoyable, the boys and the girls will not be discontented and want to go to the city; it will tend to make farm life more attractive, a thing much needed to-day.

This government has been fortunate in many respects but there is one thing left for them to be fortunate in and that is that the people of Canada should turn them out of power before the bad times set in.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 27, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 127) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George M. Depew.—Mr. McCarthy—by Mr. Logan.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 122) respecting the Rathbun Company.—Mr. Harty.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Eastern Townships Bank.—Mr. McIntosh.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Bank of Montreal.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 68) to incorporate the Lumberman's Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Charlton.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

WOODMEN OF THE WORLD.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 31) respecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—Mr. Calvert.

On section 3,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the attention of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has been directed to the wording of this clause. I thought possibly he might have some criticism to make as to whether it was justified or not. I observe it permits the order to invest in the bonds of any company incorporated in Canada whose bonds are adequately secured by mortgage to trustees.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The hon. Minister of Finance is not here just now, but I have no doubt the clause has been considered in committee and that he is satisfied with it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I imagine he is satisfied.

Bill reported; read the third time and passed.

QUESTIONS.

TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL.

Mr. CLARKE asked:

1. Has any protest been received by the government, and if so, on what date, from the Toronto District Labour Council, respecting the following cablegram, which apeared in the Toronto 'Telegram' of Wednesday, 8th of April:—

'NO MECHANICS AVAILABLE.

'(Special cable to the 'Evening Telegram.')

'London, April 8th.—In an interview given to a representative of the 'Pall Mall Gazette,' Mr. W. T. R. Preston, the Canadian emigration agent, stated that mechanics were simply unobtainable in Toronto, owing to the great demand for skilled labour in that country.'

2. Has any reply been sent to the protest received from the above council; and if so, when was it sent, and what was the nature of the reply?

3. Have any instructions been sent to Mr. W. T. R. Preston respecting the protest of the above council; and if so, what is the nature of the instructions?

4. Have any protests been received from labour organizations, other than the Toronto District Labour Council, respecting the statements alleged to have been made by Mr. W. T. R. Preston, in the interview above quoted ; and if so, from what labour organization ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. On the 23rd instant a communication was received from the secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada on behalf of the Toronto District Labour Council, with reference to a telegraphic despatch in the Toronto 'Evening Telegram' of the 9th instant, with reference to an alleged interview of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, with the representative of the 'Pall Mall Gazette,' wherein Mr. Preston is alleged to have made the statement in question and requesting that inquiry be made as to whether Mr. Preston has been accurately reported.

2. The communication was acknowledged on the 25th instant, and Mr. Preston has also been communicated with as to whether he has been correctly reported.

3. Instructions have been sent to immigration agents to confine their efforts towards promoting the immigration of agricultural classes.

4. A communication on the subject has also been received from the Federated Trades Council of Toronto and vicinity.

IMMIGRANTS FOR THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. EMMERSON asked :

1. Are any efforts being made by the immigration officers of the Dominion in Great Britain and Ireland to secure immigrants to settle in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island ?

2. Have any efforts been made to induce any of the immigrants who have recently reached our maritime ports, to settle in either of the said provinces ?

3. If any efforts have been made, or are being made, to secure such immigrants for the maritime provinces, or either of them, what is the nature thereof ? What means are exercised, and what methods adopted ?

4. Are any pamphlets descriptive of such provinces, or either of them being circulated, and to what extent ? What particular pamphlets are being circulated ; and by whom were they respectively prepared ?

5. Have any immigrants, as a result of any such efforts (if any), settled in any of the said maritime provinces ; and what number in each of said provinces ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The work of the immigration officers is directed to securing immigrants for the Dominion, leaving it to settlers to select the parts of the country where they desire to locate. Immigration literature, in describing the Dominion, incidentally refers to the various provinces. During the calendar year 1902, 3,161 immigrants arriving at a Canadian port declared their intention of settling in the maritime provinces, and 1,879 have done so for the first quarter of 1903.

COST OF DREDGES.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

What was the cost of the following dredges when built new :—'St. Lawrence,' 'Prince Edward,' 'Nipissing,' 'Canada,' 'Sir Richard,'? What number of yards capacity for each lift has the dipper attached to each dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

The 'St. Lawrence,' cost $114,911.23, has 33 buckets of 8 cubic feet on ladder.

The 'Prince Edward,' acquired from the Prince Edward Island Government at the time that province entered confederation, on payment of $22,000 ; capacity of bucket, 1½ cubic years. Original cost, $23,582.

The 'Nipissing,' cost $15,501.57, including two scows ; capacity of bucket, 2¾ cubic yards.

The 'Canada,' cost $41,300.19, has 24 buckets of 5 cubic feet on ladder.

The 'Sir Richard,' cost of hull and installation, $12,934.74. Her machinery is that formerly used on old dredge No. 7 ; and, as altered, it is valued at $3,000, making the total value of this dredge $15,934.74.

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER.

Mr. BELL asked :

1. Who is lighthouse keeper at Pugwash, N.S.?

2. Is he allowed to engage in any business ?

3. If so, what is that business, and why is he allowed to absent himself from his post ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. Murdock A. McLeod.

2. Yes.

3. The business of a stevedore in Pugwash harbour. At some stations where keepers are not paid sufficient salary to entitle the government to the whole of their time, they are allowed to engage in such private occupations as will not interfere with a proper performance of their work as lightkeepers. Mr. McLeod receives only $250 per annum, and has, therefore, been permitted to supplement his salary by work as a stevedore in Pugwash harbour. This permission was given with the proviso that it should not interfere with his personal discharge of duties as lightkeeper at night, and that when he is absent during the day he leaves some responsible person in charge of the station.

SPRINGHILL, N.S., ARMOURIES.

Mr. BELL asked :

1. Who is caretaker of the regimental armouries at Springhill, N.S.?

2. What is the age of the caretaker ?

3. Did Major Potter, of Springhill, resign his commission in the 93rd Regiment ?

4. If so, what action has been taken on his resignation ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden):

1. Joseph Wylie Potter.
2. Not known.
3. He tendered his resignation.
4. It was not accepted.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY RATES.

Mr. BELL asked :

1. What are rates over Intercolonial Railway for live stock, coal, lumber and for classification 1-10, between Stellarton and West River ; and between Stellarton and Antigonish ; and between Stellarton and Pictou Landing, at present ?
2. What were rates for same classes between same points in 1897 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair): The answer to the hon. gentleman's question would require quite an array of figures, and if he will kindly move for a return, I will furnish him with the information forthwith.

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM—SALE OF BUTTER.

Mr. MONK—by Hon. Mr. Haggart—asked :

1. What is the total amount obtained from the sale of butter at the Experimental Farm, Ottawa, during the past year ?
2. Is any portion of said butter disposed of gratuitously ?
3. If such gratuitous distribution is made, in favour of whom is it so made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. The total amount obtained from the sale of butter at the Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, during the year ending June 30th, 1902, was $703.80. The total quantity of butter produced during that period was 3,646 pounds. The above sum is the proceeds of the sale of 3,284½ pounds. Of the remaining 361½ pounds, a part was on hand on the 30th of June, 1902, and the proceeds of the balance sold during that month were not received in time to be included in the returns for said fiscal year.
2. No.

HEALTH ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. MONK—by Hon. Mr. Haggart—asked :

1. Have any regulations in council been passed under the Preservation of Health on Public Works Act of 1899 ?
2. Have said regulations been printed ?
3. To which of the public works referred to in report number 14, of the Minister of Agriculture's Report, of 1902, did Charles Fisher, the public health officer, make a personal visit ; and which of them were inspected by other persons ?
4. Was anything paid for the reports of physicians detailed in said C. Fisher's general report ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding).

1. Yes.
2. Yes; in the 'Canada Gazette' of May 25th, 1901.
3. Mr. Charles A. L. Fisher, the inspector under said Act, made a personal visit to all the public works referred to in his report, being Appendix No. 14 to the report of the Minister of Agriculture of 1902, with the exception of the Welland canal works, of which the inspector had such information that he did not consider a personal visit necessary. The department is not aware that any of said works were inspected by other persons.
4. No.

SALE OF PUBLIC LAND.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Has the government disposed of any public land by public auction in or near the city of Winnipeg recently ?
2. If so, how was it advertised ?
3. Who were the purchasers, and what was the price received for each parcel ?
4. What were the terms of sale ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. Yes, a portion of the outer two miles of lot thirty-five, in the parish of St. John.
2. In the Winnipeg 'Free Press' and by poster.
3. D. K. Elliott and R. T. Riley. The price per each parcel sold is as follows :—
Parcel No. 2, $9,782; parcel No. 3, $8,740; parcel No. 4, $6,000
4. One quarter cash at time of sale, balance in three equal annual instalments, bearing interest at five per cent per annum.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

Is it the intention of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister to recommend to His Excellency the Governor General the propriety of proclaiming the 17th of March, St. Patrick's Day, a public holiday, following the example of His Most Gracious Majesty the King ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to inform my hon. friend that the advisers of His Excellency believe that we have a sufficient number of public holidays in this country, and therefore it is not their intention to add another one to the list.

POSTAL FACILITIES AT ST. BONIFACE.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. Has the honourable the Postmaster General received a copy of the following resolution passed by the town council of St. Boniface, Manitoba, during its meeting of the 9th March, 1903 :—

'Moved by Councillor Cinq-Mars, seconded by Councillor Cusson, that the postal authorities

be requested to erect a suitable post office at St. Boniface ; and also, to give better postal facilities than exist to-day. Adopted.'

2. Is it the intention of the government to satisfy the just demands made by the authorities of St. Boniface ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. Yes.

2. The question of the erection of a public building at St. Boniface is under consideration.

3. The department is not aware of any request for better postal facilities at St. Boniface which has not been granted.

WELLAND CANAL WATER POWER.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. What is the quantity of water from the Welland canal per minute, or per second, in cubic feet, which has been granted, or promised, by Order in Council, lease or otherwise, and the duration of the concession, to the Hamilton Cataract Power, Light and Traction Company, limited, or its predecessors, the Hamilton Electric Light and Cataract Power Company ?

2. Have the said companies, or either of them, been authorized to take their supply of water from the Lake Erie level of the Welland canal?

3. What quantity of water, per minute, or per second, in cubic feet, can pass at present, or after the enlargement now in progress is completed, without detriment to navigation in and along the Lake Erie level of the Welland canal, from Port Colborne northerly to Allanburg ?

4. What quantity of water is required for the feed of the new Welland canal for purposes of navigation ?

5. Has authority been granted, or promised, to either of the aforesaid power companies to place any structures, dams, or other erections, in the Beaver Dams creek that will obstruct or otherwise interfere with the free flow of waste water from the old Welland canal through Higgins' flume, and in the channel of the said Beaver Dams creek, which latter privilege the government enjoys by agreement from riparian land owners ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. 700 cubic feet per second leased. Twenty-one years renewable to January 1st, 1906. Lessee—Hamilton Electric Light and Cataract Power Company, Limited.

2. The lease gives the right to draw the water from the Lake Erie level.

3. Say 2,000 cubic feet per second.

4. From 250 to 300 cubic feet per second.

5. No.

RIVER NAVIGATION IN MANITOBA.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. Has the following report of a committee of the Winnipeg Board of Trade been submitted to the honourable the Minister of Public Works ?

'Winnipeg, 18th March, 1903.

'The President and Council,

'Winnipeg Board of Trade.

'Your committee appointed to report on the Assiniboine river as a navigable stream, beg to report as follows :—

'1st. That all the bridges now existing on the Red and Assiniboine rivers, east of Portage la Prairie, have been constructed with swing spans.

'2nd. That the population along the banks of the Assiniboine is becoming dense enough to provide traffic on the river.

'3rd. That with the completion of the St. Andrews locks and dam, it is believed that an impetus will be given to river traffic.

'4th. That the extra cost of providing for a swing span is inconsiderable.

'5th. Therefore, the committee recommend that the board should use every means to have the Assiniboine and Red rivers retained and held as navigable streams ; and to that end, that representations be made to the Minister of Public Works.

'All of which is respectfully submitted.

'ANDREW STRANG,
Chairman.

2. Will the minister refuse to authorize the construction of any permanent bridges on the Red and Assiniboine rivers, unless such bridges are provided with swing spans ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes—on the 7th April instant.

2. It is the intention of the department to preserve the navigability of this river.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND (North Essex). Mr. Speaker, the splendid financial showing of the budget speech, on which the hon. Minister of Finance and the government received such well deserved congratulations, was received on this side of the House with unqualified approbation; and indeed it seems to have been received also with approbation on the other side of the House, because our hon. friends opposite are, like ourselves, Canadians, and could not but for the moment forget their party feelings in the pleasure and satisfaction which they felt at the splendid showing of the hon. Minister of Finance on this occasion. In this respect they gave an apt illustration of that sentiment so well expressed by a Canadian poet—the 'love of country soaring far above dull party strife.' But there is something more important than the spirit in which the budget was received in the House and that is the way in which it was received by the people of Canada at large. And if one can gather from the sentiment expressed by that exponent of public opinion in Canada, the public press, the facts set out in the budget speech have been greeted with approval from one end of Canada to the other and have aroused the greatest possible satisfaction—a satisfaction which will no

doubt find vent in new trade activity among our people.

Before addressing myself particularly to the matter in hand, I desire to offer a word or two of sympathy to my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). Three years ago he was elected to the honourable and responsible position which he now holds, and shortly afterwards the debate on the budget was announced. At once my hon. friend began to look around among his followers to find one best capable of filling the role of financial critic. His eye fell on an hon. gentleman who enjoyed a great reputation as a financier, and who was naturally expected, when he entered the House, to become an able financial critic. That hon. gentleman essayed to follow the hon. Finance Minister in his first budget speech of this parliamentary term. Did he come up to the expectations formed of him by his leader at that time and the party opposite ? Did he answer the requirement of a financial critic, in the opinion of his friends on the other side ? Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the fact that since that time that hon. gentleman has not been asked to repeat the performance is abundant evidence that he did not. In the year following, 1902, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition again looked around among his followers for some one competent to take up the mantle dropped by Hon. Mr. Foster when he left this House. It was rumoured that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) had been qualifying for the position. And so eager was his desire to lead the attack, that he sprang to his feet no less than sixty times during one afternoon and evening of the first session of this parliament. It was also reported that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was girding up his loins for the same work. And evidently there was no lack of foundation for that report, because our hon. friend from East Grey went the hon. member for Bothwell one better by rising to his feet about ninety times on another afternoon and evening of the same session. Then came the session of 1902, and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition found himself compelled to take up the task himself because he was unable to find any hon. gentleman behind him to whom he could safely trust it. I am bound to say that the hon. gentleman acquitted himself very well, but how he relished the duty we can judge by what happened between the session of 1902 and the present one. Between 1902 and 1903, a chorus arose from the Conservative leader, members, party and press, the burden of the song being a request to the hon. Mr. Foster to consent to be returned to the House. Hon. Mr. Foster did not turn a deaf ear to their pleadings and consented to present himself as a candidate in North Ontario. But North Ontario was obdurate, and instead of answering the prayer of the Conservative party to elect its financial critic, answered the prayer of the Liberals by returning Mr. Grant to this House. Again the leader of the opposition was compelled to search among his followers for a financial critic, but despite his most vigilant search, he was unable to find one. It really seems to me that out of sympathy for their leader, who has so many other duties to discharge, some hon. gentleman on that side should qualify for the position and relieve his leader from this one which usually devolves on the first lieutenant of the party in opposition.

In reply to the budget speech this session, the hon. leader of the opposition made some very sweeping statements. On page 1479 of 'Hansard' he is reported to have used these words :

> I think we all pretty well know what was done; goods coming to us from the mother country had the duty increased upon them in 1897, and then the merchants of the mother country were presented with a preference which left the rate of duty practically the same as that which is paid on the imports from the United States, even if you take into consideration dutiable goods alone.

I submit that is not in accord with the facts. I submit that, as a general proposition, it is entirely inaccurate; and if it be, then I think it is pernicious, coming as it does from so prominent a member of this House as it will tend to lower the good opinion the British people will have in reference to integrity, good faith and reliability. It may be true and it is that the tariff was slightly raised on a few articles of cotton, and some of wool, but with the 33⅓ per cent off the rates of duty on even these are substantially reduced under the preferential tariff to what they were under the tariff prior to 1897. I submit that there is not an hon. member opposite who can point to a single item of the tariff which under the preferential rate is equal to or higher than it was under the former tariff.

While I am anxious to give every credit to the hon. leader of the opposition for frank and honest criticism, it seems to me that he was far from displaying these qualities in the language I am about to quote. He said, as reported on page 1475 of 'Hansard' :

> Is there not some attraction to a certain class of people in this country when a surplus of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 is announced ? There are people in this country as well as in every other, whose chief concern about the public revenue is to appropriate some of it to their own use under the guise of a parliamentary vote.

That is a statement which, I submit, is not creditable to the hon. gentleman. He could not have ignored the fact that the hon. Minister of Finance had stated explicitly that the surplus was to be applied not in improperly assisting party friends but in a manner most gratifying to the people of this country, namely, to the reduction of the public debt. Not only is the public

debt to be reduced, but it is to be reduced by about $6,000,000, which makes this the best financial record in the history of Canada. Hon. members opposite invariably, when dealing with the question of surpluses, refer back to statements made in other times and under other conditions by leaders of the Liberal party. But the people of this country are not so much concerned with what the certain members of the government may have said ten or fifteen years ago, as with what they are doing in the present day. What particularly interests the people is the manner in which the business of the country is being carried on. I do not agree with those who blame the government when they have a surplus, who find in a surplus nothing but an occasion for adverse criticism. In my opinion, there are several ways in which a surplus may be a matter of usefulness. When there is a large surplus, as at present, it can be used to reduce the public debt. That is what the hon. Finance Minister has told us he intends doing. In the next place, the fact that we have a large surplus of itself attracts the attention of other countries to Canada and gives Canada a higher position in the world at large. Then there is another advantage arising from a large surplus, and that is the effect it has in stimulating trade and commercial activity, opening up every avenue for progress and expansion. The knowledge that our public finances are in such a condition that we have a surplus of $13,000,000 inspires public confidence.

The leader of the opposition seems to be very much concerned about the fact that we are buying so much more from the United States than we sell to them. That is something we would all prefer to see a little different. But, if he sympathizes with us in that respect, he must sympathize with the efforts of Mr. Chamberlain to sell more British goods to Canada. But he seems frequently to give forth this idea—that we should deal with our brethern in Great Britain practically as he says the United States deal with us; we should seek to keep them out of our market. This, I suppose, is another sample of the Conservative patriotism we hear so much about. The policy of the Liberal government is to admit the British goods under a tariff which admits of reasonable competition, while that of the Conservatives seems to be to leave to our British brethern only such small crumbs and pickings as they can gather under a high protective tariff. A good deal is said by the Conservatives about the preference and about the probability of our getting a preference in return. This matter has been somewhat changed, perhaps, even since this debate began. But Sir Charles Tupper, Mr. Foster and the present leader of the opposition seem to have moulded their policy on the belief that a small preference should be given to Great Britain for which we should get a small preference in return. But we know that it has been declared clearly that no small preference will be considered as of importance by the British statesmen. Mr. Chamberlain and others have said so, and have even gone to the extent of saying that a preference of 33⅓ per cent was not of much value. So, whatever chance the Liberal party, with the preference now afforded, may have had to get a preference in return, the Conservative party, with its declaration that the preference is too high and should be lowered, have no chance whatever.

Beyond this, I desire to consider, for a moment or two whether or not the preference has been of any considerable benefit to our British brethren. One would think at the outset that the matter was scarcely worth discussing. It would seem quite obvious that an advantage of 33⅓ per cent would be a wonderful advantage to such merchants and manufacturers as those of Great Britain. But hon. gentlemen opposite criticise it, and even our friends across the water criticise it as of very little importance. It strikes me that if representatives of British and American manufacturers were to come to Ottawa and seek to sell to one of the merchants here the same class of goods, the merchant realizing, as he must and does, that, buying goods from Great Britain under the preferential tariff, he will be charged 33⅓ per cent less duties on bringing them from Britain than from the United States and this will be a great inducement to buy from the British manufacturer, as it will be such an aid to him in selling to the Canadian purchaser. It has been said that this preference is of no consequence, but we see cases in which it must have been and has been of a great deal of consequence. It would have been of more consequence if our British brethren had realized its possibilities and seized upon it as they ought to have done. But in this, as in other matters, they seem not to have the necessary knowledge of the conditions in this country, and so they are handicapped as compared with the manufacturers of the United States. Now, I do not know where the position is put so well as it is in the colonial conference blue-book 1902, in a memorandum prepared by our own commissioners in answer to the memorandum prepared by the representatives of the British Board of Trade. At page 121 of this book, our commissioner deals with a couple of the conclusions in the British memorandum. Section 13 of that memorandum is quoted as follows:

> We should not expect to find any material effect exerted by the preferential tariff in the case of heavy and bulky goods in which freight bears a high proportion of total value, and it is precisely in these classes of goods in which the main increase of Canadian imports has recently taken place. It is also in these classes of goods e.g., coal, grain, raw cotton, timber, iron and steel, and heavy manufactures thereof,

such as bridges, girders, rails, engines, &c., that the United States, by geographical contiguity as well as wealth of natural resources is to a large extent beyond reach of any competition from the United Kingdom in the Canadian market even if aided by a greater preference than that now accorded.

Then they quote also from section 14 in the British memorandum :

The articles stated are :—Metals and manufactures thereof, coal and coke, grain and breadstuffs, meat, dairy produce, and fruit, wood and manufactures thereof, raw cotton.

Having quoted these, the Canadian commissioners then deal with and criticise these statements in the following practical and forcible way. At the same page :

If we eliminate the dutiable imports of such articles in which it is admitted that Great Britain cannot compete in the Canadian market even if aided by a much greater preference than that now accorded, and compare the progress of trade in the balance of dutiable imports, it will be found that the preference has been of substantial advantage to Great Britain.

Then they proceed to give this statement :

THE following statement shows the net dutiable importations for consumption after deducting these articles.

1901.		1897.		1893.	
	$		$		$
Total from all countries..	70,849,785	Total from all countries..	48,133,701	Total from all countries..	47,772,916
Increase 1897–1901	22,716,084	Increase 1893–1897	360,785		
Rate of increase, 47 p.c.		Rate of increase, 1 p.c.			
From Great Britain.....	28,052,385	From Great Britain.....	17,603,948	From Great Britain.....	26,559,888
Increase 1897–1901	10,448,437	Decrease 1893–1897	8,955,940		
Rate of increase, 59 p.c.		Rate of decrease, 33 p.c.			
From United States.....	24,493,414	From United States....	16,378,627	From United States. ...	13,406,351
Increase 1897–1901	8,114,787	Increase 1893–1897	2,972,276		
Rate of increase, 49 p.c.		Rate of increase, 22 p.c.			
From other countries....	18,303,986	From other countries....	14,151,126	From other countries....	7,806,677
Increase 1897–1901	4,152,860	Increase 1893–1897	6,344,449		
Rate of increase, 29 p.c.		Rate of increase, 81 p.c.			

Then, at the end of page 121 and the top of page 122, they summarize in this way :

These figures are instructive.

Briefly stated they show, first, that between 1893 and 1897, the imports from Great Britain declined by 33 per cent as compared with an increase of 22 per cent from the United States, and an increase of 81 per cent from other countries. But a change took place during the following four-year period when the preference was in operation. During that time British imports increased 59 per cent, United States 49 per cent, and other countries 29 per cent. The increase in the total from all countries was at the rate of 47 per cent.

Then they summarized the whole thing on another page, 125, in the following words :

It might be remarked here that if any doubt exists in Britain as to the substantial nature of the preference granted by Canada in favour of British goods, certainly none exists in the United States. The manufacturers there have found it necessary to reduce their prices to Canada to offset the preference.

To conclude and to summarize it is respectfully submitted :—

1. That the preference is a substantial and genuine one.

2. That it gives British merchants a material advantage over foreign competitors in the foreign markets.

3. That the preferential rates are not too high to shut out reasonable competition with the Canadian producer.

4. That the preference has resulted, not only in arresting a continuous decline in British trade but in stimulating the trade. If it had not been granted it is not very likely that the volume of British imports into Canada would be as large as it is to-day, to say the least.

5. That the advantage given by Canada to the British manufacturer is proved beyond all question. If he has not fully availed himself of it that is not the fault of the Canadian government, or of the Canadian fiscal policy.

Surprise is sometimes expressed at the trade we are doing with the United States, but there are reasons why that is not unnatural. We are lying alongside that immense country for thousands of miles, and the nearness of the Americans to Canada enables them to become vastly better acquainted with the people of Canada than are the British people across the water. One of the things that we complain of from time to time is the fact that the British people do not seem to acquire, as quickly as the Americans, a knowledge of Canada and of Canadian wants and interests, and as a result they are not able to compete with the Americans in our market. It appears from the statistics quoted in this blue-book beyond doubt that if Mr. Chamberlain, before making his speech, had had before him the facts and figures which were set out in that memorandum of our Canadian com-

missioners, he never would have said what he did about the preference, and certainly he would never have attempted to belittle it. The preference which we have given Britain over the United States is a real and true preference, it is a preference which the condition of things between Britain and the United States on the one hand, and Canada on the other, makes perhaps not as effective as we would like it to be, but makes it one which helps the British manufacturers and minimizes the consequences of the fact that the United States manufacturer is closer to the Canadian market than the British manufacturer.

Now the leader of the opposition has made, in a moment of candour, a significant statement, as a former leader of the Conservative party made once in a moment of weakness. On page 1471, the leader of the opposition, speaking of the large expenditure made by this government, said this :

> I do not pretend for a moment that these increases are all unjustifiable. On the contrary, I regard some of them at least as entirely justifiable ; indeed, I should be glad to see the increase larger in some cases.

Now the criticism of the leader of the opposition amounts to this : The expenditures are very large, and I criticise them on that ground ; but I cannot and do not point out a single instance in which they are too large. I would point that out if I could, but I cannot. Indeed, if I were Finance Minister, there are some cases were I would make expenditures larger. I do not think a criticism of that sort will appeal very strongly to the people of this country. He is the watchdog on the opposition side to whom the public is looking to see that the government does not make an extravagant expenditure ; and when the people of Canada are looking to him, all they can find is the statement that although the expenditures are large, he does not know in what respect he would reduce them ; that while the expenditures are large, in some respects he would make them larger. I think the people will see in that statement one more testimony to the efficient and business-like administration which this government is giving to the country, one more testimony to the fact that the opposition cannot complain of the existing condition of things.

Another ground of complaint that we hear from across the floor during the progress of this debate, is that the government is taking too large a revenue from the people. But the obvious answer to that is that if hon. gentlemen opposite had their way, if they were able to introduce the higher protective tariff which they had in vogue prior to 1897, millions of dollars more would be taken out of the pockets of the people, that is to say, millions of dollars more in revenue would be collected, of course assuming that the same amount of imports would have come into the country under the late tariff as under the present tariff, which is very questionable. Again, there is a consideration arising out of this budget debate which strikes us as peculiar on this side of the House, and must strike the country in the same way, and that is the question as to what is the real tariff policy which hon. gentlemen opposite would introduce if they had an opportunity of doing so. We hear a great deal of general talk from the other side, but we never hear an exact definition of the tariff policy which they would bring down to the House, stated in such precise terms as that we could discuss it and see in what respect it differs from ours. It seems to me that the present government, when they created this tariff, were guided by a principle of moderation that must always be followed in conducting the affairs of this country. Very recently a book was published in this country which gave the following estimate of the character of the leader of this government :

> Moderation is the keynote of his career, and the secret of all his achievements.

It seems to me that this characteristic, along with the splendid abilities which have made the present Prime Minister so successful in his administration, also belonged to another great Canadian, perhaps the greatest public man that Ontario has yet produced, Sir Oliver Mowat, who has recently died, and is now being mourned by all true Canadians, moderation was the great characteristic of his magnificent life, and was the secret of his wonderful success. This same moderation is required in the government of this Dominion, in view of the varying conditions of the people, and of its varying industries and material wants, and no fiscal policy can be successful in this Dominion which is not based on the principle of moderation, and which does not have as its keynote the intelligent compromise which characterized the tariff policy introduced in 1897. Rightly or wrongly, the public have thought that the Conservative policy was one of high protection for a few interests, and that any measure of protection which might be given to the great farming interests would be merely incidental. That seems to have been the impression which the people of Canada have got.

Now we have five great sources of national income upon which we do our national housekeeping. Some of our industries, particularly manufacturers, it is generally admitted require some protection ; but the real question is how far can we go in protecting manufactures and at the same time deal fairly with the other great interests that require consideration at our hands. I believe that the true policy was inaugurated in 1897 by the present government. We can judge by results as to whether that tariff was a good one for the manufacturing interests or not, and under that tariff the manufacturing interests of this country

seem to have progressed and prospered in a remarkable degree. I am one of those who believe that when the time comes to revise this tariff, we can safely leave the work to the government that has dealt so successfully with the various large public interests in the past, feeling assured that no interest, manufacturing or otherwise, will be sacrificed or jeopardized by them.

I believe heartily in the care of the manufacturing industries of this country, because wherever large manufacturing concerns arise success and prosperity follow in their train. The very construction of a large manufacturing building gives employment to various sorts of artisans. The moment a manufactory is started wages are paid out with which to rent homes or build homes, money is distributed amongst the merchants in the various parts of Canada, and in one way or another all along the line a great manufacturing establishment is a very useful thing for the people in any locality in the country. But while that is so, the interest of the agricultural class is a matter of equally great concern as that of the manufacturing class of the country. If we make the farms of Canada attractive, if we seek to do what we can for the farming interests, if we encourage men to go upon the farm and stay there, if we take care of the immense numbers of people who are coming into Canada to take up lands, we are going to help create that great home market which we all appreciate and which our manufacturers are particularly anxious to have, and to my mind the best thing we can do, not merely in the interest of the farmers themselves, but in the interest of the manufacturers as well, and in the interest of every other class of the community, is to do all we can to aid and assist the farmers. This government has been seeking to do that in various ways, by assistance in transportation facilities, by assistance in the way of providing cold storage facilities, by diffusing information and the results of experiments among the farmers, and thus making them, I believe, more intelligent than their competitors in other countries. This work has been aiding and assisting the agricultural classes very much, and in the railway commission which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) proposes to pass this session we will have railway rates attempted to be remedied, we will have the cattle-guard question dealt with, we will have drainage across railway property provided for, and in these ways the agricultural classes will be still further benefited. On the other hand, in the revision of railway rates, in the power taken by the government of reducing duties on raw material, in the increase of the home market that the government is concerning itself about—in all these respects the manufacturer will be benefited as well.

Now, one would think at times, although that story seems to be getting a little weaker, that, in the opinion of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, under the existing tariff, manufacturers could not exist or prosper, and that new manufactories could not be started. Is that true? Do the facts warrant any such view as that? Is it not the fact that the existing manufactories of the country are for the most part, and as a general thing, very successful and prosperous at this time? I think that I can appeal confidently to almost every hon. member when I ask him to look upon the manufactories in his own immediate locality to bear testimony to the fact that in the main the manufacturers are prosperous. The introduction of large manufacturing concerns into this country proves that under the present tariff business men are not afraid to invest their money in these enterprises. In this connection I desire to read a couple of extracts, which, coming as they do from unbiased authorities, are extracts which I regard as being more forcible and effective than the mere statement of an hon. member of this House. On the 14th October, 1902, the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, presented a statement to the meeting of the shareholders of the company for the first six months of that year, and in presenting that statement he made use of these remarkable words:

> A very interesting return had been prepared by the traffic department. During 1901 no fewer than 115 new industries comprising many large works and manufactories were established or put in course of establishment along their line in Canada, representing a capital of $5,541,000, and 51 industries along the line of the Grand Trunk Railway in the United States with a capital of $1,985,000. It would be difficult to afford a more practical illustration of the prosperity of the times and of the increased carrying capacity of the Grand Trunk Railway arising therefrom.

It seemed to me, when I read it some time ago, a most remarkable statement, that along the line of one railway in Canada no less than 115 new, and many of them large, industries and manufactories in one year were commenced or in course of commencement representing a capital of $5,541,000. It is a complete answer to those who say, or who attempt to say, that under the present tariff manufactories are not being started and are not prospering in this country. But there is another citation which seems to me to be a very important one. In the Montreal 'Gazette' of November 27, 1902, there is a statement which Major John L. Bittinger, Consul General of the United States in Montreal, furnishes to his own people on the other side of the line. It is not at all likely that this United States officer is going to exaggerate the facts in this report, a report sent to his own government, and which reads as follows:

The people of the United States are aiding largely in the development of Canada. Within the last year, millions of dollars have been invested here in agricultural and timber lands, mining and manufacturing industries.

Canada is also showing wonderful enterprise in self-development. People are throwing off their conservatism.

I do not know whether that refers to the election of 1900 or to the previous election.

When industrial openings are presented to them they no longer take a year for consideration, but investigate promptly, and when satisfied, invest liberally.

Many American syndicates have been looking over the ground in Canada during the last few months. A significant fact to those connected with the paper industry is that the largest of these syndicates, the Gres Falls Company, is controlled by men prominent in the International Paper Company. The Gres Falls Company was organized in April last, and owns water power and extensive spruce limits at Three Rivers. The company is capitalized at $500,000, and it is said to be the intention to develop the industry at once.

LAND PROJECTS IN WEST.

The investments made by Americans in agricultural, grazing, and timber lands amount to many millions of dollars. Only recently, a Columbus, O., syndicate purchased 600,000 acres in the North-west Territory. A Minneapolis and St. Paul syndicate has purchased a much larger area, and is promoting emigration from the western states to the Canadian North-west, to which over 50,000 settlers have gone during the present year.

The consul-general then specifies the following industries, either recently established or about to be started and financed wholly or partly by American capital.

Louis B. Jennings, New York, has recently organized the Canadian Steel and Coal Company, capitalized at $6,000,000. His properties consist of 4,000 acres of iron ore, and 3,000 acres of coal lands.

Claus A. Spreckles and W. W. Cool, of New York, have made application for the incorporation of the Federal Sugar Refining Company, Limited. The capital of the company is $6,000,000. The refinery will be located in Montreal.

Theodore P. Burgess, president and general manager of the Burgess Sulphite Pulp Company, of Berlin Falls, N.H., has closed a deal with the Quebec Department of Lands, Forests and Fisheries, for the purchase of 600 square miles of timber on the Upper St. Maurice river.

BIG PLANT FOR TORONTO.

Another large American industry has decided to evade the duty of 25 per cent on agricultural machinery, and establish itself in Toronto. The new firm will be known as the American Abell Engine Thrasher Company; it has taken over the Toronto Abell Works. Behind it are two of the largest thrashing-machine manufacturers in the world. Their agents have already placed orders for 1,000,000 feet of hard-wood lumber. The new company is to have $1,000,000 of capital stock, and it will employ about 400 men. The company will erect a large warehouse and machine shop at Winnipeg.

The Westinghouse Company, of Philadelphia, the Ingersoll Sargent Drill Company, of New York, the Port Huron Thrashing Machine Company, of Port Huron, Mich., and the Deering Harvester Company, of Chicago, are engaged in the location of great plants in Ontario.

The Oil Exploration Company, of Canada, a new concern, has been incorporated with an authorized capital of $200,000, with the head office at Walkerville, Ont.

The Canadian Coral Marble Company has been incorporated, with the head office at Toronto, with an authorized capital of $500,000, of which it is said, the largest amount is American.

AMERICANS AT ST. JOHNS.

It is stated that as a result of the investigation made by American capitalists in St. Johns, Que., an extensive plant for the manufacture of porcelain enamelled baths will be established there.

The Locomotive and Machine Company, of Montreal, has just been incorporated to carry on business. The capital stock is $1,000,000, largely American.

Letters patent have been issued incorporating Robert Stuart, of Chicago, Walter Donald Douglas, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and several Canadians as 'The Northern Cereal Company.' The capital stock is $2,000,000, the majority of which is American.

The meat-packing firm of Swift & Co., of Chicago, recently purchased the property of the Fowler Canadian Company, of Hamilton. A new pork-packing plant is to be erected, which will be larger than any like establishment in the Dominion.

The Haines Piano Company, of Rochester, N.Y., has purchased the old Hess factory, at Toronto Junction. It is enlarging the plant, and will employ 200 hands.

A charter has been granted the Clover Leaf Mining Company, with a capital of $1,000,000. The head offices are at Toronto. A majority of the capital is American.

The Buffalo Forge Company, a $1,000,000 corporation, has declared its purpose of establishing a branch factory in Canada.

MONTREAL GETS A PLANT.

A New York Company has in operation in Montreal a large plant which makes lumber fireproof.

The American Bridge Company, of New York, has been licensed to carry on business in Ontario at a capital not to exceed $100,000.

The Globe-Wernicke Company, of Cincinnati, manufacturers of school supplies and special lines of furniture, is to establish a plant at Stratford, Ont.

A party of Americans is preparing to erect in Ottawa a factory for the manufacture of spades, shovels, and garden tools. The capital stock is $100,000. The company will employ 100 hands.

John Critchley, representing the American Actinolite and Asbestites Company, of New York, says that his company has commenced operations in Hastings, Ont., by working some actinolite properties. Mr. Critchley intends to establish works in Canada to refine the actinolite, which is used in the manufacture of heavy paints.

The Stohl Wagon and Farm Implement Company, of Harrisburg, Pa., will be removed to Toronto within the next month.

Letters patent have been issued for the Northern Aluminum Company, with a capital of $500,000, organized for the manufacture of aluminum and other ores. The company has erected a building at Shawinigan Falls, and is already at work. The capital is largely American.

The Montreal Novelty Company has been established here by New York parties.

Letters patent of the province have been issued incorporating the Imperial Pneumatic Tool Company, with a capital stock of $25,000. The capital is nearly all American.

TO MAKE PNEUMATIC TOOLS.

Premier Peters, of Prince Edward Island, has announced an agreement with a firm of Canadian and American capitalists, which insures for the island the most complete and modern outfit of cold storage appliances that can be obtained. The capital of the company is $1,000,000.

An important tobacco firm in Pittsburg, Pa., has written the Dominion statistician for details respecting the cultivation of tobacco in Canada, with a view, if circumstances are favourable, of establishing a large factory for the manufacture of cheroots and 'stogies.'

The International Harvester Company erecting a plant at Hamilton, will employ 1,500 hands.

The Altman-Taylor Implement Company, of Peoria, Ill., will soon establish a branch in Canada.

The Canadian Woollen Mills Company, at St. Hyacinthe, has passed into the hands of American capitalists, who will hereafter operate the industry.

The Laurentides Pulp and Paper Company has an immense plant, and has built up around it the thriving town of Grand Mère.

The latest announcement in connection with the incoming of foreign industries is the news that the International Paper Company, a gigantic concern, is about to utilize the areas it has secured in the Three Rivers district and establish pulp mills in that portion of the country.

This, Mr. Speaker, is on the whole a splendid testimony as to the manner in which capital is being attracted to Canada. This report shows that level headed business men are prepared to risk their money in Canada; it shows that Canada is prosperous under the present tariff, and it shows that few if any countries in the world are so prosperous.

Now, Sir, in my estimation, the policy of the present government has been a most skilful, statesmanlike, sane and manly policy; and, in various ways. In the first place preferential tariff was a very great stroke of political genius for not only did it reduce taxation to the Canadian consumers and assist British trade, but it also struck somewhat of a blow at the United States, and some of us are not adverse to a little of that sort of thing if the United States do not treat us somewhat better. And, Sir, the preferential tariff strengthened the ties of the empire and increased Canada's national status. In the second place the reductions in duties were with respect to goods chiefly imported from the United States and were made for our benefit. The Liberal party draws the line against a policy of retaliation or conservatism which would simply cut off our nose to spite our face. In the third place the preference in favour of the West Indies showed a commendable disposition to help a weak member of the empire and to recognize the responsibilities of the empire. In the fourth place, the opposition were prepared to allow their resentment to cause them to go right at Germany at once without conciliation or negotiation at all; but the policy of the government was quite the reverse. The government tried conciliation, they tried correspondence, they tried every reasonable, sensible, and moderate means, and when they were not able to induce the Germans to do what was fair and right, then the Canadian government adopted a policy of retaliation which all Canadians have heard of with the greatest satisfaction. Instead of starting out with fisticuffs as the opposition wanted, the government started with correspondence and negotiations, and when that would not do we ended up with a little fisticuffs on our own account. Now, in addition to all this, and in view of the fact that Great Britain does not appear to think very much of this preference; in view of the fact that she is not very well informed as to this preference and seems to look this gift a little askance, Great Britain is now told: If you do not think the preference is any good; if you are not prepared to deal with us on a little better terms then you deal with countries which give you no preference, then we will have to consider what we will do with the preference. It is also true, Mr. Speaker, that this government has made all reasonable and fair efforts to induce the people on the other side of the line to adopt a little more friendly and favourable trade policy towards the people of this country, and they are given a slight intimation by this government that if they persist in doing as the Germans are doing, one of these days they may have something of the same sort happening to them. All and all, Mr. Speaker, the policy adopted by this government is in the truest and best interests of the people of the country at large. And why should we change from this policy? Why should we change from the prosperous conditions which prevail under this policy to go back to the conditions which existed under the national policy. The national policy was reported at the start to be a wonderful policy. We were told that it would cause manufactures to start up in the most marvelous way, and would bring work and wages, comfort and prosperity and happiness to the people of Canada. But we tried it for eighteen years and with what result? Why, at the end we had made practically no progress; our population had scarcely increased. In one way and another we found that that policy was a failure. When we contrast the period before 1896 with the period from 1896 to 1902 we see in the former period a stagnant trade, an impoverished treasury, an exodus of the very cream of our population, manufacturing going on in a very slow way, and the Conservative government too busy with

its own strifes to do much for the country. But since 1896 we see a most wonderful reverse policy; a most wonderful reverse picture. We see trade going ahead in the most wonderful way at a greater ratio than that of any country in the whole world. We see a bouyant revenue; an overflowing treasury; lower taxation; reduction of the public debt; immigrants pouring into the country; the North-west being rapidly developed; factories working up to the limit of their capacity and railways projected in all directions. Surely no man, no patriotic man who desires the best interests of the people of Canada would want to recede from this present splendid condition of the country and go back to the conditions that obtained prior to 1896. Time and again in days past, eminent men have spoken of the possibilities of Canada. They have made predictions as to the future of Canada; they have pointed out that with her resources and the intelligence and pluck and enterprise of her people she was able to make extraordinary progress. But that progress did not come until the accession to power of the Liberal party and the inauguration of their policy. But now, when the east has commenced to know something more about the west, when the older parts of Canada are commencing to know more about the west and the North-west; when the various parts of Canada are being brought together by railway and other transportation facilities; when the people are beginning to understand the great resources of this country; when we are commencing to be advertised at home and abroad; when we are begining to attract population and capital; now, these pictures that others have presented in times past are being realized. One eminent man who was Governor General of this country has spoken perhaps more beautifully than almost any other man of this magnificient young country of ours, and of its great possibilities. Fortunately he lived to see the day when some of his predictions were to an extent realized. He had travelled all over Canada; he had come to know our people and to understand their intelligence, enterprise, and pluck, and he pointed to the future. I refer to Lord Dufferin who used these words :—

From its geographical position and its peculiar characteristics, Manitoba may be regarded as the keystone of that mighty arch of sister provinces which spans the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It was here that Canada emerging from her woods and forests first gazed upon her rolling prairies and unexplored North-west and learned as by an unexpected revelation that her historical territories of the Canadas, her eastern sea-boards of New Brunswick, Labrador and Nova Scotia, her laurentian lakes and valleys, corn lands and pastures, though themselves more extensive than half a dozen European kingdoms were but the vestibules and anti-chambers to all that tell them their undreamt of Dominion whose illimitable dimensions alike confound the arithmetic of the surveyor and the verification of the explorer. It was hence that counting her past achievements as but the preface and prelude to her future exertions and expanding destinies she took a fresh departure, receive the afflatus of a more imperial inspiration and felt herself no longer a mere settler along the banks of a single river but the owner of half a continent and in the magnitude of her possession in the wealth of her resources, in the sinews of her material might the peer of any power on earth.

I believe, Sir, that if the splendid policy commenced and perpetuated by this government is carried on for some years to come; if members on both sides of this House do their duty to this young country; the glowing predictions made by Lord Dufferin and others will soon come to pass and Canada will take that high rank among the nations of the world, which her resources and the character of her people entitle her to take.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman from Essex (Mr. Sutherland) in his opening remarks extended his sympathies to the leader of the opposition, because that hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) had himself undertaken the task of making a reply to the speech of the Finance Minister. Well, Sir, as an humble follower of the leader of the opposition I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) that the leader of the opposition is not at all in need of his sympathies. The hon. leader of the opposition undertook the task of replying to the Finance Minister and he acquitted himself in a highly creditable manner; in a manner which won encomiums from political foe as well as from political friend. And when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) says that the leader of a party should be relieved from such a duty, I can quite understand that if the position of parties in this House were reversed, how anxious, nay how eager hon. gentlemen opposite would be to relieve their leader from that duty because they would find him scarcely big enough to fill the bill. The hon. leader of the opposition has always been equal to the occasion when called on to speak, whether in reply to the budget speech or at any other time. We feel proud of him, and he has received encomiums from all parts of the Dominion upon having made one of the best speeches in reply to the budget speech ever delivered in this House. This is but the third session that the hon. member for North Essex has occupied a seat in this House, and I think it came with rather bad taste from him to attempt to lecture the hon. leader of the opposition as to who should or should not undertake the duty of replying to the budget speech. It is true, those who have the honour to follow the leader of the opposition in this House may not be possessed of the transcendent abilities of the hon. member for North Essex; they may not be imbued with the same amount of egotism or conceit; but they have endeavoured to acquit themselves creditably by talking from a business standpoint, unlike hon. gentlemen oppo-

site, some of whom have spoken as free traders, some as protectionists, and some as revenue tariff men, each one catering to the narrow view of the particular constituency he represents.

The hon. member for North Essex has referred to the prosperity which Canada is enjoying. This is a favourite theme of hon. gentlemen opposite. As lovers of our country, as men who put country before party, we on this side of the House also rejoice in the evidences of the country's prosperity, and at the fact that Canada has not yet entered on that down grade towards a period of depression which is bound to come in the natural course of events. The hon. Finance Minister himself admitted that two years ago, when in his budget speech he prophesied the return of a period of depression. This prophecy, he says, has been somewhat delayed in its fulfilment, and he rejoices, as we all do, that the trade of Canada is still on the upward grade. It is a fortunate thing for Canada in one respect that the Conservative party at present occupy the opposition benches. Were the positions reversed, were a Conservative government in power, and were we taking from the people the large amounts of revenue now being taken, imposing upon them the large taxation now being imposed, and piling up the spurious surpluses which hon. gentlemen opposite are gloating over, we would never hear the end of these things from hon. gentlemen opposite, who, when it suits their purpose, do not hesitate to go the length of libelling their country and prejudicing her in the eyes of the world. This has been their history in the past, and, unless they have changed greatly, it will be their history in the future. Now, you do not see Conservative speeches ornamenting American immigration literature to the detriment of our country. You do not find Conservative leaders playing the unpatriotic part of visiting the American republic and advising the statesmen of that country how best to put the screws on Canada, in order to make her subservient to American interests. Nor do you find them lauding American states as fields for settlement to the detriment of their own country, nor advocating a policy that would result in our tariff being made at Washington. We have, however, witnessed these and other things of a like character when the opposition benches have been occupied by the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, who, in their despair, have resorted to every expedient to reach the goal of their ambition, the treasury benches. We trust that the good example set by the loyal and patriotic Conservative opposition may prove beneficial to them, so that when again, in the course of a short time, they come to occupy their proper places on this side of the House, patriotism will be a more prominent feature of their conduct, and that in this respect their past record will not be repeated.

The hon. leader of the opposition has so well acquitted himself in that able address of his, in which he dealt with everything of importance touched upon by the hon. Finance Minister, and he has been so ably followed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that little remains to be said of an original character. But it is the duty of an opposition to indulge in legitimate criticism of the government's policy and record, past and present, even at the expense of a certain amount of repetition.

Now, if there is any body of men, in the history of this or any other country, who have laid themselves open to adverse criticism and to charges of inconsistency, duplicity, double-dealing and want of statesmanship, it is the hon. gentlemen who now constitute themselves the representatives of the Liberal party of Canada and the so-called government of Canada. Why, Sir, there is scarcely a promise which they made to the Canadian electorate, and on which they secured their support, that they have not shattered ; there is scarcely a profession which they made that they have not openly abandoned ; there is scarcely a policy which they formerly advocated that they have not turned their backs upon ; there is scarcely a principle to which they formerly gave their allegiance that they have not ignominiously violated or repudiated. This is the second parliament in which I have occupied a seat in this House ; but the time has been long enough to enable me to witness an amount of political acrobatism on the part of these hon. gentlemen to which the past history of the parliament of Canada has not afforded a parallel. Lines of policy advocated on this side of the House which at the time met with the jeers and the strenuous opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite, have been adopted by them ; and the very men who formerly belittled and decried them now uphold and applaud resolutions, clear cut and decided, setting forth the policy of the Conservative party of Canada. Questions of great national importance which formerly met with the gibes and sneers of hon. gentlemen opposite, have since, in almost identical words, been put forth at the intercolonial conference as the expression of the views of the government of the day, in their attempt to obtain that which they formerly described as absurd and impossible. We all remember how the desks were pounded and how this chamber rung with the plaudits of the government supporters when a member on that side of the House rose and said how absurd it was to expect that England would impose an import duty upon or tax food stuffs, and how they cheered when members accused the Conservative party of want of loyalty and patriotism for even daring to ask that England should give to Canada a preference in her markets. We have seen that tax on food stuffs imposed. We have seen hon. gentlemen opposite not merely asking, but

demanding that Canada be given a return preference in the British markets; and these same gentlemen have applauded to the echo, not the mere request, but the threat of the government that unless this preference were granted, Canada would hold herself free to withdraw the preference accorded to England in our markets. With so docile and subservient, though none the less inconsistent a following to the puzzled Conservatives, the skill of these hon. gentlemen as political acrobats and humbugs can scarcely be over-estimated. To the old-time Liberal, who in years gone by was led to believe that when Canada had an expenditure of some $38,000,000 or $40,000,000, the country was fast drifting on to the shoals of bankruptcy, it must come as a rude shock and surprise to be now told by these former prophets of evil that an expenditure of $65,000,000 is justifiable and commendable and deserving of their support. Party lines are pretty strongly drawn in this Canada of ours, and the average follower will forgive his political leaders a great deal, but still I think to the honest Liberal it must be with many an inward gulp and an extra prayer for forgiveness that he attempts to mark his ballot for those who have betrayed his confidence, secured his vote under false pretenses, and who now in their pharisaical manner attempt to justify and condone that which they formerly denounced as ruinous and inexcusable.

The policy laid down by the late Sir John Macdonald that a government should not rush into huge expenditures of public money merely because we had a buoyant revenue but should rather prosecute the necessary public works in periods of depression, when labouring men are more in need of work, is, in my opinion, a wise and judicious policy. The hon. gentlemen on the government benches seem to have reversed this policy. They are heaping huge burdens on the people and leaving to posterity the trouble of paying in periods of depression the large debts they are creating. These large surpluses which they were wont to declaim against in days gone by as an evil, they now laud as evidences of statesmanship. But these much-vaunted surpluses are really not surpluses in the proper sense of the term. They are simply moneys wrung from the people for the most indefensible purposes and to suit political and party exigencies. These hon. gentlemen will find it far easier to incur large expenditures, to pile up our debt and increase our taxation in a period of prosperity than to reduce these expenditures and come back to a normal condition in a period of depression. I need only quote an authority which will be acceptable to hon. gentlemen opposite to back up my opinion. I refer to that authority, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, who, in criticising the budget speech delivered by a Conservative Finance Minister, used the following expression:

Now it is quite true so long as we continue having this prosperity the mischief of this may not be so apparent, but even the hon. Minister of Finance will hardly venture to say that he has any patent that will enable him to secure a continuance of this prosperity for ever, and the moment the check occurs, the moment times become in the slightest degree hard, then, Sir, our surplus will disappear, but unhappily our taxes will remain. And the scale of expenditure which the hon. gentleman is now fixing will remain too; there is no more difficult task than to cut down, or materially reduce the expenditure of any country, when it has been allowed to attain a certain figure.

If these words were true and applicable at a time when our expenditure was only $40,000,000, they are doubly true and applicable to-day, when our expenditure amounts to the enormous sum of $65,000,000. Since these words were uttered, we have had an addition to our annual expenditure of $23,000,000, an addition to our taxation of some $16,000,000, and an addition to our public debt up to the 30th of June, 1902, of about 13,000,000. Or, in other words, to the burdens of each family of five there has been added an increased expenditure of $19 per year, an increased taxation of $15 per year and an increased debt of $13 per year, or a total increased burden of $47 annually. If public men are to be allowed to hold one set of opinions and views out of office and another set in office, then responsible government becomes, in the words of the Finance Minister, a farce. And if the words I have just quoted are true, when applied to an expenditure of some $40,000,000, how much more forcible are they when applied to an expenditure of some $65,000,000?

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition visited last fall our western country. He met the people from the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia and from the North-west Territories, face to face, and learned for himself, at first hand, their wants and requirements. The hon. gentleman was welcomed by all the people irrespective of politics, for if there is one characteristic for which the average westerner is noted more than any other, it is his hospitality to the stranger. Our western people admired the practical and outspoken sentiments of the leader of the opposition. They appreciated his candour and honesty. They realized that they were not being addressed by a mere vote-hunter, but by a gentleman who was appealing to them on broad and national lines, who was not trying to secure their support on any sectional issue, who was not endeavouring to set one class against another, who was not seeking to persuade the farmer that his natural enemy was the manufacturer, but who was appealing to the people on a broad national policy which he believed to be in the best interest of the country. In fact the Toronto 'Globe' was rather surprised and shocked that the leader of a great party should give evidence of what that journal considered a tactical blunder. The display by a public man of

so much candour and sincerity came upon it as a revelation. It was something which the 'Globe' was not accustomed to witness in either the leaders or the followers of the Liberal party. Hence its surprise. Contrast the frankness of the hon. leader of the opposition with the subtlety displayed by the right hon. leader of the government. The right hon. gentleman visited that country in years gone by and proclaimed himself out there as the apostle of the new gospel of free trade. He almost made the farmers of the west weep, as he recounted to them in graphic language the great burden under which he declared they were groaning 'Death to protection,' was his battle cry, and the sonorous tones of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), as that hon. gentleman took up and repeated the cry, rolled across the verdant prairies and reverberated through the distant hills and gorges of that western country. The right hon. gentleman promised to strike off every shackle that fettered the tiller of the soil and to make this country a cheap one to live in. How was he to accomplish that purpose? By giving the farmers free raw material, by lowering the duties on the necessaries of life, by reducing expenditure and by divers other methods—all of which would only be put into effect if the Liberal party were returned to power. Well, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman, in the course of time, reached the goal of his ambition, and he has now been some years enjoying the sweets of office. Has he kept faith with the people? Why, there is not one promise on which he has not turned his back. His broken pledges confront him on every hand. Is it then to be wondered at that the people of that western country should have welcomed with open arms the leader of a party which has been consistent with its principles from 1878 down to the present, which has invariably been true to its policy of preserving our Canadian markets for our Canadian people.

The Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) stumped Brandon in 1896 in the interests of the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy. From one end to the other, that county was placarded with the motto: 'Vote for McCarthy and free agricultural implements.' He told the people that they were being robbed in order that the manufacturers of agricultural implements might amass huge fortunes. He touched their hearts and their pockets by appealing to them to return the Liberal party to power and put an end to this deplorable condition of affairs. Let me contrast this appeal with the speech made by the hon. gentleman for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). He said that the people of the west are perfectly satisfied with the tariff as it stands.

Now, what has occurred in relation to the tariff to change the hon. gentleman's opinion since 1897? If the hon. gentleman will look up his speech in 'Hansard' in 1897, when the present tariff was submitted to the House he will find that he declared against the tariff and stated that the people would not be satisfied particularly with this duty on agricultural implements, and that he himself was not satisfied with it. The tariff was the same then as it is to-day. Why, then, does he state that he is satisfied?

The hon. gentleman said speaking of the farmer, in case of an increase in the tariff——

> —he will have to pay so much for his mowing machine and his rake, so much more for his plough, so much more for everything else he uses on his farm.

Now, these were the remarks of the hon. member for Saskatchewan. The Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) during the Brandon campaign of 1896, preached the same doctrine. He told the farmers they were being discriminated against by the manufacturers sending their machines to England, Australia and elsewhere and disposing of them at $90, whereas the Canadian farmer had to pay $140 to $150. The Minister of the Interior has somewhat changed his tune. He tells the farmers now that not only is this not a protective tariff, but the duty of 20 per cent on agricultural implements is not even an average revenue tariff. Reduce it, he says, and what condition of things will be brought about?

Nine thousand workmen now engaged on Canadian soil will make their homes across the line, there to swell the population of the American republic and buy the products of the American farmer. And, for a while, there must be a reduction of the price of machines by the slaughtering of American goods. But, afterwards, up would go the price of machines, and the last stage of the Canadian farmer would be worse than the first. Good Conservative doctrine. What a wonderful effect the responsibilities and emoluments of office have had in changing the hon. minister's opinion. He tells us now that if you reduce the duty you will increase the price of goods. But the hon. member for Saskatchewan tells us that if you increase the duty you increase the price. I would advise these gentlemen—both of whom were in the Lisgar campaign—to get together and have a little rehersal, so that when they address the people they may tell the same story. But if this is true as applied to agricultural implements, may it not be equally true as applied to other industries? Why draw the line at agricultural implements? Take, for instance the very few articles upon which there have been a reduction. They have been mentioned before, but they will stand repetition. Take the case of barbed wire and binder twine. Barbed wire was reduced in duty; but that which was promised did not come about—there was no reduction of price. On the other hand, the farmer is paying more for his barbed wire than he did when the Conservative

government was in power, notwithstanding that the duty has been reduced. The simple reason is that the Canadian barbed wire industry has been crushed out, the Americans have a monopoly of our market and we are now under the domination of the American combine. Binder twine was placed on the free list by this government, although the duty was only 12½ per cent. And binder twine is higher in price than it was under the Conservative government. Thus the very thing that the Minister of the Interior now tells us will come about if there is a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements has come about in the connection with barbed wire and binder twine. Now, some of our opponents, especially the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) declared that we cannot protect the farmer. However, there is a member of the cabinet one of the hon. gentleman's own colleagues who does not agree with him. I refer to the Minister of Custom (Hon. Mr. Paterson). That hon. gentleman is at heart a protectionist. We have had a good certificate of character given him by a gentleman who ought to know the facts. 'Birds of a feather flock together'—and the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has been working in harmony with the Minister of Customs for years, and now he thanks him for having stood up in favour of keeping the tariff as high as it is. The Minister of Customs thinks the farmer can be protected, unless he has fallen from grace in recent years—which could hardly be the case in view of what we have been told about him by the ex-Minister of Public Works—but he makes his own views subservient to party interest. The hon. Minister of Customs said :

> The administration should protect our agricultural interest. Such a duty would not in any way bear upon the consumer and would be of great advantage to the interests concerned. The small duty on grain would benefit the farmers of this country. It is well known that we pay a bonus to the inhabitants of other countries to come into Canada and settle in our midst. I believe, by a defensive tariff, that you would not have to pay to bring those men here. Adopt it, and you will find that the steam whistles of our factories will be the call for them to come. The other year, the Finance Minister, in revising our tariff, gave some encouragement to one industry which it never had before. The result was that one thousand men who were engaged in that industry in Germany, were literally transported by the change in the tariff to Canada and set to work here. The cost of the article was not increased one iota, and Canada got all the benefit.

So, the Minister of Customs advocated protection not only to the manufacturing industries but to the agricultural industry as well. But some of these hon. gentlemen take the ground that because the farmers dispose of their products in the markets of the world it is impossible to protect them. No greater fallacy could be propounded. When it is realized that not less than 80 per cent—I think that is a fair proportion—of the farmers' products are consumed in Canada, will any intelligent man pretend to say that the home market is not the most valuable market ? Keep that market for our farmers, shut out the unfair competition of the products of the American farmers coming in here, and you will secure better prices for our farmers. I do not think anybody will gainsay that proposition. The home market is the best market. Selling in the home market does away with a great deal of the expense necessary to place our products in the markets of the world. It does away, to a large extent, with freight rates, insurance charges and other charges incidental to the shipment of our grain to a long distance. If we can protect our market properly by adequate duties we shall, as I say, afford a better market to our farmers. There were imported into Canada from the United States during the last year, of the products of the farm, as follows :

Animals	$ 751,623
Breadstuffs	7,432,530
Fruits	2,433,974
Provisions	2,257,183
Seeds and roots	1,205,435
Vegetables	370,419
Total	$14,451,164

Will any man say that these cannot be grown on our Canadian farms or that they should not be ? These importations displace Canadian products which would have been sold here had they not this unfair competition to contend against. Take also the following list of articles that came in from the American side last year :

Butter	$ 179,479
Cheese	245,489
Bacon and hams	656,024
Beef (salted)	123,242
Pork, barrelled	587,784
Meats, dried	193,328
Other provisions	565,366
	$2,550,712

We have sent our money over there for these articles to enrich the American farmers, that we should have kept in our own country to go into the pockets of our own Canadian people. Now what is the key to this position ? If we compare the duties imposed by the Canadian tariff to those imposed by the American tariff upon the same articles, you will find a solution to this difficulty :

Article.	American Tariff.	Canadian Tariff.
Wheat	25 cents a bush.	12 cents a bush.
Oats...	15 cents a bush.	10 cents a bush.
Barley	30 cents a bush.	12 cents a bush.
Pease..	40 cents a bush.	10 cents a bush.
Hay....	$4 a ton.	$2 a ton.
Apples	75 cents a brl.	40 cents a brl.
Potatoes . ..	25 cents a bush.	15 cents a bush.
Beans..	45 cents a bush.	15 cents a bush.
Butter.	6 cents a lb.	4 cents a lb.
Corn..	15 cents a bush.	Free.
Wheat flour.	75 cents a bush	60 cents a brl.

Is is at all surprising that, with this discrepancy in the tariff duties, we have so large an importation of staple articles coming into our country from the American farmers ?

But, Mr. Speaker, if there is one feature of the trade policy of the present government upon which, through their erratic course, they have left themselves open to ridicule, it is their action with regard to preferential trade with the mother country. They came into power on the promises of getting a mutual preference, promises sacredly made to the people of Canada, promises made in addresses delivered by the Prime Minister prior to the election of 1896, wherein he lauded the advantages to be derived by Canada if the products of our farmers were admitted into the English markets on a preference over the products of other countries, when he pledged his word to the people of Canada that one of the first acts of his government upon their accession to power would be to send a commission to England to negotiate a basis for preferential tariff with the mother land. The hon. gentleman was returned to power in 1897, and the Minister of Finance propounded his tariff policy, which he himself and those who followed him declared not to be a preference to Great Britain alone, of which any other country in the world could avail itself by complying with the conditions of our Canadian tariff. But the tariff was an illegal one, and though its defects were pointed out by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, the government would not be guided by our advice. The matter was carried to the Privy Council and was there decided against them, and were it not that England came to their relief and denounced the German and Belgian treaties, they would have made themselves the laughing stock of the world. When the Prime Minister visited England, in the very first speech he delivered after landing upon English soil, did he attempt to impress upon the people and government of England the necessity of granting Canada a preference in her markets ? On the contrary, he told them, in those brilliant phrases of his, that Canada did not take into consideration at all any preference to be granted in turn by England to Canada, Canada's action was taken out of the fullness of our heart, we did not ask or desire a preference. The people of Canada were astounded when they read these remarks of their Prime Minister. They could not understand how that hon. gentleman, coming so recently from the electors, who was sacredly bound by his word that he would endeavour to obtain a preference, immediately on arriving in Great Britain, betrayed his country and went back upon the policy he had formerly advocated. The hon. gentleman when he was in England made use of the following expressions :

> Now, Sir, this is what we have done deliberately, and for this let me tell you, gentlemen, the Canadian government and the Canadian people ask nothing in return. They have done it out of gratitude to the motherland. They do not ask any 'quid pro quo' ; they do not ask for the pound of flesh ; they do not require a price for their loyalty.

Language calculated to tickle the ears of the particular audience he happened to be addressing at the time. Now the people of Canada took him to task upon his return to this country, but still the members of his government scouted the idea of our seeking a preference in the old country market. Resolution after resolution introduced by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in favour of a mutual preference, was voted down. The Liberal press of Canada stated that if the Conservative party were returned to power one of the first things they would do would be to repeal the British preference, this one bright and shining act of their administration, although in the performances of which they had sadly bungled, this one feature which has since been denounced by its own friends. British statesmen like the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain have denounced this preference as entirely worthless to Great Britain. At the Intercolonial conference, Mr. Chamberlain spoke with no uncertain sound, and stated that the authors of this preference to England were themselves disappointed with it; and speaking as a member of the British government, he and the English people were disappointed at the results. Well, the English people had evidently been humbugged with regard to this preference; they did not realize that a confidence game was being played upon them by our Canadian ministers when this tariff of 1897 was submitted, raising the duties upon importations that came over from England before applying this preference of 33⅓ per cent in favour of English goods. The English people were deceived by the spurious cries of loyalty on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite and by their press. The members of the British government were particularly pleased when the Prime Minister stated that he was giving them a cut of 33⅓ per cent on their general tariff, but they failed to understand that the Canadian government had already raised that tariff before doing so.

Now after what has taken place, what must the British statesmen think of our Canadian statesmen, so-called, when they compare these high sounding phrases of the Prime Minister in 1897 with their state-

ments committed to paper in black and white at the colonial conference? After the Prime Minister had stated that Canada had granted this preference out of the fullness of her heart, and that she desired nothing in return, we find it laid down in black and white, in a memorandum submitted to the British statesmen by our representatives to the colonial conference, that unless a preference is conceded by England to Canada, Canada will hold itself free to abolish the British preference. This is the only intelligent interpretation that can be placed upon that declaration. Very soon, no doubt, we may hear the Prime Minister reiterating his sentiments of 1892, when he declared:

> Our duty is to Canada, not to England. Just as the British government teaches this government that the first duty of the British government is to England and not to Canada, so I insist that in all these matters it is for any self-governing colony to look to its own interests, first, last and always.

Those were the notable words of the Prime Minister when he was advocating unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and which probably we will hear again in the near future.

Consider once more the government's position with regard to Germany's treatment of Canada since the abrogation of the German and Belgium treaties. Time and again hon. gentlemen in the Conservative party have pointed out the unjust discrimination to which Canada was being subjected at the hands of Germany by having the maximum tariff levied upon the products of Canada that were imported into that country, whereas German goods were imported into this country under the guise of the British preference to the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth. Immediate action was urged by gentlemen on this side of the House, but the government refused to take our advice. In fact the hon. Minister of Finance, as recently as last session, attempted to defend and justify the action of Germany in its treatment of Canada. The Liberal press of Canada attempted to establish the extraordinary claim that Canada was not being injured by this discrimination. It condemned the Conservative party for advocating what it said was a policy of retaliation, and it upheld the government for not protecting Canadian interests. But, as in other respects, the government was forced to yield to a growing public opinion, and the coon came down. The government has abandoned its former position, and now we see it levying on future importations from Germany a one-third higher tax than that under the general tariff of 1897, as a result, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) says, of its own blunder. Now, we will hear, and we do hear the Liberal press and Liberal speakers applauding the recent action of the government, showing that there is no corner so sharp that they cannot take the turn. Take, again, the government's position in regard to the question of reciprocity. Prior to 1896, prior to the Liberal government's accession to power, it was, they said, the easiest thing in the world for the people of Canada to secure a fair reciprocity treaty with the Americans by those whose hearts were in the business. That able luminary of the government, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) stated that if his leader were in power the feat would be accomplished by the mere scratch of a pen, and that within twenty-four hours he and his friends could secure a fair reciprocity treaty. The ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Sir Louis Davies) followed in a similar strain and claimed that any honest man could secure this treaty. We, therefore, watched with increasing interest the negotiations that were carried on by these gentlemen for six months with the statesmen of the American republic. We thought, surely, that if in the words of Sir Louis Davies, one honest man could secure a treaty, this aggregation of honest men, representing the government of Canada, would be able to secure a treaty. What was our surprise—I will not say surprise, but it must have been a surprise to those who pinned their faith to the government's declarations—when these hon. gentlemen announced their failure to secure a treaty of reciprocity with the people of the United States. The only legacy we have of the attempt of these hon. gentlemen is an account for $34,000 for the high jointers expenses. Then, we had the right hon. Prime Minister rising in his place a very few sessions ago, and declaring that after all Canada is not anxious or desirous to secure a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Now we have the negotiations again pending for a reassembling of the joint high commission in the near future, and we have this announcement following closely upon the heels of the notice that has been served on the home authorities that unless they grant a preference Canada will abolish her preference to the mother country. Can it be that we are once more to have the American dollar preferred to the English shilling? Are we once more to hear from the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) that Canada owes nothing to Great Britain save Christian forgiveness for the bungling she has done? Are we to hear him raising the issue again—give me the seventy million market that lies right at our doors? I would rather that we should be excluded from the markets of the world than that we should be excluded from the markets of the American republic? The right hon. leader of the government told us upon one occasion:

> It is absurd to suppose that, situated as we are, the interests of Canada will always be identical with the interests of Great Britain. Some day must come when these interests will clash, and whatever the hon. gentlemen may

be, for my part, whenever it comes to that, and however I may regret the necessity, I will stand for my native land. I, for one, when I made up my mind in favour of this policy of unrestricted reciprocity, looked first and last to the interests of Canada and not to the interests of England. Let the British subject who sits in the British parliament look after the interests of England. I do not believe in the principles of the United Empire Trade League, for the reason that that scheme limits trade to allegiance. It proposes to make allegiance the basis of trade, whilst we desire to make trade interests alone the basis of trade.

It was rather a different kind of song that the right hon. gentleman sang when he was in England, and when he based his whole policy on the question of sentiment and on what we owed to Great Britain. Stranger things may come to happen than to see these hon. gentlemen falling back upon the policy which they advocated in years gone by. These hon. gentlemen, with their devious records, have become experts in the accomplishment of turning somersaults, and they will stop at no policy in order to cater to political party exigencies. Now, we have to-day, a balance of trade against us with the United States of $67,000,000 per annum. It is true that we purchase from Germany seven times more goods than Germany purchases from Canada. Last year we exported in settlers effects to the United States, notwithstanding the stopping of the exodus referred to by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Sutherland), $1,502,265, and this has been steadily increasing every year since the Liberals came into power. We imposed on British imports, dutiable and free a tax of 17·18 per cent, whereas, we imposed on United States imports dutiable and free a tax of 13·20 per cent, notwithstanding the British preference. This, in days gone by, would have been seized upon with avidity by our opponents as evidence of gross discrimination against the mother country. The government have extorted from the people by way of this spurious surplus, upwards of $13,000,000 during this present year more than was necessary to meet the exorbitant demands of this most extravagant government. The hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) has been starving his service and his department in his vain efforts to make a little political capital for himself at the expense of his employees, who are over worked and underpaid. We have seen the administration of justice prostituted in the interest of party ends; we have seen political criminals released from the consequences of their crimes. We have seen members of the government resorting to all sorts of legerdemain in their efforts to create a fictitious surplus by charging to capital account that which was formerly and properly charged to ordinary expenses. We have watched with interest the declaration of the hon. Minister of Finance year after year to see if he would implement the pledges of the preceding year, but all we have seen is that he has been jollying us, to use the street vernacular, and no intelligent man can say what the policy of the government is. These hon. gentlemen are always ready to trim their sails to catch the popular breeze, no matter how contradictory their course may prove to be. We have, to-day questions of great national importance to grapple with, and questions which should be grappled with in the near future, questions such as the granting of local autonomy to our great North-west Territories, so as to allow them to be more self governing and not to be hampered by unnecessary restrictions. We have the great transportation question to solve, a question of national importance, particularly to the great west, whose productions have already assumed gigantic proportions, and for the moving of which it is necessary that we shall have improved transportation facilities. We have these and other important questions to grapple with, but the present government seems not to have the courage or capacity to cope with them. On the other hand, the record and history of the Conservative party are a safe guarantee to show that it has within its ranks sufficient statesmanship to cope with and carry to a successful issue these great important questions involved in the building up of a great and thriving nation.

The Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald and his able and distinguished colleagues of the past securely and firmly laid the foundations of our present prosperity, notwithstanding the opposition they met at the hands of their Liberal opponents, and the criticisms and carpings they indulged in at that time. And, Sir, now that we are reaping the benefit of his statesmanship, now that we are having the great west filled with an incoming population—the country that was referred to in years past by Liberals as being a wilderness that it would be a doubtful benefit to open up to civilization—now that Canada is reaping some of this prosperity that is universal in its character; we find these hon. gentlemen opposite attempting to take to themselves all the credit as being the originators and authors of it, thus stamping themselves as political mountebanks, whose professions are as foundationless as they are absurd.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not intrude further on the attention of the House, but will simply say in conclusion: It is my intention to support the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition; first, because it is definite in its policy and cannot be misunderstood; it is based upon the underlying principle of protection that has done so much to make Canada what she is to-day. Second, because I am convinced that the people of Canada prefer and desire that a party aspiring to govern this young country should have some policy that cannot be misunderstood; some principle underlying that policy—though certainly our amendment

will be misrepresented by hon. gentlemen opposite, as would any declaration of policy on our part. And in the third place, Sir, because the government, though they have been in office for seven years and have had ample opportunity to formulate a definite policy, have lamentably failed to do so, and have simply been actuated by political expediency, and political expediency alone.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, those fortunate mortals who had been summoned to a banquet of the gods, on their return reported that the bill of fare was very scanty, and that the nectar had made three or four rounds of the table before they were called upon to take a sip. My hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Sutherland) made an allusion to my hon. colleague the leader of the opposition which was of a highly complimentary character. He said that several other gentlemen on that side had been selected to criticise the statement made by the Minister of Finance and that they had not been found adequate to the task. He said that the leader of the opposition, not having anybody behind him capable of ably criticising the speech of the Finance Minister, took that duty upon himself. My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) intended it as a compliment and in no way as disparagement of or a flaunt at the learned leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition was well within his rights when he challenged the speech of the Minister of Finance, but he incurred a great responsibility in doing so. No living mortal could fathom what was the intention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax). Perhaps he was actuated with the desire of heading off some of the divergent opinions of his supporters; perhaps he wished to prevent the policy of the Finance Minister from being too largely expatiated upon or too much explained before he promptly presented his amendment. Now, let me ask: What has the learned leader of the opposition left out by his resolution? His amendment is, that after the word 'that' the whole of the motion should be struck out, and his amendment substituted. Now, Sir, the leader of the opposition has left out of consideration our gross trade of $423,000,000, the largest trade enjoyed in the history of Canada; he has left out a revenue of $58,000,000, the greatest in our history; he has left out a surplus of $7,000,000; he has left out a reduction of $5,000,000 in the debt; he has left out of consideration also the generous provisions for all the services of the country and for all the public works throughout Canada—a more generous and sensible provision than ever was made in the history of the Conservative party. That the statement of the Finance Minister was satisfactory to the country, we have the opinions of bankers, of capitalists, of investors in stock companies and savings banks, of merchants, of labourers. The manufacturers of Canada have generally admitted that they are prosperous and that their warehouses have grown in order to provide ample space for the goods which they produce. All this was admitted, even by the speakers on the other side of the House. In connection with this state of affairs we have a tariff comprising schedules of duty with exact sums set against certain articles, definite and intelligible.

Now, Sir, those gentlemen of the opposition who contended that the tariff was not exactly that which they would approve, and those who contended that the tariff was not the cause of the prosperity, did admit that the country was prosperous. If the tariff was not the causa causans of prosperity it certainly was not hurtful; it certainly was not powerful enough to counteract the growing trade of the country and its rising prosperity. If the tariff did not assist that prosperity; if it did not conserve that prosperity, it was certainly harmless to prevent the energy of the country exerting itself and achieving beneficial results. But what did the leader of the opposition give us as a substitution for our present fiscal policy? He gave us an exceedingly nebulous and indefinite resolution. He gave us no statement of specific duties. He did not give any tariff rate that he would have levied upon articles if his motion were to prevail, but he simply submitted that very stretchable policy, which might mean something in the west, and could be stretched to mean something else in the east. He gave something to awaken the hopes of manufacturers and others in order to obtain votes, it may be—although I believe he has not the slightest hope of obtaining votes by it. However, he gave us a policy which might be made so flexible and so adaptable to certain localities that it might be supported by his followers and declared to mean something in one direction and the very reverse in another. Now, Sir, we on this side of the House prefer that there should be a policy definite and intelligible, and we also realize the acceptance of the poetic lines in their application to this case:

'Tis better to bear the ills we have, than fly to others we know not of.

My ethymological and orthoepical and philological friend from Brant (Mr. Heyd) when he read the resolution of the leader of the opposition, and the term 'adequate protection,' in it referred to that source of consolation on this and every occasion, the dictionary. There he found that the term adequate meant something that was equal to the occasion, something that was enough, something that was sufficient. Now, we all know, without the dictionary, the acceptation of the term adequate. We know that it is something operative, something that answers the expectation, or the purpose, what is effectual, what is conclusive. What does that term adequate mean when inter-

preted in this way ? Does it mean a duty of 20 per cent or of 30 per cent, or a duty within any moderate limits ? Does it not mean, when interpreted in its entirety, that if a duty of 20 per cent, or 40 per cent, or 50 per cent, or 100 per cent, is not sufficient to keep out the goods on which this tariff is levied, it shall be made effective to the utmost extent of the word, and that a prohibitive tariff must be put in force in this country ?

The learned leader of the opposition is under no obligation to me whatever. I do believe that I have never given him any of my votes in this House, and therefore I have no right to call upon him for information or for anything else. But I think he intends by his resolution to gather together the votes of all those behind him, and I believe also he wishes to appeal to the ingenuous band of moral reformers on this side of the House, and endeavour, if possible, to secure some of them for the support of his resolution. Besides, and outside of the Conservatives and the Liberals of the House, amongst the Conservatives and amongst the Liberals, there are plain men ; on their behalf I call on the learned leader of the opposition to make an explicit declaration, not in legal or metaphysical phrases, but in plain and sufficient language, what specific duties he will apply, if his policy is carried out, to the articles enumerated in the tariff, so that merchants, business men, and plain men of all classes throughout the country, may know what they are to expect and may give their approbation or disapprobation to the proposals of the hon. gentleman.

The tariff is a complex instrument. It goes much further than mere verbiage, because it applies itself to various interests and various articles throughout the country. It has not an arbitrary application, but it is a system of balances, adjustments and allotments of certain duties to certain articles, with regard also to the localities in the country where those articles are consumed, so that the taxation will not bear more heavily on one quarter of the country than on the other. A tariff of that kind cannot be summed up in general business phrases; but to have a general understanding and comprehension of it, it is necessary that its elements should be specifically mentioned, so that the people at large can understand what they are, and judge whether it is an acceptable and proper tariff, or something that ought to be rejected. The learned leader of the opposition, by the terms of his resolution, is not to wait for anything; but he has proposed his resolution as an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, in order that the House may take up his proposal to revise the tariff and put a new tariff into operation, without any delay, without any time being given for consideration, without any reference to men expert in the construction of tariffs, without any regard to the present interests of the country, without any reference to what the future interests of the country may be. But, my learned friend the leader of the opposition may say : I am not a trader; I have no right to mention articles and to state what duties may apply to those articles; I am not conversant with mercantile affairs; I am not a buyer or a seller of goods, my duty in this parliament is to gather up the opinions of those behind me, and express them in the most forcible and telling way as parliamentary questions; I have framed my resolution so that its corners cannot be cut off, so that it cannot be headed off. But my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has behind him gentlemen who are skilled in the work of analysis, in the decomposition of tariffs, in the enumeration of goods and of the duties that should be laid upon them. He has behind him my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) with his encyclopedic mind; and he has behind him the gentle and insinuating revealer of truth, my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). If these gentlemen were not sufficient, he has behind him a gentleman who has taken the ground that a tariff of 17 per cent must have been a protective tariff, and who two sessions ago delighted the House with a list of all the articles under the sun and everywhere else, which read like the inventory of a Newfoundland store. He could have informed my hon. friend the leader of the opposition precisely what articles ought to be charged with certain definite duties, and how those duties would bear with reference to other duties. He could have given him all that information with cheerful power and persuasiveness, with the comprehension and approval of members on this side of the House who are supposed to have protectionist proclivities, and with the cheers and support of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are so ready on every occasion to pay a tribute to his parliamentary skill on all other subjects brought forward from time to time. But my hon. friend the leader of the opposition did not present his case in this way. Therefore, because of the indefiniteness of the resolution of my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, I shall be compelled to vote against his proposition. We have heard a great deal of argument, in this House and out of it, to the effect that a tariff higher than 17½ per cent, or at any rate, higher than 25 per cent, must of necessity be protective. But I think that I can demonstrate clearly that the present tariff, while giving sufficient protection, is mainly a tariff for revenue. Exigencies may arise under a revenue tariff which call for the imposition of a higher scale of duties. Exigencies will arise of a public nature which can only be met by a large revenue than would be obtained under an ordinary protective tariff, so then the rates levied under any tariff is no indication of its being purely protective or purely

for revenue. Such a tariff must be judged by the intentions of those who put it in force. On the other hand the national policy although intended to be protective to some industries, although professedly protective, was really the highest conceivable grade of revenue tariff and the highest amount of excise which could be extracted from the people to meet the requirements of the government. This is proved by the increased importations of goods and the increase in our revenue following the introduction of that policy.

Hon. gentlemen opposite complain that we pay too much attention to the argument derived from the increase of exports and imports, as indicating the beneficial character of the policy of the government. But you will remember, Sir, that in days gone by, the Conservative government and its followers always pointed to the fact that under its regime, our exports and imports were increasing. This they pointed to as an indication of our growing prosperity, and this they gave as a reason why the electorate should retain them in power and reject the appeals of dishonest free trade Liberals. In addition to that argument, they urged that the Liberals were utterly incapable of administering the affairs of the country and moulding its destinies. They said that the Liberals had not the requisite experience, that they were not men of proved business abilities, that they had not a sufficient acquaintance with public affairs to control the business of a great country like Canada, and that if they should be returned to power, one calamity after another would arrive as the result of their mismanagement, and the country would very soon hurl then from their places again. They dilated on the disappearance of the tall chimnies and the sorrowful wail which would arise from the poor starving children and wives of the labouring people deprived of work. They predicted all sorts of direful calamities which would follow the election of the Liberal party to office. When we remember these prophesies, are we not justified in pointing to the increased prosperity on every hand, to the factories running over with orders, to labour abundantly rewarded, to merchants and traders prosperous to an increasing public revenue, to the service of the government amply provided for, and to the smiling, content and satisfaction prevailing throughout the land, as a flagrant contradiction to these dismal forebodings. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of crediting my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce with certain utterances made by him on previous occasions. Well, Mr. Speaker, my memory runs back a little further. I remember when the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the late Alexander Mackenzie had to contend against the charge of woeful extravagance and wastefulness of the resources of this country, levelled against their administration. I remember how they were denounced for taking $23,500,000 out of the hard won earnings of the consumers of this country. Put us back into power, they cried, and we will conduct the affairs of this country economically, we will make ample provision for all our public works and requirements, and we will do it on $22,000,000. Well, Sir, the people took them at their word and put them back into office. What then happened? Did they confine themselves to an expenditure of $22,500,000? No, Sir, they did not. In the first year of their administration, they spent $24,500,000, in the next, $25,000,000; in the next, $27,000,000; and in the following year $31,000,000. And so their expenditure kept on swelling and soaring ever since. Such were the promises against which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had to contend in those days, and it were well that hon. gentleman opposite should remember those broken pledges. Let me remind these hon. gentlemen that the phrase they are so fond of using: Wrung from the pockets of the people,' is neither novel nor original.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, the method of argument used by the leader of the opposition reminded me of the method of the Rabbins. They did not give an authoritative statement of their own upon which to found an argument, nor did they state any facts positively; but they said: I, M say, on the authority of N that so and so is so and so; and on that they based an argument. That is the method pursued by the leader of the opposition. He takes, for instance, an extract from the speech of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and on that he proceeds to build up a scale of figures, tables or elaborate argument to prove to a demonstration or to his own satisfaction on that hypothesis that certain things are untrue and that certain things are condemnable. The hon. gentleman should not take the statements he quotes from the Minister of Trade and Commerce as being absolute ones, definite and limited, and complete of themselves. He should give the accompanying circumstances. He should give the context of the speech and the circumstances under which the speech was delivered, the contentions made and the position taken which he was rebutting. Then we could understand the full force of the argument. But why base it upon the hypothesis of the statements of the Minister of Trade and Commerce? Why does he not go back to the foundation of the matter and establish what is the first truth; establish his proposition as a universal one and then go on to make his argument. By

these tables which he has submitted the leader of the opposition hopes to make out his case that the tariff is unsatisfactory to the country, and he gives certain quotations from the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce as tests by which we would acquire a knowledge of popular opinion on this subject. Now, I would be content that we should rest our case entirely upon the speech and upon the tables presented by the Minister of Finance, taking in addition to the very excellent speech and very conclusive tables which have been submitted by my hon friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd). But the leader of the opposition when he gave his tables and when he arrived at his conclusion, lest he should be taken to task for having opposed votes for some of the services which make up the total of the vote, said that as to some of the details, he approved of them and wished that the expenditure under these headings had been greater. So, his argument that these expenditures were excessive falls to the ground. And so, whether he relies for his argument upon the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce or upon the tables prepared by himself his argument that the government have taken too much money from the people will not stand.

In the course of his very excellent speech this afternoon, my hon. friend and namesake from Marquette (Mr. Roche), condemned the government for not negotiating, at the time when the preference was established in this country, for a similar reference to be extended to Canadian goods when brought into the British market. A great deal of ridicule has been thrown on the government for its course in huckstering, now, when before, they were so very open and generous in allowing British goods to come in under the preference, exacting nothing in return. Now, a number of those opposed to the government in this House have plumed themselves on that fact, as they allege it to be, that the preference tariff was a failure. Some of them contend that it was futile as a means of introducing British goods. I do not understand exactly their attitude with regard to preferential tariff, whether they wish British goods to be introduced or whether they wish the British goods to be kept out. But, however, if they wished the British goods to be imported under this tariff the resolution proposed by the leader of the opposition is against that end, because he proposed to lay heavy duties on the goods imported so as to practically prohibit them and give the market to the producers of Canadian goods. So, I count that the leader of the opposition is against preference treatment. The examination given that tariff is entirely superficial and entirely inadequate. You cannot, by contrasting the amounts of money set forth in columns of figures say exactly what articles might have been brought in or the quantity of articles there were brought in. You have to examine the cost of these articles that you may learn whether there were more brought in. That of itself may not in this case make a very essential difference. But certainly, the mere inspection of a column of figures will not show you whether the preference tariff had an influence in bringing in these goods and allowing them to be consumed in Canada. But what is the fact? These imports from Britain are the precise qualities of goods, the veritable articles which are duplicated by the manufacturers of Canada. The Canadians have aimed at manufacturing such articles as were brought in under the preference tariff. Therefore, as our manufacturers increased, as they improved the quality of their goods, more and more of British goods have been kept out. It is a proof of efficacy in the preference tariff that, where the amount of British goods imported into Canada was declining by a regular process, after the introduction of the tariff, the amount of these imports which had fallen from $43,000,000 to $22,000,000, a decline of $21,000,000, rose again. Thus the preferential tariff checked a decline of importations and changed it into an increase. But how much would have been the decline of importations without the preferential tariff? How far would the manufacturers of Canada have displaced these British goods, and how much would the manufactured goods of the United States, made of a similar material and perhaps of better quality, perhaps with finer adaptation for our wants have displaced these goods, if the tariff had not been such as to lower the price in our markets of the British goods and so prevent the American goods entering? If I had been in this House when the preferential tariff was introduced I do not know that I would have voted for it. I do not know that Canada was bound at that time to pass a measure which favoured the introduction of British goods. But the tariff, including this preferential feature being in force, and desiring that British goods should be introduced, desiring to cultivate British trade, certainly that preference had a good intention and it was effective in carrying out the object by preventing the decline of British importations and converting it, on an ascending scale, into increased consumption in our markets of these articles. Now, I do not know that it is the function of the Liberal government to stand by inactive when a movement takes place by a combination of manufacturers in a foreign country, or when, by any legal enactment of a foreign government any industry in the country is menaced, I do not think the Liberal government will stand by and say it has no duty to discharge to manufacturers or the people in the encouragement of any energy which was overborne by any adverse influence outside of the ordinary competition of one manufacturer with another. If there be governmental action, if such action is needed, government is erected for

the purpose of controlling these combinations. The people have entrusted the government with the function of regulating these matters. It is one of the duties and powers of government to interfere in questions of that kind, and to aid struggling manufacturers, struggling industries or struggling interests, to overcome obstacles so far as governmental action can do so.

Now so far as my opinion goes, I believe that a revenue tariff, by its uniformity, gives such proper inducement and such proper attention to the various interests of the country, that they all flourish and are all equally treated under it. But if the government should think it necessary to encourage any of the industries of the country, if the government should think proper to develop any of the manufactures of the country, I think it ought to be done along economic lines. If encouragement is afforded, it should be to industries which are beginning. I do not think that an economical policy should specially favour those industries that are well established, after their products have obtained currency in the country, after they are well known. I do not think that such industries should be assisted by increased duties on competing commodities imported from other countries. I think that goods made from the raw material of Canadian origin might be a subject of this protection and this ecouragement, so as to spread the benefit over a larger number of people, that producers of the raw material might benefit as well as the manufacturers, and that the business of transportation might also partake of the benefit which is given by the government. Such public contributions ought not to be monopolized or absorbed by the capitalist who runs the factory, irrespective of any other interest or industry which may exist in the country.

Secondly, when government aid is afforded it should be in favour of those goods which have an economic value. It is no advantage to make goods that require an enormous assistance so great as to deplete or exhaust the country; there is no public advantage in giving such assistance to manufacturers, industries or employments of any kind which have no natural hold upon the people, and which cannot be economically managed or carried on to the advantage of the people. It would be better to employ the people in some other industry; because in imposing enormous protective duties we are fighting against the arrangements of Providence, we are fighting against natural laws, we are fighting against the diversity which nature has established in the productions of the various countries, and against the natural law that the productions of one country should be exchanged for those of another, all tending to that end so much condemned by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), the brotherhood of man. Now, Sir, there are compensations to be considered when manufactures are encouraged and assisted by government funds or by tariff arrangements, there should be compensation given to other industries and to other localities where those industries do not exist, because if one locality is benefited by money taken from the whole country, and if there be no counter-balancing advantage to the various sections who contribute to the individual section, evidently there would be injustice.

I think that under the present conditions in this country, due encouragement should be given by the government to the manufacture of iron, because iron enters into the manufacture of the machinery used in all the various industries of the country. So many employments, so much mechanism depends upon the cheapness of iron that any encouragement that is given in that direction is certainly justifiable and is part of the duty of a paternal government. Another thing that might be done is to improve the style and quality of the fabrics, to introduce artistic excellence, to patronize artistic schools of design whereby the nature and symmetry of the articles produced might be improved. The quality of all our Canadian manufacture ought to be improved so that they may be equal to the best productions of other countries which enter into competition with ours. Our Canadian manufactures should not be made out of shoddy, should not be made of adulterated or inferior material; but all the articles that are made in Canada should be stamped 'made in Canada,' and that stamp should be a guarantee of the excellence of the material and the artistic nature of the workmanship. In the next place, provision should be made that all the benefits should not inure to the capitalist, or to the manufacturer, or the company that owns the factory; but the workmen should equally enjoy a portion of the benefit of the protection afforded by the government, either in the encouragement of new industries or in the sustentation of old ones.

Some hon. gentlemen on the other side in talking to us about suffering industries which ought to be the subject of public assistance, have mentioned the article of woollens. Now woollens is a very general term, and comprises a great deal. I would like to be instructed on the subject of woollens. I think there are some gentlemen in this House who are familiar with woollens. But what is comprised in that article? Ought not any woollen factory which obtains benefit from the tariff, or any encouragement from the Dominion treasury, enter into a stipulation that the product of that factory should be made from Canadian wool alone, so that the Canadian raw material may be entirely used in the composition of the article? Would Canadian woollens thus made be as good as those made of imported wool? Would they be as en-

during, would they be as acceptable to the people ? Now what do we mean when we speak of woollens ? Do we mean that every woollen factory, every industry in that line, should receive benefit by the tariff ? There are cloths, for instance. Now we know that the cloths made in Canada are made to the appearance of English cloths. Are they as good in quality ? For instance, there is the article of underwear, shirts and similar articles that are comprised under the name of woollens. Then there are carpets, and a great variety of similar articles. Now we ought to trust to Canadian sentiment to some extent to patronize goods produced in Canada. If the articles are of equally good quality as those imported, I have no doubt that they would be extensively used in Canada. In my own province, those woollen factories which make cloths and other articles, have more orders than they can fill, and the reputation of those articles is very high. They are made of good material, they are well made, and they are durable.

Then again we must remember that in Canada these articles of Canadian tweeds, Canadian cloths, &c., have displaced the imported clothing which formerly came from England and as the taste of the people has now moved in the direction of accepting these articles which are made in Canada, great care should be taken that in their manufacture they reach the very highest artistic perfection and that they be composed of genuine materials made in Canada. There is another article, which cries out, I believe, for protection, and I ask this House and particularly hon. gentlemen opposite : Should protection be accorded to it ? I refer to the article of cotton. There are gray cottons and printed cottons. The printed cottons come from England, and, to a very large extent, from the United States. We know this is not an article that is grown in Canada. Should cotton printers and those who manufacture cottons have the same assistance as those who manufacture woollens ? Again, taking this as an illustration, should not the line be drawn between those factories which work up American and foreign goods and those which work entirely upon goods or material of Canadian growth and which articles are used by the Canadian people ? I think there are other articles the manufacture of which should be encouraged. I refer to manufactures of wood. Wood largely grows in this country, it is very useful in the manufacture of furniture and other products and an advantage might be given to these articles under the tariff. To me it seems that the articles most susceptible to the application of government favour should be those in the manufacture of which iron enters, because, this is one of the greatest industries of the new and the old worlds and is an industry in which Canada should participate and which Canada could pursue with great advantage. The raw material is here, the refining can be done here, the application of the arts can be made here and all the combinations into which iron enters can be readily carried out in Canada. Therefore, I think it should receive government assistance. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will not think it mock modesty in me if I announce to you, in confidence, that the right hon. the premier has not called upon me to speak. If I could gather anything, not being exactly a mind reader, from the indications of the government I sometimes imagine that they often say : I wish to gracious he had never got up, and when he is going on, I wish to gracious he would finish soon. It was a very interesting incident in which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) figured the other day. The gentle and insinuating way in which the hon. member for Bothwell extracted from the hon. member for North Norfolk an intimation as to whether or not he was to speak was highly amusing, and also the efforts of each to get before the other and make his little pirouette before the footlights. I have to say that if the policy outlined by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) should be carried into effect, if we had a strong prohibitory tariff, if we should think it would be to the advantage of Canada, to adopt the enactment that the hon. leader of the opposition has proposed, it is quite manifest that a heavy loss would be inflicted upon some portions of the country. I think a very large proportion of the loss would be suffered by the extreme west and the extreme east. No doubt if a prohibitive tariff were adopted against the United States they would retaliate against us. How do you contemplate the compensation which ought to be given to the lower provinces for the loss of the lumber trade which might follow ? That amounts to the sum of $7,000,000 annually. Then, again the American tariff might be elevated so highly that the American people would not take the fish which are caught in the lower provinces of a valuable character and that mainly find a market there. They might prevent our fish from being admitted to the United States and if we suffered the loss of that market it might be that we would look to the government for compensation. Suppose that the duty on coal, which is now suspended in the United States, should be reimposed and increased, suppose we should lose the market that we at present enjoy in the United States and the coal owners of Nova Scotia be compensated for the loss which they would sustain through this tariff ? Suppose we were to lose the market of our plaster in the United States which is at present a large one, would we be compensated for that ? Suppose, for instance, that a duty should be placed on the salt which is used in the fisheries, and I under-

stand there is a movement on foot to place a strong duty on salt, should not the maritime provinces be compensated for that? Suppose that we should lose our market for deals in England? A very large amount of lumber, both timber and deals, is shipped to England. We have only a market on the west coast of England, the Norwegians and Swedes have the market on the east coast of England, they are penetrating more and more to the central parts of England, and they are likely to come over to the west. They are also competing with us in pulp wood. Large mills are being erected in Norway and Sweden, and they will place pulp on the English market in enormous quantities and probably at better rates than we can supply them. Suppose a high tariff should prejudice the British people against us, suppose that we should lose that market, suppose that the additional cost that the lumber men have to pay on their supplies and provisions would make the cost of lumber higher than that at which it can be produced in Norway and Sweden and with the lower freights and shorter distances to carry the Norwegians and Swedes should exclude us altogether from that market and thus destroy to a great extent the lumbering industry which is one of the largest industries in Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces—suppose these things happen, I would like to know if, under this scheme which is being proposed, parliament would be prepared to impose a duty of a dollar a ton or more on the anthracite coal which is imported into the province of Ontario. I want to know if the manufacturers of Ontario, as compensation, would submit to pay the increased cost of those articles which we are told enter so largely into the cost of these products. If we were to lose the American market and if we are to be put under the disadvantage of the increased cost of the production of the article of coal, the coal miners will naturally look to an increased market in western Canada. Are the farmers, the manufacturers and the coal consumers in any part of western Canada prepared to pay a very large additional amount for that necessary article?

Again, Sir, the loss of the carriage of these articles to Europe would cause an increase in the price of freight, and the reduction of the quantity of articles brought to the west from Europe, would cause an increase in the price of freight charged for carrying these bulky articles from the place of production to the place of consumption. England and other parts of Europe. I want also to know what compensation would be given to the labourers who handle these goods which are brought into this country. Would there be any provision made for them; would there be any scheme of superannuation when they grow old; would there be any scheme of weekly allotment of wages to compensate them for the loss of the employment which they have all along obtained? Would the miners, the exporters, the steamboat men and all others be content that their employment should suffer, and that they should lose their great industry, lose their great employment, lose the labour of their people, their wealth, their maintenance, for the sake of charging an additional tariff on goods in order that the consumption of these goods may increase. These questions are quite crude, as I have put them down, they need elaboration, and they might be elaborated by the skilful mind of the leader of the opposition. At all events, they would have to be considered. They are of living interest in the country; there are a large number of people who are concerned in them and they want to know. We are told by gentlemen on the other side that the tariff is unsatisfactory, but is it not true that with the adverse conditions which an increase in tariff would bring about, there would be a great deal more dissatisfaction. My hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) compared the United States with Canada, and he said in effect: that the United States had been built up by a high tariff; that it had become a manufacturing country mainly, that Canada could imitate it, that Canada would become a second United States if the tariff was increased and if we were to become a manufacturing people. Well, there is no analogy between the United States and Canada. There can be no just comparison formed between them. The United States front on two oceans; it is almost a square block of territory; it is intersected by great rivers; it has the most wonderful productions in the soil and it has all kinds of minerals in rich profusion. It has a great quantity of cultivated land; a great quantity of rich soil. It has advantages which Canada does not possess in that it is a part in the semi-tropical regions; the greater part of it, of course, being in the temperate zone. Furthermore, it is a continent, it is a continent in itself. It enjoys free trade throughout the whole of it; it enjoys its own market. There is no legislative restriction on the interchange of goods between one state and another. They have every facility of transportation; they have cheap transportation by river and canal and quick transportation by railroads and every such appliance that can be invented. The United States cannot repeat itself. It was brought into being at the most favourable epoch. The manufactures of the United States, its agricultural interests, its resources were built up in the trying times of the Napoleonic wars. They were matured and encouraged by circumstances which can never be paralleled. They obtained their vast extent, their predominance, simply because the rival nations were engaged in cutting each others throats, and destroying each others resources, and the United States at that time went on to build up her resources and to flourish. There is no comparison

possible. Canada must now enter into competition with the most highly developed nation in the world. If we take the line, not of utilizing our natural resources in which we excel; not of cultivating the design of being a great user of raw material; if we take the line that we shall not aim at sending our grain, our cattle, our deals, our fish, all our products to these highly cultivated countries in Europe, and if we are to aim at rivalling them, we have undertaken a great contract. My contention is, Sir, and it is the contention of this side of the House, that we should largely follow the lines of developing our natural resources. We should not destroy ourselves by emulating our rivals or by competing with them in things in which they have a great predominating advantage. On the contrary, we should use our own resources in which we have advantages and use them for the benefit of the whole people of Canada. Mr. Speaker, you will remember that a short time ago when you and I were boys, there was a very popular economic work called 'Poor Richard's Almanac,' and Richard complained that his trade of almanac making was very much interfered with by a rival almanac-maker. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition is a constructor of tables and he has great rivals in the construction of these very useful implements. There was some time ago a very interesting discussion in this House, and my ears were wringing with the eloquence of the member for Simcoe, who announced in very emphatic terms that this government had increased the duties on the articles which were consumed by the poor—cottons and other fabrics—while they had reduced the duties upon the silks and ribbons of the wealthy classes. Our rival table-maker from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) in making up his list of the articles which formed the necessaries of life on which duties were increased by the tariff in 1897, charges the government in the opposite direction, for he says: That the duties were increased from 30 to 35 per cent on ribbons of all kinds. Well, I do not think that ribbons are necessaries of life. And then, as a further necessary of life, he quotes $7,000,000 of sugar on which the duty was increased from 50 to 66 cents. I quite well remember the exhaustive and learned argument of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) on the establishment of the sugar industry, in which I believe he went the length of saying that the duty on sugar should be very much increased for the benefit of the sugar industry; while the table-maker from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) denounced the taxes which were levied on the necessaries of life by this wicked government. Mr. Speaker, we send $107,000,000 of our productions to Great Britain. How are the British people to pay for these enormous quantities of goods which they import for consumption, if the countries which send those articles do not take in exchange the products of British labour? How are they to continue to be the great absorbing market of the world, if they can give nothing in exchange? Their money would soon become exhausted. They would either have to abstain from importing those articles or they would have to convert their surplus land into wheat fields and produce for themselves many of the things which they now import. How could they find employment for their vast and teeming population if the products of their factories could not be sent to all lands with which they trade? Unless they are treated with reciprocal fairness, how can their resources continue? How long can England continue to take freely our wheat, our timber, our cheese, our cattle and everything else we choose to send, if she cannot pay for these articles with the productions of the labour, the skill and the enterprise of her own people? We know, Sir, that the great resource of England is not her army or her navy. These are her outside defences. We know that Great Britain has often in war perpetrated great blunders. At the commencement of many of her campaigns, from imperfect strategy or from lack of preparation, she has suffered defeat and discomfiture, and her resources have sometimes been reduced to a very low ebb by the military successes of other powers. But through all her wars, the war with Napoleon, the American war, the Peninsular war, the war with Russia, the resources which Great Britain accumulated from the labour of her mechanics, from the produce of her mines and the savings of her people, have carried her through all her struggles, and have brought her out triumphant at the last. Not alone her armies or her fleets, but the subsidies she was able to give to the other countries of Europe, enabled her to come through with unimpaired resources, and to spread her power and influence to all quarters of the globe, the triumphant, respected, venerable empire to which we pride ourselves to belong. And will Canadians now refuse to take a portion of her goods? Shall we put up a prohibition against British goods? When the British people take so much from us, shall we take offence at the rebuff we have had from Mr. Chamberlain, or from any one else who knows nothing about our circumstances or our affairs? Or, shall we act in a generous spirit as children of the empire, and aid Great Britain in her great financial problems? The lion is at bay, beleaguered by all the nations of Europe, ready through their protective tariffs or their governmental arrangements, to snatch the bread held in his hand. They are gathering around him, but he can fight them all; he can meet them all and vanquish them all, provided America does not combine with the nations of Europe in commercial rivalry or military operations to destroy the prestige and power of the empire. I wish my hon. friend from North

Victoria (Mr. Hughes), the Wallenstein of Canada, were here. I would ask him, although he feels himself to have been grievously treated by the British government, if he would stand up and vote for such a resolution as that proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition, knowing that the effect of it would be to aid the enemies of Great Britain in refusing to receive British goods, and to minify the resources of that great empire which depends on the labour and accumulations of her people during many years of peaceful industry.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I have had a great deal of pleasure in listening to my hon. friend and fellow countryman (Mr. Roche, Halifax), but I find it somewhat difficult to determine which side of the question he is on. I was glad to know that so far as protection to all the native industries of Nova Scotia is concerned, he was sound, and I presume that, generally speaking, he will be found not to be a local politician, but a gentleman of breadth, who is prepared to support not only the industries of his native province, but those of the Dominion generally. I was inclined to think that he was a little severe on the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) in passing over the argument which I understood him to say the hon. leader of the opposition cited on the authority of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, as to what was the proper rate of expenditure for this country, so carelessly and lightly as he did. We are inclined on this side of the House to regard the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce as a very weighty authority; and I was a little surprised to find my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) disposed to pay very little attention to that authority. As I said, I am somewhat at a loss in attempting to reply to or criticise the speech of the hon. member, because I failed to grasp very clearly what his attitude on the question of protection was. From what I heard, I rather supposed that he was inclined to support the amendment moved by his colleague from Halifax, the hon. leader of the opposition; and perhaps for that reason we should not criticise him at all, but rather welcome him to our ranks as an ally. The discussion which we have had in connection with the budget has been, as usual, one which has taken a somewhat wide range. I suppose, strictly speaking, we should confine our arguments in this debate entirely to the amendment of my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition; and while I shall no doubt be permitted to avail myself of the same liberality and kindness as the House has extended to other speakers, I shall endeavour to do so as closely as possible. It is somewhat difficult to fasten oneself down to what is more particularly the object of our debate at this moment, and it is almost inevitable that one should wander more or less over the whole range of subjects introduced by the Minister of Finance in the course of the speech.

Generally speaking the result of the discussion so far has not been to emphasize any great difference of opinion between the opposing parties. I do not think that any one at all speaking from the government benches, with the exception probably of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has pronounced any strong opinion in favour of free trade or a reversion to a low tariff. Generally speaking the trend of the speeches made from the other side has been not to declare for any present increase in or revision of the tariff, but rather to discuss when is the proper time to make that revision. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance certainly did not very definitely lay down any opinion on the subject of protection or free trade. I know of no one in this House who, during this debate or at any time, has advocated what is strictly free trade. While the hon. Minister of Finance did not announce himself as opposed to the revision of the tariff, either this session or last, neither did he in either session advance any reason why this tariff revision should not be made at the proper time. Naturally he used the opportunity given him to bring prominently to the notice of the country—which I think it was perfectly legitimate for him to do—the fact that Canada is to-day in a highly prosperous condition. I now repeat what I have said on every occasion when we have had the pleasure of listening to a budget speech made in the exceedingly prosperous times in which the lot of this government has been cast, that we are as delighted as are our hon. friends opposite over this prosperity. In fact we are more so because it enables us to demonstrate to any reasonable audience that the abundant prosperity now prevailing in this country is due entirely—so far as it may be said to be due to the legislation or the efforts or the foresight of any administration—to the foresight and the wisdom of the administration which preceded the present one. Generally speaking, the country is much interested in the facts and figures given on the occasion of our annual stock taking. As a rule, the average citizen looks more particularly to the facts and figures showing our trade and the ratio in which that trade is expanding. The average citizen looks to the general impression prevailing in his own mind and to be found in the opinions of the people as well, as showing the existence of good or bad times. But he does not, as a rule, make as close and careful an estimate of our circumstances in exceeding good times as he does in those which are less cheering. He is not disposed to be so critical when times are prosperous, work plentiful and wages good, as he is at other times. Still if he will give his atten-

tion to the condition of affairs in the country generally, he will find every reason to admit that while the government has its lot cast in prosperous circumstances, on the other hand this prosperity is largely offset by the fact that he is contributing to a very large extent to the revenue and the resources of the government. Our population is increasing at a fairly good rate. It is estimated by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and no doubt fairly, that we had in Canada in April of this year about 5,500,000. At that time we were collecting from those 5,500,000 some $65,000,000. A year ago we were taking from the same people—or some 50,000 less—some $58,000,000. A year ago these 5,450,000 people had expended for them by the government nearly $64,000,000. In the course of this year, as nearly as I could estimate the expenditure for the current year—the hon. Minister of Finance did not give the exact figures in his speech—the expenditure of this country will be something like $58,500,000 down to the 30th of June. That is to say, to put it into the form in which it will come home to every man, our revenue of 1902 was $10.55 per head of the people and in 1903 it will be $12 per head. Then our expenditure, which in 1902 was $11.80 per head will this year, 1903, be $11 per head. If you multiply these figures by five and a half—taking five and a half to be the average number of a family—you will arrive at the exact amount, or nearly so, which every head of the family contribute in taxation, in one form or other, to swell the revenue and resources of the government. And on the other hand, you will find, by the same process of calculation, just about what this government is expending per head of the population. The result shows that in good times the amount of money which the government collects from the individual citizen, in one form or other, is largely increased, and that the amount which our paternal government is expending for him is still more largely increased. The net result is that just as in the case in a period of inflation, the business of the whole country is approaching the point where depression is bound to begin, so this increasing expenditure is bound, in the course of a few years, to bring about that change when the individual citizen will begin to realize that the times are not so good and that he is being taxed too heavily.

Now, though, two years ago the Finance Minister expressed the opinion that we could not always have good times, that we could not always be upon the crest of the wave of prosperity, that, under the operation of natural laws, hard times would follow the good times, yet I do not find any evidence in the financing of the present government of any great preparation for these hard times which they say they expect and which we know they must expect. We have the fact that this year there is an attempt, or a tendency to prepare for a rather more limited expenditure. But I am inclined to suspect, and I think my suspicion will prove fairly well founded, that this is not so much an evidence of a change of heart with respect to the matter I have just referred to as it is an evidence, which we may well take to heart, that the country may expect to be in the throes of a general election at an early date. It seems to me that the tariff bears evidence in several particulars to convince any disinterested person who looks at its provisions that this government will appeal to the country before long, probably before another session. I may be mistaken in my judgment, but I do not think I am. Therefore, I do not attribute to any desire on the part of the government to relieve the burden of taxation upon the people, any diminution of the tariff that we may see; but I look upon it, rather, as the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said in drawing a distinction between the ways a government may manage its business, as politics, not policy. Now, the reasons assigned by the Minister of Finance for not favouring the country with a revised tariff at this time were three. First there was the prosperity of the country, which he said was a sufficient reason why matters should not be disturbed. The second was that this government had made application to the British government for preferential treatment. The third was that negotiations were to be resumed with the United States with a view to negotiating a reciprocity treaty with that country. We have to admit, and we admit with pleasure, the fact that we have prosperity in the country. We must admit that we have rather abnormal prosperity in this country. If we look back over the years the government has been in power, we must see that this is a government that has had an exceedingly great share of good fortune. There was a series of years, when the late government was in power, when we had not one good harvest. In that I speak particularly of my own province. On the other hand there has not been a year since this government came into power when we have not had a good harvest. And, if my hon. friends opposite want an argument, an argument such as I have heard them use in the past, they have it in this fact. They may ask, as they have asked : What can be said against a government so blessed by Providence as never to have known a bad harvest ? But not only have we had exceedingly large increments of wealth from the hands of Providence in the shape of large harvests, but we have had the special advantage that, almost uniformly, we have been able to sell these large harvests at high prices. Since 1897, we have had good prices. But we are not willing to allow the government to use the argument that these good times, these great harvests and favourable prices, are to be attributed to the fact that they are in power. We are quite willing that they should make these statements to their

friends. They may form themselves into a mutual congratulatory society for that purpose. But we cannot allow such a statement to pass here unchallenged. We must recall to the minds of the people the fact that while times are exceedingly good in Canada, times are exceedingly good everywhere throughout the world. To this, I presume, we may, to a certain extent, attribute the fact that we have good prices. Not only have we customers abroad who can buy what we want to sell, but those customers are in easy circumstances and can pay good prices. A good deal of time has been spent in this House arguing as to the effect of the British preference. But that preference is about to undergo the experience which generally comes to every visitor who outstays his welcome. It looks very much as though the British preference, which was hailed by the friends of the government as one of the most cherished and beloved of all the products of the brains and heart of this administration, is to have its face turned towards a cold outer world and the door closed behind it. There has been, however, a great deal of argument addressed to the consideration of this very matter. It has been argued upon the government side that the British preference has resulted in increasing British trade with Canada. And the speakers upon the government's side point to the fact that, while British trade with Canada had sunk to a point when the imports amounted to only $29,000,000, those imports have increased to $42,000,000. And as this has synchronized with the period of the British preference, so they have assumed and stated very freely—led by no less a person than the Minister of Trade and Commerce—that this very desirable result of increasing the trade of Great Britain with Canada is due to the operation of this preference tariff. Unfortunately for that argument, British trade with Canada began to increase just at a time when not only the British preference was introduced but Britain's trade with every other country commenced to increase. And, while I think it would be idle to argue that the British preference has had no effect in increasing British exports to Canada, yet, when we see an increase in the volume of Great Britain's business with every other country going on regularly from 1897 to the present time, we see that it is absolutely impossible to hope that the Canadian preference was the cause of the increase that has actually taken place in Great Britain's exports to Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that Canada's purchases in Great Britain since the preference tariff was introduced have increased, and, following that form which has always been held as a model of defective reasoning, post hoc ergo propter hoc, they say that the fact that this increase follows the introduction of the preference is of itself proof that the increase was due to the preference. The history of the trade of the world goes to show, I think, conclusively that this is not a sound contention. Nevertheless I am not at all disposed to say that the British preference has had no effect whatever in increasing the trade of the mother country with Canada. We on this side of the House, I think, looking upon it as a compliment, looking upon it as an act of grace, and kindness, and friendliness, are not disposed to find fault with that preference; but in view of what is likely to be the treatment of that preference by the government, we are disposed to repeat what we said many times in the past, that in respect of this preference the action of the government was hasty, without due consideration, and that we are not unjustified when we assert that the government of 1897 blundered into the British preference, and will probably now, in some ungracious fashion, blunder out of it.

Now, the question whether we should revise our tariff, the question whether we should increase our protection, must largely be finally decided by considering what it is that makes times so good in Canada to-day. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance holds that because we have prosperity in Canada, the tariff requires no interference. That is to a certain extent a fairly workable theory on the old principle that you should let well enough alone. But if you look carefully into the conditions which are making trade good in Canada to-day, and I suppose are making trade good elsewhere as well, you will find that a statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the course of his speech the other day, was, I think, absolutely erroneous. He cited as an instance of the good working of the present system, which he described as a revenue tariff system, the fact that the imports of this country were increasing out of all proportion to the exports—if I did not misunderstand him, and I looked over his remarks again. Now, what have been the distinctive features of the trade of Canada during this period of prosperity since 1897? Whereas, during the whole history of Canada, from 1867 onwards, the imports of this country exceeded the exports by an average sum of about $14,000,000, during the present period of the regime of this government, for the most part the exports of Canada have largely exceeded the imports. We are not living in a normal condition of affairs. We are not living in Canada to-day as is the mother country habitually, in a condition of affairs in which our imports are equalled by our exports with some other resources. On the other hand, we have a condition of affairs in which the prosperity, activity and industry of Canada are producing commodities, largely natural commodities, but in some cases manufactured commodities, and in others what we might call quasi manufactured commodities, the products of the farm, largely in excess of the average imports; and we are therefore building up for ourselves a credit upon which we may draw for some

years to come, and which will help us to tide over that period of depression which I think is undoubtedly in front of us, in common with all the other countries of the world.

Now, in addressing himself to the consideration of this question of protection, the Minister of Trade and Commerce confined himself altogether to a consideration of the condition of the agricultural industries, and he thought he had made a sufficient argument against protection when he said: You cannot protect the farmer. He said, The farmer ships his wheat to Great Britain, where he has to sell it in an open market in competition with farmers in every other part of the world. He has to take the market price, and we cannot protect him in the price which he receives for his wheat; and therefore, as he assumes, the whole argument is complete, and protection must be condemned because in respect of this one of the smaller items—certainly not one of the larger ones—you fail in that specific instance to protect the farmer. But how about all the other products that go to swell these exports? How about all these other products which go to constitute that enormous stream of exports which fill the treasury of Canada, enabling us to buy from the world abroad all that we require for our comfort and luxury? What about the products of the mines, the products of the fishery, the products of the forest and the manufactures of this country? In respect of every one of these you will find that between the years 1901 and 1902 there were large increases, except in respect to the mines, which show a diminution, owing to a curtailed output in the Yukon:

	1901. Millions.	1902. Millions.
Mines	41	35
Fisheries	11	14
Forest	30	32
Animals and products	55	60
Agricultural products	39	48
Manufactures	18	21

I maintain that in so far as these are concerned, there is room for a good government to do a great deal to benefit the condition of the producers, and to help them. I am not willing for a moment to limit the great principle to that one line of protection in respect of which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has told us that we cannot protect the farmer. I think you can protect the farmer in assisting him to send his grains abroad to the most open market in the world. All the expenditure that Canada is making for purpose of improving the mode of farming in this country, of expediting the passage of the crops to the seaboard, of assisting the farmer in the preservation of his perishable products, in teaching him and showing him how best to place those products on the market in order to acquire the highest possible price—all that work is of the nature of protection, and it is done for that one class at the expense of all the other classes of the country. Now, that kind of work can be greatly increased. Who is there in this House that would raise his voice against a policy of the government to double or treble the expenditure made in this country to-day to enable the farmers to produce their products at a lower price, to market them at a less cost, and to attain, by any reasonable government expenditure, the highest possible price in the market? No one, I am sure. But that would be protection in the proper sense of the word. There are two ways in which you can benefit the producer and the man who has goods to sell. First of all, you can help him to get the highest price for his products. Or rather before that, perhaps yau can help him most of all by assisting him to reduce the cost of his products. That work has been done in this country, and is being done to an enormous extent, by the assistance which the government of to-day, following out the course laid down by the government of yesterday, is affording the farmers of Canada.

Now there is another cause to which are largely due the good times that we are enjoying to-day. That is, putting it in a more concrete form, the matter to which I referred a few moments ago, when speaking of the general prosperity. It is measured by the prices at which the commodities of this country and of other countries as well were selling in 1896. Take breadstuffs and other leading commodities. The prices in 1896 were 67 per cent of an assumed normal price represented by 100. In 1902, in March of that year, these prices had advanced from 67 per cent of the normal to 85 per cent. They have made an advance of 27 per cent, or nearly one-quarter above the point at which they stood in 1896. That was a time in our history when we had reached a low point of depression, a point in our history at which the government of the day were not in a position to say that their lot was cast in very happy times, and scarcely a time when the sunshine of prosperity was shedding its rays very fully upon them. But, we must remember that while we have a tremendous increase of products from the mines, our forests, and our agricultural lands, that our prosperity is not altogether owing to this great mass of products which is being placed at our disposal for sale, but it is to the favourable condition of the market to-day, and we must realize that we cannot always have plentiful harvests or good times, and that when the bad times come, when shrunken and shrivelled harvests occur, we will have shrunken and shrivelled prices as well. It should be the policy of the government not to live up to the full income which is given to it by the favourable times we are in at present, but to a certain extent, to be prepared for the bad times which unquestion-

ably will be ours before very long. Generally speaking, the manner in which the people of the country ought to estimate the advantage of their position, ought to measure whether or not they are being favoured by the government, ought to estimate whether it is a good government, is to measure it by the way in which it touches themselves personally. It is in the end inevitable that the general prosperity is represented by the individual, that the wealth of the country is the wealth of the individual, that if too large drafts are being made on the individual purse, in the end it will be found that the common purse is depleted, and that the country, instead of being as prosperous as it thought itself, has not maintained and has not the power of maintaining the standard to which it has, to a certain extent, grown accustomed. Measuring it by the individual experience, you will find that these good times in which we are at the present time, have been accompanied by a tremendous draft upon the resources, the patience and the patriotism of the tax-payer. In 1896 the average taxation for customs and excise, the branches from which the government derive the largest part of its revenue from the people directly, was $5.46 per head. I am only taking the figures to be found in the official books, so as to leave the matter beyond criticism. In 1901 it had risen from $5.46 per head to $7.19 per head, or an increase of $1.73 per head, or over $10 per family.

Mr. COCHRANE. They are bleeding the people white.

Mr. BELL. I am sorry to find that one of my hon. friends on this side of the House (Mr. Cochrane) is recalling one of those old speeches which I think we in all charity should try to forget. He is reminding us of a speech in which an hon. member of the government spoke of bleeding the people white. It seems to me that the contrition which the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) must have felt hundreds of times in this House when this speech has been referred to ought to have produced for him a certain amount of forgiveness and a charitable desire to forget the old, unhappy words, and while they never cease from rankling in that hon. gentleman's mind and heart, it would be a kindness on our part not to remind him any further of them. There is, I must say, a certain amount of justification for my hon. friend who recalls that remark, because, in so far as the government of the country is concerned, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce does not seem to make very ardent efforts to stop the process of bleeding. He does not seem to be so much opposed to whitened countenances as he was at one time. It almost seems that he had become a patron of vivisection, and was rather enjoying this bleeding process in order to ascertain how much bleeding a Canadian citizen could stand without absolutely expiring. The expenditure per head, which was $7.26 in 1896, and that was a time, when, according to our friends opposite, it was $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 too much for the good of the country, had increased in 1901 to $8.70. The revenue has gone up from $7.20 per head, to $9.55. Measured by these figures, which are put in such a form that every citizen, every householder, every head of a family, can decide for himself what was the relative advantage which he received from that protection loving government, that government which was said to favour combines and combinsters, which was said to be impoverishing the poor man and enriching the rich man, which was said to have nothing in its conscience or in its convictions, to check it from carrying Canada along on a course that was bound to end in its destruction, and what are the benefits he derives from the present government? He now has an opportunity of measuring by these simple figures, by this yard stick, that I am putting before the House, which government has been the more satisfactory, and of determining to what extent one party or the other is more deserving of his confidence. Let us, for a few moments, see what results from the process which this government is carrying on. It is not economizing, it is spending money more freely, it is not reducing taxation, it is rather increasing taxation. It is not content with being a protectionist government, as it really is, but it is a revenue tariff government as well. It cannot get enough money out of the people with a protectionist tariff alone, and therefore it adds to it a revenue tariff as well. In the mother country, today, the government levies taxation for revenue and it does not exact anything out of a protection tariff. It takes its tax upon sugar and tea, and it, in a great emergency, took a tax upon corn, and it collects in general a large amount of money from these indirect sources, but it is a revenue tariff government, and it does not take protectionist rates as well. In that respect our friends in Canada have learned not only from the government of the mother country, but from the United States, and to-day, while they are maintaining tariff rates of from 35 to 40 and often a higher percentage, they are in addition, maintaining in full force and effect every one of those great imposts which they placed upon the people when they came into power in 1897, and they are doing it in the face of the fact that they do not require it according to their own showing for the use of the country, and are simply undertaking to extract these vast sums from the pockets of the people in order that they may be able to wave over their heads a flag inscribed with the figures of the great surplus that they have heralded in order to mislead the citizens of this coun-

try as to the source from which that surplus has come, and which gives the present government the credit of being the greatest tax gathering government that Canada has ever known. The surplus in 1902 was $7,291,398, and the hon. Minister of Finance was proud of it. He has not for the first time boasted of his surplus. Two years ago he and his friends in this House were cheering and jubilating over the fact that they had the largest surplus that Canada had ever known. It was my duty on that occasion to recall to the mind of the hon. Minister of Finance and his friends the fact that they were shouting before they were out of the woods. I reminded these hon. gentlemen that they were not in possession of the largest surplus ever known, but that away back in 1883, when Canada was a comparatively small and poor country compared to its condition to-day, Sir Leonard Tilley had a surplus of $8,060,000, considerably in excess of the boasted surplus of to-day, and considering the condition of the country, if not in excess, it must be considered quite equal to the surplus which these hon. gentlemen anticipate at the end of the current year.

Our friends opposite are inclined to forget these things, or perhaps they do not take the trouble to know them. They do not seem to think, as has been well observed, that there is much profit to be derived by them from any study of the history of the parties in this country. For a time after they came into power, it was their fashion to devote all their ability to pointing to the prosperity of Canada and to citing this as evidence of the heaven born statesmanship of the gentlemen in power. All their speeches in this House year after year contained nothing of argument, contained nothing but a simple vaunting and glorification of the fact that these gentlemen were in power, that they had a tremendously increased trade and a tremendously increased surplus. To some extent age is bringing to them wisdom and experience is correcting the pruriency of youth in this respect. Latterly there has not been so much evidence of a constant desire on their part to call attention to the fact that times are good and to claim the credit for it. But to my great surprise and regret, the Finance Minister—and I take a great deal of pride and interest in him, he being a fellow-citizen of mine from Nova Scotia—much to my regret, the Finance Minister, in his budget speech, lapsed most fearfully into the old fault. In his speech he takes the four greatest years of expansion of trade that this country has ever known; he adds together the surpluses acquired in these four fat years, and he boasts that he is able to show in these four immensely prosperous years a net reduction in the debt of Canada amounting to $94,000. I suppose that the Minister of Finance may be admitted to be at least, if nothing else, a good politician, and I presume that he thinks that the recital of such figures as these, added to the fact that a Liberal administration has been in office during the time that all these good things are happening, will be a sufficient reason for the people of Canada to want to keep that particular brand of politician in office as long as possible. I presume that is his intention and purpose. Well, I do not know that it is a very convincing argument so far as I am concerned, and I do not know that it will be a convincing argument with the country. I can scarcely believe it possible that in our province of Nova Scotia, where the schoolmaster is abroad, and where we enjoy the blessing of the parish school which the Scotchman used to boast of; I can scarcely believe it possible that the Minister of Finance will be able to persuade the people of Nova Scotia at all events that because there has been a large trade in the last four years, and because the government has been unyielding in extracting the last drop of blood in the shape of taxation, and thereby rolling up an immense surplus; I can scarcely think it possible I say that that will pursuade any reasonable Nova Scotian to be thankful for the fact that he has been ground under the force of the wine press to such an extent as to enable the government to boast of the fact that out of the taxes of the people the government has reduced the debt of Canada by $94,000 in these four abundant years. But even if our education in Nova Scotia were not so advanced as it is, I think that in the Scotch county of Pictou, or in the Scotch county of Victoria, whence my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) comes, our knowledge of Scripture would help us to give an answer to the boasts of a government with such a record as that. We would be able to avail of the instruction we received in the Sabbath school and at our mother's knee, and we would recall the experience of Pharaoh, whose Finance Minister had administered fat years and lean years. If Pharaoh's Finance Minister would come to him and say: Look what a wonderful Finance Minister am I; in these four fat years I have actually cut the expenditure of the country down by $94,000 under the receipts; I have accumulated a genuine surplus of $94,000, or about $23,000 a year; what do you think Pharaoh would answer to such a Minister of Finance? In the face of the fact that Pharaoh and the rest of his people knew that the four fat years would unquestionably be associated with four lean years, Pharaoh would say to such a Finance Minister: Surely thou takest me for a sucker.

Mr. KENDALL. He would vote all right, though.

Mr. BELL. I cannot believe he would vote all right. I cannot believe it possible that the people of my province would not be saved either by their knowledge of Scripture or by their knowledge of arithmetic,

and that they would not agree with Pharaoh that the Finance Minister should have been able to report something better than that. If in a condition of things which has been unparalleled in Canada, and during a time when there were no great public works to construct, no unusual demands made upon the treasury; if during these times which are absolutely unexampled in their prosperity, and when conditions exist that might have justified the claim of this government to being the greatest administrators Canada has ever known; if in the presence of all these things they can only keep the expenditure of this country under the revenue by $23,000 a year, I say, Sir, that they have failed to establish the fact that they are an able, or a competent, or an economic administration.

Now, Sir, the amendment which has been moved by the leader of the opposition is to the effect that we should at once proceed to change the tariff; not to change it radically, because to my mind that is not necessary. We are to-day, on both sides of this House, either supporting or opposing, as the case may be, an administration which is a protectionist administration. I cannot for a moment see how my hon. friend from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) can sit with any kind of comfort or quiescence on his side of the House at all, because he is undoubtedly, as he takes occasion to let the House know, an ardent free trader.

Mr. NORTHRUP. He used to be.

Mr. BELL. How can my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) content himself to sit under the administration that is now in power, and be content to believe that he is a free trader?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Where would I go?

Mr. BELL. Well, if the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross) is going to support a protectionist government at all, he should support one that has the proper brand of protection to offer. Let him come to this side of the House and assist us in getting a little more protection—not a bit more than this government professes to be willing to give—but to get it at such a time as it will serve the interests of the country. Then, if my hon. friend is anxious to know where he must go, I would suggest that he must form a government of his own. My hon. friend is very fond of telling stories. I remember one which I think would fit his case. A preacher was telling about the two great roads—the narrow one which led to salvation, and the broad one which led to perdition—and a coloured brother who was listening said: 'In that case, this coon must take to the woods.' My hon. friend, I think, will have to take to the woods to get comfort, for in my opinion he has not a very happy home on the side of the House where he is now.

The motion before the House is substantially that the protection which we have in Canada to-day is not adequate or sufficient, and we should at once adopt increased protection or modify or change the protection which we have in such a manner as to make it more effective. There is no doubt that the Finance Minister is right when he says that at present a great number of orders are coming to the manufacturers, and that their difficulty is in procuring labour and in filling orders. He is not as entirely right in that respect as he was a year ago or two years ago; because any one who is in contact with the manufacturers in this country must know that the day is comparatively past when orders were thrust upon them, when it was not a matter of price, but how to get the goods. If I am not mistaken, the time has come when the old forms have to be gone through, when the producer has to seek the customer instead of the customer chasing after the producer. The fact is, judging this matter entirely from an economic standpoint, it is impossible to deny that this government is logically in a position to give the country more protection. It is impossible to doubt what their duty is to-day. There is no reason why they should balk at or shrink from giving the country protection. To my mind the rather apt expression of my hon. friend from St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) applies to the whole position of Canada to-day, when he said that the course followed by the administration did not represent policy, but politics. Why should the government hesitate to give the country a little more protection? The government of Canada is in a far better position to give an increased rate of protection to-day than it was in 1897 to give the rate of protection which we have now. This government came into power in 1896 fully pledged to do away with protection. It had gone through a great many changes of mind as a party. It had wooed the public of Canada under a great many guises. It had been a commercial unionist, it had advocated unrestricted reciprocity, it had worn the clothes of the advocate of continental free trade, and finally it approached the last election, at which it was victorious, in the garb of an advocate of a revenue tariff of the brand they have in England. When the government came into power in 1896, it was pledged so far as a party could be pledged by the utterances of its leading men, to do away with protection in Canada. There could be no question about those utterances. The right hon. leader of the government, when he visited Winnipeg, told the people of the west that he was there to preach to them the gospel of free trade, that it was the message that would bring them relief from bondage, that it was not an imaginary bondage, but as real as that which had existed in the United States, and that he would lead them out of that bondage to a land

flowing with milk and honey, the land of free trade. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, too, exhausted the resources of the language in pronouncing the protective system as one which was not human, as one which was inhuman, and he posed as the St. George who was going to pierce the dragon of protection with his spear. If we wanted examples to place in our school books and to put into the hands of our children as everlasting warnings against a disposition which was irrational, insincere and unsound, we could do nothing better than take extracts from the speeches delivered by the Finance Minister and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and other members sitting in the government of Canada to-day. These hon. gentlemen came into power in 1896 pledged to abolish protection. Did they abolish it?

Mr. COCHRANE. Not much.

Mr. BELL. I think that is a very good answer; it exactly summarizes the situation. They could easily say that they had no mandate from the people to abolish protection or to introduce free trade, and we are bound to say that that is true. They were not elected in 1896 upon their tariff policy. It was not a decision of the people that they wished to turn from protection and revert to free or freer trade. Hon. gentlemen opposite were put into power largely as the result of an agitation and a movement which drew a line across the tracks which the two parties had been following, and which had created the most extraordinary alliances, and out of the action of those extraordinary alliances the present government came into power. Therefore, I feel grateful that they did not give us free trade in 1897. Between the contending forces in the government, some for free trade, some for revenue tariff, and others for common sense and protection, if I were not convinced that common sense and protection would be successful, I would regard the hon. gentlemen as benefactors, because they have failed to do what they pledged themselves to do. They might have taken the reverse course; they must have said: We must be consistent; there are people who supported us because we professed ourselves ready to bring about free trade.

I do not, in my own heart, believe that they had a mandate from the people, when they were elected in 1896 to change our policy. They had ample excuse for doing so. They had claimed for years that the Conservative policy was a mistaken and damaging one which they were going to change. They did not change it in 1897. On the contrary they gave us the same policy that came down form the Conservative party since 1879. All they did was to make some small reductions in the tariff. According to some statisticians on the other side, the reductions they made ranged from one to one and a half per cent—not very far from one per cent. Contrast this with what was done by previous administrations. The Conservative administration, which previously held office, never for a moment denied that they were protectionists, yet they often made greater reductions in the tariff, when they thought it was in the interests of the country, than have been made by the present government. So that so far as regards the extent to which they have reduced the average taxation of the country, these gentlemen had every example from the Conservative government to warrant them in going to the extent they did. But now when there is undoubtedly a demand from the country and from the manufacturers for greater protection, this government hesitates to give that for which the people are clamouring. How is it that this government, which did not hesitate to incur the charge of shameless inconsistency by keeping intact in spite of all its professions, the system it had denounced for years in opposition as one of oppression, ruin and tyranny, which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was wont to stigmatize as responsible for all conceivable ills, real and imaginary, refuses to-day to act one way or the other. We now find the hon. Minister of Finance resorting to any and every kind of argument as an excuse for not doing anything. My own opinion is that in this case hon. gentlemen opposite, if without a policy, are not without a following. You will find to-day that the forces of this country are making for increased protection. Go over the proceedings of parliament since 1879, and you will find that there has ever been a conflict between the partisans of a high and a low tariff. You can see it in our debates and in our legislation. The live question which divided the two parties has always been the question of protection to our industries. That question is still paramount. There is still a great demand for increased protection, and that demand is largely due to the fact that in 1897 the government plunged into the British preference. If they had not thrown that little sop to the free traders—for that is what it was—the people and the manufacturers to-day might have been fairly well content. But the result of the operation of that one feature, in respect of which they departed from the protective system, is the trouble they now suffer. I was not much amiss last session when I compared the government to Sinbad the sailor staggering along under the weight of the old man of the sea whom he had unwisely taken upon his shoulders and of whom he could not get clear. What is the position of the government to-day on this question? No one can tell. Last session there was agitating in the country, delegations were here waiting on the government, but the Minister of Finance shelved the question for the moment and gave the country to understand that the tariff revision would take place this year. He never said that tariff revision would never take place. All he said was

that the time was not yet opportune. And he left the impression that in another year he would revise the tariff. What do we find to-day? We find a change of wording but the very same plea used for doing nothing. The policy of the hon. Finance Minister is a do nothing policy. His policy is to borrow another year from the future. He is not pressed at the moment very hardly, but he might be if he undertook to decide the question. Therefore his argument to-day is exactly in the line of his argument a year ago. He furnished reasons why nothing should be done now, but he does not say that he will never do anything. Just look at the beautiful position in which this policy leaves the government. When in opposition these hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches had the support of the free trade element and also the support of those who were in favour of reciprocity with the United States, as well as of those who advocated reduced taxation and cheapened living. And we have the authority of the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that, at the last moment, in 1896, they also secured the support of the manufacturers by giving them the promise that if returned to power they would keep faith with the manufacturers and break faith with the free traders and those who favoured reciprocity. Viewed from the standpoint of a politician, the position of the government is an admirable one. If politics were statesmanship, if evasion of resposibility were the crowning mark of a statesman, I would say that the budget speech was exceedingly clever, and that the situation created for the government, with the assistance of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), is an admirable one. Here we have the Finance Minister practically promising protection. He says there is no reason why I should not give you protection but I will not give it just now. But as an assurance of my intention, I give you $7 a ton protection on steel rails, which surely is an ample measure coming from a free trader. Then comes the Minister of Trade and Commerce who makes a speech in praise of free trade. He has the audacity to tell the people that the present tariff is not protective at all but a free trade policy. He has the assurance to declare to the people that all the evils which existed under this tariff, while the Conservatives were in office, disappeared the moment the Liberals took charge of the administration. He said that the tariff previous to 1897, which we all know is practically in existence to-day, drew $2 from the people for every one that went into the treasury, and then he proceeded calmly to argue that ever since 1897, by some mysterious mystical working out of a similar tariff, the extraction of the $2 from the pockets of the people has ceased—that while the government gets its one dollar, there is no tribute of two dollars to the manufacturers. This is arrant humbug—if I may use that expression without violation of parliamentary rules, Mr. Speaker—it is asking the people of Canada to believe something which is manifestly absurd. To say that a tariff of 35 per cent previous to 1897 passed two dollars into the pockets of the manufacturer and one dollar into the public treasury, and that that same tariff of 35 per cent in 1897 ceased altogether to have that effect and that the two dollars are now left in the pockets of the people and only the one dollar taken out which was taken for the government by the Conservative government, is arrant humbug. If such assertions as that can be accepted by any rational creature as argument when given forth, as they are, with all the fluency and assurance of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, they may have some effect. But, to my mind, the only effect is to make every citizen wonder that any man can have the audacity to stand up in the parliament of Canada and seek to establish such a proposition. Now, you will see that the government has two strings to its bow. The Minister of Finance is ready to oblige the manufacturers at the right time, while the Minister of Trade and Commerce appeals to the farmers. When the Minister of Trade and Commerce tells the people that, though they pay increased taxation on their sugar and tobacco, and the same taxation on cottons, woollens, and many other manufactures, there is no longer a protectionist tariff in existence but that they are living under a free trade system, those who believe in the Minister of Trade and Commerce and in free trade will naturally be prepared to vote for the maintenance and continuance of such an admirable policy, a policy which, by some mysterious process, keeps the old system in force and yet gets rid of its bad effects. But, to make the thing complete, and to make an ideal condition for a government going to the country, they are not satisfied with the manufacturers and the free traders, but they are going after that class, no matter how few or how many they may be, who believe in reciprocity. And, so we find the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who came last year and propounded a big, manly policy—so far as words went—of meeting hostile tariff with hostile tariff and extending a measure of good-will and favour to the country that showed good will and favour to us—we find that hon. gentleman, at the beck of the government, ready to assure the people of the country, as the Minister of Finance is doing, that the time for increasing the protection against the United States, the time for setting up a tariff that will admit of a 40 per cent reduction has not come. It will come—when? Next year? May be next year or in two years hence. But, at the moment, the hon. gentleman who argued so strongly and conclusively last year that it was essential to the people of Canada to assert their independence and manhood by meeting the

hostile act of the American administration with a tariff that would put our manufacturers, farmers and other producers in a position of independence and equality, is induced to use his great authority with those who hold that particular brand of opinion to say, with the Minister of Finance, that that time has not come to follow this particular policy. So, you have a policy announced and advocated by the government and its supporters that will allow everybody, no matter what his opinions and hopes and wishes are, to vote for the government. And, no matter what his opinions may be, he has as good a chance as anybody else of getting what he wants. I think that a government that can take such a position as that is very fortunate. The only drawback that may cause us to say that they are not fortunate is that the people of the country may see through it and express the opinion which I have always thought was held by the people, that the government to administer the affairs of this country ought to have a clear, decided policy and express it honestly, that a government that would try to ride even two horses, much more a government that would try to ride three horses, would be sure to come to the ground. And, for my part, I feel that, by the course they pursue, they forfeit all confidence and all claim to the vote of every man who has opinions upon public questions and desires to see in control of Canadian affairs a government with a declared policy, ready to stake its existence upon the success of that policy.

There is one thing about this government which I think is very admirable from an educational point of view—it is a government that can learn. As I have said, they came into power pledged to free trade. They were only in power a few months when they learned that that would not do, and they adopted protection. They threw a sop, as I have said, to the free trader in setting up the British preference. I do not know anything that was ever so vaunted and magnified in this country as that alleged concession to the British people, the so-called British preference. They felt so strongly on the subject, that one time, their only course, when any objection was raised, was to challenge hon. gentlemen on this side with the question: Would you repeal it? Manifestly, it was one of the most sacred things in the house of their gods. They could not believe that any man on this side would have the audacity to touch the sacred thing. But hon. gentlemen on this side were not slow to give their opinion. They said: There is nothing in the British preference so dear to us as the prosperity of the Canadian producer, and the Conservative party cannot be frightened by a bugaboo of that kind. You cannot silence us by saying that the Conservative party is not loyal to Great Britain. The record of the Conservative party was too good, too manifest, too consistent, to give members of it cause to fear. The Conservative party was in a position to act upon its judgment, it was in a position to say: No, we will not bind ourselves to support the British preference, unless it can be shown that it can be maintained without injury to Canada. Even up to two years ago, hon. gentlemen on the other side were ready to stake their existence upon the maintenance of the British preference. Where are they to-day with reference to that subject? There can be no doubt that in the correspondence and proceedings of the conference of colonial premiers there is a threat—it may be a veiled threat, but it is a distinct one—addressed to the British government, that if the government of Canada does not receive a quid pro quo, if it does not receive concessions in return for the concessions it has made, it will know how to act. So, this government is one that can learn—it has learned. It has learned from its Conservative opponents to become protectionist, to maintain a protectionist system in force, and it has learned that the criticism directed by its opponents directed against this so-called British preference, was sound. Hon. gentlemen on this side, even when this so-called British preference was proposed, declared that it was not a British preference, but involved a preference with any country that had a treaty with Great Britain, having in it the most favoured nation clause. They laughted at this assertion, but they learned that it was right in the course of time. This so-called British preference was decided by the British courts to be a preference to be applied to every nation in the world that had a treaty with Great Britain calling for most favoured nation treatment. They were very fortunate then in the fact that the British government, in order to help them out of what was unquestionably a very awkward situation, incurred a certain amount of odium and ill-will from the German people and the Belgian people by denouncing the treaties which caused that state of affairs. And it was not the wisdom of this government of Canada, it was not their foresight, or their knowledge of the conditions that would ensue upon the establishment of the British preference, that kept them out of trouble, it was the kindness and assistance of the British government which got them out of trouble after they got into it.

Now these gentlemen are in a very awkward situation indeed. They have as usual talked far too much. The right hon. the Prime Minister who leads the government, and other gentlemen as well, have assured the British people over and over again that the preference was not given in a huckstering spirit, that we wanted nothing for it. The Prime Minister definitely told the British people that it was given in return for that splendid freedom which we enjoy in Canada. Now we still enjoy that splen-

did freedom. Why, then, do the present government propose to withdraw the British preference? The manifest objections that existed when it was first given, involving the same concession to some twenty other countries in the world, had been removed by the assistance of the British government; there is not the same objection to the British preference to-day that there was then; why, then, is it not to be maintained? How is it that this government, which has been in power for six years, and which began with such magnamious declarations, such broad and kindly views, with such a complete absence of anything like chaffering, or bargaining, or huckstering—how is it that this administration to-day, after having assured the people of Great Britain that this concession was not given for a price, are now prepared, so far as we can judge, to withdraw that concession from the British people? To my mind they are at last convinced that that British preference has been carried too far, has been raised to such a point that it is really inflicting a certain amount of injury upon certain branches of manufactures in Canada; and seeing no other way to relieve those branches of manufacture from the injury they are now receiving, the government has made up its mind to do a disagreeable and unpleasant duty. They are going to do that in the interest of the manufacturers of Canada, and if we can judge at all from their words, they are going to repeal that British preference.

Now they have to a certain extent repealed it already in connection with the surtax which they have imposed upon importations from Germany. They have to a certain extent deprived the preference of the value which it had in the minds of the British merchants. The British manufacturer is one man, and the British merchant is another. The British people are perhaps almost greater as merchants than they are as manufacturers. They gather into their markets the products of the whole world, and distribute them again to the whole world. Now the concession made to the people of Great Britain by Canada in the form of a preference, had a large part of its value from the fact that it permitted not only the British manufacturer but, the British merchant as well to send into this country the goods which he had purchased in the marts and workshops of the various countries of Europe. That part of the value of the preference is all wiped away. They have not made a formal withdrawal of the preference, but you will find, in connection with the imposition of the surtax of one-third upon the duties levied upon German goods, that all goods imported from Great Britain, of which the major part of the value is derived from work done in Germany, are to be subjected to the surtax; the British merchant will find that, instead of getting on those goods a reduction of one-third, he will have to pay an increase of one-third. So that, so far as the products of German workshops are concerned, the preference has already been withdrawn from the people of Great Britain.

Now there is apparently a very strong opinion in the mother country that that preference is either of no value, or is not of sufficient value to warrant them in making any concession to us. They have refused within a few months to give to the people of this country a concession in respect to the cattle trade, which the people of this country feel they ought to receive, and which would be of great value to them. They have within a few hours repealed the corn duties, which were somewhat unexpectedly imposed upon grain last year by the British parliament, and which gave us the only hope we ever had that we would get a preference in the British markets. That hope has gone. There is, I fear, a certain amount of danger that a little ill-feeling may grow up between ourselves and the mother country in respect to this matter. In my opinion, now that the preference has been given to the mother country, I think it would be better, if any other way in the world could be found in which we could obviate or prevent the injury that is being suffered by certain manufacturers in Canada without repealing the preference, I would say that would be a preferable course to adopt. The Canadian government has not formally repealed the preference, though it has to a certain extent, as I say, repealed it so far as the German goods are concerned. But there is absolutely no necessity why the Canadian government should repeal the preference. They can continue it. All it has to do is to follow the course that has been advocated and adopted in every country in the world that has a tariff in existence to-day, that is to say, where the tariff is an important matter, and where it has had to be changed to meet changing conditions and to meet friendly and unfriendly legislation on the part of other governments. All that is necessary for this government to do is to raise their general tariff, the very thing we are asking them to do. At this moment, by raising their general tariff, they can continue to give the people of the mother country that same preference which they now enjoy over every nation in the world. And this is what the mother country might expect of us, and it is, I think, a thing that we ought if possible to do. For my part I should be very sorry indeed to see the preference struck down or taken away in such a manner as might cause a great change in that feeling of kindness and good-will which it excited when it was given, and which it drew forth in large measure from the people of the mother country.

Now there were several other matters touched upon by the Minister of Trade and

Commerce in his speech on the budget. I have already referred to his extraordinary declaration as to the effect of the tariff. Now the Minister of Trade and Commerce has again this year referred to a subject which he dealt with largely last year. He deals in striking assertions, and he has again this year repeated an argument which he used last year when he wished to make capital for his party out of the prosperity of the country. He argued that because Canada is prosperous under the present tariff, the present tariff is the cause of prosperity. In connection with that argument he referred last year to the census of this country. In order to maintain his argument that Canada has made no progress during the last years of the Conservative administration, he asserted that the exodus from this country had been completely stopped. If all these things were true, I suppose we would have to admit that the Minister of Trade and Commerce had furnished certain reasons why things were well enough and we should not ask for a change. But the fact of the matter is that there is no warrant, so far as I can discover, for these assertions. They rest upon the bare affirmation of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I think a little examination will show that probably he is entirely mistaken in what he says in that regard. He asserts that the census of 1891 was absolutely wrong, that the figures were largely concocted; while at the same time he argues that the figures of the census of 1901 were correct.

Now these two censuses have been made by two different administrations. If one of these censuses be wrong the chances are that the last census is not the accurate one. The census of 1891 was made by trained enumerators. It was made by the same gentlemen who had made the enumeration in 1881. They were, to a certain extent experienced, while in 1901 the enumerators came to the business new and without previous experience. The enumerators had more to do, they had a larger number of schedules to fill in, and the chances are that the errors correspondingly increased. Taking the estimated population of Canada as made by a mathematical calculation from the census of 1891, and when the estimated population came in 1901 to be corrected, by the new census, the possible error in the original estimate in 1891 could not have exceeded 1 per cent, and it may not have exceeded it at all, because the error was more likely to occur in 1901 than in 1891. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce says the exodus has ceased altogether, that it was very active and that a great number of people were going out of Canada under the national policy as administered by a Conservative government, and that it had ceased under the national policy as administered by a Liberal government. The figures which I read in the House last year are still available to any one who wishes to see them. A census taken by the Comonwealth of Massachusetts goes to show that the exodus, instead of diminishing after 1896, rather increased, and that more people actually went out of Canada and into the United States after the incoming of the present government than before the incoming of the present government. Therefore, that argument advanced by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to persuade the people that the country is prospering at the present time and that the cause of this prosperity is a revenue tariff, falls to the ground as far as the census is concerned. The census is rather an important affair in the history of Canada, and possibly a few moments of consideration may not be out of place. Last year one of the reasons advanced by the right hon. Minister of Finance why we should not have a revision of the tariff at that time was that the schedules relating to manufactures in the census were not completed. It is a rather singular fact that they are not completed yet. Two years have elapsed since the census was taken. Apparently the government laid the greatest possible stress on the importance of these schedules of manufactures. It was apparently waiting to obtain all the information in order to settle upon its policy, and although this service is entirely under the control of the administration, a remarkable fact exists that up to the present moment, two years after the census is taken, the members of the House of Commons have not seen one of these manufactures' schedules, and so far as I can discover, they are not likely to see them. We are practically told that the expenditure on the census is completed. Still all these important schedules which would reveal the advancement being made by this country in the matter of manufactures are still unclassified and untabulated and useless to the people.

Mr. MONK. The hon. Minister of Finance said they had been completed.

Mr. BELL. The enumeration may have been made, and the other day I received the schedule relating to the agricultural condition of New Brunswick, but, as far as I know, no progress has been made in the preparation of the schedules relating to the manufactures of Canada, and judging from the amount set down in the estimates, and the assurances we received the other day that only $10,000 more was to be expended on the census, it looks almost as if that work is not to be completed at all. Now, this is a very extraordinary thing. The hon. Minister of Finance was waiting last year for these particular schedules. He was not in a position to revise the tariff last year, and after waiting a year, we find that he is still disposed to wait another year, and not at all disposed to find fault with the fact that this census, which has cost as

much as the last two censuses, and twice as much as the last census, and is probably the worst census that has ever been taken in Canada, has not been completed. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he gets up to assure this House and the people of Canada that the census of 1891 deserve to be looked upon with suspicion, and to be criticised as inaccurate, is probably entirely wide of the mark.

Now, I do not wish to detain the House much longer, but I really feel as if it would not be amiss to call attention to a few things which were not in the budget speech. We find that there is a certain amount of protection. We have a tax of $7 per ton to be imposed on steel rails, but there are a great many things which are generally looked upon as proper and which generally find a place in the budget speech that did not find a place in the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) drew a very amusing contrast between Canada and the United States, the most amusing contrast I have ever listened to, for in every thing he said, except in one or two items, the circumstances of the two countries were practically the same. One of these exceptions was the tropical or subtropical section of the United States. We were told that the United States fronted upon two oceans. Well, Canada fronts upon two oceans. We were told that the United States had enormous resources and rich lands. Canada has these. But, in speaking of one of these matters, I think he did make out a case. He pointed to the fact that Canada had no tropical or subtropical region. Undoubtedly, Canada has not, and in respect of that matter it is not probably as well rounded out as the United States, but I do not know that we would be willing to exchange our present climate and northern mining regions for the subtropical regions of the United States, which will not produce as good citizens as the hardy men of our high lands. But, there is a chance for a progressive and able government that is willing to stake its existence on the policy which it may enunciate to secure for Canada a tropical region in the West Indies. Two or three years ago the hon. Minister of Finance did seem to be making a little effort to secure trade relations with the Island of Trinidad, in respect to which, however, I fear he was not very successful. Although this is one of the most important questions from a national standpoint that could engage the attention of the government, no progress has been made, and apparently no attention has been given to this subject. It would be of the highest importance that all the British possessions on the American continent should be gathered together under one government. It would round out our nationality, it would make of Canada a microcosm, it would make a complete world in itself, and give a market for the produce of our fisheries in those islands, and a market for the sugar of those islands in this country. It would be worthy of the statesmen of Canada to undertake to bring these islands of the Carribbean sea under the flag of Great Britain that waves over Canada, but although this is an important matter, and although attention is called to it from time to time, alhough it is mentioned in this House year after year, we find, so far as we can judge, that the government has not even attempted to deal with the subject, and has nothing to report in connection with it. There is another matter of even greater importance. There is the island of Newfoundland, the oldest British colony in the world practically, outside of the home island, and the oldest British possession in America. There is an island whose possession at some time or other is absolutely essential to the welfare of Canada. It commands the great sea approach, the gulf of St. Lawrence, in such a fashion as to make it impossible for the citizens of Canada ever to contemplate without shrinking, the idea that it should pass into the possession of any other power. It ought to be part of the confederation of Canada, and the work of bringing it into the confederation is the only work left to be done, because the statesmen of the Conservative party have completed the rest of the work so far as the northern part of the American continent is concerned. The work of bringing that last outlying post of British population within a Canadian nationality, is one that lies unquestionably at the door of this government. And yet we find that towards this question of the very highest national importance, this question that is so urgent that one must think it calamitous should the object not be accomplished; towards this question our government is apparently indifferent. So far as we know, they entirely ignore its vast importance. It may be that there is correspondence, and we will, perhaps, get it some time, but so far as we can judge, no progress has been made towards bringing in Newfoundland, nor is there in the mind of the government of Canada any aspiration in that direction.

Then again, this government has made no effort to secure new markets for this country. The only action they have taken is in regard to our trade, is to impose a surtax on German products, and that I consider an exceedingly proper course to adopt. But that is in the direction of curtailing our markets and not of increasing them. It is, however, the right course to follow, and I was rather surprised to find that two years ago, speaking in the budget debate, when I took occasion to recommend the very course that has been followed, namely, that increased taxation should be imposed on the products of Germany, the Minister of Finance answered me by saying that the government had already imposed a preferential tax against Germany, and he argued that in so far as they had given a preference to

Great Britain they had imposed a disability on the German empire, and they were disposed to rest satisfied with that. I am glad to say that in this respect as well as in others, the government has shown itself willing to learn, and that it has bowed to the suggestion of the opposition, and in respect to that its action in that particular it has the support and the good wishes of every man who sits in His Majesty's opposition in this House.

I believe, Sir, that the great question that is uppermost in the minds of the people of Canada is: Are we going to have a more active and a more positive realization of the purpose of keeping Canadian trade for Canada and the Canadian people? It has been argued by the Minister of Finance that a policy of Canada for the Canadians would mean the disintegration of Canada; would mean the separating of the west from the east, because he alleges that the west and the east have such diverse interests that they cannot be harmonized. If that were the case, we would have no nationality. If you could not get the inhabitants in one section of Canada to be willing to co-operate with those of another section in order to maintain a common policy for the common good, you would have no nationality and you would have no Canada. Such a suggestion coming from the Minister of Finance shows that he is not telling us seriously what he thinks on that subject. There is no country in the world in which the inhabitants living in different sections have not diverse interests. The people of the British Isles, two or three hundred years ago, were further apart, more divided by race, as much divided by religion, more divided by interests, and most of all divided by the want of intercommunication, than is the case with Canada to-day. But all this did not prevent the development of the home land, and it should not prevent the development of any part of the empire outside of the home islands in which there are the advantages that we in Canada possess. The existing conditions in Canada should not prevent us looking to a homogeneous population, all of the same education politically, all of the same aspirations, and all with the same dream of a great imperial federation in which Canada is to occupy a foremost part. If it were possible to have in Canada a people who were so local and so selfish that they could not realize a national policy for the common good, and could not be filled with a common desire for the welfare of Canada, then we would not be the people that we are. But with such a population as we have, there is every reason to believe that there should not be any trouble in persuading the people of every section of this country to join in a policy which would be for the good of all. In opposition to that idea of a harmonious Canadian nationality, we had the speech of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who was put up to advocate the cause of reciprocity with the United States. That hon. gentleman advocated a policy, which if it could be enforced, would break Canada up into three or four sections. You would have on the Pacific coast a commonwealth composed of two or three states of the American union, and the province of British Columbia. You will have in Ontario a people who had no care for their fellow-citizens of British blood in the east and west, but whose whole trade and whose whole sympathy would be with the people of New York, and Ohio and Indiana. And the people of the maritime provinces living under the idea involved in the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) would carry on their commercial affairs with the people of the United States, and on the whole you would perfectly destroy for ever that Canada which is in existence to-day. The fact that we have a Canada; that we have a national policy; that our statesmen in the past have found it possible to persuade the people of Ontario to submit to a tax on coal and the people of the maritime provinces to submit to a tax on flour and cornmeal, because in doing so they are giving vitality to a national policy; all these facts accomplished in the past are a guarantee that they can be continued and should be continued with much more ease and much greater facility in the future. It is a very short-sighted policy, to my mind, to endeavour to persuade the people of Canada that the interests of the west cannot be harmonized with the interests of the east. It is quite easy to show that the interest of the arable west is at present very largely in the one direction. They are producing wheat. It is said you cannot protect the farmer. Well, the western farmer cannot be improved so far as his conditions are concerned as a farmer, because his conditions are absolutely perfect to-day. He has a magnificent soil, a perfect climate. He has seed time and harvest, and he is not subject to the interruptions which come to us in the lower provinces from the broken seasons we have there. He has an ideal condition of farm life, but he has one disadvantage—he is out there on the plains producing wheat and the farmers about him are producing the same crop; they are competing with one another; his disadvantage comes when he goes to market, because the wheat which is grown by himself and his neighbours who are his rivals, is to be sold on the other side of the Atlantic ocean, thousands of miles away. He has to go five or six thousand miles before he can sell his wheat. Will you not protect that farmer when you can build up at Brandon, at Winnipeg, at Sault Ste. Marie, at all the towns of Ontario and Quebec, large manufacturing and commercial centres? You can protect the western farmer in the most effective and complete fashion by giving him consumers in Canada. But more than that, I think it would be anything but statesmanlike to admit that

the people of the west are to be for ever limited to the productions which they have now. To my mind the salvation of the people of the west is involved in their ceasing to be wheat growers exclusively, and in becoming mixed farmers. They are doing the best they can at the moment; they are doing that which is ready to their hands; and the conditions are so favourable that they are producing wealth to an enormous degree, and the whole of Canada is reaping the benefit of it. But any one who knows what the best conditions for the development of our race are, knows that the man who is living in a small house, and is merely a producer of wheat on an open plain, is not living under conditions tending to develop his highest characteristics as a man. These can only be realized by bringing to the prairies the mixed husbandry of the older provinces, and to that end the policy of the government must contribute as rapidly as possible. Not only is this important to the western provinces, but to the east it is absolutely essential. Though we are greatly interested in the west, we must not forget the east. We have not in the eastern provinces the great perfection of soil and climate that they have in the west. Our conditions in the east are such as to make it out of the question that the people there shall become great producers of grain. They cannot, in fact, realize the conditions of the west. In the east we can realize the condition of the husbandman who pursues mixed husbandry. But in spite of the assertions of the Finance Minister, the exodus in eastern Canada has not ceased and the people who are leaving are not going to the west; they are not tempted even by those marvellous lands of the Saskatchewan valley and the great plains; but they are going to the United States, to a highly protected country, to the manufacturing cities of the New England states, and it would be impossible to change the character or the disposition of those people. They are not disposed to be farmers; they are not convinced that the highest condition of life would be realized by their becoming farmers; but they wish to live a life of greatly diversified interests in which the manufacturing interests should occupy a very prominent and important place. These men do not want to live on a thousand acre farm without a neighbour within a mile and a half of them. They want to live in cities where you can enjoy not only all the conveniencies and comforts and pleasures available in cities to men with reasonable incomes, but where they can share the luxuries and refinements of life, and indulge their taste for the graceful and the beautiful. The disposition of these people is not only to go to the cities of the United States, but to build up cities in our country as well; and no policy would be the best for Canada or can secure the approval of the Canadian people, which does not recognize that there are in the country great and varied possibilities entirely outside of the production of wheat even on the most fertile acres in the world. We want to build up in this country a state with great industrial resources. Who are the people who are taking the lead in the world today? They are the great manufacturing peoples; and with our vast country capable of supporting two hundred millions of people as rapidly as they can be put into it, with the skill and energy of our people, with our illimitable and varied resources, we should aim to develop the highest possible state of civilization, and to realize that ideal we must have not alone an agricultural population, but a people trained in all the varied pursuits that are to be found in countries which at this moment stand in the van of civilization. Therefore, while it may be good politics and good tactics on the part of the administration of the day to so shape their tariff and so control their discussions as to let the public of Canada feel that they will not be unfavourable to them, whether they are lovers of free trade or a revenue tariff or reciprocity or protection, it is not a position that stamps it as an administration of clear convictions, but rather as a do-nothing, opportunist administration, and one which cannot and ought not to have the hearty and earnest support of the people of Canada.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 28, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) moved:

That the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates in this House during the present session which recommends the appointment of Léon Gérin to fill the vacancy on the staff of translators of the debates; also, the payment of Sylva Clapin, for services rendered in connection with the translation of the debates be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 129) respecting the Crown Bank of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 130) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—Mr. Henderson.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Experimental farms for the year 1902—Hon. Mr. Fielding.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. W. S. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). Mr. Speaker. On account of the agitation which has been going on throughout the Dominion, particularly during the past year, with reference to the tariff question, I think it is the duty of every member of this House to place himself on record as to what he considers is the best fiscal policy for this country. There are certain deterent influences, Sir, which might prevent a person not much accustomed to public speaking from addressing this House at this time. I mentioned last year, and the same thing applies this year, that one very deterent influence especially for young members, is the lack of attention which is paid to speeches in this House, and the very few members who remain in the Chamber while the debate is going on. There is another influence which may perhaps deter some members from speaking much in this House of Commons. It is this. If the mathematical calculation of our friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) is correct, the expense of running this House is $28 a minute, and some of us may be afraid to score up a very large bill against the Dominion, for fear our electors may call us to account for it when we return home. For instance, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) who closed the debate last evening ran up a bill of $3,380, if the calculation of the hon. member for Elgin is correct. Some of us may have some doubt as to whether the speech was worth it or not, but that is a matter for the hon. member to settle with his constituents.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) ?

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). I have not had sufficient time at my disposal to figure up his account.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He would have a big bill.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). This debate has gone on for several days and some twenty members have spoken. Some of them have done what I intend to do before I sit down, namely, to give my own views regarding the best fiscal policy for this country, but in the case of a great many of them it would be very hard to ascertain just what their views were. I am free to admit that every member of this House must be to a certain extent influenced, it may be imperceptibly, by the environment in which he is placed. I do not mean by this that I think it is the duty of every member to try and square himself with his constituents, although probably there may be a temptation to do that. It is my idea, but of course I may be wrong, that one of the objects which a great many members of this House must have in speaking at such length as they do, is in order to get their speeches down on 'Hansard' and circulated through the country and in their constituencies. Apart from that I cannot see very much use in a great many of these speeches which are delivered, probably late in the evening, when there is barely a quorum present, and when those who are present pay little attention to what is being said. What I have said with regard to the environment of members, is based upon the fact that I live in a purely agricultural community. We have not in the county of Huntingdon any manufactures of any importance; not more than would supply the local demands. Our farmers are principally engaged in dairying and pork raising which is a by-product of dairying. Our farmers are to a large extent free traders, or low tariff men at all events. The principle products of the county of Huntingdon are butter and cheese the price of which is fixed by the market in England, and I suppose the same rule would to a large extent apply to our product of pork and hams. The trouble with our people, as with a great many agricultural people is, to know where the compensation comes to them for the increased price they have to pay for manufactured goods by reason of a high tariff. I came to this parliament with my own idea as to what was the best tariff for this country, and that idea was that a low tariff fills the bill. You may call it a revenue tariff or whatever you please, but at all events I am decidedly against any increase in the tariff, and so are a great many people throughout Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). My feeling is that we should try to legislate for the masses rather than for the classes. As I have said I came here with my own idea as to the best fiscal policy for the country, and I suppose every member of the House has come here with his mind made up on that question to a greater or lesser extent. But while that is true, I came here also with an open mind ready to be convinced and ready to change my views if the arguments brought forth should lead me to believe that my own ideas were wrong. I must say that so far that I have not changed my mind, but that I have continued to believe that the best policy for this country is a low tariff, or what may be called a revenue tariff. Another thing is that I came

here a new member; one who probably had not taken that interest in these public matters which he ought to have taken. My principle business in connection with political matters heretofore was simply an anxiety to see that the man of our choice was elected and we generally succeeded in doing that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). The word 'statesman' is bandied about here, but I must confess that I yet do not know exactly what it means. Some people have a different idea of as to what a statesman is or ought to be, from others, but be that as it may, my opinion is that for a person to make a success in public life it is necessary for him to come here in early life. As the saying is, he ought be caught young. I am afraid that quite a number of members of this House came here when it can hardly be expected that they would be in a position to qualify as statesmen.

I consider, Sir, that the agriculturists of this country have their rights; so does everybody. But, one difficulty in connection with the agriculturists asserting their right is that the manufacturers are organized and they are not. That is no reflection on this government because it would equally apply to all governments, and the fact remains that those people who can bring their views most directly before any government are most likely to get their grievances redressed, or, to get what they want. It is natural to expect that. If you see a particularly well dressed, well groomed, well fed body of men about the Russell House or around the corridors here, and you ask who they are, in nine cases out of ten you will be told that they are the representatives of the Manufacturers' Association or some kindred organization of that kind, who have come here to place their views before the government, and to try to worry the government into granting their requests. I might say just here, that before I came to parliament I never had as much sympathy with the ministers of the Crown as I have had since. I think that they are a much abused lot of men. I think that they have to stand a great deal, and it does make my blood boil when I hear some of the members of the opposition taunting them for the salaries they receive, and for drawing salaries for doing nothing. Why, Sir, I believe that if the ministers were paid according to the annoyance they have to put up with, they would get double their present salaries. Now, Mr. Speaker, the farmers are in an altogether different position from the manufacturers with regard to placing their views before the government. I have not had much to do with manufacturing interests myself, but judging from appearances the manufacturers are pretty well off. The farmers are different. The farmer cannot come to Ottawa to state his case. He has got to stay at home looking pretty closely after his farm and his stock in order to make ends meet, and there is not much junketing around for him in special cars to come here to interview the government. In that way the manufacturers have a great advantage over the farmers, and seem to get favours which the farmers and the great consuming classes consider are inimical to their best interests. The Manufacturers' Association we have heard so much about appears to be a wonderful combination. Wonderful resolutions they passed at their meeting at Halifax. They were so wonderful that even the Tory 'Gazette' of Montreal spoke about them adding hypocrisy to folly. These men are organized, and they are in a better position to bring their views before the government than the farmers and the great purchasing classes.

Since I have come to this House, I have heard a great many figures and statements quoted to show the condition of the country. I do not take much stock in these things, because it appears to me that the same figures are quoted on both sides to support different arguments. I would rather be guided by my own experience and observation in a matter of this kind. I know that so far as my own county and the adjoining counties are concerned, there is no question about the prosperity of the country. Everybody admits it. Eight or ten years ago the farmers had mortgages on their farms, and were paying 6 or 8 per cent interest on them. These are all wiped out now, the farmers are able to get money at 4 or 4½ per cent to pay them off, and the men who a few years ago had to borrow money, have now money to lend. I would rather judge of the prosperity of the country from my knowledge of such facts than from all these statistics.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) who spoke last night, was figuring up what it cost per family and per head to pay the annual revenue received by the government, and he, very pessimistically, I think, came to the conclusion that if the present state of things continued very much longer, the hard times would return, and the people would be in want just as they were when our hon. friends opposite were in power. I know that at present the people have enough to pay their way, and something left over. The deposits in our savings banks and other banks are increasing greatly, which is a sure evidence that the country is prosperous.

What I am going to speak of may be considered ancient history; but hon. gentlemen in the opposition have been going so far back that I think I have a right to follow suit. Our hon. friends opposite are in a kind of dilemma. When the present tariff was brought in by the hon. Minister of Finance, we all remember the howl that went up from the Conservatives, that it was going to ruin the country. They claimed, as they have always done, to be a highly

protective party. In 1878, when the national policy was introduced, they prophesied that it was going to do many wonderful things which it did not do, and they intimated that if they got into power again they would reintroduce the national policy, and give the country that prosperity which they failed to give when they were in power. You remember how they promised that industries would spring up all over the country, and that population would flow in and occupy the vacant lands of the North-west, and the farmers would have a fine time raising food to supply the millions who were to work these industrial establishments. We were in fact going to have something approaching the millenium. Such did not turn out to be the case, however. In the census of 1891 there was a great deal of padding in regard to the number of industrial establishments in the country. Some of the padding was done in my own county. Eighteen or twenty squaws who were engaged in making baskets in their cabins were put down as so many industrial establishments. A woman working at a hand-loom in her home, was put down as another industrial establishment. The cobblers working at their benches were enumerated in the same way. But notwithstanding all that padding, the Conservative party failed to show the results which they had promised to bring about under the influence of the beneficent national policy. Now they are obliged to admit that under the tariff policy of this government, the country has not gone to ruin, as they prophesied it would. I will not say they are sorry for that; I think they are glad that the country is prosperous, though they do not like to admit it. But it is remarkable what a different tone they take now from what they did in 1897, when this tariff was introduced. You remember what a doleful story was told about the ruinous state of things that would ensue under this tariff, and how it was to do away to a certain extent with the beneficent results of the national policy. What is the fact? Listen to this from a speech by one high in the ranks opposite, our hon. friend opposite:

> Now what is the result. The result is that this tariff goes into operation and the hon. gentlemen know that the industries of this country are already paralyzed in consequence, while hon. gentlemen gloat, vindictively gloat over the destruction of Canadian industries. I was reading the wail, the sorrowful wail in the Montreal 'Gazette,' where one manufacturer after another declared that their industries were ruined, that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face, a return to the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House was in charge of the fiscal policy of the country. I say that a deeper wrong was never inflicted on Canada.

I fancy it is not necessary for me to give the name of the speaker. The older members of the House will recognize, from the strong language, who he was. The same speaker made another statement as to what was to happen; but he was not wholly disheartened. He saw that some good was likely to come out of all this wreck and ruin; but he felt that the new policy would so dishearten and disgust the people of Canada that they would soon turn out the Liberal party, and return the Conservatives to power. Here is what he said:

> I feel that far from rejoicing at it, from a party standpoint, I deplore from the bottom of my heart the ruin that is going to be inflicted upon the best interests of Canada and upon its great industries. Still I hesitatingly say that from a party point of view they are doing our work, they are showing the people of this country that having obtained power, which was all they worked for, they are now prepared to use that power at the cost of the sacrifice of the industries of Canada.

This was very pathetic and very magnanimous on the part of the speaker. How his heart must have bled for poor Canada. Even the thought that the tariff as framed by the party in power was going to drive the Liberals from power and was going to be the means of placing himself and his friends once more on the treasury benches, was not sufficient to assuage the grief he felt as he thought of the battered and bruised condition in which his beloved Canada was to be left if the fiscal policy as set forth by the party in power became law. The sweets of office were nothing to him compared to the grief he felt that all these magnificent industries which had arisen all over the land under the fostering care of the national policy, were, by the iniquitous tariff now introduced, to be blighted and scattered. We had the same kind of attack on the tariff from the ex-Minister of Finance, Mr. Foster. He went more into particulars. He foresaw, with the keen sight of a seer, the complete destruction of the woollen industry, that the Canadians were to be driven out of the confectionery business, and that there was to be complete and wholesale desolation in the homes of the makers of shirts, collars and cuffs. This is what he said:

> I can take him (Mr. Davies) down to the French constituencies in and around Montreal, and I can show him one of the most widely spread industries you will find in Canada, which is to-day distributed among hundreds and thousands of habitants, homes where the women add to the daily fare, and keep their homes by working on these articles at a moderate rate. I say that with simply an ad valorem duty that business will go to Troy or to Germany and Belgium, or to England. No person in this country feels the impost added to the cost of his shirt and collars compared at all with the derangement and destruction of an industry which goes into the homes of hundreds and thousands of people in the rural districts around the cities and villages of this country.

It seems to be a favourite pastime of some speakers to set up a man of straw in order that they may have the pleasure of

knocking him down again. The same speaker made a further prophecy with regard to the woollen industry.

> Why should they imperil the great and widely distributed woollen industries of this country which are spread from British Columbia to Cape Breton. My firm belief is that with five cents a pound off and only 35 per cent left on we may bid adieu to the greater part of the widely distributed woollen industry of this country.

I could keep you almost any length of time with quotations of that kind, showing you the opinions of the Conservatives of that day regarding the effects which this amended tariff would have on the destinies of the country. These are not the opinions of the rank and file of the Conservative party—that is if there be any rank and file—but of previous leaders of the Conservative party ? These are the words of Sir Charles Tupper and the hon. Mr. Foster, ex-Finance Minister, the acknowledged leader of the Conservative party. Both of these hon. gentlemen predicted that ruin and desolation were certain to come upon Canada if the Liberal party persisted in enforcing that tariff. But what positon do our hon. friends opposite take now ? The tariff in existence to-day is practically that which came into force in 1897. The same tariff which was introduced in 1897 has practically been continued down to the present day, and is the tariff which was so fiercely denounced by the Conservative party and its leaders. Has all this desolation, has all this ruin, so freely predicted, come upon the country. Why, Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that the country is prosperous. Our hon. friends opposite have to admit our prosperity, but they strive to account for it as being due to causes completely beyond the control of the government. Well, Sir, I am not one of those who say that our prosperity is due wholly to the policy of any one government. I do not think that any body on this side takes that position. I have certainly not heard any statement of the kind made in the House. But while we acknowledge that the prosperity of the country is due, in a large measure, to other causes, we also claim that there is something due to the policy and administration of the government. The fact remains at any rate, that the Liberal party are in power and that the country is prosperous, and surely the government is entitled to some credit for that condition of affairs, just as the government would be held responsible for an opposite condition. There is no lack of precedents for coming to this conclusion. Some of the older members in this House will remember the position taken by the Conservative party during the regime of the Mackenzie administration. They charged against the government all the hard times then prevailing. I cannot personally vouch for the fact, but, according to the tradition which has come down to us, they even held the Liberal government of that day responsible for the plague of grass hoppers and the entrance into Canada of the potato bug. Surely then the Liberal government now in power is entitled to some credit for the prosperity we are now enjoying. In what way have they contributed to that prosperity ? They have contributed to it, Sir, by the lowering of the tariff, by the active work they have done in connection with transportation, and the good work they have done in connection with agriculture. Our agriculturists have certainly benefited to a considerable extent by the cold storage system. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite say that that system was introduced by our predecessors, but even if it were no one can deny that it has certainly been enlarged and perfected under the administration of the present Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher). It would be difficult indeed to over estimate these advantages our agricultural community at large derive from that system which enables them to put their products on the British market in perfect condition. At any rate we cannot fail to admit that the Liberals now in power, are entitled to at least as much credit for the prosperity we are enjoying as the Conservatives claim was due to themselves for the much lesser share of prosperity which prevailed during their administration. That our country is prosperous is evident by the better condition of the people, by the large increases in bank deposits, by the paying off of debts and by the general satisfaction and contentment displayed on every side. There is an old saying of that wise man, the late President Abe Lincoln, concerning the folly of swapping horses when crossing a stream, and I think that saying is particularly applicable at the present moment. It would certainly be a bad time for the country to change its fiscal policy when the country is so prosperous under conditions that now exist. These hon. gentlemen opposite are playing the pessimistic role of croakers. They are continually predicting hard times and telling us that we ought to prepare for them by reducing our expenditure. Well, some of my constituents think that the present government are too lavish in their expenditure. I myself would like to see the expenditure curtailed in some respects. However, the main thing to consider is are the expenditures made on necessary works, and do the government get good value for amount expended. In one word, Mr. Speaker, I consider the policy of this government should be to as far as possible make Canada a cheap place to live in. There is a large immigration flocking into the country ; we need more. What we want is population to occupy the vacant lands of the North-west and other parts of Canada. These immigrants are mostly persons in very straitened circumstances, and should be able to get their implements, clothing and other manufactured articles at the lowest possible price.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to take up very much more of your time because I have always present to my mind that mathematical calculation of my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), and if I speak much longer there will surely be a very serious charge of wasting the public money rolled up against me. But there is one other word I wish to say. A great deal has been said by hon. members opposite during the session, more particularly by the hon. member from East Grey against hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches. He said that they were nothing but procastinators, and that they had not performed one statesmanlike act during their whole administration.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). Well, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend be correct in his estimate, we on this side of the House must be a poor deluded lot, far inferior to that hon. gentleman and to those who share his views. Have we really been deluded all these years in believing that we have a business administration at the head of affairs ? According to that hon. gentleman we have, but we enjoy this one consolation that we are superior in numbers, and I think, to put it mildly, equal in intelligence to himself and his friends. We have believed during all these years that we have had our country's affairs administered by the best men the country could afford. I am not saying this for the purpose of flattering hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches, but simply in vindication of myself and hon. members on this side. Is it possible that when, after the election of 1896, the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier chose the members of his administration he blundered and was utterly mistaken in his choice when, in forming his cabinet, he associated with himself men who made their mark in local and Dominion politics ? And when these men, in after years, appealed to the country on their record and when they were approved by a large majority, I do not believe that the people were misled or deluded. I believe, on the contrary, that the estimate put by the people on these men is the correct one and not the estimate of these hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side and who speak disparagingly of those who are their superiors. I believe in praising the present government for what they have done. I believe in expressing my high opinion of the abilities of those men who have held their own with the best British and colonial statesmen and the best statesmen of the United States. Such men can well afford to be sneered at by crude and unsuccessful politicians, and we delight to honour them notwithstanding the disparaging remarks of that illustrious statesman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the sneers of other hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclaren, Huntingdon), was not good enough to tell us any one thing that they did, all the same.

Mr. M. K. RICHARDSON (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House, I am conscious that the subject of debate has been already so fully discussed as to leave very little room for the introduction of new facts or new arguments to be adduced from the facts. But I avail myself of the opportunity given, of the privilege afforded, to each member of the House to place on record his views of the financial situation and of the government's policy. I also join in the general congratulations that the country is enjoying a measure of prosperity. And, indeed, Sir, looking out on the civilized world and considering the plenty that has blessed the world during these seven years, it would be somewhat surprising if Canada did not share some of that general prosperity. I congratulate the government on the happy circumstances under which they are placed in holding the reins of power at such a time. It will be conceded on all hands by any who have given the matter attention that the reverse conditions to these—adversity, depression from whatever cause arising—have been the cause on many occasions of leaving even good governments a very precarious hold upon the confidence of the country. I say I congratulate the government as well as the country. From whatever cause our present prosperity arises, whether from the general wave of confidence throughout the civilized world with the expansion of trade resulting from it, or whether from a series of bountiful harvests, or whether, still better, it can be traced in any degree to any policy initiated and put in operation by the government—the government are to be congratulated. And, if any connection or relation can be traced between the prosperity of the country and their policy, they are welcome to all the credit they can claim and all the adulation they can crave from their supporters on that account.

But, here we may fairly ask to what extent they have changed the policy of the government which they supplanted, that policy which they had so persistently condemned before their advent to power, and which they had pledged themselves if given the power, to destroy root and branch ? What have they done towards carrying out these pledges and promises which they gave to the country ? It is true that when they came into power they gave a new name to that policy, but without importing into it any new principle. And they would now hold up that new name as sufficient to satisfy the public that they were honest in their professions and to prove that they have been consistent in their acts. But, when the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cart-

wright) tells the House and the country that the protective policy of the former government put two dollars into the pocket of the manufacturer or merchant for every dollar of taxation that was put into the treasury, and that the revenue tariff of this government puts every dollar of taxes into the treasury, he draws too heavily upon the credulity of the people and banks too much on his own reputation as a statesman of long and wide experience. I think it demonstrates that it is possible for a man to outlive and out-talk a fairly good reputation for honesty, consistency and good sense. If when he counsels merchants and manufacturers to avail themselves of these fat years to lay up reserves for the lean years sure to follow, to retrench, to pay off their debts if they have any while they have the revenue coming in—if he would give such advice to the government, that, while they have a buoyant revenue they should be prepared for the adverse conditions which are sure to follow, which always do follow a period of expansion and of great prosperity, if the hon gentleman would apply this advice to the government and to his own department of the government, it would perhaps redound more to his credit than making such manifestly absured statements about distinctions in tariffs which differ not at all in principle and the differences in the application of which are so infinitesimal that they are really differences in name only.

The country was led to expect a revision of the tariff this session. But, whatever, need may exist for revision the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) says there will be no revision at present. The government are looking at present to Great Britain for a preference in that market, and to the United States for some arrangement for a reciprocal tariff. But since the budget speech has been delivered, all hopes for British preference have been dispelled by the abolition of the corn tax. I quote from a London paper of last week as follows:

No Preference Now Possible.

The budget is remarkable also because it retraces the step which Sir Michael Hicks-Beach was induced to take last year alone what radical critics then called the 'slippery slope of protection.' It is far fetched to suggest that Mr. Ritchie deliberately set himself to answer the Canadian Finance Minister's threat to withdraw the British preference in the Canadian tariff, unless Canadian products shall have a preference in the British markets; but it is quite certain that if the colonies had accepted, instead of rejecting Mr. Chamberlain's suggestions for free trade within the empire, with duties against foreigners, Mr. Ritchie would not have abolished the cereals tax from which the Canadians desired exemption. England now is on the way back to Mr. Gladstone's free breakfast table and, even if Canada refrains from withdrawing her 33 per cent preference for British goods anything like tariff unity for the empire, except on a free trade basis, is less probable than ever. In these two respects the budget is a budget of Radicalism, not of Toryism.

Sir William Vernon-Harcourt, M. P., Liberal, said:

I am glad the grain tax has been repealed. It was an infamous impost.

Mr. George Toulmin, Liberal, M.P., for Bury, Lancashire, said:

The repeal of the grain duties makes it impossible for any future Chancellor of the Exchequer to initiate a preferential tariff on colonial wheat.

So, that even since this debate commenced, and since the hope expressed on the part of the Finance Minister all hopes of such an arrangement with the British government are, for the present, at an end. Any satisfactory arrangements with the United States are equally hopeless. We have given to both Great Britain and the United States all we have to offer in exchange for any concessions from them. To-day we stand with empty hands, having nothing to offer them. Our government has been one of great claims and great purposes, great promises also, but both promises and purposes have come to nought. Chasing bubbles they have grasped at nothing. A government failing so often is always changing, facing now this way and now that. This is still their condition, and they have no fixed, determined, proclaimed policy for the country, but stand Micawber-like, waiting for something to turn up. Yet, because we are buying more goods from other countries than formerly, we are asked to jubilate that our products, and frequently our money go freely to pay for our heavy purchases in the markets of the United States and other countries.

At the opening of this debate, the House was given an instructive lesson on the wisdom and astuteness of the government in giving a preference in tariff to Great Britain without any advantage being asked in return; for while it would have been a very difficult thing to induce the British government to impose a tax on breadstuffs, exempting the colonies only, now, having given the prefernce so graciously, and Britain having since that put on a corn tax, it would be much easier for Britain to reduce that taxation by exempting the colonies from its operation. But while we are still in this debate, that hope has been dispelled, Britain has abolished her corn tax, and Canada has nothing to expect in that direction. Oh, but, say they, we can do away with our preference to Britain, and an implied threat to that effect closed the Finance Minister's speech. And so our pretended gratitude for the splendid freedom that Britain gave us will stand in history as a mean and servile hypocrisy, seeking to obtain by subterfuge what a self-respecting nation should have sought for honestly, on a sound business basis. So our attitude to Britain to-day is hostile on trade relations.

But how do we stand with Germany? Our relations were friendly, our trade growing, but how is it now? We have considerable settlements of Germans, both in the older provinces and in the new territories. They form no inconsiderable portion of our best citizenship. In arts and manufactures they bring to bear that intelligence and that application that challenge competition with the world. In agricultural pursuits they are not excelled and rarely equalled by any other nationality in Canada. We want emigration from Germany, but our bungling over preferential trade with Britain has aroused such a feeling of resentment against Canada in Germany, that we are singled out of all the world as the country to which a higher prohibitive tariff must be applied. We are no longer to have the German market for our products on the same conditions as other nations. Our Finance Minister announces that we are accepting the German challenge to a tariff war; it is on now, and may embroil Great Britain as well. Our attitude to Germany is hostile.

France is another country with which we are endeavouring to cultivate better trade relations. So far our relations have been of a friendly character with that country, but now it appears from correspondence which our government has had with that country that the overtures for improved trade offered by Canada, have met with but slight response from France. Our treatment of Great Britain and our treatment by Britain, do not seem to have inspired respect for and confidence in our methods by other countries. Our relations with France, if not hostile, are not particularly amicable.

But there is our great natural market in the United States, that country that has snubbed us at every turn; that country that deserves from us no friendship in tariff relations, that country that has treated all our approaches to reciprocal trade with contumely and insult, the country that we were told in this House last session would never again have the opportunity of turning us down, the country towards which in future we were going to stand on our dignity—no more High Commission junketings to Washington for bettered relations; they must be the seekers not we. What is our attitude to them to-day? Why, we are informed that our government are again making their bow to Washington, and interchanging letters regarding resuming negotiations; and any needed change in our tariff must wait, wait till we see what our American friends will do for us; and possibly we may see more summer trips, pic-nics, banquets, and in the end, a big bill—that, and nothing more.

This negotiation is like chasing a bubble which, when caught, is less than nothing. Mr. Speaker, we have learned, or should have learned by this time, or long ago, that we have nothing to expect from the United States. It is not for us to be surprised that the United States statesmen should regard it a patriotic duty to trick and trip Canada at every turn. Why should they lend their support to any policy that might by any possibility help to a more rapid development of a neighbouring state, that is destined not only to be their only rival on this continent, but will rival their supremacy in trade, commerce and manufactures in the whole world. Such, I believe to be the undoubted destiny of Canada if we be true to ourselves, and to the best interests of this country.

The first unfriendly blow given to our young commonwealth by the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty was intended in no friendly spirit for Canada. It was intended to be a knock-out blow to the aspirations of our young nationality. I well recollect, and it must be within the memory of many members of this House, the feeling of dismay that spread through the country when it was announced that the United States had abrogated and would not renew that treaty. There were hundreds, possibly thousands of business men throughout Canada, who felt that our chances of success in competition with them were so small that we might as well, to use the common expression, throw up the sponge, that we would have no chance with them. But that which was intended to be a blow to our national aspirations proved indeed a blessing, because out of it sprung the first feeling of self-dependence, that first feeling of national sentiment which was so much needed by Canada at that time, and which is sometimes needed by Canada even at the present time. Not only then but on every subsequent occasion when we have received similar repulses from the United States, the consequence has been to strengthen and intensify that spirit of self-reliance which is a more valuable asset than the most favoured treaties could possibly be to this country. There is no fear that Americans will waste any sympathy or sentiment on Canada. We will never get any trade treaty with them, advantageous to ourselves, even though we sought for it, until they find that they need our markets. I advocate no spirit of enmity or animosity to the United States, but we have had a surfeit of such nostrums as commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. Let us have no more coquetting with a nation ostensibly unfriendly in every trade relation with us. I would recommend the adoption of that aphorism from a popular American book, David Harum. He says: 'When you go to trade hosses do to the other feller as he intends to do to you, only be sure you do it fust.' We should, as a self-respecting people, have a declared policy framed for Canada, a policy of protection for the toilers on our farms, our forests, our fisheries, for our miners and artisans in mill or shop, that there shall be for every man, as far as government can secure it, a fair return for industry and enterprise, and a certain and safe investment for capital. A weak, vacillating, uncertain, waiting policy, such as may be described in the old distich.

We can and we can't, we will and we won't,
We'll be blamed if we do, and condemned if we don't.

Is not a policy for a great, progressive country like Canada to pursue. Mr. Speaker, let us once more glance at our foreign relations—to England hostile, to Germany hostile, to France not friendly, to the United States temporizing with the only nation that merits our contempt, we are waiting for a dicker or a deal. To such humiliating conditions the present Liberal government have brought us. The United States will never give us reciprocal trade while they have our market without it, at the same time shutting us out of theirs.

But, we are told we have a big surplus. If we ask where it is we shall probably be told that it appears in the Public Accounts. But if it had any real, tangible existence, we might use the hon. Finance Minister's own argument and blame the government for taking so much more taxes from the people than they require unless it was to be used to pay off our indebtedness. It is folly to expect an uninterrupted continuity of increasing revenue any more than the increase of our population will create a corresponding increase in expenditure. I said if there be a surplus such as stated, but if it has no real existence as a convertible asset, if it is a visionary, attenuated, intangible ghost of figures created by a system of arithmetic not yet introduced or taught in the common schools, where they still believe that two and two only make four, and still believe that four from four leaves nothing, then the government have no right to take credit for it.

We are doing a large trade, but buying more than we sell. We buy from the United States in dairy products and meats $2,550,712, and in grain $14,451,461. Our total imports of agricultural products amount to some $28,000,000 from them, and we export to the United States only $8,000,000, leaving in agricultural products alone an enormous balance of trade against Canada, our total imports from the United States in 1902 being over $129,000,000, our exports $71,000,000, leaving the total balance of trade against us nearly $50,000,000. They set up a tariff wall against our products, and it is no wonder, with such a balance of trade in their favour, that they do not wish for much change to be made in our trade relations. Just let me give a few figures illustrating the character of our relations with the United States. I have not introduced much in the way of statistics. I have avoided statistics, because so many have been quoted during the debate so far, but the few figures which I will give will not be out of place as contrasting their tariff with ours in relation to agricultural products. Against wheat they put up a tariff of 25 cents a bushel. Our tariff against their wheat is only 12 cents, the United States tariff against our oats is 15 cents, ours against theirs 10 cents, against our barley 30 cents, ours against theirs 15 cents, against our pease 40 cents, ours against theirs 10 cents, against our hay $4 per ton, ours against theirs only half that amount, $2 per ton, against our potatoes 25 cents per bushel, ours against theirs 15 cents per bushel, against our beans 45 cents per bushel, ours against theirs 15 cents, against our butter 6 cents per pound, ours against theirs 4 cents per pound. Our apples have to pay a duty of 75 cents per barrel, while theirs only pay 40 cents per barrel coming into Canada. Their tariff against our flour is 75 cents per barrel, ours against theirs is 60 cents per barrel. Their corn comes in free, but for every bushel of corn we send to the United States there is a duty under the tariff of 15 cents. These figures illustrate the unfair trade relations existing between these two countries, and I think we can scarcely expect anything in the way of reciprocal trade while we are placed in this position. Our only hope for reciprocal trade will be in placing our tariff in such relation to theirs as to make it their necessity to seek to obtain our market by a mutual lowering of tariffs. They need our trade and our market and cannot well afford to lose them.

The expenditures of the government have been running up to an alarming extent. I do not wish to enter much into statistics, as this question has been gone over repeatedly during this debate, but I shall refer to just one item of expenditure. For immigration in 1896 the expenditure was $120,196, while in 1902 the expenditure was $494,842, an increase of $374,643. I do not complain of that increase in expenditure if the results warrant it, but I think our immigration agents have gone far afield to find settlers for the great territories now opening up for settlement and taking no note of the fact that thousands of our young men have been leaving our older provinces for the United States, and they have neither made intelligent effort to stop the drain nor replace the loss by directing the stream of immigration to the older provinces. I believe it is well that a portion of the immigration coming from the old country, and especially from Great Britain, should be absorbed by the older provinces. Farm labour is very much needed, and I believe that immigrants will more quickly become accustomed to the different life from that which they left in the old country if they settled in the older provinces, as the difference between conditions in the old country and the older provinces would not be so great as the difference between life in the old country and the western part of Canada. Had the immigration department afforded the same aids to settlement to our own people that were given to Doukhobors and others, thousands of our people who have drifted to the United States might have remained citizens of our own country. When the farm is too small

and will not bear further division, the necessity for change becomes pressing. It may be desirable to hold the family together, and as many people may not have the amount of money that is required to transport themselves and their families across the great distance separating the older provinces from the west, some of our annual expenditure on immigration purposes might be profitably employed in assisting the settlement of such people in the west. We need something more to bind the west to the east than railway lines and telegraph wires. We need more even than the bonds of commerce. We need the stronger bonds of sentiment and kinship, and for our farmers, compelled by growing families to move, it were infinitely better to assist them to settlement in our west than permit them through our indifference to drift across the line. I do not wish the government to enter upon a scheme of granting assistance to drain the older provinces of population, but there are individual cases where assistance might very wisely and profitably be given to settlement, assistance equal to that given to people from the older countries in Europe, who are not nearly as desirable citizens as our own Canadians are. One farmer's son from the older provinces of Canada settling in the Northwest would be worth a dozen such men as the Doukhobors, the Galicians and others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after making these few desultory remarks I shall conclude. But let me ask: What is our attitude to-day with regard to the nations of the world. Is it that self-respecting, self-dependent position that a young country like Canada with all her wealth of natural resources with all the intelligence and enterprise of her citizens; is it, I ask, that self-respecting position which Canada should occupy. Should the government of such a nation as ours have such a policy as is characteristic of the government of to-day. Should we have a waiting policy; waiting on the wishes and whims of other countries. Should our policy not be rather a recorded policy, a pronounced policy for Canada, one that will preserve for all the citizens of Canada that fair return for labour, for enterprise, for toil, for investment that is to be found in other countries that have not the resources of Canada. It is due to ourselves, Sir, that while we shall be friendly to all, we shall be determined that we will be servile to none. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. ROBERT HOLMES (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised that the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) should have in the course of his remarks, endorsed that statement credited to David Harum, that: If you are doing business with another fellow you should try and do him up. It seems to me, Sir, that this quotation applied to individuals would also apply to nations if it is possible to put it into practice, and I do not think that it would be either wise or commendable to adopt the spirit of the quotation there alluded to, and endeavour to do the other fellow up. All the more is that the case when in doing so we would obtain no advantage to ourselves. It has not surprised me, Mr. Speaker, that not alone the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) but the majority of members on the other side, are endeavouring to depreciate as far as they can the magnificent showing that has been made in the budget speech delivered from the treasury benches. If I am not mistaken, the hon. leader of the opposition, in a speech made during the recess, when regretting the absence of a certain gentleman from this House of Commons and pleading with the people for his re-election, admitted that the opposition needed that gentleman's presence in order that they might avail of his services as a critic of the government. That admission was not very complimentary to the gentlemen who sit behind the leader of the opposition. It is equivalent to saying, that these gentlemen, able as they are, are not competent to criticise the actions of the government, or else it means that the actions of the government were so far removed from fair and honourable criticism that the opposition required some man in the House who would resort to extreme measures in order to base a criticism on the conduct of the government. That is the logic to be drawn from this statement of the leader of the opposition.

Now, Sir, while I agree with the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) when he stated that to a certain extent this debate had lost its interest, yet, I think there are a good many features in connection with the budget that might be emphasized. Although to a certain extent it is true that when the leaders on either side have spoken, they have said practically all that can be said on the question. I do not suppose, Sir, that I shall say anything new, and I certainly shall not say anything that will be remarkable, but I shall endeavour to try to impress upon the House one or two facts that stand out very prominently in connection with this discussion. I am satisfied that if our friends on the opposition benches had been able during any of the eighteen years they were in office, to present so magnificent a showing as has been presented by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), they would have cried it from the house tops and reiterated it in black face type in all the Conservative newspapers of Canada. It seems to me, Sir, that the object of this government and of any government, should be to propound such a policy as will be for the general well-being of the country at large, and not for the well-being of a few manufacturers alone. And, while I do not claim that this government in its administration is entitled to all credit for the remarkably satisfactory record dur-

ing the time they have been in power, I do claim that they are entitled to some credit for it. In making that claim I am simply doing what our opposition friends did for eighteen years, because during the time they were in office, they claimed credit for any progress which was made, they claimed credit for, and attributed it to the beneficent influences of the national policy. Now, in order to show the general prosperity of Canada, I desire to quote for the benefit of the House, and more especially for the benefit of the country, some figures in reference to our trade returns. It will be remembered that the national policy was introduced with the object of especially developing our industries and increasing our trade. In 1893, after a long experience of the national policy, our total trade reached $247,000,000, which was the highest it ever reached during the Conservative regime. In 1896 our total trade was only $239,000,000. During the twenty-three years preceding this, our total trade had only increased by a little over $60,000,000, or an average of less than $3,000,000 a year. Be it remembered that during all that time we had what our friends on the other side of the House called a policy of adequate protection. We had what they believed to be a policy of sufficient protection; what they believed to be the highest perfection so far as legislation is concerned, that could contribute to the well-being and advancement and prosperity of the country. How well the national policy accomplished that, or how well it failed, may be shown by comparing our trade returns during the Conservative administration with our trade returns during the Liberal regime. In 1896, as I have said, the total trade of Canada amounted to $239,000,000. The Liberals had no sooner taken hold of the reins of office; they were no sooner installed apparently, than our trade began to advance at a marvellous rate. Here is the record:

TOTAL TRADE OF THE DOMINION.

Year.	Amount.	Increase of one year over the preceding year.
1896	$239,000,000	
1897	257,000,000	$18,000,000
1898	304,000,000	47,000,000
1899	321,000,000	17,000,000
1900	381,000,000	59,000,000
1901	386,000,000	5,000,000
1902	422,000,000	35,000,000

I have given these figures in round numbers, and they show that during the six years of Liberal government, our total trade increased by $163,000,000. Now, our total trade for the current year shows an increase along the same lines, which increase will probably amount to $40,000,000, so that the total increase for the seven years of the Liberal government will amount to $200,000,000, or an average yearly increase of nearly $30,000,000. I am not surprised that in the face of these figures our friends on the opposite side should endeavour to underestimate the prosperity which this country is enjoying. I am not surprised that they should endeavour to explain away as far as they can, the prosperity which exists and attribute it alone to the general prosperity prevailing all over the world. I am not prepared to admit, Sir, that our prosperity is due solely to the fact that other nations are prosperous. If we accept that as a suitable argument we are thrown back upon the proposition: That during the eighteen years the Conservatives were in power the other nations of the world were not making that progress which they relatively should, and it also follows, that this policy of protection in which the Conservatives place so much confidence now, did not produce the good results which they claimed it would during the years they were in power. Nor am I surprised that the gentlemen on the other side of the House endeavour to underestimate and depreciate the remarkable financial record which was proclaimed in the speech of the Minister of Finance. Had our Conservative friends been able to show the very large surpluses which the Liberal government have been able to show, they would have extolled it as a renewed evidence of the statesmanlike policy of their party. When the Conservatives were in power they claimed credit for all the good things that were going. Not only did they claim credit for the prosperity of the country, but they claimed credit whenever they had a surplus. They did not claim credit for having deficits, but while they were responsible for the surpluses, nevertheless they left the deficits out of the reckoning when they were glorifying themselves. I have here some figures which have already been submitted to the House, but they will bear repetition. They say that a good story cannot be told too often, and acting upon that principle, I desire to submit some figures bearing on our present financial standing.

In 1896-97, the Liberals, on entering office, having assumed certain responsibilities and obligations which had been incurred by their predecessors, found themselves face to face with a deficit of $519,000. In the following year they had a surplus of nearly $2,000,000, in 1898-9 they had a surplus of nearly $5,000,000, in 1899-1900, a surplus of $8,000,000, in 1901-2 a surplus of $7,000,000, and this year they will have an estimated surplus of $13,350,000, or a total surplus in the seven years of nearly $41,000,000. The average annual surplus during the seven years of the Liberal administration has been $5,569,275, while the average annual surplus during the eighteen years of Liberal-Conservative rule—and our Liberal-Conservative friends used to boast upon the housetops and everywhere else of the great success of their administration—amounted to $544,000. Now, I am not specially concerned about the increase of the debt. I think the people of this country will not

quarrel with the administration about any increase of debt provided it is a legitimate increase, by virtue of the construction of various public works of a productive character, and provided that the money is properly and honestly expended, as it is under the Liberal administration. Our friends on the opposition benches may naturally take exception to an increased expenditure; but they have been unable so far to point to any expenditure that has not been in the general interest of the country at large; and I am satisfied that the people will endorse an increased expenditure so long as it is consistent with the development of the country, and in its best interests. But there is this fact to be borne in mind, which would have afforded unbounded glory to hon. gentlemen opposite if they had been able to report it in their time, that there has been an actual reduction of $5,000,000 in the debt of the country. The government has carefully looked after all the public works required and the various matters calling for expenditure, not only without any increase in the public debt, but with an actual reduction of the debt.

Now, our friends on the opposite side of the House have taken the members on this side and the government to task for having no declared policy on the question of protection. I have listened to almost all the speeches which have been delivered by members on the other side of the House, and so far I have failed to hear any specific declaration as to what they think should be the amount of protection afforded to the various industries of the country. They do not define it in their resolution. They state that there should be some declared policy of adequate protection. Members on this side have asked the hon. leader of the opposition himself as well as those who follow him, to define or specify what they mean by a declared policy of adequate protection, and so far no member on the other side of the House has given any definition thereof. As a matter of fact, the amendment before the House is a negative amendment, because it proposes actually nothing at all. It simply states that there should be adequate protection; but none of the hon. gentlemen opposite apparently are able or willing to state what in their opinion may be regarded as adequate protection. What might be adequate protection for one industry might not be for another, and what might be adequate protection in the mind of one member might not be adequate protection in the mind of another. Therefore you may realize the difficulty of arriving at a definite conclusion upon an indefinite term of that kind, in the absence of anything specific in the resolution. Looking over our tariff, I find that it runs all the way from 20 to 40 per cent; and it seems to me that a tariff offering 40 per cent or even 35 per cent protection should be sufficient under normal conditions for our manufacturers. It simply means that if a manufacturer under ordinary conditions produces and places on the market $100 worth of goods, the present tariff, which our hon. friends say is not adequate, enables him to charge for those goods $135. It gives him an advantage of $35, which it seems to me should be sufficient for all practical purposes, and I am not one of those who think that this protection should be increased very materially. I notice that I am quoted by the hon. leader of the opposition as being a protectionist. In his speech he did me the honour of including me with some others as being in favour of protection. Well, Mr. Speaker, I assume that we are all more or less protectionists, according to local circumstances or conditions; but as to being a protectionist in the ordinary sense of the term I have to deny the soft impeachment. I am not a protectionist, but, I believe in freedom of trade, so far as we can have it consistently with the needs of our revenue.

As to the marvellous development which has taken place in the trade of the country under the Liberal regime, our friends of the opposition claim that that is due to world-wide prosperity—that it is because there is prosperity in all other nations. We might ask, what is the reason that other nations of the world are enjoying prosperity? I think they will find, if they inquire, that the reason is not because of an artificial system of protection, which would go to the upbuilding of manufactures, but that it may be—I will not say must be—due to natural causes. If it be true that the prosperity of other lands is largely due to natural causes—and I believe that is the case in the United States—while our friends opposite cite the United States as an example of the benefits of a highly protective policy, they forget that within themselves the United States are a free trade people. Having various kinds of climate, and soil, they are not in a position to be compared to the Dominion of Canada. But if it be true that the prosperity of the world is due to natural causes, and that the general progress and prosperity of Canada is due to the same causes, then I contend that it is the duty of this government, as far as lies in its power, to look to the development of our natural resources, whereby we may increase the wealth of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite want that to be done by a higher tariff. I believe it can be done by a lower tariff. I believe that it has been done by a lower tariff, and if we seek to develop our natural resources, as far as we can, without putting oppressive burdens on the people, it will be better for the prosperity of our own country. The hon. member for North Grey referred to the action of the government.

Mr. SPROULE. It is South Grey and not North Grey.

Mr. HOLMES. I am much obliged to the hon. member for East Grey for the correction. If I understood the argument of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson), rightly, he condemned the government for its attitude with reference to Germany. He did not do so in specific terms, but the inference to be drawn from his argument was that he was opposed to the action of the government. He went on to point out that the effect of this would be to prevent immigration from Germany, which we should rather encourage, and that consequently, the putting up of a protective wall against Germany was an unwise policy. But in the very next breath he condemned the government for not having done precisely the same thing with regard to the United States. He argued that we should raise our tariff wall against imports from the United States, but that we were acting unwisely in raising our tariff against Germany. While the government were unwise in raising the tariff against Germany for one reason, they were equally, for another reason, blamable for not raising our tariff against the United States. The position he takes is illogical. If the government is to be commended for adopting any measure of protection, surely it is not to be condemned for the course it has taken towards Germany. It seems to me that we must adapt our tariff to the existing circumstances as far as we can; and if the government think it wise to put a surtax on German imports. I am not going to find fault. And even if it be a policy of retaliation, I think that retaliation, under the circumstances, is justifiable and in the long run will bring about beneficial results.

A number of hon. gentlemen opposite have contended that we should put up our tariff so high as to practically exclude imports from the United States and also practically prevent any importations from Great Britain. Well, Mr. Speaker, that may sound very nice as an argument on the hustings, but what would be the practical operation of such a policy? It seems to me self-evident that if we do not import, we cannot export, that if we do not sell to foreign countries we cannot buy from them, and we might just as well at once put a stop to our improvements in harbours and terminals at Quebec and other points where we expect to make tremendous shipments to the old country. We will simply be throwing away money, because if we are going to put up a high tariff which would prevent importation, we will of necessity by the same means prevent exportation.

Another argument advanced is that a prohibitive tariff would not only create new manufacturing industries, but contribute to the well being of those already established. The hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said that our cotton industry was languishing owing to insufficient protection, and his statement was applauded by hon. members opposite. Well, Sir, I hold in my hand a pamphlet, issued by the cotton manufacturers, in the interest of the Canadian manufacturers, and which no doubt has been circulated among hon. members of this House. In that pamphlet I find a paragraph headed 'Canadian goods cheap to the consumer,' and it goes on to say:

> There is not the least doubt that the Canadian consumer saves nothing on imported goods.

If that statement be true, if our cotton manufacturers can convince our wholesale and retail merchants that they have nothing to gain by importing cottons, then this particular Canadian industry at least has nothing to fear from outside competition. Then we have this further argument:

> An illustration of this fact recently came to light. A wholesaler imported a line of fancy shirtings and laid them down at 8½ cents per yard. He sold them to the retailers at 11½ cents, who resold at 17 cents. A Canadian firm duplicated the pattern, sold it at 8 cents, the wholesaler sold at 10 cents, while the consumer got it at 12½ cents, meaning a saving of 4½ cents per yard to the wearer of the shirts.

I commend that Canadian manufacturer for his ability to manufacture that article apparently cheaper than it could be manufactured in the old country. But while I commend him for so doing, is it not evident that this very fact contradicts the position taken by our manufacturers, that they are absolutely in need of the highest protection in order that they may retain the Canadian market? A good many of the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite are practically of the same character. When you come to analyse them, you find that they are not only able to hold the Canadian market but are doing remarkably well in connection therewith. I have no desire whatever other than to see the Canadian manufacturers prosper to the fullest extent. I am a Canadian from the sole of my foot to the crown of my head. I have been born in Canada and I live in Canada and I expect to die in Canada. I am just as desirous as my hon. friends opposite to see our manufacturers enjoy the fullest measure of prosperity, but I do not think it is right and fair to ask the consumers to put their hands in their pockets to a greater extent than at present. There is a feeling among the people in Canada that they are willing to stand by what may be called a limited protective policy for the benefit of the Canadian manufacturers. They are willing to allow our manufacturers a moderate amount of protection. That protection they are enjoying under the present policy, and I do not think that it should be materially increased except under some special circumstance, when some particular industry may be suffering from unfair competition which may be removed by a change in the tariff. While I do not agree with all my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)

said regarding the question of reciprocity with the United States, I am in favour of reciprocity provided we can get it on fair and honourable terms. I cordially agree in the opinion expressed by the right hon. the leader of this House when he said: I think it was in the city of Quebec—that the Dominion would never again go to Washington and get down on its knees and ask for reciprocity. But while that statement meets with my fullest approval, I am in favour of securing reciprocity on fair and equitable terms. I believe that if we had reciprocity in natural products, our Canadian manufacturers would be able, with their well known energy, enterprise, force of character and determination, to compete with our American neighbours on equal terms and under equal conditions. I have the assurance of manufacturers to-day that, if the American market were thrown open to them they would not fear the competition of the manufacturers of that country, but that they are perfectly willing to enter the American market if they are given access thereto—

Mr. TAYLOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. HOLMES—And that statement, I take it, is endorsed by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor)—

Mr. SPROULE. But will the American market ever be thrown open to our manufacturers? Until it is, we have a right to look after our own.

Mr. HOLMES. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) may be correct, or he may not. But he must bear in mind that, for all time to come, we remain the neighbour of the country to the south of us; and so, for all time to come, we should try to secure the most workable and favourable trade relations with them that it is possible for us to secure. Our destinies may not be bound up with theirs, and yet, to a certain extent we are one nation, speaking the same tongue. And I do not wish anybody to assume from what I say that I am in favour of annexation, for I am not in favour of that at all. During visits I have made to our American friends, when opportunities have presented themselves on public occasions, I have publicly repudiated the idea that any feeling in favour of annexation exists in this country. I do not believe that any such feeling exists, but I believe a strong feeling exists in favour of good trade relations with our neighbours to the south. And I say that, situated as we are, it would be almost—suicide, I was going to say that that would be rather a strong term, perhaps, but it would certainly not be in our best interests to erect a high tariff wall between ourselves and our neighbours to the south. Our friends on the other side of the House advocate the erection of a Chinese wall. They would have us trade absolutely within ourselves. Anybody who knows anything about trade knows that that would be impossible. If we were able to secure concessions from our friends to the south—and the indications point that way notwithstanding what my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says—it would be in the interest of Canada for the government to entertain any proposition looking to that end. I listened to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) the other night, and was more than surprised that a man living in the neck of land that my hon. friend lives in, the south-western part of Ontario, should take the stand that he took in opposition to closer trade relations with the United States. He has a right to his opinion, as I have a right to mine, but I have conversed with many men who live in that section and have come in contact with a large number of them, and I say without fear of successful contradiction—a man may contradict and yet not contradict successfully—that that neck of land lying west of the city of London, if we had closer trade relations with the United States, would increase in prosperity, and its land would rise in value to a marvellous extent. Hon. gentlemen opposite seek to make it appear that we have no trade with the United States, or rather that we are buying from the United States and not selling to them. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) quoted the American tariff to show that their tariff was higher on certain lines than ours, and therefore it was wiser for us not to seek better trade relations with them or to do business with them. There is no force in saying that their duty on grain is 25 cents a bushel while ours is lower. It would make no difference if their duty were 50 cents a bushel—it would not affect the price of the Canadian farmers' grain, and, those hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are farmers, know that this is true. But, to show the House and the country that we do trade with the United States notwithstanding their hostile tariff—which trade would be larger, then, if they had not a hostile tariff—I wish to quote a few figures. These relate to agricultural products, and they are not all the figures that might be quoted. Hon. gentlemen opposite never tire of seeking to convince the House that our farmers suffer by the competition of the people to the south of us. The fact is that there are no articles that have been mentioned that come into competition with the articles produced by the Canadian farmer. The figures I shall quote show the exports from Canada to the United States of certain articles notwithstanding the high rate of duty they have to pay:

Horned cattle, year old, $124,497, duty of $2 per head; horned cattle, over year old, $699,178, duty of $3.75 per head; horses, $652,303, duty of $30 per head; sheep, year old or less, $803,701, duty of $1.50 per head; sheep, over year old, $118,436, duty of $1.75 per head; swine, $81,516, duty of $1.50 per head; poultry, $55,862, duty of 3 cents per pound live, 5 cents dressed; animals, all told, living, $2,535,493.

Barley, $9,499, duty 30 cents per bushel—(Dingley) ; beans, $185,921, duty 45 cents per bushel ; buckwheat, $2,141, 15 cents per bushel; oats, $62,322, 15 cents per bushel ; pease, $145,-102 ; grain, all told, $446,712.

So, we sell living animals to the value of over two millions of dollars notwithstanding that our American friends are producers of the very class of stock that we produce. It will be seen from the figures that we find very little market now in the United States for our barley. That market was nearly cut off by the Dingley tariff—nobody disputes that. The beans, of which we sent $185,000 worth, notwithstanding the duty of 45 cents per bushel, were the product, very largely, of the province of Ontario, and of that section of it represented by my hon. friend from Bothwell, a section which, he intimated, would receive no advantage from reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) if all these goods he has enumerated were entered for home consumption in the United States, or are they goods exported in bond and re-exported ?

Mr. HOLMES. These goods are not all re-exported.

Mr. TAYLOR. But in part, and greatly.

Mr. HOLMES. The figures I quote relate to agricultural products that are entered for home consumption in the United States. It may be that there are exceptions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. HOLMES. I am quite free to qualify the statement. I have compiled the figures carefully and I do not think there is an exception, but there may be.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman furnish me with the statistics ?

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) can have them and welcome. Some I got from the American returns and some from our own. I declare myself in favour of reciprocal trade relations with our neighbours to the south. I say I am in favour of it because I believe that it would aid to the well-being and advancement of this country. I am glad that our government has taken the wise step of either lowering the duties or taking off the duties upon certain articles of the produce of the United States. I think the present government have conferred no greater benefit upon the farmers of the Dominion of Canada than by taking off entirely the duty on corn. Notwithstanding what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite, I am satisfied that the government conferred an inestimable boon upon the farmers when they removed that duty, and I am satisfied that that opinion is held by the farmers of the Dominion irrespective of their political predilections.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman think that the Western Ontario peninsula, of which he has spoken, will endorse that ?

Mr. HOLMES. I feel sure that the section of which my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is one of the representatives will endorse it, for the reason that the corn that comes in does not enter into competition, to any appreciable extent, with the corn grown in the district represented by my hon. friend. I have had Conservatives come to me, men of pronounced political convictions, men who have no sympathy with this government but have done everything they possibly could to prevent the return of its supporters—I have had these men come to me and endorse in unqualified terms the action of the government in removing the duty on corn. I have heard them commend the government because of its attitude on this matter, declaring that if in no other respect the government was worthy of commendation, it was worthy of commendation in this. What does it do, Mr. Speaker ? It enables the Canadian farmer, to a greater extent than he ever could under former conditions, to finish his Canadian cattle and to put them on the English market in competition with his American friends, almost upon equal footing. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) knows perfectly well—he poses as a farmer while I do not—that the Canadian farmer was handicapped in the fact that he was compelled to fall back upon his own coarse grains for feeding his stock, and therefore it cost him more to feed his stock than it would, under ordinary conditions, if he could have secured American corn. There are years when he cannot secure American corn, when it is too high, and it may be more profitable for him to use his own coarse grain. But the Canadian farmer knows to-day that it has paid him better to sell his coarse grains in the open market, and buy corn for the purpose of finishing his cattle, which he can then send to the English market in competition with the American farmer. My hon. friend may laugh; but I am prepared at any time to go on any platform in the country, and face him in advocacy of that position. Then I say that I am in hearty sympathy with the idea of obtaining reciprocal trade with our neighbours to the south of us, assuming, of course, that it is possible to get it. If it is not possible to get it, then I would do the best I could in the development of our own interests in some other direction. But I think it would be to the advantage of the Dominion at large to have reciprocal trade relations with the United States, to some extent at any rate.

Fault has been found and is found with our immigration policy. But it does not lie in the mouths of our hon. friends on the opposite side of the House to point to what they claim to be the shortcomings or defects of our immigration policy. We know that the policy pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite did not enable them to get immigrants to come to this country, at least we know in how few numbers they came

when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. On the other hand, whether it is due to the marvellous prosperity and progress of this country or not, immigrants are now coming in by the thousands and tens of thousands. Moreover, our Conservative frieds say, why does not the government take more interest in Canadians and do something for Canadians instead of spending their time and money on foreigners? Why did not our hon. friends do it when they were in power themselves?

Mr. BROCK. That is no argument.

Mr. HOLMES. It may not be a very good argument. The hon. member for Toronto does not regard it as a good argument because it happens to hit his own party in a tender spot. If the argument is good in the one instance, if it is right now that the government should pay special attention to Canadians, it was right during the eighteen years when our friends opposite were in power; and they should be honest and candid enough to acknowledge that they did not do during those eighteen years what they claim now we ought to do. I say this, Mr. Speaker, that while I am perfectly willing that the government should do its utmost for Canadians who are within our land, and while I believe firmly that Canadians would make better settlers in the North-west than quite a few who are now coming from foreign lands, still I am not hostile to foreign immigrants, a term that I suppose will embrace the Doukhobors and Galicians, and men of that kind. I have conversed with people in the North-west, as I presume some of my hon. friends opposite have done, in reference to the Doukhobors, and notwithstanding their mistake of last year—and for that I think they are perhaps entitled to a certain amount of consideration in view of their circumstances—the people of the North-west will tell you that there are no better settlers, taking them all around, there is no community in the North-west that gives better promise for the future than the Doukhobors.

An hon. MEMBER. All bosh.

Mr. HOLMES. Perhaps it is all bosh. The hon. member for Halton knows how easy it is to say, it is all bosh. But that is no argument. As the hon. member for Toronto said himself a moment ago, that is no argument. My hon. friend who makes that remark cannot go into any town in the North-west adjacent to a Doukhobor settlement, and repeat the ejaculation that he throws across the floor of this House.

Mr. BROCK. I made no remark at all about the Doukhobors.

Mr. HOLMES. I did not allude to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BROCK. He said the member for Toronto.

Mr. HOLMES. I alluded to the hon. member for Halton, who was using an argument similar to that which had just been used by the member for Toronto.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman by a single word.

Mr. HOLMES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I thought it was he who made the remark.

Mr. HENDERSON. There was a good deal of bosh in what he said, but I did not interrupt him.

Mr. HOLMES. I am sorry to attribute to the hon. gentleman any views he does not hold, I accept his disclaimer, and I hope he will have the forbearance to accept my apology. When two or three members opposite are making ejaculations it is not always easy to tell where they come from. But I do not wish intentionally to wound the feelings of the hon. member for Halton, and if he did not make the remark some other hon. member opposite did make it. I think the present government is entitled to commendation for its immigration policy. In order to develop our country we want population, and if we can get population of a more or less desirable kind, I think the government is entitled to credit therefor. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be a picayune policy indeed to take exception to this, that, or the other nationality who are coming here, although in due course of time they will no doubt take the oath of allegiance and become good Canadian citizens, just as good as any other people we have. If we go back to the history of this country we will find that it has been settled by men of different nationalities, Germans, Irish, Scotch, and perhaps some heathen. But in course of time they have developed into good, industrious and reputable Canadian citizens. I do not think it becoming in hon. gentlemen opposite to throw stones in the way they do at the different nationalities. I have no special love for any particular nationality, but when they come to our shores and assume the responsibilities of citizens, and take their due part in building up this country, they are entitled to every credit and consideration.

Now what should the government do for Canadians? How many Canadians are there who go to the North-west who would be willing to accept government aid and government assistance, even to the limited extent that we give it to those who come to us from foreign shores? Very few Canadians indeed. The spirit of independence in the heart of Canadians is so strong that they are unwilling to accept what may be for the time being reasonable assistance in order to help them move their homes to other portions of the Dominion. But I say that the Dominion government to-day offers the very same facilities to any residents of the older provinces that they offer to residents

of foreign lands. There is no hindrance whatever to native Canadians obtaining for themselves a home in the North-west; they have the very same privilege which is given to incoming immigrants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, reference is made in that resolution to the protection of the farmer as well as to protection of the labourer. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to convince the House, though it seemed to me they were arguing against their own convictions, that they believed in a policy that could protect the farmer. Well, the protection that the farmer can get from any policy of adequate protection or from the indefinite protection advocated by the hon. gentlemen opposite, is so infinitesimally small that, to use a common phrase, it does not amount to a hill of beans. The farmers were hoodwinked in Canada once by the promise of increased protection. A man came into my office immediately after the adoption of the national policy and he said to me: 'We are going to have a higher price for our wheat now.' I said: 'I am glad to know that you are going to have a higher price for your wheat. How are you going to get a higher price.' He said: 'We have the national policy and it is going to give us a higher price.' I asked: 'How are we going to get it?' 'Why,' he said with confidence in his face, 'Didn't Sir John go over to the old country and arrange, himself, that they should give us a higher price for our grain?' He went away with the conviction that Sir John, the old hero and chieftain of our hon. friends opposite, had actually arranged with the authorities of the mother country that they should pay a higher price for our grain. Our hon. friends opposite know that it is absolutely impossible to protect the farmer. They know perfectly well, notwithstanding their own statements, that no matter how high we put the tariff it cannot protect the farmer, because, when the farmer is compelled to find a market for his products in the market of the world, his products are subjected to the competition of the world, and no amount of protection can remedy that condition. What the government can do, what the government has done, and what the government desires to do, is to relieve as far as possible the burdens that were oppressive so far as the farmers are concerned, and in this way it is doing everything possible to promote the development and prosperity of the country. Then, I would like to ask our hon. friends to define, or declare in some specific way, how they are going to protect the labourer of this country. The labourer was once misled. He thought that if the national policy was adopted, as it was adopted, he would enjoy a larger measure of prosperity than ever before. Yet, the experience of the labouring classes was not in harmony with that belief. Under the policy which we have at the present time, under the policy condemned by our hon. friends opposite, under the policy which they say does not give the manufacturer his home market and does not contribute to the prosperity of the mechanics and labouring classes generally, there is such a demand for skilled labour that not long ago a lot of men in the city of Toronto went to the Ontario government, a thing that never occurred during the eighteen years' regime of our Conservative friends, and asked the government if they could not make some arrangement whereby additional skilled labour could be brought to this country. They said they could not get enough skilled labour, that the demand is so great, that under this policy, as was stated by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. MacLaren), at the present time the industries are so thriving, so prosperous, that they cannot secure the amount of labour that they require at the present time. There is undoubtedly a great demand for skilled labour. But, my hon. friends opposite say that the government has done nothing, that we are not enjoying any marked prosperity, but at the same time they want to introduce a policy which would take the labourer from one class of labour and put him possibly at another, while there is a greater demand for skilled labour as compared with unskilled labour than there has been at any previous time in the history of Canada. One speaker on the other side of the House, I think the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) in his eulogy, made the statement that a lot of the credit was due to the splendid national policy that was introduced eighteen years ago and established by the present opposition when they were in power. He said that a great deal of our prosperity was due to that fact. Well, if the prosperity that we enjoyed, such as it was, was due to the national policy, the prosperity we are enjoying now, such as it is, is also due to the administration of affairs at the present time. One is as logical an argument as the other. Then we are told that we ought to manufacture every dollar's worth of goods that we import at the present time. This is an important statement, but it is no argument, because, if we manufactured every dollar's worth of goods we import now we would have to resort to direct taxation for revenue or raise the revenue in some other way and, therefore, the policy we are pursuing at the present time is the best policy that we can pursue in harmony with the existing state of affairs. I was glad to notice that the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his admirable speech the other night, brought out the fact that the development of the foreign trade of this country amounted to 96 per cent, while the development of the foreign trade of the United States only amounted to 46 per cent, which in itself is a contradiction of the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not want to take up the time of the House, because I am simply going over matters that have been gone over

before, but if necessary I could go through the various departments and show the excellence of the administration in connection with these departments which has contributed to the general prosperity and general well-being of the country. I am not surprised that our hon. friends opposite sometimes almost turn green with envy at the magnificent showing that has been made in the different departments. Take the Post Office Department, the Railways and Canals Department, the Department of Agriculture and any other department that you might name and you will find that the administration has been far superior in its results at any rate to that in vogue under the regime of our hon. friends opposite, and the results have been so striking that I am not at all surprised that they endeavour to minimize them as much as possible. But, the people of the country who are intelligent, notwithstanding the misrepresentations which may be thrown abroad at different times, know perfectly well that we are not alone enjoying prosperity, but that we are enjoying a greater degree of prosperity in the various departments than under the old regime. It was said by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and it has been stated by speakers on the other side of the House, that no country can be prosperous with a large balance of trade against it. When the hon. gentleman made that statement and supported it by figures without end, our friends on the other side of the House applauded the statement as if it were a fact. What is the fact? If no country can be prosperous with a large balance of trade against it, will our hon. friends opposite tell me how it is that Great Britain has always had a balance of trade against it? The balance of trade has been against Great Britain for almost all time and if the argument used by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, and endorsed warmly and applauded by hon. members opposite, be true, then Great Britain must be almost in a state of national bankruptcy. We know that to be entirely contrary to the fact. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to look at a country where there is disclosed, perhaps, the logical results of a high tariff, they have simply to look at Germany, where they will find a state of affairs existing which is one we would not like to copy in this country. I do not think the labouring classes or the farming classes in Germany are enjoying that measure of prosperity that we have been enjoying. Germany has a high protective tariff, but it has not the prosperity which hon. gentlemen opposite claim we would have if we adopted that tariff. My hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) informs me that it has a large balance of trade against it; therefore, it cannot be prosperous. There are one or two other matters I want to allude to and then I shall take my seat. I agree with the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) in one respect, that the government might have gone farther than it did so far as the reduction of the tariff is concerned. I do not know why the tariff on coal oil is kept on. It is a small amount. It does not look to be very large. It is true that the government has reduced it and I think they were wise in reducing it. I do not know perhaps that it would make very much difference if the duty was taken off altogether so far as the price is concerned to the consumer, under the existing circumstances. But insignificant as the item may appear, there are a good many people in rural sections especially who wish to see the duty taken off coal oil. I would have been glad had the government seen its way clear to do what apparently would have been in the interests of the consumer, and I do not know that any existing industry in Canada at the present time would have suffered in connection therewith.

I stated at the outset of my remarks that all men were more or less protectionists according to local considerations and conditions. I stated that on general principles I believe in freer trade, though not absolute free trade, because we can not have free trade. And yet at the same time, I am to a certain extent a protectionist. There may be exceptional cases in which protection would be advisable—I use the term in a qualified sense. Sometimes I have thought that hon. members on the other side of the House produced strong cases for exceptional treatment, and the government apparently took that view in connection with some of its own legislation. Notwithstanding the fact that the government stands for tariff reform or a tariff for revenue, (and a tariff for revenue is protective to that extent at any rate), the government took the view that on certain lines they would be justified in increasing or readjusting the tariff. They may be right; I will not say they are wrong. To that extent I am a protectionist, and I am a protectionist by virtue of local surroundings and circumstances——

Mr. CLANCY. What were these articles?

Mr. HOLMES. I do not call them to mind at the moment, but it did suggest itself to me when I heard some of these gentlemen opposite speaking.

Mr. CLANCY. Salt for example?

Mr. HOLMES. I am going to allude to salt. Even at the risk of my hon. friend calling me inconsistent, I think I can show that the tariff on salt is not just what it ought to be, and I will point out to my hon. friend and to the House why I think so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HOLMES. The government thinks that special treatment should be accorded to beet root sugar. That may be right and it may be wrong. I am not a very strong supporter of the beet root sugar argument, because I am a little inclined to think that we will never be able to successfully es-

tablish a beet root sugar industry in this country, unless it is done by subsidies or bonuses or something of that kind. I think that is the experience of our friends on the other side of the line, and I am not satisfied in my own mind that the beet root sugar industry can be permanently established here. If it can, well and good. If we can make it a permanent success without it costing our people too much, then I am not prepared to find much fault with it. But, if we believe in a tariff for revenue as we advocate, then I say that the tariff should be so adjusted as to produce the revenue that is necessary. Then the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) called attention to the circular placed in the hands of members of this House by a firm representing the salt industry in my own town—it not only represents the salt industry in my own town but it largely represents the salt industry in the province of Ontario. Because all the salt industries in the province of Ontario are under the direction of two or three individuals, and one of these firms has its office in my own town. Now, the government believes it was wise and prudent to extend special consideration to the beet root sugar industry.

Mr. CLANCY. In what way ?

Mr. HOLMES. In providing especially that machinery might be introduced free of duty in connection with the beet root sugar industry.

Mr. CLANCY. A great concession, that.

Mr. HOLMES. Nevertheless it is a concession, whether it is great or otherwise. The government took the same view with regard to steel rails. I presume that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) with equal force and logic will say that that is a great concession also. At any rate the government took the ground that with reference to steel rails certain consideration should be shown to the manufacturers of steel rails.

Mr. CLANCY. What do you think of putting a duty on steel rails ?

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) would like to lead me astray by drawing a herring across the track.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HOLMES. I am a little afraid that the duty on steel rails will not turn out in the end as some of the gentlemen on the other side think it will. That is my opinion with reference to steel rails. At the present time the manufacturers of salt have a duty of seven and a half cents per hundred on salt in packages, and five cents per hundred pounds on salt imported in bulk. The manufacturers of salt would not find fault with that if they were not handicapped in a way in which perhaps other industries are not handicapped. It is not for me to advise the government as to its trade policy, but while others have expressed their opinion on this side of the House, I presume that I may express my opinion also. I think it would have been a wise thing on the part of the government to have met our American friends in the matter of the remission of the duty on coal. Where the Americans have taken the duty off coal I think it would have been a wise thing on the part of this government to remove our duty on coal. I believe it would have been a concession to the manufacturers all over the Dominion. It would have been equivalent to a certain amount of protection, and to that extent the salt manufacturers think that it would have been especially to their advantage had the duty on coal been removed. The salt manufacturers are handicapped in this way : they do not complain alone about the competition from the United States, but they also object to the competition from the old country, and they claim, I think with a great degree of force, that believing as we do in a tariff that shall be a revenue producing tariff, there should be a tariff upon salt the same as there is upon any other article. Binder twine was singled out by the government for special consideration, and the government takes to itself power to deal with binder twine in case they find it advisable and necessary to do so.

Mr. CLANCY. No, they do not.

Mr. HOLMES. Our salt manufacturers complain of two things. They complain of the free importation of English salt, and they complain generally of the importation of American salt. The English salt comes in here free of duty by virtue of being used in the fisheries, and if you take the returns of trade and commerce you will find that it is not alone imported from Great Britain but it is also imported to a certain extent from the United States under this head. The manufacturers of salt think that when they are handicapped by taxes of various kinds, that English salt manufacturers should be placed in the same category as they are, and should contribute a certain amount to the revenue of this country. They do not see why even the maritime fisheries should enjoy the benefits of free salt, while people in the upper provinces are called upon to pay an increase cost by virtue of the tariff if they import salt. If the English salt was used for the fisheries alone, there would not be so much force in my argument in asking for a duty upon it, but unfortunately for the manufacturers of Canadian salt, English salt also enters into commercial competition, because it comes westward and is sold in competition with Canadian salt. To that extent the Canadian manufacturers are handicapped in that direction and are unfairly and unjustly dealt with.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) For whose benefit ?

Mr. HOLMES. Presumably for the benefit of the fishermen of the lower provinces.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Yes, and for the farmers also.

Mr. HOLMES. Of course, if my hon. friend assumes that position he should throw the duties off entirely, and make all things equal. But the salt manufacturers are called on first of all to pay a duty on coal which amounts to the equivalent of 4 cents on every barrel of salt. That may seem to be a small amount, but when they manufacture a great quantity of salt any one can see that in the aggregate it would amount to a great deal. The salt manufacturers are exceptional with respect to their use of coal, for there is no industry which I am aware of in the prosecution of which it requires such a large quantity of coal to produce a given amount of manufactured goods as it does in the manufacture of salt. The coal tax presses particularly heavy on the salt manufacturers, because it takes a ton of coal at least to make two tons of salt. I do not think a similar condition prevails in any other line of manufacture. Our salt manufacturers ask, and with a certain degree of reason and force, that our tariff should at least be made equal to the American tariff, or if not, that it should be logically called a revenue producing tariff, because the English salt, which comes in and enters into competition with Canadian salt, should bear a share of the burden which the latter has to bear. The salt manufacturers are also taxed for their bags, taxed on iron, and on a variety of articles used in connection with their business. It seems to me, free trader as I may be, that there is a great amount of force in the contention that our salt manufacturers are unjustly dealt with by being taxed on their raw material while they are not in a position to compete on equal terms with foreign producers. Our American friends have this advantage, that they are endeavouring to force the small manufacturers of the United States into a large combine, and, in order to do that, are selling salt at low prices. The Americans have the further advantage of cheaper transportation than we have in Canada. In all these respects our salt manufacturers are placed at a disadvantage, and for the reasons stated I think are deserving of consideration at the hands of the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said practically all I want to say. I say unhesitatingly that the general policy pursued by the present administration is a policy that very largely meets with my approval and endorsation, not simply because I sit on this side of the House, but because it seems to me to be the policy best adapted to promote the development of the country at large, and the interests of all classes of our people. Somebody has said—I think it was my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd), with whom in private conversation I have sometimes a controversy on these questions—that this country should not be an agricultural or pastoral country. On this point there is one fact that must be borne in mind. We may develop our manufacturing industries to the fullest extent possible, whether by virtue of the development of our lands or by virtue of increased protection ; but, first and foremost, this country must be for all time an agricultural country. We cannot help it. Let any man travel over the Dominion of Canada, from the Atlantic on the east to the Pacific on the west, and he will come to but one conclusion, that with the large agricultural area which we possess, and the vast extent of territory yet undeveloped which must inevitably come under the farmer's hand, we must first of all give attention to the development of our agricultural interests ; and with the development of these will come the development of our manufacturing interests. One is a sequence of the other. Therefore, I contend that it is our duty first and foremost to see to the well-being and prosperity of the largest class in the community. The farmers are by all odds the largest class ; and if by legislation, or in any other way, we can contribute to the prosperity of that class, if we can make two blades of grass grow where only one grew before, it is our duty to do so. Then and then only will come the true and solid development of our manufacturing industries—a development that will stand for all time to come. We have a noble heritage ; we have a grand country, and I am glad to see that hon. members on both sides of the House wish it to develop and prosper. Unfortunately, we are not all of the same opinion as to how that development and prosperity can be best brought about. There is no reason why we should not agree to differ on questions of policy ; but in our legislation and in whatever action we take, we should have in view the interest and the welfare of the masses and not the classes, of those who bear the burden and heat of the day, of those who sweat and toil, of those who are not in the fortunate circumstances of the men who have the advantage of protection, of those who have not as luxurious homes or as many of the luxuries and comforts of life as most of our manufacturers. I do not say that this is true of them all ; but relatively speaking, the manufacturers enjoy a greater degree of wealth and prosperity than the farmers, and I do not say this in any way as reflecting upon this important class in the community, but it is the duty of this House to legislate in such a way as to contribute to the development and well-being of the greatest body in the community.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). Mr. Speaker, representing, as I do, one of the largest agricultural constituencies in the province of Ontario, I think I am simply doing my duty in voicing what I believe to be the opinions of the large majority of my constituents. Before I address myself particularly to the budget speech made by the hon. Minister of Finance, and to the amendment thereto moved by the hon. leader of the opposition, I want to say a few words in regard to the speech which has just been

delivered by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes). That hon. gentleman has travelled north by south, east by west. He is a protectionist, a free trader, a revenue tariff man ; anything that the government may adopt he will follow and cheerfully support. He quotes a number of statistics of agricultural products which he claims are exported to the United States for home consumption ; but in the short time that I have had to look into the matter, I am satisfied that the great majority of these exports have been bought by speculators and exported in bond through the United States to other foreign countries. Then, in discussing the position of the manufacturers in this country, he told us that one of them had said to him that he would be quite willing, if the United States would throw down their tariff wall, to meet the American manufacturers on fair ground. I am satisfied that that statement is true. The hon. gentleman cannot find in this country a manufacturer who would not be willing to meet the United States manufacturers in a fair field, but he is not willing to meet them with one hand tied behind his back, as he is by the Canadian tariff being so much lower than the American. But give us a fair field, and the manufacturers of Canada are prepared to meet those of the United States in the open market. So are our farmers ; but we do not want the United States to be pouring their free corn into this country when we have to pay duty in the United States on the grains which the free corn displaces. My hon. friend asked : How are we going to protect the farmers of this country ? The farmers, in my opinion, are fairly well protected now, thanks to the Conservative government and the National Policy. Let me point my hon. friend to one industry which has grown up in this country within a few years. I was the first one in this House, I think it was in 1885, to advocate the placing of a duty upon pork. I proved to the government that in the year previous we had imported into this country $12,000,000 worth of pork, beef, and the products of beef and pork. I asked the government to come down with a protective tariff on pork, and I predicted that in a very few years this country, in place of sending $12,000,000 to the United States for beef and pork, would be raising plenty to feed our own people and have a large export beside. We used to send $12,000,000 to the United States for pork and beef with which to feed the people of this country, and when the pork and beef was gone the Americans had our money and the Canadians had nothing but the bone and muscle which that beef and pork produced. The late government came down with a protective tariff on those articles, and what has been the result ? Every farmer in Canada is a manufacturer and is manufacturing sufficient pork in this country to feed our people, and is exporting annually millions of dollars' worth besides. That is an object lesson of how our farmers can be protected. In the same way we could secure for our farmers the absolute control of our home market for vegetables, which to-day are imported to a large extent from the United States. But my hon. friend is evidently a trimmer. His sole object seems to be to make a speech which will enable him to proclaim himself a free trader in some portions of the country, and then go to the salt manufacturers and others and declare himself in favour of protection.

Let me now address a few words to the government. It is well known that this government came into power in 1896 over the corpse of the Manitoba school question. The right hon. the Prime Minister promised the people that, if returned to power, the first thing he would do would be to send out a commission, headed by the hon. Sir Oliver Mowat, to Manitoba to investigate the facts of the school question and that he would then settle that question at once and for ever. Did he carry out that solemn promise which he then made to the people ? No, Sir, he did not send Sir Oliver Mowat, but sent another emissary, and managed by some manipulations and manoeuvres, to have the school question smoothed over temporarily and then said : 'Now the question is settled.' Let me ask whether the people of the province of Quebec will take the word of the Prime Minister as against that of the high dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church ? What does the Archbishop of Manitoba say on the question ? He declares positively that it is not settled, and the Archbishop of Montreal, who has just returned from Rome where he had an interview with His Holiness the Pope on this very question, also declares that it is not yet settled. Well, for my part, I am prepared to believe the dignitaries of that church rather than the right hon. Prime Minister on this point.

The right hon. gentleman made a promise to the temperance people. He said to them: 'If you elect me to office, I will submit a plebiscite to the people on the question of prohibition.' And I will give effect to the will of the people. He did submit a plebiscite, and then sent down to the province of Quebec three or four of his ministers to tell the people there that if prohibition were carried, it meant an extra two dollars a head of taxation on every man, woman and child in the country, and as every French Canadian family is very large—pretty near 15 being the average French family.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the French Canadian voter of the province of Quebec said to himself : I do not drink any whiskey, but if this prohibition is going to add $2 per head to our taxation, it means that I will have to pay about $30 per year more on my little family, and I will vote against it. The

present Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), then Minister of Inland Revenue, and the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) asked the people of Quebec to vote against prohibition on this ground, but notwithstanding all their efforts, the result of the plebiscite was a large majority in favour of putting an end to the liquor traffic. Did my right hon. friend give effect to the will of the people ? Why, that question stands to-day exactly as it stood before the plebiscite was taken.

Then he promised that if returned to power, he would take the duty off agricultural implements. Did he carry out that promise ? He found a tariff of 20 per cent on agricultural implements. That rate still exists on these articles to-day. Did he not also, during the elections of 1896, promise the people free coal oil ? Why, we saw posted on every barn and fence throughout the country the placard : 'Vote for Laurier and free coal oil.' Has he redeemed that promise ? My hon. friend, who has just spoken, would like to see the government redeem that pledge, but how many years is he going to wait for them to redeem it ? All they did was to reduce the duy one cent a gallon on coal oil, which, I must say, is removing it in a very infinitesimal degree.

The right hon. the Prime Minister likewise promised reduced expenditure. Put me in, he said, and I will surround myself with a cabinet of business men, and we will run this country on economical lines. If elected, we will reduce the expenditure $2,000,000 or $3,000,000. The Hon. David Mills said that they would reduce it $5,000,000, but the right hon. gentleman would not go that length. He said he was not prepared to promise a reduction to that extent, but that certainly he would reduce our annual expenditure some $3,000,000 or $2,000,000. Have the government redeemed that pledge? Instead of reducing the expenditure they have increased from $40,000,000 to $63,000,000. They have increased our annual expenditure by about $23,000,000.

The right hon. gentleman promised to reduce the national debt. Has he done it ? Sir, he has put a mortgage on every farm in this country, which in the aggregate amounted to $13,000,000 taking the whole Dominion, since he came into power. My hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), when in opposition, used to work out how much every extra million dollars of increased national debt amounted to on every farm in the country, and he would exclaim : That is the mortgage put on your farm by this corrupt Tory government. Put us in and we will redeem that mortgage. Have they redeemed it ? On the contrary, although we have the largest revenue this country has ever had, they have run the country into debt, by their extravagant expenditure, on another $13,000,000.

The right hon. gentleman further appealed to the country : 'Put me in and I will abolish the national policy.' Both the right hon. gentleman and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce made the same pledge. Put us in, they exclaimed, and there will be no more protection. Have they carried out that promise ? We had the statement of the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) a few nights ago, that the tariff to-day is practically the same as that which Mr. Foster left. These hon. gentlemen made a few changes, but their tariff is the same old national policy, and the ex-Minister of Public Works stated this much more forcibly than I can do it. Let the members of the government settle with their former colleague as to which is right. The people will have no difficulty in deciding between them because there is the tariff. In the one column is set forth the old rate and in another the new rate, and out of a hundred items, not more than probably one or two are changed. Some are changed up and some are changed down.

The next promise made by the right hon. gentleman was that he would reduce the number of cabinet ministers. Has he done that ? Instead of doing that, he took two who were only door keepers in the Conservative government and made them full pledged Cabinet ministers with increased salaries.

Mr. BENNETT. And back pay.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, antedated—away back. Then he promised the people : We have one chamber of the Dominion legislature filled with old women. We will abolish that or reform it. Has he redeemed that promise ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is reformed.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is there just as the Conservative party left it, except that a few of the Conservatives have died.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, no.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) shakes his head and says it is not quite the same. The only difference is that a few of the Conservative members have died and their places are filled with partisans of the present government.

Mr. SPROULE. Old women too.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, for instance the gentleman who used to represent North Wellington is there. When the Conservative party were in office and that gentleman was in this House, he used to speak of the Senate in no complimentary terms. But he is now a venerable and distinguished member of that body. Then, the Prime Minister promised the people : Put us in and we will reduce the taxes on the necessaries of life and put them on the luxuries. I would ask the right hon. gentleman now on what necessary of life have the taxes been re-

duced, with the single exception of corn, which may be regarded as a necessary of life? And on what luxuries has he increased the taxes? On the poor man's luxuries and his alone—tobacco and sugar. Before I sit down I shall give some figures to show the enormous sums that hon. gentlemen opposite have taken out of the pockets of the poor farmers and labouring men of this country by increased taxes on sugar and tobacco last year as compared with the year 1895. Then, while promising the people of the country generally in his speeches that he would abolish the national policy, the premier went to the manufacturers, closeted himself with them, and assured them that they need not be afraid, that his party would not interfere with the national policy. Ask the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) whether that statement is true or not. He made the statement on the floor of the House, declaring that it was not a cabinet secret, that there was a private, secret bargain made with the manufacturers, that if the Liberals got into power they would not interfere with protection. And so we still have the protection, notwithstanding the promise given to the farmers that it should be abolished and the duties removed. I could go on for a long time setting forth the promises made and broken by the party now in power. But I can quote words more forcible than any I could use, from the utterances of one of their most prominent supporters, a gentleman who has done more, given more time and spent more money in the interests of the Reform party than any of those I see before me. This gentleman wrote a letter, after negotiating with his friends. He thought he had just claim, considering all the time and money he had spent in their interest, to a seat in the Senate. But he found he could not deal with them, as the price was too high. He wrote an open letter, and this is what he said:

It would be utterly wearisome to review in detail all the ugly record of promises made and broken by the present government. I can only glance at some of those not already noted. We declared that the number of paid ministers in the cabinet was too great under the late administration; we have the same number still and their aggregate salaries are $4,000 per year greater, one-half this sum going into the pocket of the minister who recently declared that every pledge has been kept. We denounced the expenditure on account of superannuation and pledged ourselves to wipe it out; it was greater by $14,331 in 1899 than it was in 1896. We denounced as useless the creation of the Department of Trade and Commerce. The 'useless' department has been continued. We promised to abolish the Senate or radically change its constitution; by affording that body an opportunity to save the country from the consequences of extravagant and corrupt deals, the government has enabled the Senate to demonstrate its usefulness, almost its indispensability. We denounced the development of monopolies, trusts, and combines as a consequence of the policy of our opponents; not a single one of those which were in existence in 1896 has been destroyed or put out of business——

He refers to the coal oil monopoly.

—while others have been created and given a foothold in the country by the direct action of the government. We declared that the expenditure for the administration of justice was too great. Sir Wilfrid Laurier even going so far as to say that thousands of dollars paid to counsel had been improperly if not corruptly paid; the expenditure of this department has been increased by $353,000. We denounced the expenditure of $120,000 for immigration purposes; we have more than doubled this expenditure, increasing it to $255,000.

Mr. MONK. It is $500,000 now.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, it has doubled up again.

We condemned the granting of public lands as bonuses to railways; only by the opposition of the Senate was the government prevented from consummating a deal by which twenty-five thousand acres of gold-bearing lands, to be selected by the beneficiaries, was to be given per mile for the building of a narrow-guage tramway, a transaction so flagrantly improper that several government supporters refused to vote for it, and it is doubtful if any one would now be willing to defend it on its merits. We denounced the granting of cash bonuses to railways, declaring it to be 'a fruitful source of jobbery, peculation, and corruption'; we have well nigh out-Heroded Herod by the reckless way in which we have granted cash bonuses to railways, giving in one instance for the same railway two millions more than we had condemned our opponents for offering, and in another actually granting a bonus to a road for which no charter had been granted and which was not even projected. We condemned all corruption; yet our leaders have made us responsible for the Crow's Nest job, by means of which the directors of the leading government organ were permitted to practically grab a quarter of a million of acres of coal lands, and the country is saddled with a totally unnecessary payment of two millions of dollars. We promised purity of administration; the history of the notorious Drummond railway job shows what regard our leaders had for such a promise.

But why go farther?

He stops, as I felt compelled to stop, for it is impossible to cover the whole list.

The record of our party while it has been in power under its present leaders is one long, shameful story of promises unfulfilled and pledges broken; of reckless extravagance; of jobbery and corruption; and of utterly disgraceful betrayal of every principle for which as a party we have stood.

I could not use such strong language if I tried, nor could I draw a more faithful picture of the present government than this that one of their own prominent supporters has drawn up—and he knew the inside workings of this government.

For the purpose of securing themselves in office the men who have been entrusted with positions of leadership have brought disgrace upon our party and dishonour upon the name of Liberalism. What then is our duty to our party and to our country? Again I repeat that

only by repudiating these leaders, by disassociating ourselves from them——

They are going fast. One honest man has gone out, the ex-Minister of Public Works. He could not swallow it all:

—and by doing all that may be in our power to punish them for their falseness and treachery, by driving them from power and from the offices which they retain as the price of their treason to principle, can we as individuals and as a party avoid sharing their guilt and participating in their shame. In no other way and by no means short of this can we hope to regain or retain as a party the respect and confidence of a patriotic and decency-loving public. It may be said that this can only be accomplished at the expense of a return to power of our political opponents; a party opposed to the political principles in which we believe. I do not dispute this, nor do I shrink from this alternative. Neither do I believe that any true man or any man who has an abiding faith in the truth of Liberal principles or in the ultimate triumph of truth will shrink from it. We are bound to assume that the Conservative party is permeated and guided by a genuine belief in the truth of its political ideals and in the correctness of its principles. At any rate we cannot truthfully charge that party or its leaders with having betrayed or abandoned its principles to get or retain office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could not use stronger language than that used by Mr. H. H. Cook, the writer of that letter.

Mr. CAMPBELL. When did he write it?

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) knows well when the letter was written, as he knows the contents of it. It was published in all the papers in Canada. But I can find it by looking up the files of the 'Globe' and 'Mail,' and I will give the date to the hon. gentleman when the House assembles after recess.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, just before the House rose, at six o'clock, I was reading to the hon. gentlemen opposite the opinion held of them by one of their supporters, a gentleman who supported them strongly in the election of 1896, a gentleman who perhaps gave more time and spent more money in the interests of the Reform party than any other man in Canada. I was reading this gentleman's opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, and of their conduct since they came into power. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) asked me when this letter that I read was written. I could not answer him just then, but said that I would do so after six o'clock. I tell him now that that letter was written by Mr. H. H. Cook about the 1st of October, 1900. After the hon. member for West York had asked me that question, the Minister of Customs, whom I am glad to see just now entering the House, said that we had had an election since then. It is true, we have had an election since then. The hon. gentleman sat in his seat while I was making accusations against the government, and while I read this letter of condemnation, written by Mr. H. H. Cook; the Minister of Customs, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce all sat in their seats, and not one of them dared to dispute a word, either of the statements that I made or of the statements made by Mr. Cook. In fact the Minister of Customs practically admitted that the statements were true, because he said: 'We have had an election since then.' As if to say, that wipes out the whole thing. It is true, all that Mr. Cook has said but we have had an election since then, and we are here and you are over there. How will the Minister of Customs make good the statement so far as it applies to the province of Ontario? Whose word was accepted in the province of Ontario, the word of my hon. friend or the word of Mr. H. H. Cook? Why, the Reform party came near being swept out of existence in the province of Ontario, and the Conservative party came back with a majority of over twenty. Where were the Reform party in that province of Ontario where Mr. Cook's letter was circulated, and where the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite had been ventilated on the platform? Manitoba, that great province, also sent a majority to support the Conservative party in this House. But we know how the majority supporting the government in this House came to be elected. They did not come from the province of Ontario.

Now, we have here a government conducted by some fifteen ministers, including the Solicitor General. We have a cabinet composed of fourteen members and a Solicitor General, each of them drawing a sessional indemnity of $1,500 a year, and the most of them a salary besides of $7,000 a year. How are these hon. gentlemen earning the salary that this country is paying them? Have they been sitting here since the Finance Minister made his budget speech? How many of these ministers that are being paid $7,000 a year by this country and $1,500 a year as sessional indemnity—how many of them are sitting in their seats to answer the charges that may be brought against them? Why, Sir, the other night the constitution was fairly wrecked when the Finance Minister moved the adjournment of the House, and looking round to find one of his colleagues to second the motion, there was not one of them in his place, and he had to ask a private member to second the motion to adjourn. That is how little these gentlemen think of attending to their duties. Why do we find so many of these ministers scattered to the four corners of the earth, enjoying themselves and having a good time? Why are

they not sitting here like honest men, earning the salaries paid them by the people of this country as civil servants to administer the affairs of this country ? They go off on jaunts and pleasure excursions at the expense of the country. Look at the Auditor General's Report, and see the vast sums charged for the travel of ministers on their jaunting tours. Where are they to-night ? The Prime Minister, it is true, is not in his place, but he is to be excused, because his health being poor, the members of the House, particularly on this side, would not expect that hon. gentleman to be in his place any evening during the entire session. But where are the other hon. members whom the people are paying $8,500 a year ? They ought to be sitting in their places to answer the charges that are made against them by members on this side of the House in respect of their conduct in administering the affairs of the country. Why are they not here earning their money, the same as members on this side of the House, and those who sit behind the ministers themselves on the other side ?

Let me imagine a large incorporated company, a manufacturing concern that employs a president, a secretary, a treasurer and superintendents of different departments. Similarly we have in this country running the government, in the Prime Minister, a president, we have the Secretary of State, and we have the Finance Minister as treasurer ; then we have superintendents of the different departments. We have the Minister of Trade and Commerce occupying that position which he said there was no use for when he was on this side of the House, and which hon. gentlemen opposite said they would abolish if they ever got into power. But he is sitting there now as a looker-on, drawing his $7,000 a year and his $1,500 indemnity. Why is he not here to-night to answer the questions that I intend bringing up shortly in reference to the trade and navigation returns ? He is not to be found. He is the superintendent of that branch of the business. Then we have the Minister of Inland Revenue, to whose department I intend to refer before sitting down. Where is he ? Earning his $1,500 indemnity and his $7,000 salary. Is he here to answer to the people of this country for the way he is conducting their affairs ? The Finance Minister is the treasurer ; as is his duty, he has generally been in his place since the debate commenced. But he is practically the only minister out of the fourteen whom we have seen here. My hon. friend sits smiling opposite me, the Minister of Customs, who is the packhorse of this government, he has been pretty generally in his place also. My hon. friend the Postmaster General is here tonight, but we have not seen much of him since this debate commenced.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I guess they are attending receptions.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of the Interior, I have no doubt, is attending a reception across the sea. Well, he should be here attending to the duties of his office, managing the affairs of his department. Why did he find it convenient to clear out just when the session was coming on, going over there to look after the Alaskan boundary ? Could not some other man out of his department have gone over there to do the work that he is doing Is it because he is afraid to face the ex-Minister of Public Works that he is absent There must be some cause for it. Is he afraid to come into the House and face the jobs going on in his department, some of which we have heard of lately from the Yukon. The Minister of Public Works is the other pack horse of the government. He and the Minister of Customs have practically been the representatives of this government during the entire season from the time the House adjourned last spring until within a few days of meeting here, late in March. These two gentlemen are the pack horses of the whole cabinet. They remain here holding the fort, each of them acting for his own department and half a dozen other departments, whose heads were away spending the peoples money and drawing the salaries that I have mentioned. The Minister of Railways and Canals—why is he not in his seat He is paid $1,500 sessional indemnity and $7,000 besides. Why is he not in his seat ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I guess he is at a reception.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, yes, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are great for receptions. If there is a reception given, either in Japan, or in England, or in any place in Canada, these gentlemen neglect their parliamentary duties and their other duties which they are sacredly charged to perform as the civil servants of the people of Canada. They desert their duties and go away to enjoy themselves and attend receptions. Then there is the Minister of Militia and Defence, we have only seen him in the House a part of two days since this discussion commenced. He should be here to defend his department for conducting which he is paid a heavy salary besides his sessional allowance. Then there is the Minister of Agriculture—where is that hon. gentleman ? Is he another one of those whom the ex-Minister of Public Works referred to as those of his colleagues with whom he was on terms of intimacy ? Is he one of those who are afraid to meet the ex-Minister of Public Works on the floor of parliament ? He is away over in Japan. We saw an account in the papers a day or two ago about his attending a reception over there with the Geisha girls. Is that what the Minister of Agriculture is paid for doing in place of being here attending to his department ? That hon. gentleman is at the head of the most important department of

this whole government, yet we have not seen him in the House during the entire session. How long are the people going to put up with this kind of thing ? Would any business concern allow its president, its secretary, its treasurer and the superintendents of each of the departments to absent themselves from their positions of trust without leave and not bring them to book ? Not an institution in this country would do it. Will the people of this country, once their eyes are opened to the conduct of these hon. gentlemen say to them: You have done well; you have performed your duties faithfully and we will return you to power ? I think nay. They will say that they have been unfaithful stewards and they will make them walk at the next election, come when it may. The hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) has been fairly faithful in his attendance in the House but he is not here to-night. We have two hon. ministers out of the fifteen sitting in the House to-night during this debate when every minister ought to be in his place. We have the hon. Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Carroll). Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were on this side of the House and when the late Conservative government appointed a Solicitor General, found a great deal of fault with that appointment, but the excuse is made now, that, that having a Solicitor General, a large amount of fees that formerly went to lawyers for transacting the affairs of the country will be saved because the work will be done by the Solicitor General's Department. Look at the Auditor General's Report and you will see that there is not a town or village in this country in regard to which there is not the record of some heeler of a lawyer having been paid large sums of money for attending to the affairs of this country when we have the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Solicitor General paid large salaries to look after these matters. We find that the amount paid out in fees for legal services is double and treble that which was paid out under the late government. The hon. Minister of Finance, in introducing his budget, suggested some changes, but very few. I am satisfied that the changes that the hon. minister proposes in the resolutions now before the House are very disappointing to a large class of people in this country, to the manufacturers, the agriculturists and the labouring men. The hon. Minister of Finance, in his budget speech last year, led the people to believe that at this session of parliament there would be a revision of the tariff and that relief would be granted to many important industries in the country. But, the hon. Minister of Finance made no changes on the lines that he had intimated he would adopt at the last session of parliament. Ask the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) He said and said plainly and above board that there would be changes, that the hon. Minister of Finance had promised them, he stated so publicly and for having made these statements the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works was walked out of the cabinet. But, the hon. gentleman who succeeded him in the cabinet and who occupies the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) when appealing to the electors in the election following his admission to the government, made statements stronger than those of the ex-Minister of Public Works; yet, he supports a government that has repudiated the statements he made when he was seeking the suffrages of the electorate. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) moved the following resolution. He said :

I beg to move the following amendment to the motion of the hon. Minister of Finance :

That all the words after 'that' in the proposed motion be left out, and the following substituted therefor :—'This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians ;

'And that the financial policy of the government should include a measure for the thorough and judicious readjustment of the tariff at the present session.'

This is the amendment that is now before the House. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) and others who have spoken have found a good deal of fault with the word 'adequate.' What is the meaning of the word 'adequate.' If I understand the English language it means sufficient.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). For what ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sufficient protection to secure to the manufacturers, to the agriculturists, and to the labourers of this country the work of manufacturing or producing all the articles that we can produce and manufacture in this country by our own labour and keep the money in our own country. Make your tariff sufficiently high to do that.

Mr. HOLMES. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) allow me to ask him a question. He has defined the meaning of the word 'adequate.' Would he tell us what he means ? Does he mean twenty-five per cent, thirty-five per cent, of forty-five per cent ? Specify it.

Mr. TAYLOR. No I will not.

Mr. HOLMES. He cannot do it.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend was willing to go as high as thirty-five per cent. Now, I am willing to go to the amount sufficient to protect the industries of the country even if it is one hundred per cent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. One hundred per cent.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, one hundred per cent, and there are articles under the tariff to-day that are practically placed at one hundred per cent. The hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) is away above thirty-five per cent on the lines he manufactures. Adequate, in my opinion, means sufficient, and sufficient, in my opinion, and in the opinion of hon. members on this side of the House means that the tariff should be so adjusted as that it will protect our industries without respect to figures. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) will call thirty-five per cent a revenue tariff, or he will call it a free trade tariff, or anything to suit himself, but he will not admit that it is a protective tariff. I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs to a few figures which I have taken from the Trade and Navigation returns and I think they will be found correct in every particular. I will just name eight different articles that were imported into this country in 1895 and the same articles imported in 1902. In 1895 we imported the following articles :—

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS IMPORTED IN 1895.

	No.	Value.	Duty.
Cultivators	1,796	$ 12,283	$ 2,456 45
Drills	1,235	15,825	3,164 84
Harrows	1,819	15,418	3,003 57
Harvesters and binders	1,045	82,094	16,418 80
Horse rakes	295	4,450	891 90
Mowing machines	1,451	48,113	9,612 80
Ploughs	1,661	29,814	5,964 99
Reapers	19	952	190 40
Total	9,321	$208,949	$41,783 75

These were the numbers and values of these articles imported in 1895 together with the duty paid. Now, Sir, what has been done by these hon. gentlemen ? Have they given the manufacturers of these articles sufficient protection or not ? Have they given the workingmen sufficient or adequate protection to keep these goods out of Canada and have them made in this country ? They have not done so. Notwithstanding that the increased population of the country required these implements no sane man after the statements made by the right hon. leader of the government and by the hon. Minister of Finance threatening free trade and threatening to abolish the duties would put his money into a manufacturing industry of this kind to make more of these implements to supply the needs of the country. What is the effect this year ? The following table will show the number of articles imported this year; their value and the duty collected on them.

1902.

	Number.	Value.	Duty.
Cultivators	2,755	$ 22,863	$ 4,566 80
Drills	2,014	50,243	10,018 40
Harrows	2,472	36,755	7,343 60
Harvesters and binders	9,230	894,474	189,035 80

1902—Con.

	Number.	Value.	Duty.
Horse rakes	9,798	181,581	36,131 60
Mowing machines	17,658	600,743	119,810 00
Ploughs	10,092	214,193	42,838 60
Reapers	786	37,879	7,265 80
Total number	54,805	$2,038,731	$417,010 60
Total for 1896	9,321	208,949	41,783 75
Increase	45,484	$1,829,782	$375,216 85

Thus, we sent to the United States last year nearly two million dollars to purchase these implements. In a very few years there will be nothing left of them but a heap of scrap iron, and the Americans will have our two millions dollars, whereas if we had a government that would have given adequate protection, every one of these articles would have been made in this country, employment would have been given to our workingmen, Canadian farmers would be supplying the home market, and we would have these two million dollars in Canada as a national capital to help on our progress and development. But the only benefit we have out of all this business is that $375,216 in the shape of duty have gone into the treasury for this government to squander extravagantly, as they have been squandering the millions of money which they are getting from other sources.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) allow me to ask him, if these were not the very articles that the leader of the opposition is reported to have said were adequately protected now ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not responsible for anything the leader of the opposition said, and further, I don't believe that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Paterson) heard him say it, and furthermore, I do not believe that the leader of the opposition did say it, because he has explained last year and this year, that adequate protection means sufficient protection to have these goods manufactured in this country.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is reported that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) said it, and it has not been denied.

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, there are lots of reports, and I could give some reports about my hon. friend's (Hon. Mr. Paterson) industry up there, too. The contention of this side of the House, and it is the argument of every man who has the interests of the agricultural and labouring and manufacturing classes at heart; the argument on our side is that every article I have enumerated there should be manufactured in this country so as to give employment to the labour that would consume the produce grown in Canada, and would keep our money at home as national capital instead of sending it to a foreign country.

But let me call the attention of the House to another matter. These gentlemen on the treasury benches promised that when they

got into power they would give free trade and in order to hoodwink the people on the free trade question, they put corn on the free list. What has been the result of that ? In 1896 we imported into Canada 1,485,980 bushels of corn, which paid a duty for all purposes, whether for manufacturing into liquors or otherwise, and we imported free corn to the amount of 262,680 bushels, or a total of 1,748,660 bushels. What was the result last year under the policy of this government ? The duty collected in 1896 was $207,301.29. In 1902 we imported 474,-950 bushels of dutiable corn that went into the manufacture of whiskey, I suppose, and paid a duty of $35,609.62, but we imported free corn to the amount of 4,485,372 bushels, a total for the year of 4,959,987 bushels against a total importation in 1896 of 1,748,-660 bushels, or a total increase this year in dutiable and free corn over 1896 of 3,211,217 bushels. What does that mean ? It means that these 3,211,217 bushels of foreign corn have displaced the Canadian farmer's products of peas, oats and barley, that would otherwise have gone to feed the pork and the beef that was raised by the Canadian farmer. And in consequence the product of the Canadian farmer had to find a market elsewhere on account of being displaced by American corn. My hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Holmes) says that the people of his county want free corn. I can tell him that I represent a constituency in which there are as many well-to-do farmers as there are in West Huron, and I do not think that you will find a farmer in my county who will not vote against the importation of free corn. If the farmers of this country would sink their political feeling and speak their minds they would say, that they can grow all the corn and coarse grain needed in this country to supply the market. There is another matter I want to call attention to. The Prime Minister, and the Minister of Customs, and every member of the cabinet, promised that if they got into power they would take the tax off the poor man and put it on the rich man. They announced that the necessaries of life should be free and that luxuries should be taxed. Let us see what this government did in relation to some of the necessaries of life. Let us see what happened in connection with sugars and syrups. In 1902 we imported of refined sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard, 51,379,-428 pounds, on which a duty was collected amounting to $642,278.53; we imported of sugars not above 16 Dutch standard, of all kinds, 318,696,019 pounds, on which a duty was collected amounting to $2,107,149.64. These are the raw sugars brought in to supply the manufacturers of this country, and that is the amount of duty the government collected from that article. Of syrups we imported last year 1,355,552 pounds, on which a duty was collected of $10,104.09. On molasses a duty was collected amounting to $423.84; on sugar candy a duty was collected amounting to $54,-248.23 ; on glucose a duty was collected amounting to $38,177.16, and on sacharine a duty was collected amounting to $64,573.80. On all these articles I have mentioned the duties collected in 1902 amounted to $2,916,-955.29, whereas on the same articles in 1895 the duty collected amounted only to $365,-796.23, or an increase of duty on the poor man's sugar amounting to $2,551,158.06. Here was over two and a half million dollars wrung out of the pockets of the poor men of Canada, in order to swell the treasury for the government to squander it corruptly. What becomes of their promise that they would take the taxes off the necessaries of life. Sugar is a necessity of life, and yet this government have collected two and a half million dollars on it, more than was collected under the Conservatives in 1895. And the government do this in order to swell their surplus to $13,000,000. Why was it that the Conservative government had not a surplus in 1895 ? It was because the then Conservative government took the taxes off sugar and let the poor people of this country have free sugar. But these hon. gentlemen on the raw materials of the sugar manufacturers of this country collected taxes amounting to over $2,000,000, and the refiners can only take it out of the pockets of the people who consume sugar.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then the hon. gentleman is not in favour of a duty on sugar ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am in favour of a duty on manufactured sugar, but not on the raw sugar. I am in favour of admitting the raw sugar free and giving our manufacturers a chance to employ labour in refining it. This is what I am in favour of, and evidently the hon. gentleman is not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You forget that you put a duty on raw sugar again after you had taken it off.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have given the figures showing what we did in 1895, and what hon. gentlemen opposite have done in 1902. Let the hon. gentleman contradict the statement if he can ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You left a duty upon a certain grade of sugar in 1895.

Mr. TAYLOR. And if the Conservative party, when they went out of power, left a duty on any article, our hon. friends opposite pledged themselves that when they came into power they would remove it. They pledged themselves that they would remove the taxes from the necessaries of life. Have they carried out their promise ? Is it an excuse to say, we will not do as we agreed to do because the bad Tories, when they were in power, left a duty on a certain article. They think as much of their promise as a bird does of its song.

Anything will do, so long as they can say, we are here and you are there.

Let us see how the matter stands with regard to the excise duties. No doubt hon. gentlemen opposite will say that tobacco is a luxury, and the people who use it must expect to pay for it; but this is the way they have soaked the poor man on his tobacco. The total excise duties collected by the Conservative government on liquors, cigars and tobacco in 1895-6, as compared with those collected by the Liberal government in 1902-3, were as follows:

In 1902-3..	$11,130,348 67
In 1895-6..	7,801,671 94
Increase..	$ 3,328,676 73

On tobacco alone the excise duties collected were as follows:

In 1902-3..	$ 3,505,214 79
In 1895-6..	2,369,830 84
Increase..	$ 1,135,383 95

This shows how much more this government has taken out of the pockets of the poor men in this country who happen to use tobacco than the Conservative government took; and yet they promised to relieve the taxpayer. They required this money so that they might be able to boast of a surplus of $13,000,000.

I hope my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell) is now in his place, because I am going to deal with fruits and vegetables which are imported into this country to come into competition with the products of the market gardeners for whom he promised to obtain protection. Last year we imported from the United States fruits of all kinds, such as apples, berries, &c., on which a duty of $765,771.70 was collected; and vegetables, such as potatoes, tomatoes, &c., on which a duty of $86,074.02 was collected; making a total tax collected from the people of this country who consumed these articles of $851,845.72. In 1895-6 there was collected on the same goods $573,732.86. There was collected last year $278,002.86 more than in 1895-6. These figures are taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns at pages 95 and 132. Surely the farmers, the fruit growers and the vegetable growers of this country, if they were given the adequate protection which the hon. member for West York said they ought to have, could produce these articles in this country. The $278,000 of money which went into the treasury would have been deducted from the surplus which the Finance Minister boasts of, and not only that, but $851,000 of our Canadian money would have been kept in Canada instead of being sent to the market gardeners of the United States, to pay for fruits and vegetables to feed the people of Canada on. When the fruits and vegetables are gone, there is nothing left to show for what has been sent to enrich the farmers of the United States. Will the hon. member for West York carry out his promise and see that sufficient protection shall be given to the market gardeners of this country, so that they should be able to produce and sell all the articles of this kind that we may require in the country?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Would my hon. friend have any objection to read, or is he going to hand to 'Hansard' the different items to make up these imports?

Mr. TAYLOR. They are all here in my statement.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will the hon. gentleman read them now?

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. minister want any one to make a whole tariff for him?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I was merely asking the hon. gentleman to read the items which make up those imports.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will give my hon. friend the page in the Trade and Navigation Returns, where he can find them and work them out for himself. I have read the tables, and my hon. friend will see them in 'Hansard.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Unless they are read, they cannot go into 'Hansard' except by consent.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have read them; I have given the quantities and the amounts; and I think there will be a good deal more of the hon. gentleman's speech not read that will go into 'Hansard' than of mine. I wish to ask why this government have collected these large amounts of taxes from the poor people of this country on sugar and tobacco and on fruits and vegetables, to put into this overflowing treasury? It is only for one purpose, that they might squander this money among their supporters. They have spent the largest amount ever expended in Canada in any one year. Where can they point to any large or important work that they have built during the past year? It is true, they can point to some wharfs and piers down in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec and to a few in Ontario, and to a few public buildings scattered here and there. Some days ago I asked the question: what was the cost of taking the census in 1871, in 1881, in 1891, and the amount paid on account of taking the census of 1901 up to the 1st of March, 1903. The return brought down gave the cost as follows: In 1871, $511,330.40; in 1881, $456,904.19; in 1891, $570,115.54; and in 1901, up to the first of March, 1903, $1,112,900.20. More than double, on the average, what it cost the corrupt Tory government, as my hon. friends opposite used to call them, for taking the census in 1871, 1881 and 1891. And all this increased expenditure was simply to give a place to a lot of party friends

who wanted a job. I do not know that I can do better than read an article published in the 'Weekly Review' of April 17th, 1903, which came to my observation a few days ago. The article is as follows:

THE CENSUS FRAUD.

The Auditor General's Report under the head of Dominion census throws some light on the subject of the expense being doubled, while the publication has been delayed and the returns are less accurate. The process seems to have been to appoint double the number of officials from their party office seekers, and to give each of them the same pay as their predecessors, who did twice as much work.

One expenditure to which the Auditor General objects is that of $1,486, incurred by the census branch investigating the census of 1891. Several men were employed at high salaries to endeavour to ferret out ex parte information that might seem to discredit the former census. For instance, diocesan records were procured, giving lists of the faithful in the various dioceses, and these were shamelessly used in the House as being enumerations of the total population. This expenditure of $1,500 would have an indirect value if Mr. Ross was not a traitor to his province, for he could urge it as a precedent of 1901, which, being fraudulent on the face of it, requires investigating far more than that of 1891.

But the most objectionable expenditure is that for the salary, $2,500, and travelling expenses, $1,032, for Mr. Thomas Coté, assistant special commissioner. This is only from June, 1901 to June, 1902, so it does not include the amount before then, or since, if he is still drawing pay. And we in Ontario have to contribute to this expenditure incurred for the purpose of manipulating the Quebec enumeration so as to defraud us out of our rightful representation in the House of Commons. No excuse can be offered for this appointment. There was no more reason why there should be an assistant special commissioner for Quebec than for Ontario or indeed for any of the other provinces. If the language difficulty were alleged it would be a flagrant false pretense. Mr. Blue, the special census commissioner, already had an assistant commissioner, Mr. E. H. St. Denis, an experienced census official, whose tongue is French though he is equally at home in English. Thus there was already ample provision for the instruction of the French-speaking chief census officers, for correspondence with them, and the county commissioners, and for any other duties requiring a proficiency in French. The only possible reason for the appointment of this unnecessary official is the obvious one of securing an over-enumeration of the population, while no such efforts were made on behalf of Ontario and the other provinces. The object was gained by such an unfair exaggeration of the figures for Quebec as compared with Ontario that we have been defrauded of six members. To arrive at this conclusion it is not necessary to suppose that Mr. Coté was dishonest in the execution of his official duties. It would answer the purposes to instruct him and to impress upon his mind the importance of making the best showing possible for Quebec and the propriety of giving the most generous construction to the confessedly doubtful application of the de jure system to non-residents. He would pass this on to the county commissioners and they to their enumerators, who would one and all be ready and willing to carry out such agreeable instructions. With another instructor for the Ontario chief officers and their subordinates, laying stress upon the necessity of being very careful not to count any persons as to whom there was the least doubt, the relative proportion of the provincial populations could easily be affected. We have no hesitation in charging the ministers who made this improper appointment with having done so with the deliberate intention of robbing us of our rightful representation in the House of Commons.

As we have seen there has been an expenditure of $1,500 to investigate the census of 1891. If Mr. Ross was not so busy with his efforts to cling to his unusurped power instead of looking after the interests of his province, he would demand that a similar amount should be expended in investigating the census of 1901 in this direction. A beginning might be made by examining special schedule A in which the names of non-residents were to be inserted by the enumerators. This might throw some light upon the subject.

That article, coupled with the return I have just read, shows how this $63,000,000 was expended by this government last year. Everything they touched, every job they did, cost double what it should. Money has been squandered in every direction just as it has been in the taking of the census, on which $1,200,000 has already been expended, and the work not yet nearly completed. We find that the cost of taking the census in Ontario was double what it was in 1891. That is a fair example of the manner in which everything is conducted. Take up the Auditor General's Report, and you will find that the same vile system was carried on last year, which was in force the previous three or four years—the system of buying goods from party friends and paying two or three times their value. The government buy coal oil at retail price. They pay 32 cents a gallon and $1.25 for the barrel, and last year bought some twenty or thirty barrels. I find that every dollar of public money paid out has been paid out without competition to political supporters, and two or three times the value of the goods paid. Why does not the government do, as any business man would, have all the buying done, after calling for tenders, and see that the money of the country is fairly and honestly expended?

Mr. Speaker, I have occupied more time abusing this government than I intended to do and yet I have not said one-half what I could say and which I would be justified in saying.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monk). I regret, Mr. Speaker, that owing to a business engagement which I was forced to keep, I was unable to hear the first part of the speech of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Taylor). For this I am very sorry indeed, for what come to my ears has given me a keen appetite for more. With several of the hon. gentleman's statements, I am able to agree, but with others I must disagree. Let me first pay some attention to the remark with which he started after dinner when, referring to the result of the last general election in Ontario,

he said that that great province had returned a majority of twenty Conservatives to this House, and concluded with the very pertinent inquiry: Where were the Grits of Ontario? I can tell the hon. gentleman; the Grits of Ontario are to-day doing business in those dives where he and his friends had put them by legislative enactment. But I can tell the hon. gentleman also that there is a great singing and buzzing of wings in those hives, that many of these bees are taking new wings, and that at the next general elections the Conservative party will be very lucky in that province if they break even.

Mr. TAYLOR. Their majority will be increased to forty.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monk). But if I cannot agree with my hon. friend on this point, I can agree with him in his heart-felt sorrow that more members of the cabinet are not in their seats when such hon. members as the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) undertake to address the House. On both occasions, we should have the fourteen cabinet ministers, and the Solicitor General as well, in their places.

Reducing the matter to a cash nexus which the hon. member for South Leeds seems very fond of doing, I have to commiserate him upon the fact that while he made the major part of his speech only $14,000 worth of ministry, qua ministers, were in their seats—though I am glad to say that to listen to me I have about $21,000 worth of ministers.

An hon. MEMBER. The leader of the opposition is not present.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monk). That is quite true. But I can understand that the leader of the opposition knew who was to occupy his place in the matter of speech-making and he felt that it was in safe hands.

I was surprised to note during the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Taylor's) speech that it had not come to his knowledge where the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) is. I followed his remarks rather carefully, and I am glad to inform the hon. gentleman that the Minister of the Interior is now in England, in connection with the Alaska boundary commission, where he will do good work, for the Hon. Clifford Sifton has never undertaken anything that he has not carried through with remarkable success. The hon. member for Leeds speaks as if the work in connection with this commission was work that oculd be very well done by any third-class clerk in one of the departments. I differ with the hon. gentleman on that point; that work is so important that we can well afford to send one of the ablest Canadian public men to look after it. There will always be some other ministers to take his place during his absence, and see that the work of the department goes merrily on.

I do not intend to deal at length with the charges of extravagance and squandering which the hon. member for Leeds has made against this government, but I wish to congratulate the hon. gentleman on having introduced something entirely new into this debate. Having listened to many of the speeches in the debate, I had about come to the conclusion that there was nothing new to be said. But it filled me with admiration when the hon. gentleman introduced an entirely new point. Speaking of the importation of agricultural implements he said: In a few years they will be nothing but scrap iron, and the Yankees will have our money. I wondered that he did not follow his argument further and run it down to its logical conclusion. When he came to deal with the importation of free corn, why could he not have said: We have imported hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of free corn: the hogs have eaten the corn and the Yankees have our money. The argument is quite as good in one case as in the other. The hon. gentleman has overlooked the fact that, while it may be true that the Yankees have our money, we have got some little benefit out of the articles we have bought, while we are converting them into scrap iron or into bacon as the case may be.

Coming to the main part of what I have to say—and I shall be as brief as possible—I note that the hon. leader of the opposition, whose remarks I read carefully after having listened to them with equal attention, did not attack with any force the financial record of this government. He did not make the wild charges of extravagance which many of his followers have made, including the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. But his leading organ in the province of Ontario, in many editorials, has gone so far as to dub the government 'the Ottawa prodigals.' So, it seems I shall do right if I undertake to show wherein the expenditure has increased between the days of the Conservative government and the days of the Liberal government, by way of proving that the charges of extravagance are entirely without foundation. To do that, I would take the Conservative expenditure of 1895, not the year 1896, and for a very evident reason. In 1895, the Conservative expenditures reached their height; in 1902 the expenditure reached its height with the Liberals. The comparison then is fair. But there is another reason. We know that in 1896 the Conservative expenditure was purposely kept down because the government was going to the country and was desirous of making as good an appearance as possible before the country. Therefore, many public services were starved, with the result that the year following when the Liberals were in power the entire forgetfulness—if it were forgetfulness—of the Conservative govern-

ment of the good adage that a stitch in time saves nine, brought it about that the people had to pay for the nine stitches where they ought only to have paid for one. Therefore, I compare 1895 with 1902. Now, in 1895 the total expenditure was a little over $38,000,000, and in 1902, it was $50,759,000. I have a difference of $12,627,000 to account for, and this is a task I assign myself here tonight. First, I come to the increase on account of interest on the public debt, and half a million disappears in this item. In the year 1895, our Conservative friends added to this debt $6,891,000, and in the year 1896 $5,422,000, or a total of $12,314,000, on which they did not have to pay a single cent by way of interest in the year 1895, but on which we had to pay interest in 1902. This accounts for almost $400,000 of this increase of $500,000 in interest on the public debt. As for the balance, we admit we have increased the debt somewhat—of which more anon—but the main part of this amount, that is, $400,000, was the work of hon. gentlemen on the other side for which we should not in any way be considered responsible. Next, we come to the increase in the cost of management. This item is comparatively small, but sometimes such items have to be carefully dealt with, because it is in small rather than large items that slipshod methods creep in. We find that the increased cost of management is $48,000 odd. Of this about $37,000 was increase in the cost of printing new bills, cancelling the old, signing the new, &c. The fact is that the old bills had become worn out and dirty and we thought that clean currency should accompany clean government. I am not going to apologize for spending the money in this way, although there is an increase of $37,000 on this account. Then there was an amount of $6,598 for stamps in excess of the expenditure of 1895. This was an expenditure in England over which we have no control, a tax which we must pay, because, in common with other nations we go to England as our money market. And as to the balance of the account—and I have accounted for practically the whole $48,000—where it could be kept down it has not been increased by one solitary cent under this government compared with the expenditure of 1895. In the matter of brokerage, commissions, management of the debt in England, the charges are identical in one case and the other. Then as to the expenditure of managing the savings banks throughout the Dominion, if hon. gentlemen will compare the two records, they will find precisely the same in each town in which these banks exist, although they are being reduced in numbers and eventually will be wiped out. There is an increase in the sinking fund of $567,069. We know that we have spent that much more money than the Conservatives did, but it was spent in only one sense. We bought securities with it, and when the time comes to redeem our indebtedness, we shall realize on these securities and shall have that much money to reduce the debt. It is an expenditure in one sense, but not in the other. It is simply taking the money from one pocket and putting it into the other. And so half a million of the twelve million is accounted for in less than two minutes by the clock. Next, we come to the item of arts, agriculture and statistics. Here we find a very large increase of $1,058,049. No less than $793,365 has been spent on the census. Now, I am not going to discuss the subject of the census. No doubt, later on, there will be a debate on the subject, and I believe the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), when he comes back from Japan, will be able to explain that matter and take his own part. But as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has taken up the subject and referred to it in the most disparaging way, I may say that the census of 1891 was clearly shown by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) to have been a fraud—and I use the word because I believe the word. The present census is all wool and a yard wide—a good census—and you have to pay a good deal more for broadcloth than for shoddy. But, leaving this item, which should not be charged to agriculture, we come to Liberal expenditure on exhibitions—about $90,000 more than that of our friends opposite. The Conservatives did spend $26,000 on exhibitions in 1895. But, of this, something over $24,000 was spent on exhibitions in the North-west Territories, and, if all be true which we have heard about that exhibition, there was indeed a feast of reason and a flow of souls, though whether it promoted the interests of Canada along commercial and agricultural lines is open to doubt. But, even allowing that we expended in exhibitions $90,000 more than hon. gentlemen opposite did, it must be remembered that this included the Glasgow, Paris, Cork, Wolverhampton and Buffalo exhibitions, accounts for all which will be found in the statement for 1902. I will admit that there is some excuse for hon. gentlemen opposite in having taken no part in exhibitions in various parts of the world during 1895, for so far as I know in those dark days of Conservative rule, there was nothing in Canada of sufficient magnitude and nothing wonderful enough in workmanship to deserve an exhibition, unless it was deficits, and so far as I know, no prize was offered for these in any of the exhibitions of the world.

Next we come to the subject of cold storage. There has been an increased expenditure in connection with agriculture by way of cold storage and dairying, amounting in all to $136,000, and on experimental farms, $23,940. These items taken together, coupled with the census item I have mentioned, will go far to make up that $1,058,000 of increase in arts, agriculture and science with which I started my statement on this head. With regarfd to that cold storage, I, as a

farmers' representative, coming from a county largely agricultural, coming from a county that has no large towns, am free to confess that the farmers of this country have reason to thank the Liberal government for that expenditure upon cold storage. I note the fact that in 1895 the Australians were getting in the markets of England for their butter from two to three cents a pound more than the Canadians were getting. And why ? Because they had good cold storage when we had poor cold storage, or none at all. They brought their butter across the Pacific, then across this great continent, and when they got it into the English market they got that much more from it than we did for our butter, though having to ship it a far less distance. I know that some money was being spent at that time by the Conservative government along these lines. But my charge against them is that when Australia had a system so perfect as that, by which butter could be transported that long distance in perfect condition, it was nothing to the credit of the Conservative government that we could not transport our butter a shorter distance, and that we got the price we did, although we are now getting a better price for the butter than the Australians. Therefore, I am not going to apologize for that part of the increase of $12,000,000 which hon. gentlemen opposite have dubbed extravagance.

The next item is immigration. Well, I am sure you will admit that not much need be said on the head of immigration. True, we are spending $299,000 more than our opponents spent, but with what result ? We are all rejoiced to see the influx of settlers from the United States and England. Do you suppose they would have come here entirely of their own accord ? No, our immigration agents have been doing excellent work among them, have been sowing the seed, and the harvest time is now upon us, and we are gathering in as a result of their labours. I think that our friends opposite might better have described the movement under their regime as an emigration movement from Canada, judging from the cancelled homestead entries and other evidences. So I am not going to apologize for that item.

For quarantine there is an increase of $163,000 over the expenditure by our opponents in 1895. Now, it is necessary to keep disease out of the herds in this country, and when I tell you that a large part of this expenditure has been to indemnify Canadian herdsmen for the slaughter of their diseased cattle and hogs, and in order to preserve Canadian hogs from the hog cholera, you will admit that in the interests of our farming population this was an increase at which nobody can cavil, and I believe hon. gentlemen opposite have made no objection to it. I will not go extensively into the subject of what this government has done in the way of reopening a splendid market in the United States for our live cattle trade. But we do know that in the days of the late government there was such an embargo upon our cattle going into the United States that trade with that country practically failed, and for four years and a half we shipped into that country less than 4,000 head of cattle, and we got back scarcely $50,000. But after the energetic action taken by our new farmer-Minister of Agriculture, through whose agency the restrictions were removed ; this trade went up by leaps and bounds, and one firm, the Ironsides Brothers, among the largest dealers in Canada, is my authority for the statement that the action of the government in getting that embargo removed added $10 a head to the value of the live stock in Canada. When I tell you that we are a beef-eating people in Canada, that we devour something like 100,000 head of cattle per month, the consequence of that statement is readily apparent. If we eat 100,000 head of cattle per month, we devour 1,200,000 head in the course of a year; and at $10 per head that would mean $12,000,000 extra added to the wealth of the farmers of this country by this farmers' government. You cannot get away from the fact, you may say the figures are extravagant, but you will admit that there is but one market price for cattle, that if the American buyer comes in and gives a certain price for a two-year-old to take over the line, the local butcher has got to give as much for another two-year-old in the same market. So when you raise the price of our export cattle you raise the price of our cattle for the home market; and we have a right to claim that millions upon millions per annum have been added to the wealth of the farmers of this country by the energetic action of the Minister of Agriculture. Having recaptured this market, is it strange that we should be willing to spend more money to retain it ? We know why the Americans put that embargo on in the first place. They did it because they said that disease existed in our herds. Well, suppose that disease broke out again and became widespread, back goes your embargo, and you would have as hard a time to remove it in the case of the United States, as you are having now in making an unsuccessful attempt to remove it in the case of England. Therefore we cannot consider any expense too great to ward off such a disaster as that coming upon the farmers of Canada. No one will object to the government spending on quarantine fully as much as that service requires.

Now, Sir, I come to militia, and this is a subject in which, as you know, I take considerable interest. But it does not follow that for that reason I should burden you long with a discussion of that part of our increased expenditure. Suppose we say the increase is $486,694. Analysing it, there is an increase in pay and in wages, and the increased pay to the permanent officers and men and to the militia civil servants

amounts to $76,000. Well, Sir, we know that wages have increased all along the line, in every walk of life; and instead of accusing this government of extravagance in the matter of the militia, I would rather charge them with parsimony of the most extreme kind, in that year after year they take our young fellows to the front and pay them fifty cents a day, when at home they might make $1.50. I ask hon. gentlemen to note how independent I am, how I criticise the government when there is occasion for it; therefore when I support the government hon. gentlemen should give more weight to my remarks when they see how fair-minded I am. Next we come to military property. There is an increase of $141,000. We found the military properties which we took over from hon. gentlemen opposite were all tumbling down. I know whereof I speak, I am not taking the blue-books for my authority. I have been an enthusiastic militiaman for nearly twenty years, I have kept in touch with this subject, and I pledge my personal knowledge that these buildings were in a wretched condition. Indeed they are in none too good a condition now, but they are infinitely better than they were when hon. gentlemen opposite had them in charge. So once more I will not apologize for that increase, but I rather blame the government for not having made it a little larger. In military stores the same remark applies. There is an extra expenditure of $48,000. I think it well to have good rifles in this country, we have very few of them, but they are quite useless without cartridges to place in the chambers of those rifles. Especially would you find yourself in an awkward position if you were standing at 2,000 yards opposite another fellow who had ammunition and you had none.

Then we come to the matter of clothing. where there is an increase of $110,000. And that leads me to say that in the old days of the Conservative regime only half the militia was drilled every year. That was a most disastrous thing. The fellows went down for twelve days at a time, and as two years had to elapse before they were turned out again, they forgot practically in the meantime all that they had learned in those twelve days. Wiser counsels have prevailed with this government in this matter, with the result that we now drill them yearly. Now, would you expect us to go to drill every year and wear out as little clothing as we would if we drilled only once in two years ? We have spent $110,000 more in clothing; in addition to that our stores are in better shape so far as supplies and clothing go than they have been in many a long year past.

Then we come to the Dominion cartridge factory. Gentlemen, I would not have you think for a moment that I am one of those loud mouthed jingoes who wish to see a large standing army in Canada, who would like to see this country borne down by military expenditure. I believe my views are pretty much the views of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House as I have heard them expressed many and many a time. I agree that we should as far as possible encourage the practice of rifle shooting in this country, but you cannot have rifle shooting without cartridges. The cartridge factory at Quebec has been enlarged and increased in order to deal with the new situation created by the civilian rifle clubs which are in existence and which hon. gentlemen opposite never inaugurated and as a consequence of that the factory has been improved to such an extent that now it will be able to turn out three times as many cartridges as in times gone by. If you take these items you will find that they more than account for the total increase of $468,000. Then, we come to the mounted police. The increase is $302,090, but as more than that amount of money was actually spent on the force in the Yukon, and the Yukon as we all know, taking it from the first until the present, has practically paid for the Yukon, there is no increased burden on the people. With an expenditure of a little more than $8,000,000 and with receipts of a little more than $8,000,000, the receipts are less than the expenditure by about $200,000, covering a term of years. So, I make the broad statement that the Yukon has paid for the Yukon and having paid for the Yukon it has paid for the mounted police in the Yukon. This apparent increase of $302,000 is not really an increase because the money has come back. Next we come to public works and here is the largest individual increase we have except in the case of the collection of revenue of railways and canals. We find that the increase in this department came to $2,478,976 but what more do we find ? The only way to proceed in analysing matters of this knd is to compare them with the doings and the expenditures of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in the government. I have heard the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) time and again say : We refuse to be bound by those old comparisons. Let the dead past bury its dead. But if we do not make this comparison what are we to do ? We cannot compare anything with the Conservative party's present because it is not charged with the expenditure of money, we cannot compare it with its future because we are not sure it will have any future. So, we are bound to compare it with its past. If we proceed on this principle we find simply this : that the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) in 1896, in his main and supplementary estimates, and I will admit that he did not bring down the supplementary estimates but they were drafted by the government, they were found and read—in his supplementary estimates he was willing to spend the sum of $3,998,-

610 for public works. We have spent on public works $4,221,293, or we have spent more than he was willing to spend only about $225,000. But, mark you, in that year he had a revenue under $34,000,000 with a deficit of $4,000,000 and in this year we had a revenue of $58,000,000 with a surplus of $7,000,000—a very different case indeed. But, I need not have gone so explicitly into this argument because I think this is one of the increases that no one can object to. Liberals cannot attack it because this expenditure has been made by a government in which they have every confidence and hon. gentlemen opposite should not attack it because this is the expenditure of a man to whose virtues for many years they were blind, but their eyes have been opened and they have discovered that that hon. gentleman was the brains of the Liberal cabinet. Will these hon. gentlemen cavil at the expenditure of the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) ? I take it that they will not. Therefore, I pass to the next item. It is mail subsidies and steamship subventions $111,688 of which I need say little. We have been opening up new trade channels, and establishing new lines between Canada and South Africa, and the requirements of the country are such that the increase is justified. The next we come to is ocean and river service in which there was $291,997 of an increase. This is almost wholly accounted for by the purchase of two new steamers and the balance by the increased cost of wages and supplies which we meet all along the line and which we all know in every walk of life has advanced considerably since 1895. Coming to fisheries, we have an increase of $105,000. I do not find that any of our friends from the maritime provinces objected to that. I imagine that cold storage for the preservation of bait has something to do with this increase but when we take into consideration the benefit it has been to the fishermen of the maritime provinces I am sure hon. gentlemen will admit that there is ample justification for it. Then, coming to subsidies to provinces, we find an increase of $151,423. This is a matter that is statutory. We know very well that as population increases, these provinces getting so much per head, their subsidies must increase and that accounts for the whole amount save except a small item we saw fit to pay the province of Prince Edward Island and which one of the hon. members on the other side, at present in his seat, will, I think, not dispute, was a just and honourable payment to that province. And so, we come down to Indians. The increase in the vote for Indians is $101,726. There was a time when we sang with the poet 'lo, the poor Indian.' But we do not look very much to the poor Indian just now for the good reason that he has lost his franchise. I ask hon. members of this House as practical politicians and as great statesmen if they will not agree with me when I say that in the disbursements for Indians, politicians are not under the temptation to give the Indian more than his due. The increase in the expenditure from the government of the North-west Territories is very easily dealt with. There is an increase of $188,297. It is an increase certainly, but they are our wards and as the country fills up we have more services to perform until the time comes when they set up housekeeping for themselves and then this expense will be replaced by a subsidy. It is just as broad as it is long. I wish the increase had been $1,000,000 instead of $188,297, if it had been warranted by an increase in the population and prosperity of that part of the country, because, I agree with the hon. leader of the opposition when he says that far from cavilling at this increase he thinks the amount should be further increased. Then, we come to the interesting increase under the head of miscellaneous $928,910. In the miscellaneous column are stowed away all those expenditures which cabinet ministers, by any kind of process of reasoning, can manage to eliminate from their own expenses. No cabinet minister likes to swell his expenditure, and so, if there is any excuse for him to say : Well now, that is not properly in my department, they put it under the miscellaneous head with the result that there is great comfort for the souls of some of the cabinet ministers. The first item is $462,881. for the royal tour, I had hoped that this would be passed over in silence and no attention paid to it, but very recently I read in the columns of an Ontario newspaper an article criticising this expenditure. I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I say that not only was that criticism in bad taste but it showed a lack of the knowledge of business principles as well. After the Prince and Princess had been sumptuously entertained in New Zealand, Australia and even in South Africa, I think it would have been unfitting if Canada had brought up in the procession at the tail end without a few brass bands and a little bit in the way of fireworks. If you were to come down to the cash basis to the mere question of advertising, and recollect that the heir apparent to the Crown was accompanied on that tour by some of the brightest newspaper correspondents in England, that they were cabling reports every day to the old land, that these reports were being copied throughout the British Isles in the provincial press—if we are to come down to the patent medicine argument, to the question of advertising, considering, the advertisement which Canada got, the money was well spent. And next we come to the Ottawa Improvement Commission which gets $60,000. Well, we got something in return for that; we get fire protection and free water, and I am told that is worth $15,000 or $20,000 a year. But suppose we got nothing in return; has the time come when we have not sufficient pride in Canada as a nation to be willing to ex-

pend a comparatively small amount like that each year to beautify our capital in the north. Shall we follow the example of other great nations; although we may not in strict accuracy be a great nation yet; we are on the way to it and as sure as the sun rises and sets so sure we will be a great nation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Shall we let the time slip away from us, and not beautify this magnificent city which nature has beautified so much, and which is given to us as our capital city ? Hon. gentlemen opposite have made no complaint of it. In many matters of this kind when it comes to a particular item they are broad-minded and fair as we are, but when it comes to a matter of aggregates, why then they say : The government is extravagant, the government is spendthrift; behold the Ottawa prodigals. But gentlemen you cannot do that in the aggregate if you don't do it in the details, and unless your votes in committee show that you object to this, that and other item, you have no right to go before the country and to say that this government is extravagant and is squandering the money of the people. Then we have the assay office in British Columbia, which cost us $19,424. Why, in the days of the old Conservative regime we hardly had gold in this country, but shortly afterwards it was discovered, and so we find that we now have some occasion for an assay office, whereas before there was little or no necessity for it. Then we come to the Department of Labour and there we are spending $31,963. Is that in excess of what the Conservatives spent when they were in power for this puprpose ? Not a bit of it. That is an entirely new expenditure. When these hon. gentlemen were in power, having so much the interests of the country at heart, and being the champions of the manufacturers in this country—and these manufacturers let me tell them include the labouring hands working in the factories although these gentlemen opposite do not always admit it—when these hon. gentlemen opposite were in power they never thought enough of the labour problem in this country to organize a Department of Labour. But let me say to them, that should the government change to-morrow—which heaven forbid—should the government change to-morrow, hon. gentlemen opposite would not abolish the Department of Labour, but they would keep it right on in its old track and possibly spend as much or even more money upon it than we are doing now. Then I come to the expenses of the coronation conference in London; that conference about which there is so much argument; that conference at which hon. gentlement opposite say little or nothing was done. And yet, Sir, I maintain that $20,000 is money well spent, if it decided nothing more than this : That taxation without representation will not be tolerated in Canada any more than it was tolerated in the thirteen colonies in the olden days.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). I consider myself as good a Britain as any of you, but I am that and more too—I am a good Canadian. And when the British government, or some of the British statesmen had made up their minds that Canada would collect money to hand over to them for expenditure, then I say that it is a good thing for Canada, aye and for Britain, too, that they should not be kept in the dark, that that matter should be at once set at rest, and that they should know over there that we in Canada enjoy a self-government, one tittle or particle of which we do not propose should be taken from us; and, that any money we collect for imperial objects or otherwise will be spent through our own channels.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Then we come to the purchase of the Plains of Abraham. I think that hon. gentlemen opposite will agree with me that that is perhaps the most interesting landmark in the country. We knew that the Plains of Abraham were about to be broken up into building lots, and this government came to the rescue and paid $80,000 for that historical landmark. And we know, Sir, that that was done by our generous French Canadian premier, supported by the French Canadian members of this House, who are broad enough and good enough Canadians to feel that in that battle on the Plains of Abraham, there was no disgrace for either race, and that the column erected to the joint memory of Wolfe and Montcalm in the city of Quebec, typifies the feeling of union that now exists in the descendants of those men who locked arms on these very Plains of Abraham.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Then we pass on to the grant given to Marconi, amounting to $70,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Eighty thousand dollars.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). $80,000 in all, but $70,000 expended in 1902. Why, it only shows the enterprise of the government ; that is all. Marconi's scheme was poo-poohed; capitalists interested in cable companies and all that gave him the cold shoulder; he was thwarted in every way. But whether or not his discovery be perfected for the transmission of trans-Atlantic messages, it will be immensely useful to commerce, and it is a feather in the cap of this enterprising government that it should have taken up this friendless man and sup-

plied money in aid of genius. More than that, this government did not do it for nothing. The idea of thrift came into the transaction; there is a streak of canniness in it; the Scotch members of the cabinet look after that. They said: Yes, Mr. Marconi, we are willing to help you, and if this thing comes to be successful we would like a little help in return. And so the cabinet arranged that if the matter does come out all right they are to get the services of Marconi's various offices at a greatly reduced rate; at a rate so much reduced that in a few short years the amount of the expenditure will be recouped to the government and we will be money ahead. Then we come to the banking service in the Yukon which cost $53,169. That is merely money spent in connection with the collection of the dues on gold mining in the Yukon. It all came back from other sources and it cost the people of Canada nothing. Then we spent $50,000 to aid the unfortunate sufferers in the West Indies. I believe that the hon. gentlemen opposite raised not one dissenting voice as to that item. I do not think there is a man in the House who would raise a dissenting voice against it. I believe we are all united in doing something for these unfortunates so heavily visited by the hand of God, and although they were our brother colonists I believe Canadian generosity would go even further than that, and that in the case of any great national calamity, whether the sufferers were brethren within the empire of some time enemies without the empire, we would be willing and glad to give them our assistance in some small degree to alleviate their sufferings. Next I come to an item so small that you will almost wonder why I am quoting it. It is the expenses of the half-breed claims commission, amounting to $10,161. The half-breeds in the North-west had some grievances, had presented these grievances to the government, and what did the government do? It sent out a commission and the cost of that commission is a little over $10,000. It is the association of ideas and not the amount that leads me to mention the sum. In the early eighties the half-breeds of the North-west had some grievances also, and they petitioned the government again and again but the pigeon-holes yawned for these petitions. Petition after petition was forwarded to the government only to meet with the same fate, and as a result we had a North-west rebellion, which cost the people of Canada $5,000,000 and scores of valuable lives, against a bloodless expenditure of $10,000 by the present government. It is things like these that cause me and other men of the rank and file in this House, to be proud to sit behind the men who fill the treasury benches.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). And now in that large increase of $928,000 for miscellaneous expenditure I have given you items which total $827,000, and the remaining $100,000 is composed of items so minute that it would take at least an hour to go into them, and I cannot weary the House that long, but if you refer to the books you will find that there is as good justification for every cent of the increase as there is justification for the items I have given to you. The expenditure on the Yukon provisional district was paid for by the Yukon, and it did not cost the people of Canada one cent. And yet the 'Mail and Empire' published an editorial in connection with a late interesting election contest in a constituency called North Ontario, in which it stated that the Yukon is running us behind, that there was a large deficit and that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) was trying to qualify for cabinet rank because he was trying to out—well, I won't use the word, because it would be unparliamentary—but at all events, to outstate the other cabinet ministers who had been in the riding, when he said that the Yukon had paid for the Yukon. That editorial in the 'Mail' contains a half truth, and nothing more or less. It is true that during this last year there will be a deficit if we include public works in the Yukon, but if you take the expenditure and receipts 'from the beginning of the world unto the day of the date of these presents' the Yukon has paid for the Yukon. That is what has occurred in the Yukon. Now, there is an increase in the customs of $258,391. Well, is that probably rather a questionable increase? As a matter of fact, having known the Minister of Customs since I was a very small boy, I have had a good deal of confidence in him throughout all that time, and frankly I must say that I never knew him as an extravagant man in any sense of the word whatever. He has carried his methods of economy into his department, and I have heard many business men who are not Liberals in politics, say that a better Minister of Customs Canada never had. When you consider the immense increase in revenue which the hon. minister is called on to collect, you will readily see that he cannot hope to bear the expense of his department with the same amount with which it was borne in 1895. But this he can say and prove, that so far as percentages go, he has collected every $100 of duty at far and away less cost that our Conservative friends did in 1895, even if he shows a total increase in the cost of that department of $258,000.

Next we come to the Post Office Department, in which the increased expenditure is $429,989, and I touch on this subject with some diffidence, because it is a subject on which I feel that I am sitting at the feet of Gamaliel. Yet in talking about the Post Office Department I feel that I am on safe ground, and I propose to take up the cudgels for a few moments. And here I wish to pay a compliment to the hon member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who, I am sorry to see

is not in his place to-night—a fact to which I call the attention of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) because in the event of a change of government, the hon. gentleman would be slated for a cabinet position, and if he does not stay in the House he is not training very well for the place in which he expects to earn a salary of $7,000, besides getting $1,500 indemnity. I have always entertained a feeling of respect for the hon. member for Bothwell, and to this feeling I must now add a degree of admiration for his courage in attacking the administration of the Post Office Department; because in the splendid galaxy of ably administered departments which we have in this government, there is no bright particular star more bright than that department. It is a subject on which we all like to talk when we are discussing administrative economy, and I will take up the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell and examine it. One grievance of the hon. gentleman is that the jubilee stamps which were issued by the hon. Postmaster General and were bought largely by the people of Canada, cannot now be redeemed in the currency of the realm. I wonder if the hon. gentleman is largely loaded up with this non-negotiable security. The hon. gentleman said that the Postmaster General took advantage of a loyal wave that was sweeping over the country to sell those stamps at the time; and, I suppose to complete the argument, now that the loyal wave has subsided, he will not buy his stamps back again. I think the hon. member for Bothwell must have invested a large sum of money in those stamps when his loyalty was at the boiling point, and now that it is simmering down, he has a grievance against the hon. Postmaster General because he will not relieve him of his investment. But what is astonishing to me is that the hon. gentleman, belonging as he does to the party of loyalty, cannot find some one in the party whose loyalty has not cooled, and who will relieve him of his purchase made at an unwary moment. The consequence is, the hon. gentleman says, the minister got half a million dollars by the trick, and that is the way he reduced the deficit. True, he did, and I think he was pretty clever in doing so. But he did it in one year only; he did not repeat the offence. What has that to do with the receipts and expenditures for this year? Nothing whatever, and yet he has an absolute surplus this year, when you make a fair comparison, of over $5,000. The hon. gentleman says that the hon. Postmaster General eliminates the Yukon and the Atlin districts, and were they not parts of Canada? What a splendid headline it would make for some of the Dawson papers, that the Postmaster General is insinuating that these districts are not parts of Canada! But this is poor argument for the hon. member for Bothwell. Of course, they are a part of Canada, but they were not until this government discovered that they were; that is the point. The Conservatives were not spending money on the Yukon and Atlin districts in 1895, and when the hon. Postmaster General wishes to make a comparison between his administration and that of his predecessors, why should he not eliminate what cost them nothing? When he does that, he has a surplus for this year of $5,000. But there is a discrepancy between the report of the hon. Postmaster General and the Public Accounts, and the 'Mail and Empire,' with briny tears in its eyes, asks who cooked the accounts; and it makes me a very flattering offer which I cannot refuse to accept. Referring to a speech I made in North Grey, it says:

> Sir William Mulock publicly announced that he had scored a profit of $5,000; but the post office report reports a loss of $82,375, while public accounts show a loss of $105,221.

And here, Mr. Speaker, is where I have hopes of future greatness:

> If Colonel Thompson can explain away these unfortunate discrepancies he is an excellent calculator.

Think, Mr. Speaker, what it would mean for me if I could go back to my constituency with the ipse dixit of the 'Mail and Empire' that I was an excellent calculator. It is worth making the attempt, and that attempt I wish to make now. There is that discrepancy between the report of the hon. Postmaster General and the Public Accounts, but that discrepancy will be found to exist where a similar discrepancy was the year before; and if you take the receipts and expenditures of the two years and work them out together, you will find that they work out dollar for dollar. The hon. Postmaster General did actually expend $105,000 in excess of his receipts, including the Yukon and Atlin districts in this particular year; but part of that was for expenditures incurred during the previous year; and therefore, adding the two years together, you will find that while his statement makes him about $28,000 better this year than do the Public Accounts, his statement of last year makes him that much worse off than they make him. It is simply a matter of bookkeeping. The hon. Postmaster General's administration of his department is such as would be a credit to any man, and hon. gentlemen opposite in cavilling at it, only expose themselves to ridicule.

Coming to the Public Works Department, the increased cost in the collection of revenue was $346,815. But the Atlin and Yukon telegraph lines and the telegraph lines in connection with the gulf service account for almost the whole of this amount, especially if you add $48,000 which was expended for the cable vessel the 'Tyrian.'

Then we come to the largest individual increase, the Railways and Canals, in which

the increase cost of collection of revenue was $2,804,350; but the increase of revenue amounts to $2,751,531; so that if hon. gentlemen will note the two amounts they will find that the money comes rolling back into our coffers within $50,000 of the whole amount. Therefore the people of Canada must not be led to believe that we are spending money to that extent. We are operating more railways and canals, that are not supposed to pay directly, and next year the discrepancy may be still greater, because the government have announced their intention of making the canals as free as the ocean itself. This will, of course, involve an increased cost to the country, but the results in the form of a reduction of freight rates will redound to the advantage of the shippers and farmers of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that you are taxing the people more, because in this particular you are taking more out of their pockets than you are giving back. But the reverse is more likely to be the case, and the argument is as fair one way as the other.

The cost of the administration of justice in the Yukon last year increased $115,526, but it has come back to us in the form of Yukon royalties. It is not fitting that I should pass this matter over without saying a word on the administration of justice in the Yukon. I believe that our administration of justice in that distant country is one of the proudest incidents in the national life of Canada. We all know the enormous difficulties which must be met in maintaining law and order in such a distant and sparsely settled country, and we all know that law and order is maintained there as well as it is this night in the city of Ottawa. We know that no murderer can go unpunished there, that though it may cost $100,000 to hunt him down—and I believe in one case it did cost more than that—Canadian justice has an arm long enough and strong enough in the Yukon Territory to seize him and make him pay the penalty. So far from our increased expenditure on this head being a disgrace to us, we can take credit for it.

Now, I have accounted—and I believe fairly and reasonably accounted—for more than $12,125,000 of increase. What remains over is little indeed. I could even account for that but to do so would compel me to go into items of very small expenditure with which I must not weary the House. But the general argument applies, even if I refrain from the particular, with regard to these few items, and the general argument is that with an increase of trade in the country such as we are now enjoying, you cannot expect to carry on public business with the same amount of money as before. This reminds me of an epigramatic saying of the great Napoleon, which is particularly applicable to the point I am making. When, after a famous battle his soldiers reported very heavy losses in killed and wounded, his invariable reply was, with a shrug of his shoulders 'on ne fait pas d'omelette sans casser des œufs.'

Five minutes more, Mr. Speaker, and I think I can finish. The increase in our public debt, if we can take the estimate of the Minister of Finance for the expenditures of the current year—and we are now so used to find his estimates correct that we can have no hesitation in accepting them—the increase in our national debt will be $7,681,657 at the close of the current year, or a little more than $1,000,000 per year since this government has taken office. Can we not account for some of this increase? If we take the South African war and the Halifax garrison, which was of course part of the expenditure on the South African war—that garrison having been made a Canadian garrison to relieve the British soldiers—we find that the expenditure on that head amounted to $2,830,965. That is an expenditure which certainly nobody can complain of, but it forms a considerable portion of the increase in the public debt. Then there is the discount on the Fielding loan of 1897, amounting to $826,317. But we can offset against that discount the benefit which my hon. friend the Finance Minister obtained for Canada by succeeding, for the first time in its history, in floating a loan at an interest of two and a half per cent, and thus establishing a rate for investors in the case of future loans. This loan is generally conceded by financiers to have been an extremely good piece of finance. But inasmuch as we have to charge that loan against our capital debt at par and did not obtain par for it, we have to take that discount of $826,317 as one of the items which account for the increase in the public debt. But it is an item against which no possible objection can be raised, because we get the benefit of a lower rate of interest, which in a number of years, will more than offset the discount. It is an expenditure in one sense, but it is an expenditure which comes back to our pocket in much the same way as does the sinking fund. Then there is the cost of the expenditure caused by the eastern extension railway award, namely, $671,836 in Nova Scotia and $280,692 in New Brunswick. This expenditure was the result of an arbitration arising out of the complications incurred by the late government and wiped out by this government. It represents therefore an increase in our debt for which the present administration cannot be held responsible. Then take the purchase of the Drummond County railway, which cost $1,464,000. But we have the railway and we have by this means brought the Intercolonial railroad into Montreal. That certainly is an expenditure for which we have abundant justification and in return for which we have good value to show. The next item to which I will call the attention of the

House is the arrears of the Post Office Department amounting to $685,000. When my hon. friend the Postmaster General took charge of that department, he found that not only were there yearly deficits but a large amount of old debts actually remaining unpaid, and which were carried over from year to year. Being desirous to make expenditure and revenue balance each year, so that we could tell exactly where we stood, my hon. friend asked parliament for a special vote of $685,000 to pay the debts incurred by hon. gentlemen opposite. Had hon. gentlemen opposite paid off these debts, the expenditure in their time would have been increased to that extent and also the public debt, and therefore we are not fairly chargeable with that amount of increase. I find next an item of $745,964 paid for arms contracted for by the late government, and for which they left us to pay the piper. This too should not be charged against the present administration. Then there is the sum of $500,000 paid in the settlement of claims in Manitoba, which were left unsettled by the old government. This certainly can not be charged against the present administration. Adding all these items together, they aggregate over $8,000,000 and hundreds of thousands more might be added in the same way of moneys expended because of circumstances extraordinary and unique in their nature or because of the necessity to pay debts incurred by Conservative governments. So that if we eliminate expenditure caused by the South African war and the debts which hon. gentlemen opposite should have paid but did not, you will find that we have not added one dollar to the public debt of the country, and more than that we have poured out millions like water in developing our canals and railways and making proper provision for the public works and general service of the country.

I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for having detained this House so long listening to figures at this stage of the debate, when everybody is tired. I have no more comments to make on the budget beyond congratulating my hon. friend the Minister of Finance on the excellent showing he was able to make to the people of Canada and on the increasing prosperity which the country is enjoying under the able administration of this government.

Mr. HACKETT. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks on the very important subject we are now discussing, but at this late hour, I do not wish to detain the House, and I would therefore beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The evening is still quite early and if my hon. friend desires an adjournment I do not wish to press him to go on.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Postmaster General, House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 29, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 131) to incorporate the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. McIsaac.

Bill (No. 132) to incorporate the Père Marquette International Bridge Company.—Mr. McCreary.

ANTI-CIGARETTE BILL.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 133) to prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of cigarettes.

Mr. G. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Explain.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The Bill provides practically what is contained in the resolution that the House, by a very large majority, recently adopted. The Bill is founded on that resolution. It goes so far as to prevent the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes. I understand that this Bill may not be strictly regular, but I would ask, if necessary, that the House would suspend the rule, so that we may get the first reading. If there is any further explanation that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) requires I would be very glad to give it to him.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not take exception to the Bill being presented, nor do I raise any point as to the rule, but if I understand the resolution that was passed in this House a short time ago, it demands that the government, and not a private member, should introduce this legislation. This Bill, as I understand it, somewhat affects the revenue, and it is only the government that can deal with it. In view of that, the government should accept the responsibility for this Bill and see that it is passed into law. Either the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) should hand it over to the government and let them carry out the mandate of the House of Commons contained in that resolution, or else the government should now declare that they will take the responsibility for it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is somewhat in error when he wants to minimize the powers of the members of this House. A member of this House cannot in-

troduce a measure which would put any burdens upon the people, but a member of this House can always introduce a measure which will decrease the taxation and take burdens off the people, and, as I understand it, in this case the objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) does not apply. I would also remind my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) that the government was not unanimous when the vote was taken on that resolution. It was looked upon as a question upon which the government were not called upon to formulate any policy.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that the government are simply the servants of this House, and when the majority of this House commands the government to introduce legislation the government should not attempt to shirk the responsibility which is cast upon it by a large majority of the members of this House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

THE NATURALIZATION ACT.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

Is it the intention of the government to cause to be printed in pamphlet form the Naturalization Act, with the regulations and forms, for the guidance of officials and aliens in general ; the need of which is now so widely felt in Manitoba, and throughout the Territories ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). In answer to the hon. gentleman, I have to say that the subject is engaging the attention of the government.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Hear, hear.

SUPERANNUATION OF F. X. CHABOT.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. Has F. X. Chabot, Inspector of Weights and Measures, been dismissed from his position ?
2. If so, for what reason ?
3. Has a successor to him been appointed ?
4. If so, what is his name, where does he reside, and what is his salary ?
5. By whom was that new official recommended ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. Mr. Bernier) :

1. No, he has been superannuated at his own request.
3. Yes.
4. Louis Joseph Bourget, he resides at Lauzon, near Quebec ; his salary is $500 per annum.
5. By a person in whom the department has confidence.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to call your attention and the attention of the House to a paragraph that appears in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of April 27th. It reads thus :

MR. MITCHELL SCORES DOMINION MEMBERS.

Last night in Erskine Presbyterian church, the pastor, Rev. Mr. A. E. Mitchell preached an eloquent sermon, taking his text from 1 Corinthans, xvi. 13 : 'Watch ye ! Stand fast in the faith. Quit ye like men. Be strong.' He made a touching reference to the late Sir Oliver Mowat and said that he was one of the cleanest and best politicians Canada had ever seen. Continuing, the minister said, 'that the kind of men who were wanted in public life to-day were manly men, brotherly men and Godly men, not men of the Gamey-Stratton type, but men who were not afraid to remain in the House of Commons during prayer. It is a shame,' said the speaker, 'that only thirteen members out of two hundred and thirteen would be present in the House and the Speaker waiting for a quorum to open parliament. The other members were living at ease on their $1,500 a year and travelling around the country on passes enjoying themselves. It is robbing the country.'

Now, Sir, I call attention to this because I do not think I have missed prayers more than once. I can count noses on the other side of the House—I cannot do so as well on this side—and I notice that there are always on the other side during prayers more members than this gentleman says were in the House. I hope, therefore, that ministers of the gospel will take his advice, and be not only God-fearing men, but truthful men, who will tell the truth on all occasions, whether in the pulpit of out of it. I call the attention of the House to this matter also because I think that even this paragraph may induce more of the members to be here on time.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. A. A. C. LARIVIERE (Provencher). I wish to call the attention of the acting Minister of the Interior to a motion which I made on the 16th of March last for a return of the report of the half-breed commissioners. It is a very important document, I have received many letters with regard to it, and I would like to have it brought down as soon as possible.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I will give the matter attention to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I moved some time ago for the correspondence between this government and the government of British Columbia with respect to the disallowance of certain Acts. I do not know whether it has yet been brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It has not been brought down, but I have placed it in the hands of the Minister of Justice.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations on the important matters now under discussion, I may have to traverse a good deal of ground which has already been gone over ; but I feel it a duty incumbent upon me, representing an important constituency in Canada, as well as in justice to myself, to make some remarks on this all-important question. We are discussing, Sir, the fiscal policy of our country, the expenditure of the country, the taxes of the people ; and, therefore, I feel that it is the duty of every representative of the people to state his views in parliament, and state them with candour and frankness, in order that the public interests may, if possible, be advanced. What we want in Canada is a well-defined policy, not a shifting or mixed-up policy. We have been listening during the last few days to speeches by hon. gentlemen who have commenced those speeches, by announcing themselves as free traders or tariff-for-revenue men, but have ended by proclaiming themselves to be great protectionists. There is no sincerity in that. What we want is a well-defined policy, such as that propounded in the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition, a policy of protection in aid of industries, in fact, a policy of Canada for the Canadians.

What have we heard from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House ? We had the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) the other evening, in a very long speech, stating that he was pleased with the tariff of this government, that he was a tariff-for-revenue man, while towards the end of his speech he asked for more protection for iron and coal, which are very important industries in the province of Nova Scotia. Then, we had yesterday a very long speech from the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes), who also declared himself to be a supporter of a tariff-for-revenue, or if possible a free trade tariff ; but he wound up by saying : There is an industry in the riding I represent which should be protected --the salt manufacturing industry. Note the inconsistency and contradiction of his first statement. He said that to protect the salt industry in West Huron the government should tax the fishermen's salt, which now comes into this country free. Sir, I represent a district in which there reside a large number of fishermen, toilers of the sea, who follow the most precarious industry in Canada, going out on the water in their vessels and small boats to procure a living for themselves and their families. When the national policy was introduced in 1879, I had the honour of being a member of this House, and it was regarded as a policy of compensation, so that if the fishermen of the maritime provinces had to pay a duty on flour coming from the province of Ontario, the residents of Ontario had to pay a duty on coal from the maritime provinces ; but the only protection given to the fishermen was in having free salt. Free salt is a most important commodity to the fishermen, and it has been free ever since the introduction of the national policy in 1879 until to-day, when the hon. member for West Huron, a supporter of the present government, comes out and advocates its taxation. I want, for a moment or two, to say a word in connection with the speech made by the hon. member for Haldimand. That hon. gentleman, I must say, spoke fluently and ably, but there was one element absent from his remarks, and that was the element of sincerity, and the absence of that quality completely destroyed his argument. In referring to the administration and policy of the Conservative party from 1878 down to 1896, and speaking more particularly on the subject of exhibitions, he said :

I will admit that there is some excuse for hon. gentlemen opposite in having taken no part in exhibitions in various parts of the world during 1895, for so far as I know in those dark days of Conservative rule, there was nothing in Canada of sufficient magnitude and nothing wonderful enough in workmanship to deserve an exhibition, unless it was deficits, and so far as I know, no prize was offered for these in any of the exhibitions of the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we had deficits but we had surpluses as well, to which I will refer later. But what I want at present to call the hon. gentleman's attention to is the Columbian exhibition, held in Chicago in 1893, at the time when this country was enjoying the benefits of Conservative rule. What do we find, Sir ? We find that at that exhibition the greatest in the past century—the greatest on this continent at least during this past century—Canada made a splendid showing and carried off large prizes, both in cash and other awards of merit. In the fine arts, horticulture, agriculture, live stock, dairying—in fact in all the departments at that exposition, Canada bore away numerous prizes, and yet we have this hon. gentleman say that there was no exhibition made by Canada in those days except one of deficits. Let me refer more specially to a letter which we find in the report of our commissioner, Mr. Lark, and which was written to him by a gentleman from Austria :

Brunn, Austria, December 20, 1893.

I have examined very carefully all the exhibits of Canadian textiles, and I am full of admiration of nearly all those beautiful exhibits which show the enormous progress the Canadian industry has made. The textiles exhibited were highly creditable as well in the department of cottons and woollens as in silks. Canada has, in my opinion, made most wonder-

ful progress in the sixteen years which have elapsed since the Centennial Exposition, and I can candidly say no other nation which exhibited, has shown such progress as Canada.

Here we have this letter from an exporter of textile fabrics residing in Austria, stating that no nation in the world had made such progress in manufacturing as Canada had during the sixteen years between the holding of the Centennial and the Columbian expositions—could any one require a more convincing contradiction of the statement of my hon. friend from Haldimand? For my part, it seems to me that when an hon. member rises to address this House, when he speaks for his constituents to an intelligent, deliberative body such as this, he should state the facts.

Another matter to which the hon. gentleman referred was our public expenditure, and in this connection he put down to the credit of the government the amount of increased subsidy paid the province of Prince Edward Island. That expenditure, he said, pointing to myself, is one to which that hon. gentleman would at least not object. Sir, two years ago in this House, when that increased subsidy was proposed, I approved of it, but at the same time I said to the government: You are only giving a sop to the province of Prince Edward Island; you are not giving that province a tithe of what is due it and what was solemnly guaranteed it on its entrance into confederation. This money was not given the province which I represent as an increase in its subsidy, but as some slight compensation for the loss sustained by it through its lack of communication with the mainland during the winter season.

In another matter to which he referred was the relieving of our canal system of tolls. The government, he said, were making our canals as free as the ocean. Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be all right to western and central Canada, but what is the government doing for the people of Prince Edward Island? Making the canals free as the ocean will not advance one iota the carrying out of the terms of confederation entered into between the Dominion and Prince Edward Island in 1873. The hon. gentleman boasts of the surplus of $13,000,000 which we are going to have this year. Well, we have the estimate of the most celebrated engineer in the world, Sir Douglass Fox, that $12,000,000 would be sufficient to construct a tunnel between the province of Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and if this government desires to find a place in which to appropriate its surplus to advantage, it will at once enter into a contract to have that tunnel constructed between the island, and the mainland. In this way it will not only carry out its contract with the province and relieve the people of that province from the disadvantages under which they are suffering, but will benefit the people of Canada from Vancouver to Halifax.

Mr. HACKETT.

The hon. Finance Minister, in his budget speech spoke of the prosperous times we were enjoying in Canada at present, and gave all the credit to this government, but it seems to me that while he was making that statement the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce made a rather wry face. During the administration of Canadian affairs, while that hon. gentleman was Finance Minister, we had not the prosperous and growing times which we have to-day. On the contrary, from 1873 to 1878, was the era of the greatest depression that ever prevailed in Canada. We have the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) taking credit to the government for our present prosperity, but we had in those days the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) trying to escape responsibility for the bad times then existing by saying: We are only flies on the wheel and can do nothing to assist the country. But the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald brought forward the policy of Canada for the Canadians and protection to Canadian industry. We will no longer, he said, submit to our country being made a slaughter market for the merchants and traders of the United States, but will adopt a tariff that will protect our own manufacturers. That policy was approved by the people and was followed by the most beneficial results. If we have prosperous times to-day, are we to attribute them to this government? Not at all, Sir. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to show one act of legislation or administration introduced by them that has in any way been the cause of prosperity. If we are enjoying prosperity, it is not due to any legislation of this government, but to the fact that times are good the world over. Those hon. gentlemen opposite have not done anything, they have not initiated a single measure that in any way has contributed to the welfare or prosperity of our people. On the contrary, I believe that if a Conservative government were in power at Ottawa, a government that could take advantage of the situation, a government that would have made the most of the prosperity which was just beginning to dawn the world over, when these hon. gentlemen opposite took office, Canada to-day, instead of only being fairly prosperous, would be a beacon of prosperity for all the nations of the world. In this connection, let me call your attention for a few moments to a comparison between the United States and Canada in order to show you that during the eighteen years that the national policy was in force in its entirety, before it had been emasculated and partly destroyed by hon. gentlemen opposite, the increase of exports from Canada was in greater ratio than the increase of exports from the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not ventured to go the full length of their pledges. They have retained a part of that protective policy, and had they not done so they would have been long since forced from power. But, hav-

ing retained part of the national policy, though they destroyed it in part, Canada has gone on and prospered fairly well. Reference has been made to exports. I have here the figures showing the increase of exports of Canada in comparison with the increase of exports of the United States from 1878, to 1896 and from 1896 to 1902 :

UNITED STATES EXPORTS.

Total exports, 1878.. .. ..$	694,865,766
Total exports, 1896..	882,606,938
Total exports, 1901..	1,487,764,991
Increase for five years ending June 30, 1901..	605,158,053
Increase in previous 18 years..	187,741,172
Percentage of increase in 5 years..	58·56
Percentage of increase in previous 18 years	27·10

CANADIAN EXPORTS.

Total exports, 1878.. .. .. $	79,323,667
Total exports, 1896..	121,013,852
Total exports, 1901..	196,487,632
Increase for 5 years ending June 30, 1901..	75,473,780
Increase in previous 18 years... ..	41,690,185
Percentage of increase in 5 years..	62·36
Percentage of increase in previous 18 years..	52·55

Thus, the percentage of increase in Canadian exports for the eighteen 'national policy' years was almost twice as great as the percentage of increase in the exports of the United States, the Canadian percentage having been 52·55, and the United States percentage having been 27·10; whereas, in the five years following the adoption of the Fielding tariff, the percentage of increase in the value of United States exports was slightly greater than the percentage of increase in the exports from Canada, being 68·56 per cent as compared with 62·30 per cent. About the same time that the present tariff was introduced in Canada the Congress of the United States made large additions to the protective duties under the Dingley law, and the result was that the United States exports increased even more rapidly than our own. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that Canada is prosperous, that she has gone on by leaps and bounds. It is true, but our prosperity has gone on only in concert with that of the rest of the world. What has caused that prosperity ? It was caused by the policy of the late administration by the statesmanship of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald and his associates. I remember the occasion in this House, in 1879, when Sir Leonard Tilley brought down the national policy. That policy was opposed by every hon. gentleman on the treasury benches who was then in the House. But that policy was put in force, and became the policy of the country. And it has remained the policy of the country ever since, though as I say, it has been emasculated and its usefulness to a certain extent taken away by hon. gentlemen opposite. But if those hon. gentlemen would go to the country with the fads they had at one time—free trade as they have in England, Commercial Union, unrestricted reciprocity—instead of wearing the leavings of the clothes of the Conservative party, they would not have the slightest chance of returning to power.

Hon. gentlemen opposite boast that the immigration into Canada has increased. We know that there is large immigration into the North-west, and we are proud of it. We have in that country the most fertile wheat fields in the world, tens of millions of acres awaiting to be occupied. When, in 1880, Sir Charles Tupper brought down to parliament the project to build the Canadian Pacific railway how was that project met by these hon. gentlemen opposite ? They opposed it, as they opposed the national policy, by every means fair and foul, even to the extent of getting up bogus syndicates to take the place of the syndicate that had been given the charter to build the work. Yet, in the face of all their opposition, the contract was let and the work completed. And, if we are enjoying prosperity in Canada to-day if there is a large immigration going into the North-west, it is largely due to the ability of the statesmen who were then in control of the destinies of Canada. I had the honour of being a member of this House when both these great measures, the national policy and the Canadian Pacific railway contract were introduced. I well remember the stand, the unmanly, dishonest stand, taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side, then in opposition. Now, they boast of the prosperity of the country, but that prosperity is due, as I have said, to the statesmanship of the Liberal-Conservative party, under the leadership of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, with Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Leonard Tilley as his lieutenants.

We have had some changes in the tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they assumed power, declared themselves opposed to specific duties and in favour of ad valorem duties. They made the change, and what has been the result ? Values have increased and the taxpayers of Canada are paying more to-day for goods purchased under this ad valorem system than ever before. We have the taxes of the people increased from $28,000,000 to $38,000,000, as was shown by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who addressed the House last evening, these taxes being levied on the necessaries of life in many instances. Hon. gentlemen opposite introduced the preferential tariff, and their policy was lauded to the sky. It was said to be a great thing for Canada and for the empire for it would draw closer the bonds which bind the parts of the empire together. But what did the right hon. Mr. Chamberlain say at the conference of colonial premiers ? He declared that the preferential tariff was of no service to Great Britain. And I have no doubt that it is disappointing to the gentlemen who in-

troduced it. It has proved a failure, and the Finance Minister stated the other day that it was only a matter of time when they would probably repeal the preferential tariff.

Now, Sir, I must return for a moment to the hon. member for Haldimand. He referred to an increase of $100,000 in the fishery service of this country, and he said it was mainly due to the erection of cold storage buildings and for the benefit of fishermen in the maritime provinces. Now, I have in my hand a statement which shows that so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned that money was not expended in any such manner; no part of that increase was due to any assistance rendered to the fishermen, but it was due to the extravagance, and perhaps worse, of the fishery officers in that province. I have here a statement of the expenditure on fisheries in the province of Prince Edward Island for the last three years of the late administration :

1894, total..	$ 3,078 35
1895 "	3,796 58
1896 "	3,555 87
Total for 3 years..	$10,430 80

Or an annual average of $3,476.95.

Now, what do we find with regard to the next three years under the present administration :

1899..	$ 6,832 85
1900..	7,364 20
1901..	7,934 00
Total for 3 years..	$22,131 05

Or an annual average of $7,377, showing an increase per year under the present government of $3,901, or over one hundred per cent of an increase on an average for the three years.

Let me now give the House a statement of the travelling expenses and outlay of the inspector during three years under the late administration :

1894..	$204 98
1895..	236 86
1896..	391 12
Total for 3 years..	$832 96

Or an annual average of $277.65.

Now, let us see what were the travelling expenses and outlay of inspector under the present government :

1899..	$392 71
1900..	458 72
1901..	666 46
Total for 3 years..	$1,517 89

Or an average of $505.83 per year, an increase annually of $228.18 for three years of the present government.

Now, let us look at the travelling expenses and outlays of overseer for the last three years of the late government, and for three years under the present government :

THREE YEARS OF LATE GOVERNMENT.

1894..	$164 51
1895..	273 14
1896..	323 90
Total for 3 years..	$761 55

Or annual average of $252.52.

THREE YEARS UNDER PRESENT GOVERNMENT.

1899..	$1,827 69
1900..	1,273 49
1901..	1,780 70
Total for 3 years	$4,881 88

Or annual average of $1,627.29, an increase of $1,374.77 per year over last three years of Conservative rule.

Now, what were these gentlemen doing ? They were supposed to be looking after the fisheries, they were supposed to be collecting revenue, they were supposed to make some returns to Canada for the money expended. Well, let the following figures speak for themselves :

REVENUE FROM FISHERIES, P.E.I., FOR LAST THREE YEARS OF LATE GOVERNMENT.

1894*..	$ 980 15
1895..	3,312 30
1896..	2,161 85
Total for 3 years..	$6,454 30

*This year no license fee was collected from lobster canners.

REVENUE FROM FISHERIES, P.E.I., FOR THREE YEARS OF PRESENT GOVERNMENT.

1899..	$2,242 24
1900..	2,187 12
1901..	1,525 30
Total for 3 years..	$5,954 66

Or $500 less in three years than was collected by the overseers under the previous government for one-half the expenditure made by these gentlemen at present. But the strange part of this showing is, what becomes of the money ? How do they expend it ? I remember when the inspector of fisheries, in 1900, came up to West Prince on what he called a sporting trip, shooting partridges if you will, in the month of October, but actually for the purpose of canvassing votes against the gentleman who now represents West Prince in this parliament. It was apparently proper for him to travel at the expense of the people of this country, and to run up this tremendous bill which I have read to you for his travelling expenses and outlay, so long as he was doing the work of the machine that is operated by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to occupy much longer the time of the House.

The hon. gentleman from Huntingdon (Mr. Maclaren) made a calculation yesterday that it costs the country $28 a minute to run this parliament. As I wish to save the people's money, I think it would be only right to make my speech as brief as possible. We hear a great deal about the wonderful resources of this Canada of ours, with its wealth of forest, as yet untouched by the axe of the woodman, with mines of gold, silver and coal, with fertile lands unequalled in any part of the world, with fisheries of unexcelled and vast wealth, with an enterprising population, energetic, industrious and virtuous. Why should we not go on and prosper? Why should hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to tie the hands of this young giant that is now beginning to put forth his strength? All that is required to guarantee our progress is to give proper encouragement to the people of Canada. Do not let us drive them off to the United States to look for employment in a foreign land. In the province from which I come, there was a falling off in our population from the census of 1891 to that of 1901, of over 5,000. Whether the latter census was taken correctly or not, I will not say at present. But these young men and young women have gone away because they could not find employment in Canada, because avenues of industry were not afforded them at home; and they went to seek their fortune in a foreign land and beneath a foreign sky. Sir, the great national policy inaugurated by the Liberal-Conservative party in 1879 is the policy that must stand for the people of this country. The amendment moved by the leader of the opposition is in the right direction. It is an amendment to afford adequate protection, which means sufficient protection—hon. gentlemen opposite understand the meaning of the word quite well enough—it means sufficient and proper protection for the interests of the people of Canada, for the labourer, for the manufacturer, for the fisherman, for the miner, for all the industries of Canada. That is what we need for Canada, and holding those views, I shall have much pleasure in voting for the amendment moved by my hon. friend for Halifax (Mr. Borden.)

Mr. J. T. SCHELL (Glengarry). Mr. Speaker, during the progress of this debate some very important statements have been made which have brought out some situations worthy of notice. The hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in delivering his budget, stated clearly, I think, the reasons why he has decided that there should be no changes in the tariff at the present time. He did not say that there should be no changes for one year, or two years, or for a number of years, but he said at the present time. He gave as a reason for this decison the buoyant condition of the general business of the country. Last year the cry of the opposition in the matter of the tariff centred almost entirely upon the one item of woollens. Not one specific statement has been made, not one special complaint has been delivered by the opposition, but they have confined themselves to general questions and they have not indicated so far any particular line of trade or commerce that is suffering at the present time. The surtax proposed to be imposed on German goods will probably meet to a large extent, if not entirely, their objections, so far as the woollen trade is concerned. Now, we do not hear any specific complaints so far as any other line of manufacture is concerned. It is no more than fair in criticising the budget speech that statements should be specifically made. Yet, the opposition have so far not even contended that there are any special lines of trade requiring changes in the tariff in order to ensure their success and prosperity. If we take note of the reports of the annual meetings of the cotton companies which have been lately held we will find that they state business to be good. They have declared fair dividends. Some of the companies have declared dividends even so high as 9 per cent. That would indicate that there is really no cause for serious complaint as regards cottons. Any man who has been in business for the last few years knows thoroughly well that in almost every line of business the only difficulty has been that the manufacturers have not been able to supply goods in sufficient quantity to meet the demands of the people of the country. Scarcely any line of business furnishes quotations which are not subject to withdrawal at any moment and a large number of manufacturers, especially in the iron lines sent out quotations which are not standard quotations. This has been the case for several years. It is not a question of holding Canada for the Canadians, but it has been absolutely impossible for the Canadian manufacturers for the last few years to fill the orders offered to them, and the result is that the people of Canada have been obliged to go abroad to buy a lot of the goods which they require and which have been brought into this country. That statement is borne out by the fact that there is scarcely a manufacturing concern in the Dominion of Canada but is adding to its plant to enable it to get out the orders offered to it. Manufacturing plants are being increased all over the Dominion. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) stated again his position in regard to adequate protection, but he did not deign to go into details or to make any specific statement as to what he meant by adequate protection. So far as he is concerned this House has been left entirely in the dark and we have had to get our information otherwise, and that information has been forthcoming from several quarters. When the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) made a statement of his position, and he said that he believed he was speaking to a large extent

for the people of Canada, he said that the duties should be raised to an average of 50 per cent upon dutiable goods coming into the country. When he made that statement it was loudly applauded on the opposition side of the House by hon. members generally and by the leaders particularly. That indicated that the hon. gentlemen had expressed their position upon that matter. They agree with the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, that the tariff should be upon the basis of an average duty of 50 per cent and the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has gone so far as to say: Yes, and even 100 per cent, if necessary. Upon this point the position of the two parties to-day are well defined. The position is definitely stated upon the Liberal side of the House in the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance. He has indicated that the tariff as it stands to-day shall be the tariff for the future. He has indicated that the tariff stands to-day and as it has stood for the last four or five years, shall not be interfered with, at all events at present. On the opposition side of the House the position has been taken, not definitely by the leader, but practically definitely by the party, that the average rate of duty must be from 50 per cent up to 100 per cent. I am pleased personally that the issue has become so plainly defined. So far as I am concerned, and so far as the county which I represent is concerned, I am pleased the definition is so plainly before us. I am satisfied with the plain definition before us. I should be pleased to have the hon. member for South Leeds travel over the county of Glengarry and address meetings after the style he was indulging in last evening, and I think, so far as Liberalism in Glengarry is concerned, he would fix it sure and fast for many generations to come. The opposition wish to raise the tariff wall so high that all the goods required in this country shall be manufactured in this country. Now, if all the goods required in this country were manufactured in this country where would we get the revenue ? From what source will the country draw its money to carry on the public affairs ? Will the public debt be reduced or be paid off if such a policy as that is in force ? If we were to manufacture all the goods in this country we could have no revenue and if taxation is to be at the rate of 50 per cent to 100 per cent then we have the right to ask where shall we get the money to carry on the business of the country. If we look back to the Conservative regime of eighteen years previous to the advent of this administration we find that to a certain extent they did carry out this policy. We find that they were not able to scrape revenue enough together to carry on the business of the country then without increasing the public debt. We are all well aware that the debt was increased during that time by over $150,000,000. That is the policy they proposed to put in force if they should come back to power to-morrow. And what is to be done with the money obtained from this increase of duties amounting from 50 to 100 per cent ? The hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) told us that the manufacturers of Canada numbered two or three hundred individuals.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not say two hundred; I said several hundred.

Mr. SCHELL. Well, we will say that they number a few hundred. But I would remind the House that not all the manufacturers of Canada have asked for increased duties. I doubt if half of them have asked that the duties should be increased. Suppose there are two hundred manufacturers all told, and that half of them want the duties increased, then if their request is acceeded to, this half of the manufacturers of Canada will have the privilege of taxing the farmers and the workingmen from 50 to 100 per cent more than at present, and where will that money go. Will it go to pay the debt of this country or to develop our resources ? Not one cent of it. These manufacturers are not asking that that increased taxation shall go into the business of the country, or go to pay the running expenses of the government, but they ask that it shall go into their own pockets, and that the success of their business and their profits shall be guaranteed by Act of parliament. That is what they want. I well remember the change of government in the year 1896, and I remember how the Conservatives claimed that it was a mistake of Providence to put the Liberals in power. After the elections of 1896 the leaders of the Conservative party and many of their supporters still retained their seats here, and they proclaimed in this House that the instinct of government was with the Conservatives, and that in 1900 Providence would rectify the mistake made in 1896, and again call on them to direct the destinies of Canada. But it was not to be. In the four years from 1896 to 1900, the people of Canada had come to realize the success of the policy of the Liberal party in the development of their business, and in the extra profits they had gained from their business, and they saw at once the difference between the successful policy of the Liberal party and the defective policy of the Conservative party. And after the elections of 1900, the Conservative party came back to this House bereft of all its great leaders who had made that party famous, and many of their supporters met the same fate. The Liberals had a greater majority in 1900 than they had after the elections in 1896, a testimony that the people of Canada were able to appreciate good government. I remember that in 1900, in the town of Alexandria in my county, Sir Charles Tupper, the Hon. George E. Foster, the Hon. Hugh John Macdonald, Mr. Bergeron, Mr.

R. R. MacLennan, Mr. Quinn, Mr. Broder, and a half dozen other notable Conservative started a tour which they wound up in the North-west, endeavouring to electrify the people to rally to their standard. They made a great flourish of trumpets in Alexandria; they had a street procession and a hippodrome worthy of any circus. The Liberals of Glengarry felt that they were taken by storm when this great galaxy of ability and talent invaded our town. But what was the result? The people of Glengarry are canny Scotch and they can count the dollars well. They had lived under four years of prosperous government, four years of careful administration which gave to the manufacturers and the consumers each their just share; four years of prosperity such as up to that time this country had never known and when the votes were counted the people of Glengarry declared that they would support the Liberal party rather than return to the policy of the Conservative party under which they had made little or no progress. Glengarry is not a manufacturing county. We have only one large manufacturing concern within the limits of the county, and I may say now that that concern does not ask for any increase in the duty. The men who control that manufacturing institution come of a stock who believe that they can stand upon their own merits, their own ability, and their own capital, and they do not ask for an increase of duty on the goods they are manufacturing. They are prepared to meet any competition in the country and they are succeeding enormously well. The people of the county of Glengarry are largely farmers and labourers. They realize full well the benefits that have been derived and are to be derived from a tariff such as has been maintained by this government. Where in the history of this Dominion has there been greater strides made during the past six years than in the industry of mixed farming and dairying in which the majority of the people of my county are engaged. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) spoke about cold storage and he took credit that the Conservative party had inaugurated this system. To hear him talk you would think that the Conservatives of Canada had invented cold storage. Why, Mr. Speaker, cold storage was in successful operation years before the Conservative party had anything to do with it. There was a perfect system of mechanical refrigeration carrying perishable products from South America and Australia and landing them in good condition in England, years before it was tried in Canada. What did the Conservative government do? They put in a few ice boxes and called them a cold storage system, and the unfortunate people who undertook to utilize them had their goods landed in Liverpool in a rotten and useless condition. In order to prove that this cold storage system was a good one the Conservatives bought butter at 20 cents a pound throughout the country and the result was that the butter was landed in England fit only for wool grease, that it never was put on the market and sold as butter, and that it brought only 10 cents a pound in England notwithstanding that the government paid 20 cents a pound in Canada. When the Liberal government came into power they realized that some better system must be put in operation; they realized that they must inaugurate a cold storage system commensurate with the importance of the agricultural industry, and to-day we can send our butter and fruits and all perishable articles to the old country markets and deliver them there in proper condition. There is where the present government has scored one success. The county of Glengarry consists of four townships, and is probably as small a county in area as there is in the province Ontario. That small county exported last year $1,000,000 worth of dairy products, according to the statement compiled by the secretary of the Dairymen's Association of the county. That explains the reason why the people of the county of Glengarry have such a strong regard for the present government. Nor do they believe in paying taxes that go into the pockets of two or three hundred individuals instead of paying them to build public works and promote the progress of the country as a whole. I have never yet heard any of the electors of Glengarry, whether Conservative or Liberal, say that they were not willing to pay their proper share of taxation required to properly administer and develop this country. I believe that both the labouring classes and the farmers in any part of the province of Ontario or in this Dominion are willing to pay their full share; but they do object to paying into the pockets of the manufacturers 50 or 100 per cent taxation on the articles they consume simply because the policy of the opposition is in favour of protection in the shape of high duties. No, Mr. Speaker, protection does not mean high duties; it means protecting the interests of the masses of the people.

I do not intend to discuss the mass of figures which, during this debate, have been read and reread, iterated and reiterated, and upon which the changes have been rung so many times. As has been said, figures can be made to prove anything; but there is one thing remarkable in the figures which have been laid before us. With all the extravagance charged against the government by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), with all the large expenditures charged by members of the opposition, with all the large revenues which the government are charged with having taken from the people, which the opposition now call taxes, though they did not do so in the old days, there is one thing that we should remember, that is, that the present government have administered the affairs of the country, have constructed large works, have developed the

Yukon, have paid the cost of the South African contingents, have put the Intercolonial Railway on a proper business basis, and have done all this from the revenues derived from the low tariff as it exists to-day, and without any large increase in the public debt, such as their predecessors made. Looking at the 'Canada Gazette' of April 25th, you will see that this government have been able to do all this, and still leave the public debt within $80,000 of where they found it in the year 1897.

The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) almost shed tears over the per capita taxation imposed on the people of this country. That is something like a man who has been farming or doing business all his life, at the end of a prosperous period or at a successful turn in his business, going out and buying some more property. He has the money and is able to pay for the property. Is there any reason why such a man should be commiserated because he is obliged to pay $1,000 or $2,000 for additional property which he chooses to buy? No. And we find that in the prosperous times which the people of Canada have been enjoying under the present government, they have been able to buy two or three times as much of the dutiable articles they required, and pay for them; and the bank returns show that they have not only been able to do that, but have large balances to their credit in the savings banks and other monetary institutions of the country, such as we have never known under the administration of the Conservative party. A per capita tax, Mr. Speaker, is the best evidence that can be brought to show the state of prosperity of the people. If the per capita tax increases from year to year, it shows that the people of Canada are progressing and increasing their wealth, and that the factories of the country, though taxed to their utmost to provide the requirements of the people, have not been able to supply them all, and so the people have had to bring in imported goods. Such has been the prosperity of the country during the last six or seven years under the administration of the present government. But the opposition propose to change all that. They say: No; bring in nothing; but because the people of Canada are prosperous to-day, because they are able to stand some more taxation, we will filch from their pockets 50 or 100 per cent for the benefit of one hundred, two hundred or three hundred of our friends.

As the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has said, the fight is on. Let the fight be on. If the proposition of the opposition in this House is that for the sake of a few hundred manufacturers of this country the rest of the people should be taxed 50 or 100 per cent, I say let us know that the fight is on, and I am satisfied that the next time we appeal to the country the majority in this House, as it stands to-day, will be returned 40 or 50 or 100 per cent larger than it is to-day, if that were possible. Under Conservative rule the manufacturers of this country were continually looking to the government to assure them profits and stability of business conditions—to make enactments by which they would feel safe and secure in their business enterprises. But under the system of looking to Ottawa for all the efforts that should be looked for at home, the business of this country was steadily going down. While the people were simply living on one another, the exporting business of the country was not increasing as it should have done. Under the fiscal change which was brought about in 1897 by this government, the manufacturers of this country came to feel that to be successful in their business they must depend upon themselves more than on the legislation of this country, and the result has been that many of those manufacturers who were looking to the government to guarantee their profits backed by parliament, got strictly down to business and conducted their industries on business principles, as they should have done years before, with the result that they have been able to make probably higher profits under a lower tariff than in the previous years when they were depending more on the government than on themselves. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) last night used these words:

> Notwithstanding the increase in population of the country required these implements, no sane man after the statements made by the right hon. leader of the government and by the hon. Finance Minister, threatening free trade, and threatening to abolish the duties would put his money into a manufacturing industry of this kind.

The hon. gentleman evidently forgot that that statement was not in accord with the facts. He said no sane man would put his money into a business of that kind. Why, Mr. Speaker, to-day in Hamilton there is being erected a greater concern than has been in this Dominion for the manufacture of these identical articles, in the manufacture of which the hon. gentleman said, not twenty hours ago, no sane man would put his money. Hon. members may have noticed in the newspapers a few days ago a statement made by Major Bittenger, the United States consul, that the money of the American people was pouring into this country. What for, Mr. Speaker? Are we to conclude it is because the Americans are insane? No, it is because this country to-day, under its present revenue tariff, has more possibilities for the investment of capital, more avenues for profitable trade, than are to be found in the United States. Speaking of agricultural implements, the hon. member for Leeds said further that they were not adequately protected. Well, Sir, the hon. leader (Mr. Borden) declared in Manitoba that they were. That is just a small difference of opinion between these two hon. gentlemen. However, we must not take the hon. member for Leeds too

seriously. He told us last night that he was simply abusing the government. He was simply out for abuse, and evidently the facts were but a secondary consideration. It must be well known to the hon. gentleman, as it is to most members of this House, that the demand for agricultural implements was so great throughout this country that our manufacturers could not supply them. He must have known that in July of last year there was not one agricultural implement in the establishment of Frost & Wood, which was not sold ahead and that in fact that firm could not begin to fill all its orders. He must have known that the Massey-Harris people were sold out of their binders, reapers and mowers, a month before the spring trade actually opened. So great has been the progress of this country, and consequently so great have been the demands in these lines, that the calculations of the manufacturers fell short of the requirements, and it was absolutely impossible for them to furnish our farmers with the implements that they required last year, even with all the advantages which these concerns enjoy for turning out the goods. That is one reason why our farmers bought from the United States, and why our importation of agricultural implements were increased last year. Just for the same reason have our imports increased in nearly all lines of manufacture throughout the Dominion. These are facts that are well known, and which prove that at present there is no need at all for protection in this country, even to the Massey-Harris people. There is no need for further protection for the manufacturers for agricultural implements, either in Toronto or in Brantford.

So far as I am concerned, I am content to take the issues as laid down by the hon. leader of the opposition and his lieutenants I am quite satisfied that we should go before the people upon these issues, and I have no doubt that when we do, the people will decide in favour of the policy of the present administration. I know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) like the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) spoke last night under the impression that a general election is near at hand and that this might be the last session when he would be able to make statements of any kind in this House. I believe myself that my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) will have another opportunity before this parliamentary term closes, to indulge in his abuse of the government and to define what he and his friends mean by the word 'adequate.' I hope he will address the House in the same lines as he did last night and as his hon. leader did a few days ago, and I should ask no better issue on which to appeal to the country than the policy laid down by the hon. Minister of Finance and that proposed in opposition to it by the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party in this House.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). It is time, Mr. Speaker, I should say a few words with regard to the speeches we have heard and particularly with regard to the budget speech made by the hon. Finance Minister. I must say that I thought it hardly fair for the hon. gentleman to make the comparisons he did between the large revenue he has been handling and the small revenue received by the previous Conservative government. We all know that the comparison is not one from which the hon. gentleman can draw the conclusions he did. Take up the public accounts, and you will find that in the year 1868 our revenue was some $75,000,000 and our expenditure about the same. Then turn to 1873, when Mr. Alexander Mackenzie was head of the government, and you will find that our expenditure and revenue reached a little more than $75,000,000 each. If you take 1896, you will find there was a larger revenue and expenditure, and, if you come to the last year, still larger. And so it will be for years to come—probably for ever. Therefore, I do not think it is fair for the Finance Minister to critcise as much as he did, on the basis of a comparison of the figures of 1896 and 1902. But we cannot expect much else, for every year since 1896 we have heard such talk in this House. But we have heard more than that. I heard a gentleman who was then Mr. Laurier, now Sir Wilfrid Laurier—very well, all right—I heard that gentleman say right in my own county, in 1895, on the 5th of September: If you elect me to power, I will do so and so. He had five good words to give us. One of them was: Elect me to power and I will reduce the price of coal oil. Another was: Elect me to power and I will reduce the price of farming implements. Another: Elect me to power and I will reduce the price of goods generally. Another: Elect me to power and I will reduce the public debt. Not one of these things has come to pass yet. There was another promise which he made, which I shall not mention, for, the other day I heard you, Mr. Speaker, call an hon. gentleman to order because he had wandered beyond the subject before the chair, and I do not wish the same thing to happen to me. The present leader of the government told us at that time that it was a shame for any government to have expenditures more than from thirty-eight to forty millions a year, and he declared that if he were in power he would show that the country's affairs could be carried on for that amount. Very well, what have we seen since? We see expenditures of forty-five, fifty and sixty millions of dollars a year. Then, that right hon. gentleman said: If you elect me to power I will reduce the public debt to eight or ten millions of dollars. When has he reduced that debt one cent? Never. Instead of being reduced, it has been increased, unfortunately. In 1896 the total debt was $325,000,000, in round numbers, now

it is up to $366,000,000, an increase of $41,000,000. The net debt, which was $258,497,000 in 1896, is now $271,829,000, an increase of $13,322,000. Now, we heard the Finance Minister in all his glory laughing and joking and showing himself very glad about his big income. But what does that amount to, I would like to know? It only means that the more money he has the more pleasure he has in counting it up and paying it out. That is all that is shown by this book that the government gave me, a book that there is no denying. It speaks for itself and for the administration. Now, looking at this matter in the right light, what would the Finance Minister do if his revenue were like that of twenty or thirty years ago, while his expenses were as high as they are now? Where would he land? The fact is, he gets in so much money and spends so much money and does not reduce the public debt a single cent. He talks about the surplus he has and the surplus he is going to have. We have heard a great deal about such things, and that is all there is to it. He does get a big pile of money, but where is it? The Conservative government had surpluses in the same way, but where is the money? All this talk about surpluses reminds me of a story I heard. A slave was in the barnyard with his master, and all at once he said: 'Massa, de preacher's a-comin'.' 'I don't see him coming,' said the master. 'But he's comin all right.' 'How do you know?' 'Why, don't you see de chickens flying.' The Minister of Finance speaks of the big income he is receiving and is to receive, but what is it all for? It is to hoodwink the people over the next election? We have heard such talk over and over until I have got tired of it—there is nothing in it.

I hear a great many of my friends on both sides of the House talk about protection. But I would like more than talk—I would like to have some practice of protection. We talk about the American people, how industrious, how intelligent they are. Knowing them as I do, I say the same. But why is it they have become such a great nation? It is all on account of protection. What were they up to in 1776? They were a colony, working hard for a living, and making no headway. But after they threw off the yoke, they started right up, they established protection, and practiced it.

Now, here we are, talking about our American friends being so intelligent. We talk about what they do, and yet we do not follow their example. After praising them so much, why should we not follow their example? I think they deserve to be praised. We hear a great deal of talk in this House about Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Chamberlain; we hear his name mentioned three or four times too often. Mr. Chamberlain may be a very good fellow, indeed I think he is a little too good. We have given him $2,648,495 last year under the preferential trade arrangement. I do not think that pays at all. I would sooner say more about Mr. Chamberlain and give him less money. We are the ones to be protected first—that is my doctrine, anyway. But some of our friends have a great deal to say about Mr. Chamberlain, and yet they do not want to look after themselves.

Now I would like to say a few words about the government's intention to go back to Washington. Some years ago we voted $30,000 to pay their trip to Washington; I suppose pretty soon we will be called upon to vote another sum to pay another trip. Now I wish to give the government a little advice. They talk about going to Washington to make a treaty in regard to the Alaska boundary. I would be very glad if they would stay at home. They must know very well what the result was some four years ago. Mr. Speaker, let us look at the facts of history, and you will understand how little the United States are willing to give us. After the treaty of 1784 the boundary line was run from the St. Lawrence river to Madawanpec Point in the state of Maine. Well, two years after that, our American friends were not willing to live up to that treaty, they wanted to gobble up a big portion of what now forms the state of Maine. About the same time another treaty was made according to which the line was to be drawn from the head of Lake Superior to Puget Sound. What did they do later on, in 1813? They took a strip of land from us one hundred and fifty miles wide from Duluth to Rainy River, and thence to Puget Sound. Then in 1848 or 1849 they were still unsatisfied, and they took another strip of land from us along the St. John river. True, it is not worth much, there are scarcely any settlers on it. These facts show you what we can expect from them. I have resided in that country for thirty-five years, and I have had many discussions with their people in regard to these questions. They are always willing and ready to take, but they are never willing to give. They are not even willing to give what they ought to give, and what does not belong to them. If our government go down to Washington again, the only result will be that they will spend the public money, and the Americans will laugh at them as they did at the last meeting. I spent two months last summer down in the States, and I had talks with congressmen, judges and lawyers on public questions, and they just made fun of us Canadians. They say: You Canadians come over here expecting to get a strip of land away from us, but that is all in your eye. My advice to this government is to stay where you are. That is all I have to say for the present.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (South Ontario). I feel some delicacy in taking part in this debate on account of the deep interest which is manifested by members of this House, and the large numbers present to listen to

the discussion. It is very encouraging to hon. members who wish to participate in this debate to find the House so full, indeed I may say overflowing, as it should be at this particular time. This is a time when the finances of the country are in a particularly good shape, everything is buoyant, and under these circumstances we could expect nothing else but that the House should be well attended during the budget debate.

April 16th, 1903, will be memorable in the annals of this country. It was on that day that the hon. the Minister of Finance moved the following resolution :

That the House resolve itself into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

This resolution whilst moved by finance ministers for many years, gave added pleasure to the representatives in this House from the remarks which followed on that particular occasion. As loyal representatives of the people we are pleased to accede to the wishes of the advisers of His Majesty, and while it is our privilege to criticise the expenditure, we do so with a knowledge of the facts, as recorded in the public documents and as told us by the hon. the Finance Minister, and shown by the abundant trade of the country.

Perhaps before I go further in the remarks which I propose to offer to this House, I may refer to a statement made by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin), who seems to have forgotten the facts. He said that the Liberals in opposition had promised that if they got into power the duty would be taken off coal oil, and that they had not done so. I beg to assure him that the duty has been taken off coal oil. He also said that this government promised to reduce the public debt. Well, we have the assurance of the Finance Minister that the indebtedness which has been incurred by this government will be very materially reduced, and nearly wiped out next year. The budget shows clearly that the system of taxation inaugurated by the present government in 1897 was a good one. It has made for every stability, that under its benign influence, the trade and prosperity of the country has expanded by leaps and bounds.

The revenue for 1900-01 was..	$52,514,701
" " 1901-02 "	58,050,790
Net increase..	$ 5,536,088

Mr. Speaker, this is a remarkable showing. Our revenue has increased to such proportions that it is a matter of rejoicing to every true and loyal Canadian, because of propositions with which we are confronted in the building up of this vast country. But, Mr. Speaker, although the net increase of last year was very large, the best is yet to come, and the hon. minister informs us that the year closing June 30th, 1903, will be much better, indeed far ahead of the best we have ever witnessed, with the extraordinary estimated surplus of $13,350,000. We are speaking of the present, but I would remind the House that this state of affairs, this growing time has existed since this government has been in power.

The revenue since 1896 has been as follows :—

1896..	$36,618,591
1897..	37,829,778
1898..	40,555,238
1899..	46,741,250
1900..	51,029,994
1901..	52,514,701
1902..	58,050,790

I claim it is a remarkable showing for the present government that has been so much belied. If you will look over the statement of revenue as presented during the years which preceded 1896 you will find that the revenue was almost stationary, that it did not increase at all, that as soon as this government took hold the increase became permanent and rapid, and that it went up from $36,000,000 in 1896 to $58,000,000 in 1902. The opponents of this government are apt to belittle efforts to promote trade and commerce and to attribute the growth of Canada's trade to everything and anything else than the present administration. They point to the increased trade of all the world, and then go so far as to say that if there has been prosperity it is because we adopted the protective plank of their platform. If shown different by the fact of so many items being put on the free list and radical cuts made on scores of dutiable goods they then say : It must be a miracle for none but Conservatives could have accomplished so much. I am reminded of a story of a lawyer who was examining an expert witness to ascertain if he exactly understood what a miracle was. The lawyer said to him : Suppose you find yourself in a window of that twelfth story building opposite and the next moment you fall to the pavement and find yourself uninjured—what would you call that ? The witness said : I would call that an accident. Well, that was not just the answer that the lawyer expected and he repeated the question. He asked him, if a second time, he found himself uninjured what he would call that. The witness said : I would call that a coincidence. He was getting the matter down pretty fine but the lawyer repeated the question, and said : Suppose you should find yourself upon the pavement a third time uninjured, what would you call that ? The witness replied : I would call it a habit. These distinctions are very fine. It was purely accidental that this government was able to get into office and conduct affairs, it was coincidence that they continued to do so and it is now becoming a habit. They acknowledge first, second and third, and finally they say it must be a miracle as such a thing was never known or seen for a Liberal government or party in Canada being able to properly direct the affairs of the country. People like these must surely be blind for we have the largest surplus—except one—that

Canada has ever known and that was two years since, and under Liberal rule. The Finance Minister assures us that the revenue for the ensuing year will be far larger and that he expects the revenue for this year, 1902-03, to reach the handsome total of $65,000,000.

Amongst the causes which have contributed to this remarkable state of affairs must be counted the just, and wise expenditure and administration of the departments. The Post Office Department is one, which, notwithstanding the efforts of the opposition to explain away its very wise administration by the Postmaster General, makes a record. They cannot conceive that the best and most modern methods have been adopted and abuses done away with. And it is entirely beyond their conception how a deficit of $700,000 in 1896 was reduced to a deficit of $105,000 in 1901-2; nor do they seem to realize that the postal services were extended and enlarged during that period. The number of post offices has increased as follows:—

1896	9,103
1897	9,191
1898	9,282
1899	9,420
1900	9,627
1901	9,834
1902	9,958

An increase of 855 post offices during the seven years of Liberal rule. What does this mean? It means an increase in the expenditure of the department and if anything could account for an increase in the expenditure I think it is this statement which I have just read showing the extensions which have been made in the post office service. It costs money to open new post offices. Postmasters have to be appointed, mail routes have to be provided for; these are expenses which the government cannot well get over and of course they are included in the large expenditure of this department. It was stated by one hon. member the other night, I think, by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the Postmaster General had wiped out the deficit in his department by a public grant of money. That is no doubt true, but I am informed that the reason was this. I have a statement of the post office revenue, expenditure and deficits since confederation:—

Year.	Revenue. $ cts.	Expenditure. $ cts.	Deficit. $ cts.
June 30, 1868..	525,691.80	616,802.21	91,110.41
" 1869..	535,315.14	787,886.32	252,571.18
" 1870..	573,565.84	808,622.77	235,056.93
" 1871..	612,630.67	815,470.59	202,839.92
" 1872..	692,374.98	929,609.33	237,234.35
" 1873..	833,657.21	1,067,866.09	234,208.88
" 1874..1,139,973.15		1,387,270.48	247,297.33
" 1875..1,155,332.09		1,520,861.21	365,529.12
" 1876..1,102,540.32		1,622,827.10	520,286.78
" 1877..1,114,945.78		1,705,311.54	590,365.76
" 1878..1,207,790.15		1,724,938.52	517,148.37
" 1879..1,172,418.14		1,784,423.88	612,005.74
June 30, 1880..1,252,498.22		1,818,271.05	565,772.83
" 1881..1,352,109.64		1,876,657.96	524,548.32
" 1882..1,587,888.15		1,980,567.25	392,679.10
" 1883..1,800,391.37		2,176,089.08	375,697.71
" 1884..1,755,674.49		2,312,965.27	557,290.78
" 1885..1,841,372.22		2,488,315.36	646,943.14
" 1886..1,901,690.25		2,763,186.41	861,496.16
" 1887..2,020,623.51		2,818,907.22	798,283.71
" 1888..2,379,241.57		2,889,728.59	510,487.02
" 1889..2,220,503.66		2,982,321.48	761,817.82
" 1890..2,357,388.95		3,074,469.91	717,080.96
" 1890..2,357,388.95		3,074,469.91	717,080.96
" 1891..2,515,823.44		3,161,675.72	645,852.28
" 1892..2,652,745.79		3,316,120.03	663,374.24
" 1893..2,773,507.71		3,421,203.17	647,695.46
" 1894..2,809,341.06		3,517,261.31	707,920.25
" 1895..2,792,789.64		3,593,647.47	800,857.83
" 1896..2,964,014.23		3,665,011.30	700,997.07

Expenditure to June 30, 1896 which was unpaid and provided for by special rate, $685,447.03.

Year.	Revenue. $ cts.	Expenditure. $ cts.	Deficit. $ cts.
" 1897..3,202,938.42		3,789,478.34	586,539.92
" 1898..3,527,809.69		3,575,411.99	47,602.39
" 1899..3,193,777 53		3,603,799.10	410,021.57
" 1900..3,205,535.16		3,758,014.61	552,479.45
" 1901..3,441,504.93		3,931,446.01	489,941.08
" 1902..3,918,415.55		4,023,636.82	105,221.27

There was a deficit as shown by the public accounts for the year 1896, but when the new Postmaster General came into office he found that there was an unpaid expenditure to the 30th of June. He considered this a handicap and it was provided for by a special vote. This expenditure amounted to $685,447.03, so that, in addition to the deficit as shown by the public accounts of $700,997.07 there was this expenditure of $685,447.03 which had not been accounted for. The hon. Postmaster General said: I do not care to take upon myself that enormous liability in connection with the Post Office Department. I wish parliament to take that difficulty off my hands and parliament took the responsibility of providing for the unpaid accounts amounting to $685,447.03 and they were paid out of the general funds of the country. Notwithstanding all the improvements which he has made in the service these deficits have been considerably reduced. In 1897 the deficit was $586,539.92; in 1898, $47,602.39; in 1899, $410,021.57; in 1900, $552,479.45; in 1901, $489,941.08; and in 1902, $105,221.27. I think this is a remarkable showing. The Yukon service has been inaugurated at a net total additional cost to the department up to June 30, 1902, of $283,162.86. The rate on foreign postage was reduced from five to two cents, the inland postage rate was reduced from five to two cents and who says that the department is not efficient? I think I am justified in saying that the administration of the hon. Postmaster General has been exceedingly good and that the service of the country has not been starved. I know it has not been in my riding or in places where I have travelled. I say that the post office is more

efficient now than it has been at any time in the history of Canada.

In a large department doing a business of $4,000,000 some friction to accomplish this will naturally arise; but with stiff-bent, careful, business-like and modern methods employed—and I claim that they have been so employed, and, that if there is any one branch of the public service of which the people of this country should feel proud it is the Post Office Department. I might go on to mention the extension of the railway mail service, the inauguration of the postal note system in 1898, the increase in the money orders, and other improvements, but hon. gentlemen will find these in the reports and I do not wish to take up too much of the valuable time of the House.

Mr. BROCK. Twenty-eight dollars a minute.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Twenty-eight dollars a minute, as my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) remarks. There is a matter of public interest to which I am sure, in due time, the Postmaster General will direct his attention: It is the matter of free rural deliveries. I will admit that the conditions existing in this country on account of its great extent and sparse settlements are not ideal ones. But there are some of the older settled portions of the country where it might well be introduced. It will be acceded that there has been no time in the world's history when enlightened governments have made such efforts to ameliorate the conditions of life which contribute and conduce to the happiness of the people as in the present. And our government, I am sure, will not be behind in matters which are so vital to the welfare of the great farming community. I can speak with some authority on this matter, as I come from a constituency where the greater number of our people are farmers.

The recent census taken in Canada, as well as that in the United States, go far to show that city life has its attractions over the young people in the rural districts of the country. And that wherever the great centres of population are increasing the country portions are lessened in population. In my opinion the post offices, and telephones, are to play an important part in making the lot of the farmer more congenial. And if, as is expected, the farmer has his free mail delivery, bringing his letters and daily papers with news of the outside world, a telephone in his house with which he can communicate with his neighbours and friends, and even with the more distant cities and great markets, the life of the farmer would take on a different aspect. Lonesomeness would disappear and the farmers' view would be thereby greatly enlarged.

Mr. MACLEAN. Where is that?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Free rural mail delivery; you are too late. It is easy to see how this will elevate the standard of intelligence and promote the welfare of the country people. The people of England have practically a free delivery throughout the country. The first test of rural free deliveries was made in the United States in October, 1896. if I remember rightly, the first appropriation being in the neighbourhood of $10,000. The appropriation for 1901 had grown to $1,750,000, for 1902 to $3,500,000, and I am not informed what the exact appropriation for this year is. But I am told that it is increasing and that the people of that country are delighted with the results which have been accomplished. Under these circumstances, with the knowledge I have gained regarding the working of the system of free rural deliveries, I have no hesitation in urging that at least a trial be made in this country.

Let us for a moment, Mr. Speaker, examine the management of the Intercolonial Railway. True, the revenue and expenditure account of the government railway has shown no startling surplus. But on all sides it was admitted that when the present government came into power the road was in an impoverished condition. All this has been changed, and under the able management of its present Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) it is no more a reproach, and I have been informed by commercial travellers and tourists from foreign countries that there is not a more comfortable and up-to-date railway in Canada today.

Living in Ontario, to which province the road does not extend, it was always very difficult for me to understand how a railway running through the old settled provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, having a live business population, rich in natural resources, and carrying freight to all our great seaports of the Atlantic, did not pay. The present minister undertook to extend the road to Montreal, the great eastern inland seaport in Canada, and then a change occurred. And if the surplus has been small for some years of his administration this fact coupled with efficiency and economical management accounts for the better and changed condition of the road.

If by the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal such results have been accomplished is it not fair to, at least, hope, that if the Intercolonial Railway were extended further west, to the great lakes, where it could enjoy a share of the great traffic which comes from our boundless wheat fields, greater results would follow.

In connection with the very great interest which the public are taking in railways which will span the Canadian portion of this continent, one proposition is that the government should extend the track of the Intercolonial Railway at least to Winnipeg and allow any railway wanting access to the western country from the east to have wheelage rights over this government road-

bed and it appears to me that his proposition has some merit. We have an example of a successful venture of this kind in the Wabash Railway, which owns its own rolling stock and using track privileges over the Grand Trunk Railroad running from St. Louis, Missouri, through Canada by way of Detroit to Niagara Falls. And if this be successful with a private company, why not with a government-owned system. Besides such an arrangement would not prevent the government from having a share of the trade of the western portion of our country over these lines in the east.

That the Intercolonial Railway is able to bring this efficiency was abundantly shown during the past few months. The action of the British government placing restrictions on the shipping through the United States or from United States portions, especially in the states of Maine and Massachusetts, enabling the other roads to hand over their live stock to the Intercolonial Railway, which they did with much hesitation. But the Intercolonial Railway demonstrated that they were able to transport cattle to St. Johns in good condition with satisfaction to shipping and some hours less than rival railways.

The increase on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway is no doubt justifiable because it was necessary to bring the road to a state of efficiency. Other railways are adding to capital account by issuing bonds, stock, or other security to better their trade. Why not a government road? I can see no inconsistency in the expenditure of capital on the Intercolonial Railway if it is done as has been by this government so wisely and so well.

The Department of the Interior which has such a wide field of usefulness has been well and ably administered by the present minister (Hon. Mr. Sifton). I would like to speak on the question of immigration in connection with the events which are at present occurring in this country. For years the Conservative government had been utterly unable to cope with the task of peopling this great heritage of ours, and the results at best were most discouraging. There is an interesting fact in connection with the expenditure on immigration by the Conservative government which should not be overlooked. That government did not appear to have any settled policy on immigration; and there was no regular expenditure of public money. In some years the expenditure was very large, abnormally so; in other years it was very small, as will appear by the following figures:

In 1883-84	$511,298
" 1884-85	423,000
" 1885-86	357,000
" 1886-87	341,000
" 1887-88	244,000
" 1888-89	202,000
" 1889-90	110,000

These figures show a constantly decreasing expenditure on immigration from year to year. From that time the expenditure increased slightly again, until in 1895-96 it was $120,000. This shows that the expenditure for immigration under the Conservative government was intermittent; it was not regular. Now, let us see what this government have expended on immigration during their tenure of office:

In 1897-98	$261,000
" 1898-99	265,000
" 1899-1900	434,000
" 1900-01	444,000
" 1901-02	494,000

Showing that the expenditure has been increased from year to year. From that increased expenditure there should be some result, and I appeal to hon. members of this House if there have not been magnificent results. Why, the newspapers of both the west and the east are every day full of accounts of hundreds and thousands of immigrants coming into the country. We know that some 80,000 came in last year, and the prospects are that this year 100,000 or 120,000 will come in.

This department undertook a vigorous policy, asking parliament for large and regular grants for these purposes, and the results are as anticipated. People are flocking to the land of promise; steamships are engaged months ahead and bringing British and foreign immigrants to our shores to settle on our productive soil; railways are at their wits ends to handle the people and the traffic which is offered them. It was even a question with our opponents whether the money which was spent on immigration offices in the United States was justifiable; but the results which followed the policy of this government are satisfactory. The neighbouring republic is furnishing its quota to the great North-west. Canadians who left Canada in the eighties and the nineties are returning and bringing thousands of Americans with them. We welcome them. People who are in comfortable circumstances, and understand the conditions of farming and life on the prairies make the best of settlers, and they will find that under the flag of this free Dominion, and with the protection afforded by its just and righteous laws, they will make for themselves homes of peace and contentment beyond their fairest dreams.

With regard to the foreign immigration, I am not one of those who think it is of no value. I travelled through the west last year, and spoke to people who knew the Doukhobors, the Galicians, the Swedes and other foreigners, and they informed me that when these people got settled they made fine settlers. We know that a number of foreigners settled in this country about 1878, and the children of these people are now among the best Canadians we have.

Under these circumstances, I think I am justified in supporting a department of this government which has made such a splendid record for itself as the Department of Im-

migration. And, Mr. Speaker, this policy has been carried out by this government in the face of stinging criticism, and amid predictions that the country would be ruined by the importation of foreigners. The result is now that the name of Canada is on every lip, and that this country is perhaps the most-talked of nation in the world. It surely must continue in this 20th century, that a land so fair, with such immense resources, cannot be overlooked, and that, with the vigour and energy characteristic of this government, we shall continue to see immigrants coming into Canada by tens of thousands and by hundreds of thousands if not by millions. In talking with a gentleman who had returned from a three months' cruise around the Mediterranean, I asked him if the people over there knew anything about Canada. He said: 'They know very little, but they want to know more; it is surprising to hear people talking about Canada everywhere.' This gentleman told me further, and I have heard the same thing from immigration agents in the United States, that there is an impression in the minds of many foreigners that Canada is practically dependent on Great Britain, and pays taxes to Great Britain. That idea should be dispelled, and the fact made known that Canada is a free country, freer in fact than the United States, and that we pay no taxes to Great Britain, and no taxes of any kind that we do not impose upon ourselves. This is one of the points to which I would call the attention of the Immigration Department. To my mind what this vast country needs is population; and speaking for myself, as a representative of the people, I think the expenditure for immigration purposes should be kept up and increased by moderate amounts from year to year. If our population does not increase rapidly enough by natural means, we must import more people to occupy our vast areas of fertile soil with productive farms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a longer time than I had set for myself; but it would not do for me to conclude my remarks without referring to the good work that has been done by the Department of Agriculture. The Agricultural Department of the government is not one which brings in a revenue directly, but like the Immigration Department, it is an indirect producer of revenue. I think that the expenditure of this government in agriculture has been fair and liberal. It amounts to some $600,000 per year which cannot be called excessive. It is difficult to ascertain the exact amount, as the cost of taking the census is included in the expenditure of that department. Taking everything into account in connection with the census, I fail to see why these returns could not have been completed before this. Two years, it seems to me, ought to be long enough to have these returns before us, but when we look to the record of the former government I find ample precedent for the delay. Comparing the two census of 1891 and 1901, I find the following record:

First volume census of 1891 issued March 28, 1893.

Second volume census of 1891 issued November 25, 1893.

Third volume census of 1891 issued February 20, 1895.

Fourth volume census of 1891 issued February, 11, 1897.

First volume census of 1901 issued December 27, 1902.

The first volume of 1891 contained 424 pages, with introduction and index, and consisted of seven tables.

The first volume of 1901 contains 560 pages, with introduction and index, and consists of eighteen tables.

The second volume of 1891 dealt with (1) vital statistics, (2) occupations of the people, and (3) occupiers of land and land occupied; the third volume dealt with manufactures, and the fourth with agricultural statistics, products of the forest, and ratios.

For the census of 1901 the whole of this work is well advanced, and all of it excepting tables of occupations and ratios should be in the printers' hands in August next.

I might go on and tell you of the good work done by the Agricultural Department in connection with the removal of the quarantine by the United States against Canadian cattle. The trade between Canada and the United States in live stock had sunk to nothing. If I remember rightly, the number of animals going out of this country every year to the United States was only between 500 and 600. The hon. Minister of Agriculture determined that this should be corrected, and he opened negotiations with Washington, the result of which was that the doors were let down and the quarantine restrictions against cattle entering the United States was removed. In consequence of this, instead of our shipping only 500 or 600 cattle to the United States, we are sending upwards of 60,000 per year into that country. That is one of the good things which the Department of Agriculture has been able to perform.

Another was the extension of cold storage facilities. The late government undertook to do something in the way of cold storage but did not accomplish very much. Our government asked for larger grants for parliament to perfect that system. These grants have exceeded $100,000 in some years, but, this expenditure has been the cause of a great increase in our production and shipments of bacon, cheese, butter and eggs to the old country, resulting in great profit to our farmers. I have no doubt my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) could inform the House what the government has done and what it has failed to do in this connection, as I have heard him make some very able addresses on this subject in his speeches on the budget in former years. But, to this government must be given the

credit for having developed the cold storage system to a great extent. Our ocean steamers to-day are well equipped with cold storage facilities, and we have forty-five railway routes, centreing largely at Montreal equipped with these facilities. For instance, we can load a car at Port Perry, where I reside, with produce on Monday morning and have that produce put in an iced car, and the government will pay any shortage of freight there may be in connection with that car. That produce will then be delivered to its destination in as good order as when shipped.

By this means our producers have the advantage of shipping their products at various points and having it delivered in perfect condition either for the local trade or for export. What this means in the case of butter and cheese and eggs and other perishable products, it is hardly necessary to tell our farmers.

Coming to the question of public debt, not only have we a surplus revenue, but we are reducing our public debt, which is practical evidence that the surplus is a real one. Although we have been compelled to incur a large expenditure in order to meet the needs of the country—an expenditure which is perfectly justifiable—it is very gratifying to have our Finance Minister announce that practically all the additions made to the public debt by this government would be wiped out in another year, and that the net debt of our population will be $48 per head, as compared with $50 per head in 1896. He also stated that there will be loans maturing in Canada to the amount of $2,800,000, which are now bearing 4 per cent interest and that these loans will be refloated at 3½ per cent. I hope that the people of this country will subscribe to the new loan to be voted in payment of our maturing obligations. I believe that the practice of floating government loans among the people of this country is one that should be encouraged. I think it would tend to increase a man's patriotism to know that he is holding a $100 or a $500 or a $1,000 bond of this government. What safer security can he have? If everything else should go to ruin, we still have the country left, we still have the land, and we still have ample guarantee for our government bonds. There can be no security so safe as a government loan, and the people of this country might very well invest some of the $60,000,000 which they have in the Government Post Office Savings Banks in their own national securities. For these reasons I believe that a popular loan in this country would be one issued by the government of a moderate amount, bearing interest of three and a half per cent, say for twenty years, and in denominations of $100 or $500. Such a loan would encourage national sentiment. I am a great believer in allowing our people all the privileges we can give them, and I think the privilege of investing a small amount of money in a popular loan is one which those who have money to invest would appreciate. It is gratifying to note the abundant prosperity existing throughout Canada. It would be idle to contend that the government has created all this prosperity. But is it not fair to concede some credit to the government? Former governments sought to impress the people in a general way with the idea that the country could not do very well without them and that it would certainly go to ruin under Liberal rule. But what is the condition to-day. Our railways are not able to handle with any degree of despatch the freight that is offering. And indeed, during many months, they have been paralyzed and conjested with traffic. I saw last night a report in one of our newspapers—the Toronto 'World,' I think it was—that the railways were not able to handle the traffic, that there were over five hundred cars in the Toronto yards waiting to be unloaded. Of course, that might be the fault of the railways not having enough labour to take care of the freight. But the same is true all over the country. I have seen it stated, time and time again, in the newspapers of the day, that the railways have plenty to keep them busy. Indeed, I was told recently by a man from the west that even if there were no crop in the west this year there was sufficient grain in the country, there were enough people going up and sufficient freight being carried to supply them, to keep the railways fully employed. This is the condition of affairs in relation to the railways, which are the pulse of the country. Banks have been doing an enormous business and showing fine yearly statements of earnings, and their record is that the deposits are larger than ever before in the history of the country. The demand for government currency has been abnormal, reaching $30,000,000, or perhaps $35,000,000 per year. Factories have sprung into existence everywhere, and the general testimony is that many of them have more orders than they can complete for months to come. Large industries employing thousands of men, especially in iron and coal, which are the great staple productions, have been established. The farmers of this great Dominion have grown wealthy, and there is no class of the community but have improved their earnings. It is needless for me to speak of the prosperity of other classes. But I do say that these conditions exist in my own section of the country. Everything is thoroughly prosperous, and the prospects of all never were so hopeful. If we consult the trade returns, we find that the total trade of the country has increased by $200,000,000 since 1895, or over $28,000,000 per year on the average. And of this increase about half was in the export trade, which is of the greatest benefit to the country. I wish particularly to congratulate the gov-

ernment on its proposal to place a surtax on German goods. The press throughout the country have approved of the government's action, particularly because of its departure from antiquated methods. I notice by the cable reports that the press of outside countries has commented favourably on the government's policy. If we are to believe the reports of many writers on trade relations, the coming years will witness a great struggle for commercial supremacy, and the action of Germany, which provoked our government to reprisals, may indicate in some measure the correctness of this view, and shows that we must take care of ourselves. No doubt, this government will be able and always willing to take care of the trade of Canada. It is satisfactory to observe the buoyancy of the revenue derived from customs duties. For, after all, this is the chief source of taxation. Though we pay for the support of government in other ways, the chief source of the government's revenue is the customs. One can idealize and theorize on a tariff and can frame a tariff in his mind which, to all intents and purposes, will be a perfect one. But it is a difficult thing to enter practically into the trade of the country and collect a revenue from the vast number of articles which are brought in and, at the same time, not materially injure or oppress any interest. Now, in a general way, I think this government has done this, and that Canada never had a tariff which could meet all the requirements of the people so well. It is not correct to say that it is a perfect tariff, but it has done the greatest good to the greatest number, and that is right. There are inequalities in the tariff, as we must all admit, and some of these inequalities I see exemplified in the affairs of some people in my own riding. But I am sure the government will take these things into account when the proper time comes for the readjustment of the tariff. It is not fair to say that this government has vacillated and has no policy. Our opponents have stated over and over again that their policy has been adopted. But, to my mind at least, a tariff is largely a compromise, and I repeat again that the task of harmonizing the various interests of the country has been well performed by this government. In view of what I have said, and of a good deal more that I might say, and in view of the progress of the country, I cannot support the amendment of the leader of the opposition. He asks us to declare that the present tariff is unsatisfactory. I do not believe that it is unsatisfactory ; I believe it is satisfactory ; that it has, in a great measure, created prosperity in the country. I presume I have the right to my opinion, and that is my opinion—that the present tariff has in great measure contributed to the success and welfare of the Dominion.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. McPherson.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Bazinet.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the North-west Coal and Coke Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 121) to incorporate the Consolidated Trust Corporation.—Mr. McColl.

Bill (No. 123) to incorporate the Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Thompson.

Bill (No. 127) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George M. Depew.—Mr. McCarthy.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I sympathized with the opening remarks of the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) when he drew the attention of the House to the fact of the very small attendance which he had to speak to. He had before him one Minister of the Crown. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) who, so far as all outward appearances were concerned, was fast asleep. The hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), however, came in shortly after he commenced his speech, and although I am not honoured with his presence, it is evident that he intends, himself, to make a speech and was desirous of getting some pointers from the hon. member for South Ontario. The hon. gentleman, I noticed, listened very attentively to the observations to the hon. member for South Ontario, until that hon. gentleman commenced to read from the blue-books of the various departments when he took occasion to leave the chamber in order that he might take a long breath of fresh air. In listening to the hon. member for South On-

tario I noticed that he did not touch on the preferential tariff. He avoided a reference to that very important matter. He, however, touched gingerly on the question of protection. He, I believe, has, in his constituency, some industries which are troubled with the slaughter of American goods in this market and therefore I can understand why he has, to some extent, been converted in regard to the question of protection, or, at least, why it is that his observations on the question of protection were not quite the same as when he first came to this House in 1901. I would just like to read for his benefit in order that he may be on his guard in making speeches what he said in that year :

I have not departed from the principles of free trade, but, as I engage in the business of the country, I try to find out the necessities of the country and see what is best for the country, and, under the circumstances, I have come to the conclusion, that, if this tariff should be changed at all, it should be changed in the direction of lowering the duties.

He also said :

I do not mean by that altogether, a changing policy. That seems to be a contradiction, but, it seems to me, that, in looking at the tariff and in studying it, the English tariff is the ideal one. It is a certain tariff continuing for several years, and it is only for revenue.

The reason I refer to that is not only to draw my hon. friend's attention to what he said a year or two ago but to draw the attention of this House to the fact that we are undergoing an education, that the supporters of the government appear to be getting light on this all important question of protection and it is interesting to watch their antics and to see how they can manage to throw a little protective talk into their speeches from time to time. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) preceded the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin). He appeared to be rather a Rip Van Winkle. His sentiments were such as those which were uttered by supporters of the government when they were in the greatest political darkness in regard to the question of protection. They were more like the observations which the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) made in 1897 when he was discussing the budget. We have got away from those times and I was a little surprised at the darkness which prevailed in the mind of the hon. member for Glengarry. However, we must have patience with these hon. gentlemen. I feel satisfied that they are improving in regard to this all important subject. In listening to the speeches of hon. gentlemen in discussion of the budget, I have felt that it was a great boon not only to Canada but to the whole world that this administration came into power in 1896. Our foreign trade has not only increased under this administration, but, if the observations of hon. gentlemen in discussing the budget are to be taken at their face value, this government must have been the means of increasing the trade of nearly all the civilized nations of the world for the trade of the civilized nations of the world has been greatly increased and we can take it for granted that the same conditions which caused the increase in our trade have caused the increase in the trade of the nations of the world. Therefore, it is fair to assume that it was all owing to the wise tariff legislation of the present administration. My hon. friend from South Ontario referred to the great amount of money which is flowing into the treasury of this country and he seemed to be rather satisfied with the condition of affairs which exists. In the year 1896 the revenue of this country, as he stated it, was $36,618,590. The revenue, according to the figures of the hon. Minister of Finance, for the current year, ending June 30, 1903, is estimated at $65,000,000. That shows that for the current year the people of this country will pay into the treasury $28,381,410 in excess of what they paid into the treasury in the last year under the former administration.

I take issue with my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Ross) on that. I think this government is pursuing a wrong principle in taking that amount of money out of the pockets of the people at the present time. We have no need for it. The people are being unnecessarily taxed ; the treasury is overflowing. This invites demands for all kinds of subsidies and grants and unnecessary public undertakings. The time has come, Sir, when we should have some kind of defined policy as to what manner of public enterprise will be undertaken by this government, and what their extent will be. The tariff is now principally on an ad valorem basis and the value of goods being high it necessarily produces this condition of affairs. It is called, rightly enough I think, a revenue tariff; its aims and object is to raise revenue. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) refers to the surplus of $13,350,000, but in my opinion that money had better be left in the pockets of the people in as much as we do not need it for the requirements of government. The hon. gentleman selected for his special praise the Post Office Department and the Department of Railways and Canals. He was pleased to know, as he alleged, that the Intercolonial Railway was well managed and that it was producing good results. He pointed to the fact that private railway companies were enlarging their capital, and he did not see why the Intercolonial Railway should not increase its capital if the government so desired. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the amount of money which the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island railways wrote to capital account during the past year was $5,146,588, and I would remind him that the Intercolonial Railway is not like other railways, in that it does not pay dividends. The Intercolonial Railway for the most part

runs through a country where the freight rates are profitable and where there is so much traffic that I have heard that it is the intention to double track some portions of the system. I contend, Sir, that the time has come when we should not only carry a very small amount yearly to capital account in connection with the government railways, but that we should be able to appropriate a certain amount for a dividend. That is a reasonable proposition and if the Intercolonial Railway was as well managed as other railways it could be easily done. On the whole, we have no cause whatever to congratulate ourselves on the management of the Intercolonial Railway. For my part I look upon it as being a sort of a sink hole which swallows up the revenues of this country and I think we might very well economize in its administration.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) refers to the Postmaster General's Department; and here is were the two extremes meet, when we compare the lavish expenditure of the Minister of Railways on the Intercolonial Railway with the tremendous economy of the Postmaster General. It is quite evident that the Postmaster General is economical in some directions for hardly a day passes that members of this House do not receive letters from the employees of the Post Office Department throughout Canada, complaining of their treatment and pointing out that although the cost of living has greatly increased, their salaries have not increased in the same proportion as have the salaries of employees in private concerns. That, I believe, to be the case.

The Minister of Finance, in his budget speech, made reference to Germany and to the German tariff and he read the correspondence which took place between this government and Lord Strathcona, and between this government and the Imperial German Consul. Let me say, Sir, that in the session of 1901, I asked for any correspondence which had passed between the parliament of the Dominion or the British government, or the government of Germany with reference to this question. At that time demands were being made upon this government by boards of trade throughout Canada, asking them to do something in the line of passing retaliatory legislation if necessary in order to off-set the humiliating position in which Germany had placed Canada. The Prime Minister replied in answer to my question: That there was no correspondence on the question to be brought down. Well, Sir, in looking over the correspondence which has now been placed before the House I find that on June 27th, 1898, Lord Strathcona sent a cable to the Minister of Trade and Commerce to this effect: Shall I enter protest against Germany's action; and he followed that cable up with a letter. Let me point out to the House the very dilatory manner in which the Canadian government treated this very important question. This cable was on June 27, 1898, and on August 2, of that year the Department of Trade and Commerce replied, thanking Lord Strathcona for his prompt action in connection with the matter, but giving him no further instructions whatever. That is the only letter so far as I am able to discover in this correspondence, which passed between the government and any party or parties in respect to this question until the Prime Minister took the matter up with the German Imperial Consul at Montreal, November, 1901. Lord Strathcona, on September 17, 1899, asked of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to be favoured with instructions by the government on this subject, and remarkably strange to say the Canadian government gave no reply to that letter. Again on May 8, 1901, Lord Strathcona wrote to the Minister of Trade and Commerce telling what he was doing and adding: I trust it will meet with the approval of the government. As in the former case Lord Strathcona received no reply or acknowledgment to this letter. Again on August 1, 1901, Lord Strathcona addressed a letter to this government which was treated in the like manner, and that brings us down to the correspondence of November 4, 1901, in which the Prime Minister asked the German Imperial Consul to call upon him in order that they might discuss the matter. What I claim, Sir, is, that the correspondence which was then in the hands of the government should have been brought down when we asked for it. The government treated the correspondence as though it were of a serious nature, but there was nothing secret or private about it. In the session of 1902 my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) again asked for this correspondence and it was again refused. It is very easily seen from the correspondence itself that it is of a comparatively trifling character, and my only explanation as to why the government refused to bring it before the House is, that they were ashamed to show how little attention they had given to this German business. It is only when we on this side of the House moved in the matter and forced the hands of the government that they really took the question up seriously. However that may be, I am prepared to endorse the action of the government in the stand they have taken towards Germany. I take no stock whatever in the attitude of Germany or the German press towards us. In discussing this question with shippers of grain and cereals in this country, since the Minister of Finance brought this question to an issue, they have assured me that Germany has already done all she can do against Canada.

If Germany or any other country institutes against this country a tariff which is almost prohibitive, what difference does it make how much they increase that tariff—whether they double or treble it? Whatever it is, it cuts us out of the German mar-

ket; and I think we can afford to let other countries know that on fiscal questions we are independent and can do as we desire, though being a dependency of Great Britain. The answer that I would give to Germany, if she continues to attack us, is simply this: Why should the German tariff on our products be more than it is upon the products of the United States? That is a simple way of putting the case, and I venture to say that there is no answer to it. We need not go into a discussion of the Belgian and German treaties or favoured-nation treatment. This country imports more proportionately from Germany than the United States, and our tariff is very much lower than the tariff of the United States. Therefore, I think our government have taken the right stand, and I do not anticipate any further legislation from Germany, of a character that will hurt us. I really cannot understand the attitude of Germany. We are on a par with the United States in everything. Does Germany choose to treat Canada in this way because it is a dependency of Great Britain? Is it because of the easy-going methods of the British people on trade matters that Germany undertakes to discriminate against us in this way? At any rate, I feel that we are on safe ground, and I am pleased at the stand the government have taken in regard to the matter.

I do not propose at this stage to discuss the very important question of protection which has been so much discussed in this House. I hope I shall have an opportunity at a later date to express my views on the very important subject. I may say, however, that I shall heartily support the amendment which has been placed before the House by the hon. leader of the opposition.

I would like, however, for a few moments to take up the time of the House in regard to the question of preferential trade. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that a year ago we had a discussion in reference to the invitation which was sent to the government to attend the coronation ceremonies and the colonial conference in London. We on this side of the House expressed the opinion that the government had replied to that invitation in a way that was entirely unwarranted. The invitation stated that it was desirable that the colonial conference should discuss three matters: Political relations existing within the empire, the question of defence, and the question of commercial relations. The reply of the government to this invitation stated that the only question which gave promise of useful discussion was that of commercial relations. We on this side of the House took the position that the government should go to the conference with an open mind, willing to discuss any question which might come before it. At the bottom of their reply to the invitation the government did say that they would be willing to discuss any question which came up, but it did not appear to me that that statement qualified their main position to any great extent. The position I take in regard to Canada not being able to secure from Great Britain a preference on our cereals, which I think we should have secured under the grain tax, was due to our attitude on the subject of defence. Hon. members will know in regard to this important question what my views are, as I put them on record last session and they are not too radical. As this question has not been considered to any great extent since the abolition of the war tax on grain in Great Britain, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the very serious way in which the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Chamberlain, discussed the question of imperial defence at the colonial conference. As I want to place his views before the House, I will take the liberty of reading what he said on the subject in his opening address:

As regards imperial defence, I propose to lay before you, for your information, a paper which will show the comparative amount of the ordinary naval and military expenditure of the United Kingdom and of the different self-governing colonies. You will find that in the case of the United Kingdom the cost of our armaments has enormously increased since 1897. That increase is not entirely due to our initiative, but it is forced upon us by the action of other powers who have made great advances, especially in connection with the navy, which we have found it to be our duty and necessity to equal. But the net result is extraordinary. At the present moment the estimates for the present year for naval and military expenditure in the United Kingdom—not including the extraordinary war expenses, but the normal estimates—involve an expenditure per head of the population of the United Kingdom of 29 shillings 3d.—29s. 3d. per head per annum.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is the military and naval together?

The SECRETARY OF STATE. Military and naval together. In Canada the same items involve an expenditure of only two shillings per head of the population, about one-fifteenth of that incurred by the United Kingdom. In New South Wales—I have not the figures for the Commonwealth as a whole, but I am giving those as illustrations—and I find that in New South Wales the expenditure is 3 shillings 5d.; in Victoria, 3 shillings 3d.; in New Zealand, 3 shillings 4d.; and in the Cape and Natal, I think it is between two shillings and three shillings. Now, no one, I think, will pretend that that is a fair distribution of the burdens of the empire. No one will believe that the United Kingdom can, for all time, make this inordinate sacrifice. While the colonies were young and poor, in the first place they did not offer anything like the same temptation to the ambitions of others, and, in the second place, they were clearly incapable of providing large sums for their own defence, and therefore it was perfectly right and natural that the mother country should undertake the protection of her children. But now that the colonies are rich and powerful, that every day they are growing by leaps and bounds, their material prosperity promises to rival that of the United Kingdom itself, and I think it is incon-

sistent with their dignity as nations—that they should leave the mother country to bear the whole, or almost the whole, of the expense. Justification of union is that a bundle is stronger than the sticks which compose it, but if the whole strain is to be thrown upon one stick, there is very little advantage in any attempt to put them into a bundle. And I would beg of you in this relation to bear in mind that you are not asked—your people are not asked—to put upon their own shoulders any burden for the exclusive advantage of the mother country. On the contrary, if the United Kingdom stood alone, as a mere speck in the northern sea, it is certain that its expenditure for these purposes of defence might be immensely curtailed. It is owing to its duties and obligations to its colonies throughout the empire; it is owing to its trade with those colonies, a trade in which of course they are equally interested with ourselves, that the necessity has been cast upon us to make these enormous preparations. And I think, therefore, you will agree with me that it is not unreasonable for us to call your serious attention to a state of things which cannot be permanent. I hope that we are not likely to make upon you any demand which would seem to you to be excessive. We know perfectly well your difficulties, as you probably are acquainted with ours. Those difficulties are partly political, partly, principally, probably, fiscal difficulties. The disproportion to which I have called your attention, cannot, under any circumstances, be immediately remedied, but I think that something may be done—I hope that something would be done—to recognize more effectually than has hitherto been done the obligation of all to contribute to the commonweal.

All the other colonies which were represented at that conference, had each a definite statement to make on this question and did make it. The first minister of New Zealand made a definite statement, and the first minister of Australia submitted a very elaborate statement to the conference. The First Lord of the Admiralty was asked to report on the question of defence, and in due course did so. He endeavoured to ascertain from each of the representatives of the British dominions what they were prepared to carry out with regard to this matter. The only colony which had no definite plan, which had nothing to suggest, was this country. But we find that the right hon. the First Minister stated, as set forth in the report of the First Lord of the Admiralty:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier informed me that His Majesty's government of the Dominion are contemplating establishing a local naval force in the waters of Canada, but that they were not able to make any offer of assistance with regard to those enumerated above.

In the memorandum with regard to defence which the Canadian ministers laid before the colonial conference, they practically reiterated this statement. Let me read the report:

In conclusion the ministers repeat that while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the majority, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purpose of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some burdens which he now bears; and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and under the advice of experienced imperial officers, so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self-government, which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

London, 11th August, 1902.

I have taken up the time of the House in referring to these matters because, in my opinion, the manner in which our representatives treated this question of defence—which was the most important question before the colonial conference—is due the failure of this government to obtain preferential trade within the empire and the little prospect there now appears to be of our obtaining it. I have for many years considered that preferential trade within the empire would be most beneficial to this country, and in my opinion, the reason given by the British government for putting a duty on grain, namely, that it was for the purpose of raising more war revenue, was merely a pretext. The British government could have raised all the money it required by other means and did not raise very much from the grain duty. My own belief is that this duty on grain was thrown out to Canada as a bait, but our government failed to rise to the occasion, and consequently a preference in the British market is further away than it has been for many years, which I very much regret. The statements put before the colonial conference at the instance of the British government, show clearly the tremendous expenditure for naval and military purposes under which the British people were labouring. Comparisons were drawn with such independent countries as Holland and Argentina, and estimates were made to show what Australia, Natal, Cape Colony and other British colonies would have to pay if they were independent nations. The matter was gone into very fully and earnestly. It was discussed in the press and we were very severely criticised for the attitude our representatives had taken. The question of preferential trade was also discussed, and a full report of what took place is printed so that we have an exact record of what happened. We know that our representatives, after trying to engage the mother country to grant us a preference, threatened to withdraw the preference which we had granted the mother country. This preferential tariff was differently explained, when first brought down, in different parts of this country. It was declared to be a measure of tariff reform in certain places and on certain occasions. But in other places and on other occasions we were told that the government gave it in payment for the debt of gratitude we owed to Great Britain, for which we did not want anything in return.

In his budget speech in 1898, the hon. Minister of Finance referred to it as a measure of tariff reform and the hon. Minister of the Interior, in the House in 1901, said :

When we give preference, if it is to be at any one's expense, it is at the expense of the manufacturer and the workingman of Canada. We go a little further, and say that it is the policy of the Liberal party of Canada to reduce the duties and to remove to some extent the burden of the excessive tariff which was imposed on imported goods by the late Conservative government.

These are the views of two of the ministers of this government. The right hon. Prime Minister, however, said something different. In interviews and speeches in 1897, he said :

I have too great a belief in British common sense to think that they will do any such thing——

He was referring to the adoption of protection by Great Britain.

What we have done in the way of tariff preference, we have done out of gratitude to England.

Therefore it can easily be seen that this government were using this preferential tariff as a sort of a political weapon which could cut any way they chose.

But when we come down to the present session, we do not see in the reply by the right hon. First Minister to the speech from the Throne any reference to the scheme which he propounded at that colonial conference with reference to a Canadian naval force. On the contrary, the government have studiously avoided any reference to that important question, which was discussed at the conference. I do not find that the hon. Minister of Finance, in his speech on the budget, made any reference whatever to this statement which was made at the colonial conference, but he held out the hope to the country that when the British budget came down, we would find in it a return for what we gave in the shape of a preference. The British budget has since been brought down; and I am at a loss to know how the Minister of Finance could have expected, after what I may term the bungling way in which this question has been treated, any such preference from Great Britain as he anticipated. The British people, realizing what had taken place at the conference and the vacillating way in which the question of defence has been treated, knowing that we were the only country that had given a preference and had been asking a preference in return, feeling that we had not assumed the obligation which we ought to have assumed, hearing of our overflowing treasury yet, knowing that we were not ready to do anything on behalf of the British navy, or the establishment of a navy of our own they swept the whole thing out of existence and thus declared that they would do no more. When you think of the teeming thousands coming into this country from the United States, is it not easy to see that one of the greatest benfits this country could have offered to these Americans who, we hope will become good Canadians, would have been to say to them: You can get a preference of from four to five cents a bushel on your grain grown in Canada. That would have satisfied them and would have had a good effect upon their minds in regard to the advantage of living in this country. But, what do we find ? For instance, what do we find to be the position the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has taken in regard to this question ? He has coined a phrase, and expects to escape under it. I think it runs, 'Canada must keep free from the vortex of European militiarism.' I do not think that, when the question is sifted to the bottom, that phrase will be accepted in place of what the government should have done by the people of this country. I do not think there was any danger to any course of a magnanimous character that we might adopt with regard to this question of defence, that would lead us into the vertex of militarism. Why could we not have said something of an encouraging character to the British people, why could not our representatives have been resourceful enough to have suggested some way whereby our own vessels might relieve to some extent the British war vessels that patrol our coasts and protect our commerce ? We shall be willing to face these responsibilities that all other nations must face, and I claim that we are occupying a humiliating position, a position which we cannot very long occupy, and which the British people have stated very plainly, through Mr. Chamberlain, that we cannot expect to occupy in not being willing to face the responsibility and perform this duty. We do not want the British taxpayers to protect us. We are in the same position as the most helpless, most significant British colony. We might have retained all our rights and yet have done something to satisfy the British people. I repeat that I am surprised that the Finance Minister expected to get any consideration when the British budget was brought down. Various unfavourable comments have been made on our attitude by the British press. Sir William Vernon Harcourt has said in speaking on the recent British Budget :—

The colonies ought to contribute to the navy. No sober-minded man could justify the enormous expenditure of the government.

So, we know what the feeling is in regard to this matter in Great Britain. But what is to be done in regard to this preference ? The government gave it as a measure of tariff reform and as a tribute of gratitude to the mother country. But when the Minister of Finance, the other day, brought in his budget, he almost repeated the words which were in the memorandum laid before the conference. He said :—

But, putting aside other considerations, if the British government and people do not show any appreciation of the value of the preference, then, so far as the British government and the people are concerned, they cannot complain if we see fit to modify or change that preferential tariff.

I was in the House when the hon. gentleman uttered those words, and nearly every hon. gentleman on the other side applauded. Is not this a notable thing when we remember that when the preference was introduced in 1897, hon. gentlemen opposite sang the National Anthem. Now we see that the government is in a most peculiar and erratic position, an inconsistent position, with regard to this matter. They have charged us with huckstering in regard to our policy on the preference. What have they been doing ? Huckstering of the very worst kind. When, from time to time, we have criticised this kind of a preference, and condemned the government for bringing it into effect, they have sought to meet us with the challenge : Move a resolution to do away with it. Our reply has been that it was not our affair. We have criticised it on what we consider a sound basis. What we have always advocated is what we call a mutual preference throughout the empire, and nothing short of that would be satisfactory. I contend that the government made a mistake when they did not proceed along the lines proposed by the opposition in this House. We are anxious to know what their policy is. Now is the time to state it. The Minister of Finance has excused himself for not changing the tariff this year. One of his excuses was the hope of a British preference to be announced in the British budget. We now have the British budget before us and know where we are. Now we ask, and reasonably ask, what the policy of the government is going to be in regard to this important matter. We have finished, I trust, in sending delegations of this character to Great Britain. In 1897 we sent a delegation to attend the Jubilee, and again, in 1902, we sent a delegation to the coronation. So far as I am concerned I should be ashamed to face the British nation or to go to Great Britain at the present time, after what we have done. I hope the day is not far distant when we shall take up this question of defence and decide what our policy is to be. We have had enough frivolity in regard to the lavish way in which our statesmen have been entertained on the other side of the water. We have had enough court dresses; we have had enough cocked hats; we have had enough garden parties; we have had enough excursions; we have had enough reviews; we have had enough after dinner speeches; we have had enough Cobden club medals. Let us now get down to our serious duties ; let us discharge our obligations

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Yale and Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the speakers who have preceded me on this side of the House in congratulating the hon. Minister of Finance and his colleagues upon the splendid showing detailed in the budget speech so ably delivered by that hon. gentleman, a showing which, I believe, has never been equalled in the history of Canada. It must be a source of gratification to every Canadian to know that his country is in such a prosperous condition as it is, to know that our finances are being ably administered by the Finance Minister and that those finances are in a healthy condition. I know that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are wont to attribute much of the prosperity Canada is enjoying at the present time to a beneficient Providence. We on this side of the House equally recognize that Providence has been kind to Canada. But while we recognize this, we claim and I think we justly claim, that Canada should feel herself fortunate in having an administration at the helm capable of turning these beneficient gifts of Providence to good account. Now, I listened with considerable pleasure to the speech of the Finance Minister. I followed him closely throughout his speech, and I may say I listened to it with considerable pride. However, there was one thing that I did not like. It seems there is no cup so replete with sweetness that some person may not find therein a little bitterness. The sweetness lasted, so far as the people I represent are concerned, pretty nearly until the end of the minister's speech. The little bitterness that crept in came when the minister dealt with the question of adjusting the tariff on lead products. We were told that the government could not see their way clear to grant the request that had been made to them by the silver lead miners of British Columbia.

Now I may say that in British Columbia the people have always been an uncomplaining people. I have lived there myself for the past seven years, and before that I had lived for some fifteen years in the city of Winnipeg and west of that towards the coast, and I am well acquainted with the western people. We have always paid taxes in British Columbia by way of duty, either directly or indirectly, on every product that was brought into that country. We pay a duty direct or indirect on all we consume, on all we wear, on all our mining machinery that is not manufactured in Canada, practically on all our mining supplies; and yet I do not think that this government or any other government has ever heard any serious complaint from British Columbia on that score. But when the conditions of lead mining became such that it absolutely required assistance in some way, then the people of British Columbia came to this parliament. Delegations waited upon the govern-

ment, and their representatives in parliament have urged their cause. We hoped therefore that so far as lead was concerned there would be a readjustment of the tariff.

Now let me contrast the duties on lead with the duties on other products which we have to buy in British Columbia. I think I am safe in saying that probably the duties will average nearly 30 per cent on the articles that we consume and use in daily life in British Columbia. In regard to lead, let me first take the article of pig lead. We find that on pig lead there is a duty of 15 per cent; with the preference of 33⅓ per cent deducted from all lead sent from London, that duty amounts to 10 per cent. Now probably every member in the House knows what pig lead is, but as possibly some one may not, I will explain that the lead ore is first smelted, and with the lead silver is frequently found. The smelted product of lead ore is called bullion. That bullion is then sent to the refinery where it is desilverized, and assumes the form of pig lead. Now note that the tariff of 15 per cent is levied on lead which has reached that state; and as I said before, with the preference of only 10 per cent as against London. Now we go further and take up the question of corroded lead, or what is known as white lead. Now note the anomaly. On corroded lead, which is lead advanced a further stage, the duty is only 5 per cent. Taking that fact into consideration, it is no wonder that we have no lead corroding works in Canada. That duty of 5 per cent would also have to be reduced by one-third in case the corroded lead came from England.

Now what is our position to-day? Canada is consuming to-day of lead products in various forms, such as sheet lead, white lead, shot and corroded leads, something in the neighbourhood of 15,000 tons. This consumption is rapidly increasing from year to year, and in view of the great immigration coming into Canada at the present time it is certain to increase very rapidly in the future. Therefore we should not be surprised to find that within a very few years Canada may be using 20,000 to 25,000 tons of lead in all forms. We have in British Columbia, particularly in the district I represent—indeed I think I represent most all the silver lead mining interests in Canada, certainly all those in British Columbia—we have there at the present time mines capable of producing 30,000 tons of lead, and even more. As I have already said, Canada is consuming at the present time some 15,000 tons. Now how much of that lead is produced in British Columbia? About 4,000 tons, or at the outside, 5,000 tons. You may ask me how that happens. The reason is that we are thrown into competition with Mexican lead. As I have shown, we are protected by no existing duty that is of any practical benefit to the mine owner or the producer; certainly the existing duty is no benefit to the producer of lead as it stands to-day. Therefore we are thrown into competition with lead that is sent in from the United States, although not by any means produced in that country. But the United States have what is called a bonding privilege with Mexico, where there are large lead mines and where a great quantity of lead is mined. That Mexican lead is sent into the United States in bond, is treated by United States manufacturers in bond, and then shipped out of the United States into Canada. That lead is very cheaply produced. The cost of labour employed in producing that lead is only 50 cents a day. I understand the miners are paid 50 cents in the Mexican mines. Against that we have to pay our miners $3.50 a day. You can readily see under these circumstances that we cannot possibly compete with the Mexican lead, unless some protection is afforded our miners in one way or another. If that lead is sent to London, or if Spanish lead is sent to London and refined there, and then sent out to Canada, that cheap lead comes in here with this preference deducted from the duty of 15 per cent on pig lead and 5 per cent on corroded lead.

Now, I wish for a moment to contrast the conditions of the United States miner and the Canadian miner of lead. For that purpose, I will take one of the western states, which has the greatest lead producing camp in the world, the Cordellaines, in the state of Idaho, which is some 200 or 300 miles south of us. I select that because the conditions there are very similar to the conditions in British Columbia, where we are operating our mines. I find that in the United States at the present time the mine owner receives for his lead in ore $3.90 per hundred. In Canada I find that the mine owner receives for his lead in ore $1.90 per hundred. That is based upon this: We receive and are settled with on the basis of the London price. The price of lead on the London market varies from time to time, varies probably every day, or few days, a few points, but at the present time the London price is $2.90 per hundred pounds. The mine owner receives only $1.90, the other dollar being taken for freight, treatment and what are called marketing charges. So that, as contrasted with the mine owner in the United States who receives $3.90, the mine owner in Canada, 200 or 300 miles north of him, receives only $1.90. Now, taking pig lead in the New York market, we find that at present the price is about $4.37 per hundred. In Montreal they buy pig lead (not the United States pig lead), and the price of pig lead in Montreal is $3.07 per hundred. I am quoting these figures to come to the point that I do not see why the charge to the Canadian consumer of mixed paints should be as much as the charge to the American consumer of mixed paints and yet we find that such is

the case. Pig lead in New York is worth $4.37 and in Montreal $3.07. Then, we find that corroded lead in New York is worth $4.75 per hundred and in Montreal $3.75 per hundred, but when it comes down to mixed paints we find that they are quoted in both countries at about $6 per hundred. One thing is sure, that the mine owner does not get the benefit of that. Why when there is such a difference in the price of pig lead and the price of corroded lead in Montreal and in New York the price of mixed paints is the same, is something that is difficult to understand. When it is mixed in with the oil and becomes mixed paint we find that, although the American paint mixer has to pay much more for the corroded lead that is used in the mixing of the paint than does the paint mixer in Montreal, practically the consumer in the United States pays the same as the consumer in Canada. This is something the government might look into.

I wish to place before the government and the House the importance of this lead industry in British Columbia, to show what it was when the conditions were favourable to mining operations there and to contrast the conditions then with the conditions to-day and with the conditions that have prevailed for some little time. These figures have been carefully compiled by men who made it their special business to arrive at the figures in order to be able to present them to the government when they came here as accredited delegates from British Columbia. There has been invested in silver lead mines in that district over $20,000,000. That is the actual purchase price of the mines. It does not include any stock dealings or anything of that kind; it is the actual purchase price of the mines and money expended in developing these mines. In connection with that, there have been railway and steamship lines built, and they were built very largely for the purpose of conveying these ores, because there were practically no other industries in certain parts of the silver lead mining district. There has been expended in that direction by the Great Northern Railway Company some $3,000,000. There has been expended by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for a similar purpose some $10,000,000. In Slocan district, which is entirely dependent on silver lead mining, we find that in the various mining camps and small towns the assessed value of improved property amounts to about $1,750,000. The assessed value of the city of Nelson, outside of that amount, is placed at about $2,500,000. There has been invested in smelters for the reduction of these lead ores some $750,000 or $1,000,000, this investment being represented by the smelters at Pilot Bay, at the city of Nelson and at Trail. I will take the year 1900, because in that year the mines were working under favourable conditions and were working to their normal capacity. In that year, while working to their normal capacity, these lead mines gave employment to 2,500 miners. This does not include men who might be employed in cutting trails or in cutting wood in connection with these mines, but actual miners, and the wages paid to these miners amounted to about $2,750,000 in that year. The value of the ores shipped from these mines in 1900 was about $5,000,000. These mines were supporting a population of some 20,000 people, I may say, almost absolutely dependent on the successful operation of the mines. Take the conditions two years later, and what do we find? We find that the value of the ores shipped from these mines had dropped from $5,000,000 to $1,154,000. We find that the population of 20,000 people that were being supported by these mines had dwindled to some 10,000 people, and that number to-day is greatly decreasing. We find that the 2,500 men who were employed in 1900, when conditions were favourable, are reduced to 500 men, and consequently, instead of having 2,500 men working in our silver lead mines, as in 1900, we have 500 men. Instead of having $2,750,000 expenditure in the shape of wages, we have now only about $500,000. You will readily see, Mr. Speaker, the great necessity there is for something being done to help this industry. It is an industry which is not only of great value to my district, but it is an industry which is of interest to all of British Columbia, to the North-west, to Manitoba, aye, and to Eastern Canada as well. If I were urging something that was only local in its character, I would not have such a strong case in coming to this House and to the government to ask for assistance. But, Sir, this is an industry which concerns the whole of Canada, and in which all Canada has deep concern.

Now, Sir, this falling off in the production of the mines is not due in any sense to the fact that the mines have petered out. The silver lead mines of the Slocan and of the East Kootenay are in a more advanced stage of development to-day than they have been in any period in the history of lead mining in British Columbia. They have ore in great quantity, and the ore is just as valuable as ever it was. It has been suggested by some that the falling off might be attributed to exorbitant freight charges on the railways and exorbitant treatment charges by the smelters, but I can assure the House that such is not the case. The mines are as productive as ever; the ore is there to be taken out, and the railways and smelters have made cut after cut in their rates in order to try and keep that industry alive. There was a two day's session in the city of Nelson, last fall, where the representatives of the silver lead mining industry met the smelter people and the railway people, and threshed the matter out. The representatives of the silver lead mines in British Columbia satisfied themselves then, that they were receiving fair treat-

ment both from the railway companies and from the smelters. In fact I am told that the rates charged were even better than the rates given to our neighbours across the line. It may be asked: What then is the cause of this slump in lead mining in British Columbia. Well it is due to more causes than one. In the first place, a good deal of our lead carries silver with it, and the price of silver and lead in the markets of the world is low. The second reason is, that owing to the conditions that prevail we cannot get any appreciable amount of the Canadian market for the Canadian product of lead. We are thrown into competition with cheap Mexican and Spanish lead which is foisted into Canada through the United States and through Great Britain. Another reason, and a very strong reason is, that during 1900 and prior to that for some years we were shipping our lead ores into the United States first, under the old Wilson tariff of three-quarters of a cent a pound, but afterwards the Dingley tariff raised the rate to one and a half cents a pound against us. When we had the American market for our products, our mines were going ahead, everything was prosperous with us, and we were able to carry on our works to their fullest capacity. But suddenly what is known as the American Smelting Trust was formed, and so soon as that trust came into existence all the smelters gave notice that at the expiration of the contracts which they then had with the mine owners of British Columbia, they would take no more Canadian ore. Therefore, the American market has been shut off to Canada by the action of that trust. Now when these conditions got to be practically unbearable, when it was seen that unless something was done to relieve the lead miners, that industry would perish; we in the lead mining district, got together to devise some scheme which we could present to the government for our relief. As the member for the district, I caused notices to be inserted last fall in the papers, asking that a meeting should be called at some stated place to discuss as to the best means of bringing about relief. That notice was heartily responded to and a meeting was called at Sandon which is probably the centre of the lead mining district. That was a very representative meeting and all the lead mines of any importance in British Columbia were represented. The managers, or engineers, or superintendents, as the case may be, met at Sandon, and after carefully discussing the question, action was taken. I may say that the men who attended that meeting were men whose daily avocation is the operating of mines; men who should be, to my mind, in the best position to judge of what would grant the most relief to that industry in its depression. It was unanimously decided at the Sandon meeting that a delegation should be sent to Ottawa to present the facts to the government, and to ask them to give us a duty on our lead that would be sufficient to place our miners—not exactly in the position of the American miners, because we felt that we could not get that—but at all events to place them in a position so that they would be able to work their mines to advantage.

Mr. BIRKETT. What do you think a sufficient duty on lead would be?

Mr. GALLIHER. What was asked was practically the Dingley tariff, which is two and one-eighth cents a pound on pig lead, and two and seven-eighth cents a pound, I think on corroded lead.

Mr. KEMP. Would that be adequate?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, that would be adequate, but I have some hesitation in using the word adequate after the explanation of its meaning given by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Heyd). As I have said, that was the decision arrived at at that meeting. The Sandon meeting was afterwards followed by a meeting at the city of Nelson where these industries were again represented, and at the meeting in the city of Nelson the resolution of the meeting held in Sandon was practically endorsed. That was followed up, as I said before, by a meeting between the mine owners and those representing the railway and smelting interests in order that the mine owners might be convinced that the railways and smelters were dealing fairly by them both in regard to railway rates and smelting charges. The meeting ended by the mine owners being perfectly satisfied on these points. It was followed by a third and last meeting in the city of Sandon, where again all these interests were represented and the original resolution was re-endorsed. At that meeting certain delegates were appointed to come to Ottawa to interview the government with regard to that resolution; and I may say that the men who composed that delegation were all practical men, men whose daily avocation was the operating of mines and the treatment of ores, men who understood the A B C of mining, and were capable of presenting the case to the government in a proper light, and who did present that case to the government in a much abler manner than I am presenting it to the House to-night. These delegates were assisted by Mr. Buchanan, who represented the federated Boards of Trade, a gentleman who probably has given more time to this question than any one else. So that our case was very strongly presented to the government, and we hoped that the government, if it could not see its way clear to go to the extent we asked in adjusting the duties, would at all events give us what we all claimed was our right, and what I claim to-night on the floor of this House is the right of our people—to have the tariff on our lead industries so adjusted that it should be placed upon a parity with the other industries of Canada. That, I claim, the people and the lead mining industry of British

Columbia are entitled to. The government have intimated, through the Finance Minister in his budget speech, that they do not see their way to interfere at all at this session of parliament with the tariff respecting lead notwithstanding the great anomaly that exists.

I was pleased to see that the government have asked for power, if certain conditions arose, to impose a duty on steel rails. I think that principle is right. The manufacture of steel rails is a new industry in Canada ; it may become a very important industry ; and when we have the raw material and the means of converting that raw material into the finished article, I believe in the principle of encouraging all new industries of that description. Such, I claim, is our position with regard to lead. When the present tariff was framed, we had no such industry as lead mining in Canada ; therefore, lead was practically put on the free list. Now that we have demonstrated beyond a question the value and importance of the industry and the fact that it can more than supply the demands of Canada, surely we should be placed in a position at least to control our own markets instead of seeing the lead in the different forms in which it is used in Canada come from the cheap Mexican or Spanish article, while our mines of British Columbia are shut down.

Now, I take it that the government, in asking power to place a duty of $7 a ton on steel rails, have placed themselves on record as willing to assist a new industry under special conditions. There could not be a stronger special case made out than has been made out on behalf of our lead industry. It is an exceptionally special case ; but the hon. Minister of Finance stated, as the reason why he had practically differentiated between the steel rail industry and the lead industry, that to have afforded the relief asked for the lead industry would have necessitated interfering with a great many other items in the tariff. That may be true ; but let us see if that is a good reason. Having once placed themselves on record as adopting the principle of assisting a new industry under special circumstances, and having applied it to a certain case, under special circumstances, I contend that they should apply the same principle to the second case of special circumstances. The fact that the application of the principle to the second case may involve a little more trouble in working it out, does not, to my mind, affect the question. The point is, is the principle established ? If it is, they should apply it in all similar cases, even if one case involves a little more difficulty than another.

In a country such as Canada is—a growing country, a country of great possibilities, a country where the conditions are changing with wonderful rapidity from year to year, and even in shorter periods—I think no government should lay down any hard and fast policy that must govern everything. I think there should be elasticity in the policy of every government. I think special circumstances should be dealt with specially, apart from any fixed principle or policy. If there is justice in the demand, justice should be done. It is all very well for an old country like England to adopt hard and fast rules of policy. It is different in Canada, where conditions are not settled, but where they are constantly changing, and those conditions should be met by any government in power, be it Liberal or Conservative.

Taking into consideration the sums of money which have been invested in that industry in that country, considering the importance of that industry, not alone to British Columbia but to the North-west Territories as well, it seems to me to call for some energetic action on the part of the government. There is no other industry, not even the mining of other precious metals which so effects the entire province as does the industry of silver lead mining. Not only does the whole province feel the evil effects of the condition now prevailing, but those evil effects are also visited on the North-west Territories. No doubt the territories are prosperous at present, and I hope that they will long continue so. There is a large immigration pouring into them, but we must not lose sight of the fact that, right at their threshold in the province of British Columbia do they find their natural market for their agricultural products. That province furnishes a very good market for the products of the farm and the ranch. We require large quantities of butter, cheese, hay, oats, cattle, hogs and various other products of the farm and the ranch, and these we get from the North-west Territories. Thus the territories find in our province a remunerative market, and they are backing us up in our application. We have received endorsation from numerous boards of trade throughout the territories and also from the boards of trade of the city of Winnipeg and other places in the province of Manitoba. Aye, Mr. Speaker, we have even received the support of the boards of trade in many parts of Ontario. So that we are not standing alone. We alone are not affected, but other provinces share in our loss, and that surely ought to appeal to the favourable consideration of this government. Seven years ago I found this silver mining district, which, a very few years before, had been a solitary wild, a business centre and hum of industry. The bustle of life and business was evident everywhere. Prospectors, miners, investors, business men were pouring in from all quarters, putting their capital into the country, either in mining or business venture. Mining camps, villages, towns and ambitious cities were springing up with incredible rapidity. Times were good, everybody was prospering, and the people naturally looked to a continuance of this condition. All the indications pointed to that district as being a profitable one for the investment of capi-

tal, and the people invested largely. But if the present conditions of affairs is to continue, if there is to be no help for us, what does it mean? It means ruin to every one of those business men who invested their money there, and there are numerous towns in that silver lead district in which vast sums have been invested. The mine owners may close down their mines and leave the country. But the merchant, the man who has his money invested in business, cannot do that. There are bills to meet, and there are vast sums of money sunk in stores and buildings, which, if abandoned, will be irredeemably lost. It was suggested, however, by the hon. Minister of Finance—and that I confess is a ray of hope to me—that there would be some readjustment with regard to bounty and that a bounty would take the place of a duty. Well, I was pleased to hear the hon. minister say so, and I hope that the bounty will be a liberal one. An adequate bounty would tide us over our difficulties for a time until the government could see its way clear to give us at least a fair, proportionate and reasonable adjustment of duties, so that our lead products, at all events, would be on the same basis as other products of Canada.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the government decides to grant us a bonus, I wish to point out that if it is to be of any practical value, it will have to be an adequate one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. A sufficient bonus, a liberal bonus.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GALLIHER. There are two things we should not lose sight of in this connection. I wish you, Sir, to bear in mind that the province of British Columbia contributes to the Dominion treasury more per capita than any other province and three times as much per capita as the average of the other provinces. I would also point out that it contributes in revenue to the coffers of this Dominion some $2,000,000 per annum more than is expended in that province. I do not mention this to say that it should be the policy of the government to expend in any one province all the money paid into its treasury by that province. But I merely wish to show that in asking for a large bonus, the province of British Columbia is not drawing from the revenue or resources of any other province of the Dominion. Some two years ago there was an Act placed on the statutes providing for the payment of a bounty for refining lead. The purpose of this was to have our home product refined at home, that it might not be sent abroad to San Francisco or some other point, and freight charges and smelting charges paid upon it. That bounty ran for five years, and was $5 per ton for the first year, $4 per ton for the second year, $3 per ton for the third year, $2 per ton for the fourth year, and $1 per ton for the fifth year, but in no year might the bounty exceed $100,000. In order to gain the whole bounty the first year, it would have been necessary that 20,000 tons of lead should be mined in Canada. That bounty, so far, has cost very little to the country from the fact that the establishment of refineries cost considerable money. The only parties who took advantage of it was the Canadian Pacific Refining Company at Trail, a town near the silver lead mining district. They have expended some $40,000 or $50,000 in a plant, and in an experiment in refining lead which was then tried for the first time outside a laboratory. The system experimented with has been demonstrated to be successful. It is known as the electrolytic system. The plant at the present time is capable only of turning out some 8,000 or 10,000 tons per annum. When the mining conditions again become normal in British Columbia, that plant will have to be largely increased. In view of the fact that the company have shown enterprise and have introduced this new system which is successful, and is in furtherance of science, and in view of the fact that probably only about $10,000 of the bonus for the year ending 30th June, has been earned, I would ask that the time be extended for a year, within which they may earn bounty at the rate of $5 per ton. Now, this bounty that already exists and the bounty that we propose asking must be treated separately. It will not answer the purpose of the producer of lead for us merely to have a modification in some way of the existing bounty paid to the refiner. What we will ask for, what we shall require in order that this industry may be stimulated by way of bounty, will be a bounty payable directly to the producer of the lead. Here is the man to whom, we claim, if we are to receive assistance, by way of a bounty, that bounty must be paid. Taking the average price of lead for the last twenty years, and taking our settlement at the London prices, it brings to the producer about $1.75 per hundred weight. By the closest and most careful figuring, the gentlemen who have had the matter in hand have decided that it is impossible for the mine owners in that district, outside of a very few whose quota would be small, to operate their mines successfully for less than a return of $2.50 per hundred weight for their lead. So, allowing for the price of $1.75, the bonus should be such as would give to the producer the difference between $1.75 and $2.50, or 75 cents per hundred weight, or $15 per ton. That is the bonus that will be asked. I may say that, since the speech of the Finance Minister was published throughout the country, I have received numerous telegrams, and resolutions from boards of trade both in the territories and throughout the entire province of Brit-

ish Columbia, urging upon me that I should ask the government to reconsider the question of the adjustment of duties, so far as lead is concerned. I am only a young parliamentarian, and I do not know whether this can be done or not. I see no reason why not. At all events, I am going to ask that it be done, that the Minister of Finance reconsider the question in regard to the readjustment of the duties and the bonus to be given us. As to duties, I will only ask them to touch one item, this item of corroded lead. We are assured by two separate concerns that, if a duty of 30 per cent is put on corroded lead, they are prepared to establish corroded works in the east here. If they do so—and they are responsible people—it means the establishment of a new industry in Canada, the expenditure of money in Canada, and the employment of labour in Canada ; and it means the securing the white or corroded lead market for the Canadian producer of lead. It is something, I think, worthy of consideration. And if it is possible or in accordance with the rules to reconsider that and bring it down by way of what we may term a supplementary budget, I would ask the Finance Minister and the government to do so. We in that country are placed in a position where, if adequate relief is not afforded us, either in one way or another, we can see the destruction of those erstwhile live businesslike towns that have sprung up in that country. We do not want that to occur. The people of my district are extremely excited over the matter as it is now ; and I urge in all earnestness upon the government and, if the government bring in any measure of relief I will urge in all earnestness upon the members of the House, to give this matter all due consideration. I hope I have made it clear enough that we are in dire need of assistance in one way or the other in regard to that great industry. We do not wish to see an industry of such magnitude perish ; we do not wish to see our country supplied with the products of other countries while we have within our own border an industry of this kind more than capable of supplying our wants. I care not how the government reach it, so long as they reach it.

Now I have done with the lead question, and before closing I wish to call the attention of the government to another matter. We have in my district, in what is known as the Kelowna valley, along the shores of Lake Okanagan, in Yale county, one of the finest tobacco growing districts in Canada. It has been demonstrated that we have in that district 10,000 acres of tobacco land, capable of producing 8,000,000 pounds of tobacco leaf, an article equal in every respect to the best tobacco grown in the United States and imported by Canada. In respect of that matter, I am asking the government to do two things. First, repeal an Order in Council which was passed in June, 1901, allowing factories importing foreign leaf into Canada a rebate of ten cents per pound on foreign leaf cuttings exported from Canada. The meaning of that is this : When factories using foreign leaf import quantities of the same into Canada there is a duty payable thereon, and when they export from Canada the cuttings of this foreign leaf they receive from the government a rebate of ten cents per pound. Now that is all very well if you want to encourage the importation of foreign tobacco, or if you want to discriminate against Canadian grown tobacco. But when we have demonstrated that we grow in that Kelowna valley tobacco equal to the best imported from the United States, and that that industry is not expanding simply because we cannot sell a pound of our tobacco to those factories that import the foreign tobacco, then something should be done ; and we call for the repeal of that Order in Council, that iniquitous order, which discriminates against our own product and hampers our own industries. They will not buy from us, because if they do they will not get a rebate on the cuttings. Why should we close the door of these factories to the producer of the home grown article ? This question affects the county of Kent, the county of Essex, and all other counties in Canada that grow tobacco. Our tobacco leaf has been pronounced by experts, both from the United States and from Toronto and Montreal, in fact all the leading cities of Canada where tobacco is used, equal to the best grade of American tobacco. Last year I think something like 60,000 pounds only was grown in our district ; between 60,000 pounds and 8,000,000 pounds there is, as you will see, a good margin to work on. I, therefore, ask that this Order in Council of 1901 be repealed, so that we may be in a position to sell to all the factories in Canada. I will read an extract from a letter of one of the largest tobacco growers in the Kelowna valley :

> Samples of the tobacco I now have in stock have been shown to all the largest manufacturers in Montreal, London, Toronto, &c., and declared by them to be equal to anything grown in the United States, but in face of this Order in Council I am unable to sell to any foreign leaf factory. To one firm, an actual sale of 6,000 pounds at excellent prices was made, provided it could be taken into the factory free of duty. They ascertained that this could be done, but if they took it in, the rebate on their cuttings would be lost. As their annual rebate amounted to more than the value of the tobacco, the deal of course fell through. I have tried factory after factory with the same result. In no case has any exception been taken to the quality of the leaf, its exclusion is due solely to this Order in Council, and as long as it is in force we shall practically be debarred from selling to foreign factories.

Now, I say there is something that can be remedied without interfering with the tariff, and the remedy should be applied at once.

It is an injustice to our tobacco growers in Canada, it is a discrimination against our tobacco growers in Canada, it is an encouragement of the importation of the foreign product, when we can produce the leaf of equal quality in our own country.

The next thing I want to ask is that only one license stamp be used, allowing all manufacturers to use the domestic and foreign leaf in any proportion they please. I understand by a ruling of the Department of Inland Revenue that the domestic leaf is allowed into factories free of duty. So far so good. But I would ask that this distinguishing stamp be taken off. Originally there were two licenses issued, one for factories in which nothing but foreign leaf was used in the manufacture of cigars. That particular license was accompanied by a gray stamp. A gray inland revenue stamp was the distinguishing mark, showing that that tobacco had been imported from some foreign country and was manufactured solely from imported leaf. The other license was what was known as a domestic license for domestic factories, in which cigars were manufactured entirely from domestic leaf, the distinguished stamp being green. But as Canadian growers gained experience, after they had brought their tobacco leaf up to a high standard, a third license was issued for combination factories, which allowed the manufacturer to make cigars partly from the domestic and partly from the imported tobacco, so long as not less than 25 per cent of the one was used in it. This amount of 25 per cent was afterwards reduced, and is now ten per cent of either domestic or imported, the distinguishing stamp being red. Now what is the object? We have in Canada a tobacco leaf equal to any that can be imported from the United States. What is the necessity of having a different coloured stamp on our cigar boxes? Some claim that the stamp merely marks it as Canadian tobacco, or as combination tobacco, or as all imported tobacco. I do not think one smoker in a hundred knows anything about that. He knows what brand of cigars he likes, he buys them and he smokes them; and I claim that the use of this distinguishing mark is practically black-eying our own products, and encouraging the public to buy an article imported from foreign countries.

Now, if the object is to protect the smoker, as it more nearly affects him, do these distinguishing marks in any way protect the smoker? We all know that there are as many grades of imported cigars as there are of domestic cigars. They range in price all the way from probably $20 or $30 per thousand to $120 per thousand. There are all these different grades and they all bear the same stamp. Is there any protection in it for the smoker? No. You buy a certain brand of cigar and smoke it and if you do not like it you try another brand. The smoker is perfectly capable of taking care of himself and if the using of these different stamps has the effect of stamping the Canadian product as inferior in any way to the imported product, then, these stamps should be removed and we should have a uniform stamp placed on all cigars manufactured in Canada. Now, I discussed this matter with the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) and he seemed to anticipate that there would be some difficulty in bringing this about; there may be; still I leave the matter to the consideration of the government. I think, myself, and I think any man who will reason it out will come to the same conclusion, that we should not either stamp our goods or exclude the sale of our goods in any factory in Canada to the betterment of the American product and the encouragement and building up of the industry in the United States or any other country.

Mr. WILSON. Come over; we will take you.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not travelling.

Mr. WILSON. You might as well.

Mr. GALLIHER. Let us consider for a moment the effect which this system has. Hon. gentlemen know how great the industry is in the United States. I do not know much about the conditions in Essex, or Kent, or in other counties in the east where tobacco is grown, but I do know what we are capable of producing in the west. I know the area that we have that is available for the growing of tobacco and I know that so soon as the conditions are made such that the people have a free hand and can act freely that industry will be started and will be prosecuted to the fullest extent. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, leave these two matters to the consideration of the government. The more vital one is certainly that of the lead ore mining industry. The other, I consider, also, of great importance and I hope that if the government decide not to in any way interfere in regard to the adjustment of the tariff on lead at the present session they will not allow another session to go by without giving us the relief that we ask for.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher), who has just taken his seat, is entitled to the fullest sympathy of both sides of the House. He has made, certainly, a very strong appeal on behalf of British Columbia industries. He has pointed out to the government the mistakes they have made in dealing with that province, and so far as I am concerned, I must say that I deeply sympathize with him in the position in which he finds himself placed. When the hon. gentleman began his address, or very shortly afterwards, I noticed that not a single Minister of the Crown was to be found in the Chamber.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was here.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not so. The hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is very rarely absent indeed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding). It is not very important, but I may say that I was not out of the Chamber at any moment when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) was addressing the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister was in the gallery.

Mr. HENDERSON. I know quite well where the hon. minister was; he was concealed behind a post in the upper gallery feeling quite sure that the bullets of lead with which he knew the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo was loaded would not hit him because the pillar was between him and the hon. gentleman.

Mr. COWAN. He was in good company.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo tells the House that the budget speech was very nice, that it was very rosy, and that he was delighted with it. No doubt, when he heard of the enormous surpluses that we had during the past year and in prospect for the current year he fully expected that British Columbia would receive some kind of fair treatment, but, lo and behold, he said that at the end of that speech there was a bitter pill for British Columbia. Well, Sir, that hon. gentleman does not seem to be alone in finding bitter pills in the budget speech of the hon. Minister of Finance. We find yesterday the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) bewailed the fact that the salt industry in his town had received no consideration from the government. He was a protectionist on salt but possibly on nothing else. I do not like to characterize the hon. gentleman as a parish politician, but I have not very much regard for those protectionists who are simply protectionists in a local way. I believe that we should have the same policy for the whole country and for all the industries in the country. If the hon. gentleman was right in his contention that the salt industry should receive the paternal care of the government, why would he refuse that paternal care to other industries which were all of just equal importance and perhaps of very much greater importance? The hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) stands along with the hon. member for Yale in his constituency. Thousands of people are engaged in the production of vegetables for the market in Toronto and elsewhere. That hon. gentleman, when last returned to this House, I believe, secured his election by his pledge to secure for those people additional protection for that important industry. Yet, we find him here, to use an expression of his own, like a bump on a log, saying nothing at all and leaving his constituents to suffer whilst the government takes no action in regard to the matter. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has become a protectionist for the cream separator manufacturers. Where is he going to be when the resolution moved by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is voted upon? Is he going to declare that the cream separator manufacturers of Guelph are not entitled to adequate protection. I question very much if he would not prefer being outside of the Chamber when the vote is taken, even if he should only be in the gallery. Then we had the member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) appealing on behalf of the town of Brantford and its industries. Binder twine has given him a large amount of trouble, and the government thinks they have fairly met him, with the slight aid of three-eights of one cent a pound, whilst if our Brantford factory would send a pound of twine to the United States they would be met with a duty of two cents a pound. Then we had the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Galliher) appealing on behalf of the lead industry and the tobacco industry in his section of the country, for some material assistance. If I remember aright, we had the member for Alberta (Mr. Davis) anxious that a duty should be placed upon horses or at any rate that an increased valuation should be put on horses so that the duty as it at present exists could be made effective in protecting the horse breeders of the west. But I was rather amazed at the member for Yale (Mr. Galliher). I was amazed at how well he enjoyed the bitter pill that was given him by the government. He said he had hopes. Well, there is an old saying about living in hope and dying in despair, and I am afraid that will be the lot of the member for Yale. It is no new thing to hear this appeal from British Columbia for assistance to the mining industry, but year after year goes on and the government declares that there is no necessity for doing anything for that province, because they know perfectly well that the member for Yale and others of his kidney will give them their support through thick and thin.

I was much pleased indeed at the reference which the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) made in his budget speech to the postal revenue of this country, and there was probably a good reason why the Minister of Finance should refer to it. His duty is to give a fair statement of the revenues and expenditures and I was pleased at his reference to that service because to a certain extent it corrected the statement that had gone abroad in the country—not with the intention of misleading any one I must suppose—that the Post Office Department had been so well administered that it actually showed a surplus of revenue over expenditure. The friends of the government throughout the country spoke of this with

great delight and great pleasure. It was the one department that showed anything like economy, and they held it up to the people as an evidence on the part of the government of a desire to fulfil their pledges as to economy. Be that as it may I fail to see why continued reference should be made to it in a budget debate. My opinion, and I think that opinion is well founded because I have carefully investigated the matter; my opinion is that any decrease in the deficit of the Post Office Department has been brought about simply by starving the service. Men are to-day performing duties under the Postmaster General at starvation wages. It is unfair in a country like this that men should be called on to discharge such duties for the miserable pittance they receive. I refer more especially to the country postmasters, and to the mail carriers as well who have arduous duties to perform and who as a rule are not sufficiently paid. I have said, and I am prepared to back up my statement with substantial proof, that this starvation of the service alone is responsible for the alleged saving in the Post Office Department. On June 30, 1891, there were 8,061 post offices in operation in Canada, and in 1896 when the Conservative government left power there were 9,103 or an increase in the five years of 1,042 post offices, or an average yearly increase of 208. Let us compare this with the conditions under the present government. On the 30th of June, 1902, there were 9,958 post offices in Canada or an increase of only 855 over the number in 1896, as against an increase in the last five years of Conservative rule of 1,042. There was an average increase during the regime of the Liberal government of only 142 per year compared with 208 per year during the last five years of the Conservative government. We have heard of the new areas that have been opened up recently to settlement in the North-west and in New Ontario, and during these past five or six years there must have been much more numerous demands for increased postal facilities than there were during the previous five years, but notwithstanding that, we find that the people of Canada are left without postal conveniencies simply in order that one member of the administration may be able to say that he had administered his department with only a small loss. Had the same rate of increased accommodation been given to the people of Canada during the last six years that had been given during the last five years of the Conservative regime, we would have to-day 400 more post offices opened in the Dominion of Canada than we have at present. Now, Sir, if we have large surpluses; if we have money to burn, how could we spend it better than in providing comforts, conveniencies and accommodation for our people, and I know of no way in which public money can be spent to better advantage than in giving the people of the country better post office facilities.

With reference to the financial statement of the Minister of Finance I intend to have very little to say. I congratulate hon. members who have preceded me, during the latter part of the debate especially, on the new policy of short speeches in this House, and I intend to-night not to break that, which I regard as a very wholesome rule.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. Therefore, any references which I shall make to the finances of the country shall be brief. We were told by the Finance Minister that during the current year he expects to have a revenue of $65,000,000. That seems to be a very large sum, and yet I have no doubt that the estimate is fairly correct. Last year the revenue amounted to about $58,000,000, so that we are to have an increase of about $7,000,000 during the current year. The minister's anticipated expenditure on consolidated revenue account for the current year is $51,650,000, leaving, as he says, a surplus of revenue over expenditure of $13,350,000. I have said before in this House that I do not like that style of putting the matter, because it goes to the country that the government have a surplus of $13,350,000, and I venture to say that there are a large number of people in the Dominion of Canada who actually believe that the government will have a surplus of that amount for the current year after meeting all the expenses of the country. However, the hon. Minister of Finance did not mislead the House in that respect, because he informed us that he anticipated that the capital expenditure of the country this year would be about $10,000,000. What I object to is the system of keeping two accounts instead of only one. I believe that the time has come in this country when it would be better in the interest of all concerned—better in the interest of the government, better certainly in the interest of the people, by enabling them to have a fairer understanding of the real condition of our finances—that the capital account should be expunged from the public accounts of the country, and everything should be entered in one ledger.

Speaking of this surplus reminds me that not only is there a division among the hon. gentlemen who sit behind the government, but it seems to me there is a great difference of opinion between the hon. gentlemen themselves who form the government. Why have we had no tariff revision this year? I apprehend that a very strong reason is that there are some very ardent free traders in the cabinet, and also some pretty strong protectionists; and it was quite impossible for the First Minister to get these two discordant elements together, and consequently they concluded that it was better to do nothing and allow the country to suffer.

The hon. Minister of Finance boasts of the surplus. Well, what do his friends say about it? I turn up the 'Hansard' of 1883, when Sir Leonard Tilley had a large surplus. Hon. gentlemen opposite were at that time on the opposite side of the House from him, and they very fully and very freely expressed their opinions. I find that the present hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) made a statement which, if applied to the position of the hon. Minister of Finance at the present time, would indicate that these two hon. gentlemen are divided in their opinion on the question of the surplus as well as their friends behind them on the question of protection. The hon. Minister of Customs said then :

> When the government find that they have beyond a doubt a surplus, when they can calculate with certainty on having one, it is their bounden duty to reduce taxation.

That was the opinion of the hon. Minister of Customs in 1883. Has he changed that opinion? Was he wrong then, or is he right to-day? He has not expressed himself yet. Possibly, when he addresses the House he may repeat his speech of 1883, because we have reason to believe that there are divisions in the Cabinet, and they may possibly come to the front, as have those existing among the hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Cabinet. The hon. Minister of Customs also said in 1883 :

> It is no part of the duty of a Finance Minister to extract more money out of the pockets of the people than is absolutely needed to carry on the affairs of the country.

What does the hon. Finance Minister think of his colleague? There is no doubt that he has been able to extract a very large sum from the pockets of the people, for which he has no possible use in carrying on the affairs of the country. He boasts of having a surplus of $13,350,000. What does that mean? It means that he has been tax-gathering, that he has been taking all the money he could get from the people without considering whether it is necessary or not. The whole machinery of the Finance Department seems to have got out of gear. It just runs haphazard ; it apparently runs itself ; there is no check on it. If it grinds out a surplus, all right ; if it grinds out a deficit, all right. The minister seems to have no comprehension of what will be the result ; but come good or come ill, of course his friends behind him cheer and applaud.

Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that during the latter years of the regime of the Hon. Mr. Foster he had a deficit. That is very true ; but Mr. Foster was a financier, and considered the interests of the country. It was not necessary that Mr. Foster should have had a deficit—not at all ; he could have avoided it. In 1891, by a single stroke of his pen, as it were, he struck off $20,000,000 of duty from raw sugar, which would otherwise have been collected during the five years from 1891 to 1896, in order to enable the country to tide over the depression that was setting in at that time. Of course his action left him with a deficit ; but it was wise legislation, because it was better that that $20,000,000 should be left in the pockets of the people during those five years than that Mr. Foster should have extracted it from the pockets of the people simply to enable him to boast before the country that he had a surplus.

Last night, while the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was speaking, the hon. Minister of Customs interjected the statement that Mr. Foster had put back the sugar duty. Very true ; he did so to a slight extent. Mr. Foster took off the entire duty from raw sugar ; but he found during the course of the five years that he had overstepped the mark, and in order to restore the equilibrium between revenue and expenditure he put back half a cent duty on raw sugar, and had Mr. Foster remained Finance Minister of this country, he would no doubt have removed that half cent, because the policy of the Conservative party was that we should have free raw sugar. That was a part of the National Policy, and it was only departed from when the necessities of the country called for a duty for the purposes of revenue. We all know that a duty was never put on raw sugar for any other purpose than revenue. It was not put on for a protective purpose ; it would be absurd to say so, because we had no raw sugar in this country to protect ; and I say still that the true policy at the present time, while the revenue is buoyant, and while we have no need of these enormous surpluses, is that the people of this country should be given cheap sugar—cheaper than it is at the present time. We have no right at present to take $2,000,000 per year out of the pockets of the people, by a tariff on raw sugar, when such a tax is not called for. But you may say : What about the beet root sugar industry which is calling for protection? If you remove the duty from raw sugar, you interfere very materially with that young industry started in Ontario more particularly, which province is especially adapted for the growing of beets. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest a remedy which, I think, will be far more effectual than any duty or increase of duty on raw sugar. The quantity of sugar that would be produced in Canada in years to come would be a comparatively small quantity compared with the large amount of 400,000,000 pounds consumed in this country. The total produced in this country would not be more than a tenth of that, and I would say : Give the people their raw sugar free, but give to every farmer who will grow the beets, a respectable bounty per ton, in order to aid this growing industry. I believe that that would be the true policy to adopt, and that a

bounty on the one-tenth part of the sugar consumed in this country would be very small compared with the tax we are paying on the 400,000,000 pounds which we are consuming at present. I would give the people cheap sugar, but I would assist by a bounty the farming community in the districts where beet sugar may be produced; the growing of which has ceased to be profitable in the province of Ontario. Our farmers will tell you that. In our province we do not eat bread made from the flour ground from our own wheat, but largely from the flour we import from Manitoba. Consequently the growing of wheat in Ontario is not as profitable as it was. The cattle industry is also showing signs of failure, and practically our Ontario farmers have now only two industries on which they can rely—dairying and hog raising; and they are attempting to supplement these industries by the introduction of a new one, that of producing their own sugar. I, therefore, hope that the government will see its way clear to give an adequate bounty in order that this new industry may be assisted and become a success in the province of Ontario, and the other provinces where it may be started.

We have heard a great deal in this debate about the reduction of taxation, but I must confess that, in my examination of the tariff and its results, as shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns, I am at a loss to find where this boasted reduction in taxation comes in. I find that the average rate of taxation is just about what it was under the Conservative regime. I do not consider that there is one-hundredth part of a cent difference to-day between the average rate of taxation in the first five years of Liberal rule and the last five years of Conservative rule. Any one who will take the trouble to investigate and make a fair comparison will find such to be the case, and that is just what the hon. Minister of Finance intended. He told us three years ago that he never intended to reduce taxation. Let me quote his own words:

> It was of the utmost importance that we should maintain a strong financial position and in view of the uncertainties as to the amount of revenue that might be produced by this lower rate of taxation it became necessary that we should take some steps to make good any possible loss that might result. It was thought that it might fairly be met by providing for the raising of some additional taxation in order to balance, or make good, the loss occasioned by the reduction of duties. . . . . It was necessary to have an increased revenue in certain directions when we were to lose revenue in other directions.

That policy the hon. gentleman carried out. He simply has taken off something here and put something on there, but unfortunately he has upset the trade of the country by the unfair way in which he has balanced up the revenue. For example he taxes the workingman heavily on sugar.

Mr. TAYLOR. And tobacco.

Mr. HENDERSON. And enormously on tobacco. Perhaps those who use tobacco may not receive very much sympathy, but they are as much entitled to fair treatment from the government as any other class.

Then, under the operation of the preferential tariff, many industrial institutions of this country have been very seriously injured, but apparently the only object which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has in view is to raise a revenue, irrespective of the interests of the country. To-night, for instance, we had the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Galliher) charging the government with paying no attention to British Columbia and not caring how the mines of that province might suffer so long as the government collected 30 per cent on everything the people used out there. I might give you any number of figures to bear out the facts I have stated, but I shall confine myself to giving a recapitulation of the average rates of taxation in the various years:

In 1892	the average taxation	was..	17.56
In 1893	"	"	.. 17.38
In 1894	"	"	.. 17.13
In 1895	"	"	.. 16.99
In 1896	"	"	.. 18.28

In the five years, the average rate was 17·46 on goods coming into this country, dutiable and free.

Compare this with the first five years of Liberal rule. I shall not take the table set out in the Trade and Navigation Returns, because the Minister of Finance has told us that he disagrees with the Minister of Customs, and that that table is not correct. I have therefore corrected it so as to make it conform with the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The hon. Finance Minister told us some years ago that it was only fair we should eliminate from our imports the amount of corn which passed through this country in transit. And in order to make the calculation fair, I have done so, and I find this result:

The average rate of taxation on goods entered for consumption was as follows:

In 1898..	18.34
In 1899..	18.14
In 1900..	16.96
In 1901..	17.25
In 1902..	16.60

And the average for the five years is 17·46 against an average of 17·46 for the last five years of Conservative rule. So that the Finance Minister has not reduced taxation one whit. It remains just where it was except that there is this difference. Under the national tariff, the taxation was so arranged as to benefit the industries in this country, whereas now it has the opposite effect. Now the duties are so adjusted as to press the harder on the people, because while a man has to pay a higher taxation, he does not receive the

help of the government in order to enable him the better to prosecute his business.

The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) I thought, went somewhat out of his way this afternoon to show what the government has done for the farmers. I say he went somewhat out of his way, because the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) told us that it was absolutely impossible for the government to protect the farmers. So here is a queer difference between these two gentlemen, one holding strongly to the opinion that the farmer cannot be protected, the other holding as strongly to the opinion that the government had been protecting the farmer. I turned up the report of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) for 1897, the first year of the Liberal government. The report was written and printed very shortly after hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. I turned to this report in order to find out for myself practically who it was that established cold storage in this country. I think it is only fair that I should read an extract from that report, for I am under the impression that many people in this country are a little mistaken on this question. This report gives what the Minister of Agriculture had to say in 1897, before he became contaminated with these extraordinary ideas which seem to prevail on the other side. This is when he came in fresh from the farm. For you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture is a farmer, a practical farmer, an innocent youth, who, at this time was just off the farm and did not know how to misrepresent a thing, but told the facts as he found them. An hon. gentleman beside me remarks that he was green. I did not think he was. I think he was all right. He came from the farm and showed the honesty of a farmer. It is somewhat remarkable, after all the boasting I have heard of the Minister of Agriculture being a farmer that, a very short time ago, he called to his assistance, as chief executive officer of his department, a lawyer. Has the hon. gentleman lost confidence in himself ? Has he lost confidence in the ability of a farmer to administer that department ? Has the department given him a great deal of trouble ? Or what is the difficulty that has caused him to call in a lawyer in this way ? I have here what he said in his innocent youthful days when he was fresh from the farm and could not tell anything but the truth.

A cold storage service for the safe carriage of butter was begun in 1895.

Who were in power in 1895 ? Why the Conservatives.

Arrangements were made whereby refrigerator cars for carrying butter were run during the summer on the main lines of railways leading into Montreal. These cars were used to pick up small lots of butter as offered at the different railway stations. Shippers by these cars were allowed to ship butter at the usual 'less than car-load rates,' without any charge for icing or special service. As far as space permitted, merchants were allowed to use these cars for the shipment of dairy and creamery butter between points at which the cars touched. During 1895 cars were run for at least part of the season on the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific railways.

Arrangements were also made for the chilling of fresh-made creamery butter at the warehouses of the Montreal Cold Storage and Freezing Company, Montreal.

Arrangements were made for the fitting up of insulated and refrigerator chambers on steamships from Montreal to Avonmouth, Liverpool and Glasgow. The chambers were constructed to thoroughly insulate——

Observe the word 'thoroughly' and contrast it with what the hon. gentleman said :—

—their contents, and thus prevent them from being heated during the voyage by any rise of temperature outside the chamber. Galvanized iron cylinders were filled with ice to cool the interior of the chamber and the outside of the packages of the butter, in so far as they were heated during the cartage from the cold storage warehouses to the steamships.

And I find that, during the shipping season of 1894 there were exported from the port of Montreal 32,055 packages of butter. In 1895 the shipments were 69,664 packages and in 1896, 157,321 packages. And yet we listened this afternoon for upwards of half an hour to the hon. member for Glengarry trying to convince this House that the present government had established the cold storage system. I wonder that if, even today, after seven years, when the cold storage system is much better understood than in 1895, they have a very much better system than was established by the former government. I think that Dr. Montague, the former Minister of Agriculture is entitled to the credit of establishing that boon to the people of this country—cold storage. It is like everything else that has been inaugurated for the benefit of the farmers—it emanated from the Conservative party. Now, the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) is willing that the farmers should pay an increased price for salt in order to benefit the town of Clinton where he chances to reside, because he wants adequate protection on salt. But I do not know whether it is for the manufacturer he wants it or for the farmer. It is the farmer who must pay the increased price if there is an increase; but, he would not need to pay it, because he could still buy his Canadian salt. And I have no doubt that he could get that salt just as cheaply if the duty were doubled. In fact, I believe that if the duty were doubled the Canadian farmer would buy his salt cheaper. In that respect, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) is a sound protectionist, he has the right principle; but he does not want to apply it to anything but salt. If he would apply it to woollen goods and cotton goods

and others, we would welcome him on this side, and would be glad to see him advocate so sound a policy for this country with that ability which does him credit. We are told by some hon. gentlemen opposite that the farmers cannot be protected. My opinion is that the farmers are protected. Some may have different ideas of protection from my own. But in my opinion to protect an industry does not mean to put it in a position to demand a higher price. To protect the farmer or to protect the woollen or cotton manufacturers is to give the market of this country to the farmer or to the manufacturer. You protect the farmers of this country when you give them the market of the country. For instance, we put a duty of thirty-five per cent on mutton, and that keeps American mutton out. Last year only $2,879 worth of mutton and lamb came into this country. The whole market of Canada with this exception was kept for the farmers of this country. That was 'adequate protection,' if hon. gentlemen opposite want to know what adequate protection is. Of fresh meats other than lamb and mutton we imported $38,198 worth. On this article there is a duty of three cents a pound.

Well, I think that three cents a pound is fairly adequate protection on an article that costs about six cents a pound. It is very good protection, and that is the protection that we believe in giving the farmers of this country. Not that we say for one moment that we are going to help the farmer to get two prices for his article, that is not the meaning of it; but we say we will put a Chinese wall right round this country, and we will not allow these Americans to come in here and monopolize the markets of this country when they do not contribute anything towards the expenses of this country. The Canadian farmer is entitled to this market, and we put that duty on to enable him to get this market, and to retain it. Pork, two cents a pound. I do not think that is adequate protection, because there were $561,414 worth of pork brought in. I believe the minister will be wise if he increases that duty to three cents and gives the Canadian farmers adequate protection. Pickled beef or barrelled beef, $77,554 worth imported. The farmers are fairly well protected on that article. The market is fairly well held by the farmers of this country. Bacon and hams, only two cents a pound. I do not think the protection is adequate. If it were made three cents we might exclude a very large amount of this $635,831 worth of bacon and ham that came in, and which we could produce in this country just as good, and, I believe a great deal better than that we get from the other side. Butter, $160,459. The farmer of this country is protected to the extent of four cents a pound. That is the duty put on to prevent the American farmer from coming into this country, and it is fairly successful in giving the farmers of this country the market of Canada. Of cheese, $31,368 worth came in under a protection of three cents. If three cents a pound is not sufficient, I would say add more. It will not increase the price of cheese in this country, because what signifies $31,368 worth compared with all the cheese that is consumed in Canada and all that is exported out of the country. That three cents a pound on cheese has no effect whatever on the price of cheese to the consumer. It does not enhance it to the thousandth part of a cent, but it does give the farmer in this country all the market we have for cheese, and that is what the farmer has a right to ask. Flour, $144,714 worth at 60 cents a barrel. I regret that the present government when they came into power to revise the tariff, interfered with the duty on flour. Formerly it was 75 cents a barrel, and they reduced it to 60 cents, and it remains at that figure still. Wheat, formerly 15 cents, reduced to 12 cents, and yet $89,470 worth of wheat came into this country. What, bring American wheat into this country? Cannot Ontario and the great North-west furnish all the wheat that is necessary to feed the people of Canada? Why should we even admit this small amount of $89,407 worth. I say the duty should be high enough to give the entire market to the people of this country. Oats, $67,223 worth came in under a protection of 10 cents a bushel, a fairly good protection. Pease, 10 cents a bushel, $15,119 worth came in.

Now, going over the list, I take it that the farmers of this country are fairly well protected so far as holding the market of Canada is concerned, and that is one of the objects of agricultural protection. No man ever dreamed that you were going to give the farmers $2 a bushel for his wheat, no man ever dreamed that you were going to give him 50 cents a bushel more than it is worth. No such idea ever prevailed. But it has occurred in this country, and it may occur again, when farmers do receive more than a normal price for wheat. I remember in 1895, in the month of June, when there was a short crop of wheat in this country, that wheat sold in the city of Toronto for 20 cents a bushel more than it sold for in the city of Liverpool. The advantage that a farmer would get in price is only when a short crop occurs, but as long as there is an abundant supply—which we always hope there will be in Canada—no farmer will expect to get an increased price by slightly raising the protection. But he does get the market. Let me give an illustration how he controls the market. In Manitoba we have enormous grist mills, I think there is one mill in Winnipeg turning out about 3,500 barrels a day. In Minneapolis they have an enormous grist-mill grinding the same quantity of wheat, No. 1 hard. The flour from Minneapolis is shipped to the seaboard, possibly it goes to Boston. The flour from

Winnipeg is also sent to the seaboard, and is possibly exported by way of Boston. Suppose a vessel goes down from Halifax loaded with fish and wants a return cargo. The owner goes to the flour dealer and he says: How do you sell flour, or what flour have you got? He says: I have American flour from Minneapolis, and I have Canadian flour from Winnipeg, both made from No. 1 hard wheat, which will you have? Well, says the shipper, I will take Canadian. Why does he take Canadian? Because he knows too well that when he returns to Halifax the Canadian flour, having been shipped through in bond, comes in free of duty, but if he took American flour he would have to pay 60 cents a barrel to the revenues of the Dominion of Canada before he could get a market for that flour. The duty of 60 cents gives the Canadian farmer the benefit of that market, the benefit of the markets of the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec. It does the same thing in Ontario, because as I told you, in Ontario we do not consume now the products of our own farms.

The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Holmes) says: Absolutely it is impossible to protect the farmer. Well, what do the farmers say themselves? Let us take a look around this House. In 1900 we had a general election, and the tariff was the leading question in the province of Ontario. I am prepared to submit that question to the farmers. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) is an example of what the farmers think of the principle of protection. North Middlesex sends a supporter (Mr. Sherritt) of the Conservative party, instead of a supporter of the hon. gentleman opposite. East Lambton sent another Conservative (Mr. Simmons), who, I regret to say, has not been able, through illness, to be in the House for some time. He replaced a Liberal who formerly sat on the other side of the House. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Thomson) is a living evidence of what the farmers think about protection. My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Richardson) is also an evidence that his constituents favour the same principle. The riding of Lincoln has sent in our friend (Mr. Lancaster), another evidence of what the people of the west think about the principle of protection. South Wentworth (Mr. Smith)—why, you find them all over, the House is filled with them. South Waterloo (Mr. Clare), another evidence. West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) also, he replaces one of the most inveterate Liberals we had in the House, and though he may not perhaps, be just what we would like him to be in the way of protection, I believe that his feelings are with us. But he represents a very critical constituency, and he thinks it is just as well to be fair to all sides. However, I hope that when the vote is taken, his conscience will dictate to him what is right, and I am quite sure he will follow his conscience. East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), another evidence of what the farmers of Ontario think of protection. Stormont, I believe, is another. South Victoria (Mr. Vrooman) is another. What shall I say of West York (Mr. Campbell)? Had it not been for the principle of protection, I do not believe that the present representative would be in the House. Here is what the farmers themselves say. They say the farmer can be protected and they are going to support the party that endorses the principle of adequate protection. Well then, how are you going to protect the farmer? I have been endeavouring to tell you that you protect the farmer by protecting his market. You give him the home market for his commodities. In that way he receives the protection that this parliament can extend to him. So long as we keep the home market for him, we do a great deal. It is our duty as well to find foreign markets for his commodities, but in seeking the foreign market the farmer has to enter into competition with countries, such as Argentina and other wheat producing countries where they have cheap labour, thus placing our famers at a disadvantage. If we can secure the home market in Canada for 80 per cent of the products of the farms of this country, we are doing a great deal for the farmers. It is estimated that the entire product of the farms of Canada is worth about $500,000,000. We exported last year of animals and agricultural products, $100,000,000, in round numbers; therefore, we consumed in Canada $400,000,000 worth of the products of the farms, or 80 per cent were consumed in our own market. Is it not a matter of importance that we should protect that home market that consumes 80 per cent of the products of the farms even if we cannot secure the same character of a market for the other 20 per cent? I say the true policy is to hedge around this country with adequate protection for the farmers and give them all the benefits that can possibly accrue to them by retaining their own market for this large percentage of their output. The city of Montreal has a population of about 267,000 people.

Mr. CASGRAIN. 300,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I take the last census. Perhaps it is 300,000 now. If we consume in Canada $400,000,000 worth of the products of this country we consume on an average $70 per head worth of the products of the farms. Seventy dollars worth of the products of the farms is the average consumption of every man, woman and child in this country. I do not mean to say that each man, woman and child eats $70 worth of food, not by any means, but there are many things that are not produced on the farm such as horses and cattle, hay, and such things that are not being consumed. The average consumption in one year or another of every individual is $70. Let us look at the value of the city of Montreal with all its varied industries. I

need not attempt to enumerate them as there are hon. gentlemen who know them better than I do. That market is worth to the farmers of this country on that basis $18,000,000 and the city of Toronto is a good second. What would the farms of this country be worth if these industrial institutions were blotted out or were hampered or hindered in carrying on their operations? It would simply paralyze this country and destroy its value. I was in the city of Winnipeg in the month of October last. I admired that growing city. I believe it is destined to be a great city. I do not know the present population, but, according to the last census, it was some 42,000. I dare say it is now 50,000, or perhaps more.

Mr. EARLE. 60,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. And I suppose in five or ten years it will have a population of 100,000. I wonder if the people of that country have any fair estimate of the value of the city of Winnipeg to the province of Manitoba? According to the calculation I have made 42,000 people would consume each year $3,000,000 worth of the products of the farms of Manitoba. In five or ten years I believe the population of that city will be doubled, and instead of $3,000,000 worth they will consume $6,000,000 worth of the products of the farms of Manitoba, affording an enormous market. What would the farmers of Manitoba do without a city like Winnipeg and without the other towns that are growing up in that country? They would be compelled to ship out of the country all of their surplus products. They would be compelled to ship out yearly nearly a half million more of their wheat and enormous quantities of the other products that are consumed there. Is it not better to encourage the growth of industries in a place like Winnipeg and encourage the bringing in of a consuming population which is not a producing population, but which will consume the products of the farms of that great province? I may say the people of Manitoba are not alive to their best interests if they for one moment would hesitate in supporting a party that would give them adequate protection, and that would give to every industry that might grow up in Winnipeg adequate protection. Why should these people not make their own agricultural implements, why should they not make their own harness, why should they not make their own boots and shoes, why should they not make their own clothes, why should they not make their own furniture? These are all possibilities and if industries of this kind were instituted there, were supported and were maintained there is no doubt at all that that city would become a very great city and become an enormous market for the products of that province and so enhance the value of every farm within range of that crowded centre. If the people of Manitoba say that they approve of that sort of thing let them send to this parliament representatives who will support the principle of adequate protection, and in due time the capital will go into that country that will be requisite to establish these industries and to give them that market. We have been asked across the floor of the House to state what was meant by adequate protection. I am surprised, I confess, that hon. gentlemen cannot form an adequate opinion of what it means. I think it is very simple indeed. Now, there is an article made in the city of Guelph which is known as a cream separator. There is a very large number of them sold in this country. That article is admitted absolutely free into this country. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) wants protection on salt. Why should he say protect the salt industry and refuse protection to the cream separator industry? To my mind the cream separator industry is just as important to be protected as the salt industry, or as the lead industry. There were imported last year $487,734 worth of cream separators into Canada. There are only two factories, both of them in Guelph making that article. Let me say that the cream separators made in Guelph are equal in every respect as to finish as the foreign made article and taking the same capacity they are as low in price as the article brought in from the United States, or Germany, or Sweden. They are sold alongside of each other. One man buys one, another man buys another. They simply buy a certain separator because a particular agent sells it. There is no particular choice, but, as a matter of fact, there were last year imported into this country about 10,000 cream separators. Let us consider what an advantage it would be to the city of Guelph if the trade of Guelph were extended by the additional labour that would be required to bring about the manufacture of these goods. Ten thousand cream separators will require a very considerable amount of labour. The money that would be paid for the construction of these machines would be paid out again to the workmen of the city of Guelph. These workmen in turn would pay it out to the farmers for their beef, butter, eggs, cheese, potatoes and flour and all the products of the farm. The money goes back to the farmer and he buys his cream separator and pays for it. The money simply keeps circulating; it does not go out of the country and you never see it again, as it would if the farmer bought an American separator, or a German separator, or a Swedish separator. The farmers are alive to this fact and they are beginning to see that their true interests lie in the protection of the industries that brings protection to the farmer. That is one of the ways to protect the farmer. If you want to give the farmer true protection, and all the protection you can give, you will have to surround the industries of this country with

a tariff that will force largely the manufacture of goods in this country, so that the markets of Canada will be increased by the addition of an industrial population who must of necessity live on the products of the farm, and thus enhance the value of the farms.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. That argument applies not only to the cream separator, but it applies to the woollen industry, to the cotton industry and to every industry in this country as well.

Mr. TAYLOR. The agricultural implement industry to ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, the agricultural implement industry as well. The trouble in this country at the present time is that we have too much taxation and too little protection. We simply want the Finance Minister to reverse the order—give us a little more protection and less taxation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. Many hon. gentlement in this House seem to think that high protection means high taxation. That is a most absurd idea. I do not believe that you will get the Finance Minister to propound that doctrine. I do not think that he would sacrifice his reputation and standing by getting up here and telling us that high protection means, of necessity, high taxation. Why it is the reverse. They tell us that their tariff is a tariff for revenue only. Well, it is not that. It is neither one thing or the other. They have a duty of three cents a pound on fresh meat and very little fresh meat comes into Canada. If they want a tariff for revenue only, let them reduce that duty to one cent a pound, and I will undertake to say that they will get three times more revenue than they get now at three cents a pound. If their tariff is a tariff for revenue only why do they not put a duty on tea and coffee ? We cannot produce these in Canada. If they are afraid of protecting or helping the people of the country; if they are alarmed that any industry would be benefited by their fiscal policy, let them raise their revenue on tea and coffee and other articles which we cannot produce, and which would not interfere with any industry, and that would be a tariff for revenue only. But that is not their policy. They adopted the old Conservative tariff to the extent that they still give us free coffee and free tea. I have said, that what we want is more protection and less taxation, and that if we had that we would not be troubled with these enormous surpluses which the Minister of Finance scarcely knows what to do with. Adequate protection does not mean higher taxation; it means lower taxation. I go further and I say that adequate protection does not mean higher prices. I know that there are gentlemen in this House who will not agree with me when I say that adequate protection does not of necessity mean higher prices, but I can tell them that if there was 25 per cent put upon cream separators to-day, the farmers of Ontario would buy them for $5 less, and if the minister does not credit it, I will undertake to procure for him a bond from those manufacturers that they will do it. If the minister will give a protection sufficiently reasonable to protect these men and give them the large market of this country, I will undertake to say that the farmers of Canada will benefit to the extent of from $5 to $10 on every separator they buy. And this is the reason. The manufacturer in Guelph sends out his agent to sell cream separators, but he meets agents from the United States, from Germany, from Sweden, from England, all selling cream separators. The country is flooded with the foreign article, and the agent of the Guelph manufacturer is possibly not able to sell more than one machine a day, whereas if he had the whole market within his reach he could possibly sell three times as many. Therefore the manufacturer's agent could sell three machines for the same expense which it now costs him to sell one. In this way the Canadian manufacturer could afford to sell a machine to the farmer for $5 or $10 less, and the manufacturer would have just as much money in his pocket as he has now. That is an example and it is an example that will apply in very many things. When I was going out to Manitoba last year a manufacturer in my own town said to me : You can tell the people out there that if I were given adequate protection so as to secure the market in this country along with those who manufacture the same article in Canada, I will undertake to reduce my prices 10 per cent; and he could do it if it were nothing more than his saving on the cost of his travellers who would sell double the quantity they do now at the same expense. I am not one of those who believe in that bugaboo that high protection means high prices. Of course if you make it exclusive, it is another thing, but that is not adequate protection. We are not asking for exclusive protection; we are not asking that everything be excluded. All that we want is adequate; just enough to accomplish the purpose of giving the markets of this country to the Canadian manufacturers and Canadian farmers so that they can make a reasonable living profit. I have said that adequate protection does not mean higher taxation, and does not mean higher prices, but I tell you honestly that it does mean higher prosperity. If you want evidence regarding that you can get it from the speech of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Holmes) yesterday. He gave us a quotation from a pamphlet which he said came into his possession, and did not doubt the correctness of it. It was a pamphlet he said that

was sent out by the Canadian Cotton Goods Company, and in the pamphlet I find a paragraph headed 'Canadian goods cheap to the consumer,' and he goes on to say :

There is not the least doubt that the Canadian consumer saves nothing on imported goods.

The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Holmes) quoted that as authority. But he gives this as an illustration, and his illustration is a very good one :

An illustration of this fact recently came to light. A wholesaler imported a line of fancy shirtings and laid them down at eight cents and a half a yard. He sold them to the retailers at eleven and a half cents, who resold at seventeen cents.

A pretty good profit by the way :

A Canadian firm duplicated the pattern; sold it at eight cents, the wholesaler sold at ten cents, while the consumer got it at twelve and a half cents, meaning a saving of four and a half cents per yard to the wearer of the shirt.

That is a pretty good showing for Canadian goods. Who says that Canadian goods cannot be produced just as cheap as foreign goods ? The Canadian manufacturer was able to compete with his foreign competitor, he was able to reproduce that article at a price below the imported article which he was able to undersell. But what advantage was there in that ? Suppose he was able to do it, where was he going to sell it ? The importers had flooded the country with that class of goods, everybody had been supplied, and when the Canadian turned out his product, he had no market for it. He might sell it at half a cent less, or even at two cents less, yet he would not find the demand for it, because the demand had been filled. That is the case with very many commodities. Let us take the case of coloured cottons to show how the Canadian manufacturer is handicapped as against the British. The latter has a market in cold climates and in warm climates. The calico printer makes his plates. In the first year the product of those plates is sold in England ; the next year it finds its way to Canada and the United States ; the third year it goes to Australia, possibly to South America ; the fourth year it is sent to South Africa, and some other distant countries ; and the fifth year it is sold in India and Japan, where the latest fashion is not so much thought of. The English manufacturer can turn out goods from the same plates for five years, and turn them out all the year round, because he has markets in colder climates and in warmer climates in various parts of the world, while the Canadian manufacturer has a limited market in Canada, and can only produce one impression from the same plates. There is no doubt that he is handicapped to a great extent, and an industry of that kind ought to have the help of the government. We have the evidence of the hon. member for West Huron that the Canadian manufacturer is able to produce these goods at half a cent less than the importer could buy them for in the old country. But he had not fair treatment; he had not adequate protection. It was immaterial whether he produced them or not. If he did, they simply lay on his hands, because the market had been monopolized by the larger producer in the old country. If there had been adequate protection to keep the English goods out, the moment the Canadian manufacturer produced his goods, he would have been able to get a fair price for them, and the Canadian consumer would have been able to get his goods at four and one-half cents less than he had to pay for the imported article. You cannot expect men to risk their capital in large industries of that kind, unless they are given to understand beforehand that they are going to have the paternal care and protection of the government to guarantee them a fair return for what they produce. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been telling us all along that these goods would be dearer under protection, and we find that statement refuted.

There is one question which I never could solve in listening to hon. gentlemen opposite. They said : Take down the tariff wall and let us get into the United States, and we shall be able to buy everything cheap. Take down the tariff wall of 20 per cent, and we shall get our agricultural implements from Chicago and other places on the other side of the line a great deal cheaper than we get them now. The strange part of it is the people who talk in that way want to get their goods in the most highly protected country in the world. To get cheap goods, they want to go to the highly protected United States, or to highly protected Germany. If these hon. gentlemen reflected for a moment, would they not see the propriety of joining with us and giving a policy of adequate protection to the manufacturers of Canada, so that we could have cheap goods without going out of Canada ? If high protection in the United States makes cheap goods, high protection in this country will make cheap goods as well. I have demonstrated that high protection does not mean higher prices. I think I can safely make this statement without fear of successful contradiction, that we never had cheaper agricultural implements in Canada than we had under the 35 per cent tariff, when the national policy was in full swing. We took 15 per cent off, but there was not a drop of 15 per cent in the price. I do not say that a binder or a mower may not cost more money to-day than it did ten or fifteen years ago ; but it is a very different implement from what it was then. It has various improvements and attachments which were not on it at that time, and it is worth more money. I also say, as a practical business man who has been handling goods for

many years, that we never had cheaper cottons than we had under the national policy. We never had better or cheaper woollen goods than we had under the national policy. We never had cheaper coal oil than we had under the national policy. What do we pay for it now ? If you want to buy a barrel of Canadian oil in the part of the country where I live to-day, you have to pay 19½ cents a gallon for it, whereas we used to pay 12½ cents, a difference of 7½ cents, although a cent a gallon has been taken off the duty. Barbed wire was cheaper under the national policy than it is to-day, and I understand it is free.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Labour was cheaper too.

Mr. HENDERSON. Under the national policy ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly ; cheaper than it is to-day ; wages were lower.

Mr. HENDERSON. And wages will be lower again, perhaps, and wages were lower before the national policy was inaugurated. The hon. minister will remember the days of the soup kitchens under the Mackenzie government, when the labouring classes were praying for a national policy, and when the government were turned out of power because they would not give it—just what this government will come to if they do not give this country adequate protection. Binder twine is nearly double the price to-day that it was under the national policy. It is no better, I suppose. Labour is dearer. How much labour does it take to make a pound of twine ? Seven and a half cents of labour to make one pound of twine ? Great heavens ! It is a big industry. Is it the labour that makes the difference ? Why, I understand that it is made in the penitentiary, where the labour does not cost anything; and yet the price is away up. It cannot be the labour, Mr. Minister; you must be mistaken. I will take a common article now; we will come down just to what any gentleman can understand. Take a common article like sewing thread. Under the national policy, in 1895, a farmer's wife got two spools for five cents, each spool containing 200 yards of the thread. But now she has to pay five cents for one spool. I suppose it is the difference in labour which is the cause. I believe it is the difference in duty. The government destroyed the protective principle applied to the thread industry, and the manufacturers were compelled to join the English combine, which they did and the prices went up. Then take sugar. Why, I remember when we used to shovel out 30 pounds of sugar for a dollar under the old national policy. No doubt the labour again is at fault. Why, I was almost going to say that I was grateful to the government, as a business man, for having made the change, because the labour we had to hire to weigh it out made the business almost unprofitable. I regret very much that my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) has gone out. I was going to submit to him a proposition. No doubt, when he gets up to address the House on this question, he will repeat the old story that high protection means high prices and that the more duty you put on, the more you will enhance prices. The hon. gentleman himself is engaged in a legitimate business, the manufacture of biscuits—a commodity which is practically a spot cash article and for which there is a very large demand throughout the country. There is a duty of twenty-five per cent on common biscuits, not sweetened, and twenty-seven and a half per cent on biscuits sweetened. The hon. gentleman is not responsible for putting that duty on biscuits, for that is just the tariff we left him. We considered that that industry was entitled to that amount of protection. We considered that an adequate protection and the hon. gentleman has never thought fit to change it. I believe that if he thought for one moment that the object of that tariff was to enable him to raise the prices and extort more money out of the pockets of the consumer, he would reduce it. The fact that he has not done so is proof that he believes these duties are perfectly legitimate. If he believed that they were too high, if he believed that they enabled either his firm or any other to extort undue prices for a spot cash article, which enters into the consumption of every family in the country, I am convinced that, as an honest man—which I believe he is—he would reduce that duty. And if he does not do so it is no doubt because he considers it a fair protection, which gives him and the others in that line the market of Canada. That is what these duties are for, and not to enable him or any other manufacturers of biscuits to get extortionate prices. That was not the intention of the Conservative party which imposed the tariff. But what we wanted was to give our Canadian market to our Canadian manufacturers as much as possible. That they have got. I find that we only imported $14,496 worth of sweetened biscuits.

Mr. SCOTT. Where from ?

Mr. HENDERSON. That was the entire importation of sweetened biscuits.

Mr. SCOTT. Where from ?

Mr. HENDERSON. One half came from England.

Mr. SCOTT. Under the preferential rate ?

Mr. HENDEDSON. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. Then one-third was taken off the duty ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then the Minister of Customs did reduce the duty. A moment ago you said he did not.

Mr. HENDERSON. He did not reduce the general duty. And the infinitesimal amount imported from the old country had no material effect at all on the prices in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite would not surely take the position that if $100,000 worth of goods of any kind are consumed in this country and $1 worth comes in from England at a reduced rate, the reduction of duty on that $1 worth is going to affect the price of the whole. That is too absurd. That shows how small are the ideas of some of those hon. gentlemen.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. gentleman not think that water will find its own level.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, and I think that the hon. gentleman has struck his level. Let me tell the hon. gentleman how many of those common biscuits came from the old country, and no doubt he will argue that because we imported $2,189 worth of biscuits from England, that importation reduced the price of the $1,000,000 manufactured in this country. I intended making a short speech, and if I have trespassed more than I intended on the time of the House, at any rate I have introduced a new feature into the debate. I have endeavoured to go along the line of adequate protection and show this House and country the advantages of a system of adequate protection and dissipate the absurd idea that because you protect an industry you of necessity enhance prices, and that high protection means high prices or high taxation. It does not mean either, but what it does mean is higher prosperity. If you want high taxation, reduce the duties. Put them down 10 per cent, and instead of a surplus of $13,500,000 the Finance Minister will be able to show a surplus of $20,000,000. Import more goods and you will collect more duties, but that is not what the people want. We want to make our goods in this country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman think that increased protection will increase the price of lead. He says that increased protection will not increase the prices.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Ask Mr. Galliher.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is a pretty heavy question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is.

Mr. HENDERSON. Lead is a pretty heavy article to deal with. Suppose it does—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE—that is enough.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not saying anything about that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend says that it does not.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know that it will. It depends a good deal on the kind of protection you give. If you give it adequate protection, I do not know that it would. But if you give it an excessive protection, I have no doubt it would. I think it depends a great deal on the kind of protection you give. I have no doubt that the hon. Finance Minister will settle that point with the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Galliher) who seems very disturbed to-night.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has helped me to settle it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very glad indeed to help the hon. gentleman, and if he will meet me on fair ground, I am sure we can settle the whole fiscal policy of the country in the interest of the country.

Mr. GRANT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE DISASTER AT FRANK.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). I would ask the government if they have received any report respecting the subject of the startling rumour which has been in circulation, of a volcanic eruption in the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I regret to say, Sir, that I am not in a position to add anything to the information given in the public press. The Prime Minister received a short telegram concerning the matter this afternoon, and instructions were at once given to inquire for further particulars. We hope that by to-morrow's sitting we may be in a position to give further information.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 30, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 128) for the relief of William Francis Schooley.—Mr. Boyd.

Bill (No. 134) to incorporate the Erie Ontario Power Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 135) to incorporate the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway Company.—Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 136) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 138) to amend the Pilotage Act.—Hon. Mr. Préfontaine.

INSPECTION OF TEXTILE FABRIC.

Mr. W. SCOTT (West Assiniboia) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 137) to regulate the sale and provide for the inspection of textile fabrics. He said: The object is to prevent the sale of shoddy as pure wool. Provision is made that all shoddy shall be accurately marked or labelled and penalties will be levied for the infringement of this provision. The Bill is of considerable importance to the woollen manufacturers and wool-raisers, and on a second reading there will be ample opportunity for full discussion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

IMPROVEMENTS AT PORT AT DIGBY.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Have any and what applications been made to the government for an appropriation of public money for the following purposes :—(a) the widening of the government wharf at the Port of Digby to such a width that a second railway track may be laid down thereon ; (b) the erection of an ell or extension of the said wharf, at the outer side thereof, of at least 250 feet in length ; (c) the dredging of the harbour at the said Port of Digby at the sides and ends of the said wharf, to a depth of at least 25 feet ?

2. By whom and when have such applications been made ?

3. Has there been any correspondence between the town council, or the mayor, of the town of Digby, or any member of the said town council, and the government, or any member thereof, in relation to the above matters, or any of them, or between Albert J. S. Copp, M.P., and the government, or any member thereof, with respect to an appropriation of public money for the above purposes, or any of them, during the year 1902, or the year 1903 ?

4. Is it the intention of the government to make any grant, or ask for any vote, during the present session, toward wharf and harbour improvements at the said Port of Digby, N.S. ? If so, to what extent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). In reply to questions 1 and 2, I beg to say that an application was made for improved facilities at the port of Digby, in a letter to the chief engineer of the Public Works Department by Mr. Copp, M.P. In reply to the third, there is no other correspondence. In reply to the fourth, the sum of $2,000 is already included in the main estimates for 1903-4 now before parliament for repairs only to this wharf.

RAILWAY LAND GRANTS.

Mr. SCOTT asked :

1. What are the names of all railway companies to which grants of land have been voted by parliament, and the area voted to each ?

2. What is the railway mileage so aided by land grants, constructed by each company (a) in Manitoba, (b) North-west Territories, (c) in other portions of Canada ?

3. What area has been earned by each company ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to submit the following statement :

(1.)

Name of Railway.	Area voted. Acres.
Alberta Railway and Coal Company (formerly North-west Coal and Navigation Company)	1,498,368
Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company	1,920,000
Brandon and South-western Railway Company	108,800
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company	2,176,000
Canadian Northern Railway Company (railway from point on C.P.R. to Hudson's Bay)	6,880,000
Canadian Northern Railway Company (formerly Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company)	900,400
Canadian Pacific Railway (main line).	25,000,000
Canadian Pacific Railway, Souris branch	1,408,704
Canadian Pacific Railway, Pipestone extension of Souris branch	200,320
Great North-west Central Railway Company (formerly North-west Central Railway Company)	2,880,000
Lac Seul Railway Company	115,200
Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company	51,200
Manitoba and North-western Railway Company	2,918,400
Manitoba South-western Colonization Railway Company	1,396,800
Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company	704,000
North-western Railway Company of Canada	3,350,000
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company	2,208,000
Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company	352,000
Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company	384,000
Saskatchewan and Western Railway Company	98,880
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company	1,536,000
Total	56,087,072

(2.)

IN MANITOBA.

	Miles.
Canadian Northern Railway	249.75
Canadian Pacific Railway	229.00
Canadian Pacific Railway, Souris branch.	144.00
Canadian Pacific Railway, Pipestone extension of Souris branch	31.30
Great North-west Central Railway	50.00
Manitoba and South-eastern Railway	98.00
Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada	182.00
Manitoba and South-western Colonization Railway	218.25
Saskatchewan and Western Railway	15.45
Total	1,217.75

IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

	Miles.
Alberta Railway and Coal Company.. ..	174.12
Calgary and Edmonton Railway....	295.07
Canadian Pacific Railway....	755.00
Canadian Pacific Railway, Souris branch.	76.11
Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada..	52.59
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.	253.96
Total..	1,606.85

IN ONTARIO.

	Miles.
Canadian Pacific Railway..	650.00

IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

	Miles.
Canadian Pacific Railway..	268.00

(3.)

Name of Railway.	Land Grant Earned. Acres.
Alberta Railway and Coal Company....	1,114,368
Calgary and Edmonton Railway... ..	1,888,448
Canadian Northern Railway.. .. .. .. (Lake Manitoba and Canal Company, 798,400 acres.) (Winnipeg Great Northern Railway, 800,000 acres.)	1,598,400
Canadian Pacific Railway..	18,206,986
Canadian Pacific Railway, Souris branch....	1,408,704
Canadian Pacific Railway, Pipestone extension of Souris branch..	200,320
Great North-western Railway..	320,000
Manitoba and South-eastern Railway.	627,200
Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada..	1,501,376
Manitoba South-western Colonization Railway..	1,396,800
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company..	1,625,344
Saskatchewan and Western Railway.	98,880
Total area earned..	29,986,826

OFFENSIVE CARTOON.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Fowler—asked :

1. Is the organ of the Canadian army, the 'Military Gazette' and 'Canadian Gentlemen's Magazine,' an official publication of the Canadian government ?

2. Does the government endorse the spirit of the offensive cartoon on page eleven of the issue of April 7, 1903, in which the citizens of Canada (of North of Ireland origin) are insulted ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). In answer to both questions, I have to say that the government has nothing whatever to do with the publication of the 'Military Gazette' and 'Canadian Gentlemen's Magazine.'

TOBACCO DUTIES.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the total amount of duty collected on tobacco for the year ending 30th June, 1902 ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

2. How much of this amount was due to the additional duty imposed in the session of 1897?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier) :

1. Four million four hundred and forty-two thousand two hundred and thirty-two dollars and fifteen cents.

2. One million three hundred and thirty-five thousand seven hundred and twenty-three dollars and eighty-seven cents.

NEGLECT OF PARLIAMENTARY GROUNDS.

Mr. G. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House and particularly of the Minister of Public Works, to what I think every hon. member will consider a grievance. I am not going to say anything with reference to the city of Ottawa—I leave it for the electors of the city to deal with the corporation at the proper time. I understand that this government is paying a large sum annually to the city of Ottawa for the purpose of carrying on some permanent improvements, and in return, they are to receive all the water required for the use of the parliament buildings and grounds, together with other considerations that may not amount to much. What I would like to ask is why the government are not making better use of the water by having the grounds sprinkled. To-day it is only at the risk of a man's life almost, that he goes from this House to the main gate of the grounds. As I passed down just before dinner, some of the new loam which has been put on the roads, but which is now turned into dust, came in a cloud and practically blinded me. If the government are entitled to use all the water they require, there are certainly men enough around the departments idle who could use that water to sprinkle the roads and lay the dust. I know that it is only necessary to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to this matter and he will see that the necessary steps are taken.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). All will admit that we have a dust nuisance on the grounds at this time. Moreover, I should be glad to take any action I could to remove the dust from the eyes of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) for he needs light very badly. But, seriously speaking, I know that, for many sessions, we have suffered here owing to the conditions of the grounds in this respect. Not only is it very disagreeable, but it does great harm in the House, and in the government offices, as well as injuring the beautiful grounds.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the hon. minister give us any temporary relief in the meantime ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As soon as I noticed the condition of the

grounds, the water carts were put on, and they are at work this afternoon. I think it would be better if we had an appropriation and could provide some better cover for the roads immediately around the building, in place of the sand and dust we have there. Even the sprinkling that is now going on seems hardly to afford relief. I will bring the matter to the attention of the proper officials and have the difficulty remedied, I hope.

MARITIME PROVINCES AND DISTINGUISHED VISITORS.

Hon. Wm. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the attention of the government to a matter which seems to me of importance. We see it stated in the press that in August next, there is to be an excursion party of seventy-five members of the imperial parliament and twenty-five Peers who will arrive in Quebec and work their way westward through Canada. I would like very much if these public men could be notified that there is a section of Canada which we know as the maritime provinces, and if some of our visitors could be led to turn their faces eastward as well as westward. I am well aware that the government cannot control the movements of these distinguished visitors. Still, certain influences might be used which would lead to some of them finding their way to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. If things go on as they are going at present, the public mind will be so exclusively directed to the west that people will forget that this Dominion has an eastern portion at all. I hope the government will succeed in using such influences as will induce some of these distinguished personages to visit the maritime provinces.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With regard to the question put by the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross) that the party composed of members of the British parliament, Lords and Commoners, who are to visit Canada in the month of August next, should not forego a visit to the maritime provinces, I would suppose that the maritime provinces required no advertisement. I should presume that they would not visit Canada without going to the maritime provinces also. The government, as my hon. friend knows, has nothing at all to do either officially or unofficially with this visit. But if by any word of mine or of my colleagues, we can further the end of my hon. friend, I would be glad to do so.

THE DISASTER AT FRANK.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the government to the very remarkable rumours that have been in circulation during the last twenty-four hours as to earthquakes and volcanoes in the vicinity of the town of Frank, in the district of Alberta. Apparently, these rumours of disturbances of that nature are absolutely unfounded, as also the reports of the immense destruction of life and property. I take the liberty of putting the matter before the government and the House in this way, because the circulation of such unfounded reports disturbing the public mind and causing anguish to relatives as well as doubts as to the values of property is a crime which should be punished. I would suggest to the government that, if it is possible to fix the responsibility for the circulation of such reports, measures should be taken to fix that responsibility and mete out the proper punishment. I would like further to draw attention to the fact that, although the reports were so greatly and unpardonably exaggerated, there still has been a serious loss of life arising from such a cause and under such circumstances, as, it appears to me, would very well warrant thorough investigation. Apparently, according to the latest reports, a landslide occurred which had the effect of displacing the drifts in the mine in actual operation. Before the mine should properly be put in operation again, it seems to me, means should be taken to satisfy all concerned that another slide of like nature or worse is not likely to occur. That is to say, I would respectfully suggest that an investigation should be held on the ground, as to the cause of the trouble which did take place, as to its results, and as to the probability of further trouble occurring.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The information which the government has received on this subject is of such a character, unfortunately, as to convey to us the fact that the disturbance which has taken place at Frank, though not as bad as at first reported, still, is very serious, and has had very serious consequences. My attention was first drawn to the matter by a telegram that I received yesterday, as follows :

Frank, N.W.T., April 29, 1903.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa, Ont.

Terrible catastrophe here. Eruption, Turtle Mountain devastated miles of territory. One hundred killed. Must have government aid quick to clear passage for river which is dammed hundreds feet high, and danger to life and property from flood most imminent. Not over one day distant at most. Answer quick.

(Signed) S. W. CHALMERS,
MARK DRUMM,
President and Secretary, Board of Trade.

Upon the receipt of this telegram, we gave orders at once to the Mounted Police and the Department of the Interior to send such relief as it was possible to send, and

we exchanged the following telegrams with our officers in the west :

Ottawa, April 29, 1903.
3.30 p.m.

Major A. B. Perry,
Regina, N.W.T.

Serious disaster reported eruption, Turtle Mountain, near Frank, Crow's Nest Railway. Number people killed and river blocked by matter thrown from mountain. Instruct officer commanding McLeod to proceed there at once with all men he can take and arrange for up to strength of twenty-five drawn from most convenient detachments to follow with extra tents and facilities for rendering assistance. Further instructions later. There will likely be a special train from Calgary to McLeod by which police from there would travel. Instruct Sanders to communicate with Mr. Pearce.

(Signed.) FRED WHITE.

Mr. Pearce is the inspector of surveys in the North-west.

Regina, N.W.T., April 29, 1903.
Received 7.30 p.m.

To Comptroller,
North-west Mounted Police,
Ottawa.

Instructions re accident at Frank being carried out.

(Sgd.) A. B. PERRY.

Ottawa, April 29, 1903.
8.30 p.m.

Major A. B. Perry,
Regina, N.W.T.

Conditions at Frank much more serious than at first reported. Mr. Pearce goes to Calgary to take charge of government relief work. Keep yourself in touch with requirements and render every possible police assistance.

(Sgd.) FRED WHITE.

At the time, Mr. Smart, the deputy minister of the Interior put himself in communication with the Canadian Pacific authorities. This morning, the following communications were placed in my hands :

Frank, N.W.T., April 30, 1903.

James A. Smart,
Ottawa.

Eighty-three killed, of which about fifteen women and fifteen children. It is thought there will be no trouble from damming of river. Rock slide about 4,000 feet long extending to highest point of Turtle Mountain westerly; end of slide thirty-three feet west of mouth of tunnel extending across the valley, and up opposite bank for one and one-quarter miles from front of Turtle Mountain, and spread out fan shape so that at extreme end slide it was nearly two miles wide. No trace of river for one mile, but water now going through rock as fast as coming down. Place very orderly this morning. Not probable there will be further slide of any consequence. Twelve police and two officers here, plenty to maintain peace and order, necessary purposes. No earthquake or volcano, all working in mine except two escaped.

(Sgd.) WM. PEARCE.

Then Mr. Smart received from Mr. McNicoll, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the following telephone :

The trouble on the Crow's Nest branch at Frank was caused by a huge rock slide. There was no explosion, but the slide was of such large dimensions that the cloud of dust was taken for smoke. Minor slides coming down were taken for inside explosions. The whole east end of the mountain extending from the mouth of the French mine has slidden into the valley. The mountain was 4,400 feet high, and the slide blocked the entire valley, about three quarters of a mile wide and a mile and a-half long.

A waterway is being cut so as to avoid flooding. The loss of life not yet estimated. Thirty miners said to be in the mine but every reason to think that they are alive. Party now trying to remove rock from the mouth of the mine. About ten houses in the east end of the village destroyed, some entire families. One of them were Mr. Leech's, three of his children escaped, parents and four children killed. The youngest child was thrown out of the house in some miraculous way and not injured. All passengers too and from the Kootenay are being forwarded by the old route via main line and Revelstoke.

Sir Thomas Shaughnessy also received the following telegram which he placed in my hand :

Report from Frank is that there is a huge slide, no explosion. Was of such large dimensions that cloud of dust taken for smoke and minor slides coming down taken for explosions. Whole eastern end of mountain extending from mouth of mine has gone out. It was 4,400 feet high and slid across entire valley blocking our track to the Frank mine track which is forty feet higher than our track. The slide extends from a point 200 feet east of Frank station, one and one-half miles and is three-fourths of a mile wide. The track is covered with rock of all sizes up to that of a double deck boarding car. Out of question to transfer trains at present. Loss of life not yet estimated. There are 30 miners still in mine and every reason to think they are alive.

Parties trying to remove the rock from the mouth. Ten houses in east end of town destroyed, some entire families. Taylor reports no reason why more of the slide of the mountain west towards Blairmore should not come down. Many new slides coming down. Only place now where line could be run quickly is from mouth of mine down the creek, but so many new slides coming down there men will not go near it. Taking passengers back to Macleod and Nelson to work via Revelstoke. McHenry and Dennis will be there this forenoon to report fully.

(Sgd.) D. McNICOLL.

It appears from these telegrams that they have explained the rumour which was spread yesterday that there was an explosion. No doubt the rumour was spread in good faith, with no malicious intent. With regard to the advisability of having a further investigation upon this subject, perhaps it is premature to give any opinion. We have some very able men on the scene of action. Mr. Pearce is a very able man, as those who are acquainted with him will testify. Major Perry of the Mounted Police is also a very able man, and so is the agent at MacLoed a man of superior ability. It is probable that when these men have cleared away the debris and performed the duties with which they are now entrusted, they will give such a report as may make it unnecessary to have

any further investigation. Then we will be able to decide whether it would be advisable to follow the suggestion made by the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver).

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). I wish to call the attention of the government to the incompleteness of the return made some days since of the papers in connection with the establishment of the Ross factory at Quebec. The return laid before the House does not contain a petition by some of the prominent citizens of Quebec against the granting of the site. I would like that petition to be included in the return.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will look into that.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty ; and the proposed motion of Mr. Borden (Halifax) in amendment thereto.

Mr. GEORGE D. GRANT (North Ontario). Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House at this stage of the budget debate, I do not expect to say anything of a very novel character. But I desire to present to the House what I believe to be the opinions and feelings of my constituents on the subject of the tariff and such other matters as are properly the subject of observation. Having recently emerged from an election contest, which perhaps was not wholly unsatisfactory to the gentlemen who are seated around me on this side of the House, I may perhaps be permitted to voice the verdict of my constituents in this place. This Dominion is to be congratulated heartily on the splendid showing which our Finance Minister made in his annual financial statement. Never before has our material prosperity been so great. I think the country is to be congratulated, not only on the splendid prosperity which has attended our efforts commercially and otherwise during the past year, but it is to be congratulated on the fact that the government has evinced its determination to adhere to that sound economic policy which I believe lies at the foundation of our commercial success. Let me assure the members of the government that the determination they have announced, (which we never for a moment doubted), meets with the fullest approbation of the people of this country. There is no blinking the fact that during the past year or year and a half there has been a formidable agitation on foot in this country for the increase of our customs tariff, and practically for a return to high protection. That the administration has expressed its refusal to accede to the extraordinary, and I may say, selfish demand of a small section of the community, is a matter of satisfaction to the country at large. To my mind, the present was an especially inopportune time for starting an agitation for a return to high protection. This campaign has not only been quite formidable and aggressive, but it has attracted a good deal of newspaper attention. But, Sir, the endeavour to persuade our people that they can enrich themselves by taxing themselves I think will altogether fail. Whilst the great majority of our factories are employed, whilst they have more orders than they can fill, and are paying on an average higher wages than have ever been paid at any time in Canada, whilst our producing powers are enormously increased, whilst our purchasing power too is growing at a tremendous rate, surely I am right in saying that this is an inopportune time to change our fiscal policy. If I may be permitted to refer to the town in which I reside, I may say that there is in that town one of the largest carriage factories in this Dominion. I am told by those who manage that concern that never before in their business history have they had so many orders and never before has such success attended the management of that business. In addition to that, in the same town, there are building at the present time two or three large factories. I have never heard that the gentlemen who are interested in promoting these industries are appealing to the government for further protection for them, nor have I heard that they have embarked upon these undertakings with the idea that higher protection will be granted. I, perhaps, am right in saying that this agitation has been begun and fostered by a small section of the community. Let me express the hope, and I am sure that in this I am voicing the opinion, broadly, of the agricultural interests in this country, that no disturbance shall take place at the present time. Now, Sir, I would depreciate any antagonism between the agricultural and manufacturing interests. I do not know that there is any occasion for antagonism of that sort. These interests are so interdependent, that, broadly speaking, what injures one injures the other and what benefits one benefits the other. I subscribe to that opinion, and yet, who can impute blame to our agriculturists if they strongly express their opinion on trade and tariff matters, when they are face to face with these well organized and financially well equipped gentlemen strongly urging the adoption of higher customs duties? Now, in the recent by-election in North Ontario which, Mr. Speaker, you will perhaps allow me to refer to without being open to the charge of being vain-glorious or boastful. the fight was forced on this very tariff issue. My hon. opponent made that point strongly at one of his first meetings in his campaign at Uxbridge and these were his words :

There is not the least shadow of doubt that the Conservative party believes in a protective tariff.

The issue then was defined and upon that the contest was fought out, and if reference be had to the newspaper published by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) it will be found in several of its February issues, under great head lines, that the tariff was the great issue in North Ontario, so also in other journals supporting the opposition. I hope they will abide by the result expressed by the electorate in that constituency. North Ontario is entirely an agricultural constituency. There is not, I believe, a factory in it, from the south to the north, and that, I may tell you, by way of parenthesis, is a very long distance in North Ontario. In every municipality of that riding and in almost every subdivision of it an increased vote was given for the humble man who carried the Liberal standard on that occasion. From that I wish to make it plain that the people of that riding, largely, as I say, an agricultural riding, have spoken on this matter of the tariff and that being the paramount issue, their verdict should be accepted as indicative of what the average agricultural constituency in Ontario, and, I believe, in the whole Dominion will say when they are appealed to on the issue of a moderate and fair tariff versus high protection. I do not for one moment believe that there is any desire on the part of the agricultural classes to unduly hamper or sacrifice the great manufacturing interests of this country. Quité the contrary. We cannot but feel that on both of these interests the future of this splendid Canada of ours depends. But, I believe, I am speaking for the great majority of the farmers not only of this province, but of this Dominion, when I say that, irrespective of party, they are firmly and unalterably opposed to the special treatment of any particular class by way of the imposition of customs duties. Speaking of that recent contest, I may say that I was glad to make the acquaintance of the very courteous gentleman who leads the oposition in this House (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I found him so in that contest. He brought to North Ontario not only that courtesy and sauvity which distinguish him, but he brought also the policy of adequate protection which he proclaimed to the electors of the riding ; but I must say that it was so carefully wrapped up to shield it (I presume from the rigour of that northern clime), that we could not make out what the term adequate protection meant. I find that on coming into this august assembly, hon. gentlemen in this House on both sides are not much more apt, or much more successful in ascertaining what the meaning of that expression is. I fear, Sir, however, that policy, whatever it may be, proved inadequate to the occasion as regards North Ontario. In this connection some of the hon. gentlemen who spoke from the opposition benches during the progress of this debate were more frank than others and, to speak colloquially, they let the cat out of the bag and intimated to us in a measure what this term adequate protection really means. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), I think it was, said that inadequate meant insufficient, and that insufficient meant not high enough. Therefore, by an easy process of logic, I conclude that the term adequate protection means, according to the dictionary supplied by the hon. member for Pictou, higher duties. Personally I have suspected that was the meaning ; I am now confirmed in that opinion by what fell from the lips of that hon. gentleman and of another hon. gentleman who must find that in this matter of the tariff, at least, his position is not quite comfortable on the benches opposite. I refer to the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson). He came out flat-footed and said that he opposed the amendment in favour of adequate protection on the ground that it meant high protection and that he was against high protection. Beyond these two expressions of opinion, or these two translations of that much debated word, I have not been able to find out directly what the term really means or what the policy is which it indicates. However, I noticed in reading the Montreal press the other day that a banquet was tendered in that city to the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition. I read, and such literature is always interesting, the inscriptions on the bannerettes which floated in the hall on that festive occasion, and according to the report in the newspapers, which I take to be correct, one of these inscriptions read : 'The same policy, 1878 and 1903.' That perhaps may give us an index as to what the Conservative policy of 1903 is. I presume that the inscription was inspired, and so the Conservative policy of 1903 really means the policy of 1878; a policy twenty-five years old, a policy utterly discredited, a policy now twice denounced at the polls. Another inscription on the bannerettes read: 'The swing of victory.' The swing of victory, Mr. Speaker ! I do not know quite what it means for the Conservative party, but they had it inscribed on their banners at the banquet tendered to the leader of the opposition ; a banquet which the hon. gentleman I have no doubt well deserved from his followers.

Another feature of the protectionist policy of which we heard a good deal recently, is its retaliatory phase. We are advised that it is in the interest of Canada to institute a retaliatory tariff against the United States, or in the more catching fashion in which it is put, they call it reciprocity of tariffs, and its adoption is urged in our dealings with the United States. Well, in so far as retaliation or reciprocity of tariffs may redound to our own gain and to our own advantage, I am an humble advocate of it;

but, Sir, to my mind, retaliation simply for the sake of retaliating is an idle and feeble policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GRANT. And strange to say, the advocacy of retaliation comes very largely from those who are constantly holding the United States up to us as the model upon which we should form our fiscal policy. It is patent to every reasonable man, Sir, that a fair analogy cannot be drawn between Canada and the United States in regard to the tariff question. We know that the American union is an aggregation of populous and resourceful states, embracing at once both tropical and temperate regions. We are not similarly situated to them. Anyway, if we were looking for instruction or guidance in fiscal or in constitutional matters generally, I for one would prefer to look across the Atlantic to the motherland for sound teaching in fiscal policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GRANT. I was amused Mr. Speaker, at the elaborate effort made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) in his endeavour to convince the farmers of Canada that protection would be a splendid policy for them. I fear that the hon. gentleman will fail in his mission. I feel confident that he cannot convince the farmers of this Dominion; aye, nor even the farmers of his own historic county of Halton, that his views are sound in that regard. The United States has perhaps the most highly protective tariff of any country in the world, and yet if we compare the condition of the American farmer with the condition of the Canadian farmer, I think the comparison will show that the Canadian farmer stands in a much better position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GRANT. I shall not weary the House by quoting statistics at any length, but I have a few figures here which show conclusively that high protection has not been of material assistance to the farmer of the United States, and arguing by analogy, if high protection has not been of assistance to the United States farmer, it cannot be of assistance to the Canadian farmer. In the twelfth census of the United States I find that there were in 1880, 4,008,000 farmers in the United States; of these 2,984,000 were owners of the soil they tilled and 1,024,601 were tenants of the land they occupied. Twenty years after that, in 1900, there were engaged in agriculture in the United States 5,739,000 farmers and of these 3,713,000 were owners and 2,026,000 were tenants. The logical conclusion from this is, that the proportionate decrease of freeholders and the increase of tenant farmers is indicative of the fact that agriculture is not prosperous in the United States; else, the increase would be in the opposite direction and there would be comparatively more freeholders and fewer tenant farmers. In 1880 for every one thousand male persons at work on farms there were 422 of them owners, and in 1900 out of every one thousand male persons at work on the farms there were but 423 owners. In 1880 for every 1,000 farmers there were 145 tenant farmers and in 1900 that proportion had grown until there were 231 tenant farmers in every 1,000. In other words, the farm owners remain stationary and the number of tenants increased by about sixty per cent. Sir, that should be an object lesson to the Canadian farmer not to be gulled by the specious arguments of the high protectionist. In 1900 there were engaged altogether in the United States in agricultural pursuits 8,771,000, persons as against 7,075,000 in 1880; this was a remarkable small increase when compared with the enormous increase in the general population of the United States which took place in the two decades between 1880 and 1900.

Now, Sir, let us look for a moment at the position of the American farmer from another point of view. Let us look at the capital he has invested in his industry, and let us compare his return from his investment with the return which the manufacturer of the United States gets from his investment. I find from the census of the United States recently published that the capital invested in agriculture, including lands, buildings, improvements and live stock, amounts to about $20,514,000,000. The income returned to the farmers of the United States on the amount of the capital invested was $3,764,000,000. The manufacturers had an invested capital amounting to only $9,874,000,000, and from that amount, after having the full benefit of $4,800,000,000 of cash and stock on hand, their returns were $8,370,000,000. Let us deduct $2,000,000,000 of disbursements for labour, working expenses, &c., which the compiler of these statistics, says is a reasonable amount, and we have a net return to the manufacturers of the United States of $6,370,000,000 from an investment of scarcely ten thousand millions of money. Compare the revenue from their investment with the revenue earned by the agriculturists of the United States and I do not think any candid man will contend that in a highly protected country such as the United States, the farmer has an even show with the manufacturer.

I have been unable to obtain complete figures for Canada as a whole, but I have taken those relating to the province of Ontario as giving a fair indication of conditions in all parts of the Dominion. I find, according to a recent bulletin issued by the department of Agriculture in Toronto, that the amount of capital invested in Ontario farms is $975,000,000, which yielded a return in 1900 of $160,000,000, not including what was fed to stock, which amounts to $60,000,000 more. So that hon. gentlemen

will see that the revenue of the farmers of Ontario has been higher than that of the United States farmers considering the capital invested.

Now, I find that the average income of the United States farmer is $288 a year. I am quite willing and anxious to say that that is not a fair indication of his condition, nor would it be a fair figure to set in comparison with the income of an Ontario farmer, because it includes many small holdings of negroes and involves other conditions unfavourable to such a comparison. But let us take some of the states along our own borders, which are not only adjacent to us, but which are very similar as to soil, climate and other conditions. In the state of Ohio according to these statistics, which bear every evidence of care in their preparation, the average income of the farmer—in Ohio—is $312, in Illinois $425, in Michigan $239, in Minnesota $465, in North Dakota $755, and in South Dakota $605. I think a comparison may fairly be drawn between Ohio, Illinois and Michigan on the one hand, and the province of Ontario on the other. In the year 1900 the Ontario farmers raised $160,000,000 worth of products, and we have in that province in round numbers from 175,000 to 200,000 men engaged in the industry of agriculture. Take the larger figure, 200,000, and by the simple process of dividing that number into the $160,000,000 produced by our farmers, we find that it nets to the Ontario farmer an average of $800 per annum. I think that is a fair statement, I think it is logical, and I think it must lead us to the conclusion that the Ontario farmers, and I doubt not the farmers of Canada generally, are getting a greater return from their labour and their capital invested than their fellow-husbandmen to the south of the international boundary, who are not thriving, but groaning, under the load of taxation which a high tariff imposes. I think hon. gentlemen opposite have a task of great magnitude in attempting to convince the agriculturists of this Dominion that a high protective tariff or adequate protection, term it what you will, is a policy which is conducive to their best interests.

The agricultural community of this Dominion are lacking in one respect, and it is natural that it should be so. They are not well organized. They have not the benefit of combination, which other interests possess, and therefore are unable to make known to the government and those in authority what their views on these matters are. They are only able every five years, or it may be in a by-election occasionally, to express their ideas on what should be the policy of this country. I feel, Sir, that it is only natural that there should be an anxiety on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to convince the farmers and the other primary producing classes of Canada that they are as much interested in high protection as those industries which at the present moment are chiefly clamouring for such protection. Stripped of all pretense, Sir, the real purpose of protection is to lessen competition and thereby increase prices. I was considerably interested in the very elaborate attempt which one of the hon. gentlemen opposite made—I think it was the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson)—to prove that the price of the farmers' produce will be enhanced by the policy which he advocates. I followed the hon. gentleman very closely, but I must confess that I was totally unable to find that he followed up his argument in that respect to a successful conclusion. True it is that he was somewhat confused by the lead question, which unfortunately for him, was introduced into the debate, and he found the matter which he had in hand almost as heavy to handle as the lead issue, because he dropped it very suddenly after the interpellation of the hon. Minister of Finance.

I do not know of what value are the opinions of newspapers on matters of this kind; but if the farmers of Ontario have an organ which may be regarded as speaking their views on tariff matters, I suppose the 'Weekly Sun,' issued in the city of Toronto, may be so termed. I have here a small clipping from a recent issue of that newspaper with regard to the present agitation for high protection, which reads as follows :

> One of the pocket pamphlets sent out by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association as a part of their protection campaign appeals to farmers to support a higher tariff on the sole ground that farmers have done so in the past. It cannot be denied that many farmers in the past have been sufficiently innocent to support a protective tariff in Canada, nor that many of them are still prepared to vote for the protection system. But this merely shows that they are not yet as keenly alive to their own interests as are the protected manufacturers. They have been deluded into playing into the hands of a favoured or privileged class. But they are gaining wisdom quite rapidly.

In this connection, the very absurd argument was advanced that the prices of farm produce would be increased by the adoption of a protective policy. But if increased duties will raise the prices of our farm produce, if increased protection will give our farmers a better return for what they have to sell, then I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite how is it that in the years 1891, 1892 and 1893, when their party was in power, grain and other agricultural products were sold at lower prices than at any other period in the history of this country. Will they explain how it was that their policy was so utterly ineffectual during those years, not only in raising the prices of farm products but even in obtaining paying prices ?

The question of surpluses is one that seems to vex exceedingly hon. gentlemen opposite just as that same question has for many

years, in the province of Ontario troubled the opposition in the legislative assembly of that province. I am not aware that our hon. friends opposite can be accepted as very competent authorities on surpluses. I am not aware that surpluses ever graced their regime to an extent that would entitle them to talk very learnedly on the subject. However, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) has described this administration as the great tax gatherer, I would like to know what the result would have been, had the policy which he advocates been in force during the year 1902, for instance. Had the same degree of prosperity obtained—which is not at all likely—there would have been collected in duties or taxes, if you will, some $15,000,000 more than were actually paid into the treasury. If the resolution of his hon. leader (Mr. Borden) means anything, it means that hon. gentlemen opposite, had they been in power, would have extorted, to use a pet phrase of theirs, this much larger sum from the consuming public of this Dominion. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was moved almost to tears the other night when he spoke of how this government wrung taxes out of the mass of the people. There was a wail in his voice, there were tears in his tones, which reminded one of the lamentation of Jeremiah. But when we come to compare the speeches of these hon. gentlemen with one another, we find most singular inconsistencies and contradictions in their comments on the budget. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) saw fit to criticise the expenditure of the Post Office Department. Did he criticise that expenditure on the ground that it was unwise ? Not at all, Sir. What he criticised the hon. Postmaster General for was because he did not spend sufficient money last year. He used these words, or words to this effect :

> If the hon. minister had generously recognized the increased needs of this country for post office accommodation, his deficit would have been as large as the Conservative deficit was in 1896.

The expenditure of last year, 1902, was $3,883,000. If we add to this the $781,000 deficit of 1896, we have a total of $4,664,000, which is an increase of $999,000 over the expenditure of 1896. This would be an expenditure of over 25 per cent in one department above the actual expenditure. Now, in order to meet the needs of the country, there should have been an increase of expenditure in one department of 25 per cent, that same remark of the hon. gentleman would apply to all the departments. Twenty-five per cent on our total expenditure would be $12,500,000, or the total expenditure of this country, which the hon. gentleman implies would be warranted by its increased needs, would amount to $62,500,000. The hon. gentleman in fact replies to his own colleague from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who criticised the expenditure of the government as injudicious, extravagant and altogether burdensome for the country.

In my opinion, the majority of our people are convinced that a protective tariff would prove wholly inadequate to enhance the prices of our agricultural products. Another objection which, I believe, the people of this country will take to the amendment of the leader of the opposition is that the policy he advocates will increase the cost of the necessaries of life. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) argued against the proposition last night. He said that if we would only impose a protective tariff, those whose business was protected would be so patriotic that they would not increase the price of their commodities. Well, Mr. Speaker, human nature is human nature wherever you find it, and in my opinion, if we gave the opportunity, by protection, to raise the prices of manufactured goods, there is not much doubt that an increase in prices would inevitably follow. To show that in expressing this opinion, I am not talking rank heresy, let me quote from the speech of an hon. gentleman, whose authority our hon. friends opposite will not question, especially on fiscal and trade matters. On the 27th March, 1894, as reported on page 198 of 'Hansard' the Hon. Mr. Foster, the then Minister of Finance, used this language :

> Another objection that has been made to the national policy and to the protective principle in it: that the cost of many manufactured goods has been enhanced to the consumer on account of the rates imposed. Now, Sir, I grant that argument at once to a certain extent. I say that in the initial years of a national policy with a protective principle in it, it will have the effect of enhancing the cost of goods and that at the first the cost of goods will be very closely up to the measure of the protection which was given.

And he went on to make this remarkable statement, which, I think, fully answers the argument of the hon. member from Halton (Mr. Henderson) :

> If it does not have that effect, why should it ever be adopted at all, and what is the good of it ?

That was his opinion on the effect of protection in enhancing the values of the commodities we use. I give the opinion for what it is worth. I am not speaking now to the supporters of the government, but I would ask hon. members opposite whether they do not accept the opinion I have just quoted as a very definite and authoritative one ?

Mr. Speaker, an hon. gentleman who spoke yesterday, whose name I do not know, but whose face is quite familiar to me, because, I think, I saw him in the northern part of this province some weeks ago, said that the agricultural constitutencies of this province of Ontario would support the protective policy. In proof of this he stated that

these constituencies had returned a majority of those sympathizing with protection and supporting the opposition in this House. Speaking numerically, it is true that the elections of 1900 had this result as regards the province of Ontario. But since the general elections of 1900, there have been appeals to rural constituencies both in Ontario and in other provinces; and I find sitting around me on this side of the House gentlemen elected from rural constituencies since the general election of 1900, and those constituencies, I think, expressed their opinion on this question with no uncertain sound. I think the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Stewart) represents a rural constituency and has been elected very recently. So does the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) and the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Law). And, speaking more particularly for the province of Ontario, I think that verdicts have been given on this subject by such rural constituencies as West Durham, West York and Russell. An hon. friend reminds me that I must not omit the signal victories in Terrebonne, Two Mountains and Maskinongé. I believe I am quite within the mark in saying that the rural constituencies of Ontario and of the Dominion are unalterably opposed to the re-enactment of high protection, and I believe that they will be strongly re-enforced by their brethren in Manitoba, the North-west and British Columbia. To sum up, I conclude as I began, that it would be entirely a mistaken policy for us, at this moment, when prosperity is high within the Dominion, when our factories are working overtime, when our workmen are getting a better return than they ever did for their labour, when our finances, as disclosed by the annual statement are in such a magnificent position, to change our fiscal policy. And, for this reason I am constrained to vote against the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition. And I have this further reason, that, if this resolution means anything, it stands for an increase of duties all along the line, and for an increase therefore of the burdens the great consuming public—and to that I am opposed.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker. No doubt any hon. member attempting to speak, on the budget at this stage of the debate will find it difficult to make his remarks interesting to the House. In the first place, I wish to congratulate the hon. gentleman (Mr. Grant) who has just taken his seat on his maiden effort; and I am sure all here will agree with me in saying that experience will do him good, as it has done most of us. The hon. gentleman made some reference to the condition of things in his own locality, and I will take the liberty of dealing with this briefly before I proceed to the general discussion of the question before the House. The hon. gentleman instanced the condition of a certain carriage factory in the adjoining county to his own, at a place called Orillia. But he did not tell you that this very class of manufactures have had increased protection from his political friends. He did not tell you that the duty on cutters and sleighs had been increased by 5 per cent since the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power and that the duty is now 35 per cent on carriages as it was previous to the assumption of office by this government. He could not take great credit for the tariff under control of his friends, and that to admit, as everybody admits, that this class of goods does not come in under the boasted preference. The hon. gentleman also referred to the verdict of the people in sending him to this House. It may not be a very kind comparison to say that his presence here shows the mistakes the pepole often make ; when his constituency might have had a better man—there is no doubt about that. Now, in reference to the polling section in his own county that made the greatest change in its political complexion during the late contest, it is to be remembered that there is a certain company there making wood alcohol, who sell their product to the government for $1.40 per gallon when it can be bought in the open market for $1 per gallon. These parties had a protection from the old government of $2.25 per gallon, and they have had this increased by hon. gentlemen opposite to $2.40 per gallon. Another feature of it is that this company had a five-year's contract which was about to expire at the time of this contest. These gentlemen naturally went into the contest with a great deal of vigour on behalf of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Grant), and, since the election they have been down to get their contract renewed. But the minister, under the circumstance, dare not renew it yet. The five year's contract they had they got without tender. The poll there, in the previous election gave a Conservative majority of five. This was changed to a Liberal majority of fifty—by alcohol. So much for the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Grant's) reference to his own locality. There is one other point which I must as well refer to, when dealing with the hon. gentleman's remarks. He referred to the flags around the room when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) whom I am glad to follow as my leader was banqueted. Well, there was nothing indefinite about those flags; everybody knew what they were and what they meant. But no man under heaven could tell what flags to put up if hon. gentlemen opposite were being banqueted. What about the legends of ten years ago ? Would that be around the fences and on the barns and on the big stones along the road, if hon. gentlemen opposite were appearing to the people to-day ? No, we hear no more of them.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Oh, oh.

Mr. BRODER. They might be heard of down in Nova Scotia where my hon. friend

lives—he has not heard of the change. But, Sir, there is not a man in this country who can tell what kind of flag to put up if hon. gentlemen opposite were being banqueted. Why, what do you find? One man stands up and he wants the leaden sky in his constituency lighted up by the sun of protection. Another wants his political loins girded up with a stronger binder twine. Another one gets up and says: Salt won't save me if you don't do something for the salt business. That is what is going on in this country, and there is not one minister who has had courage enough to get up and defend the citadel from the attacks of their own friends. Not a particle of cohesion or unity of purpose among hon. gentlemen opposite. A stable tariff—that is what they say they are giving to this country, a stable tariff, something that is hung up between heaven and earth, and no one knows what it is. They take away from this House the right to control the taxation of the people and give to the executive the right to say whether they shall tax this concern or the other, behind the backs of the people. Seven dollars a ton upon rails—that is to be decided when the ministry is satisfied that somebody is capable of making these rails. That contrasts strangely with the position taken by the Minister of Railways when he proposed to let a contract for a large quantity of rails to a company before they had any plant ready to make them. What was the statement of the ministry? They were satisfied that Mr. Clergue was in a position to manufacture all that they were giving him a contract for. Now, Sir, after the plant is on the ground and another plant is being built down in Nova Scotia, they are afraid they cannot carry out their contract, and they are holding it above their heads—for a purpose. Why don't they carry out the policy that they pretend is in the interest of the country? A stable tariff! If there is anything in this country about which there is a doubt, and has been a doubt, and will be a doubt so long as hon. gentlemen opposite occupy the treasury benches, it is the tariff of this country.

They talk about revenue tariff. The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce told us when he was in opposition that the then tariff took $2 out of the people's pocket and put it directly into the pockets of the manufacturers, while only $1 went into the treasury. I would like that hon. gentleman or or any of his friends to explain how it is that where, for instance, the duty is 25 per cent on a wagon, and was 25 per cent on a wagon when he made that statement, how it is that same tariff to-day does not put $2 into the manufacturer's pocket and only $1 into the treasury. If the tariff did that before it does it to-day, because it is the same tariff. The western gentlemen were clamouring for less duty on agricultural implements. Where are they to-day? They want the tariff to remain as it is. Twenty per cent on mowing machines, on reapers, on binders, put there by the Conservative government in 1894. These gentlemen and their friends were then clamouring for less duty; now they want it to remain as it is. It was a curse in the hands of the Conservative government, but it is a blessing in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite.

This tariff reminds me of a story—and I can tell a story once in a while, Mr. Speaker, as well as any other man. There is a gentleman in Montreal who was in the grocery business, and he used to sell sugar, but he used to sand the sugar pretty freely. One of his customers went to him one day and said: See here, I don't think I will buy any more sugar of you. What is the trouble, asked the grocer? Why, he says, there is not enough sugar to sweeten my tea and there is not enough sand for building purposes. Now that is the tariff we have to-day from these hon. gentlemen. There is not enough sugar in it to sweeten our tea, and there is not enough sand in it for building purposes.

The preference, there is a great deal said about the preference. If there is one mistake the hon. gentlemen have made for which they are sorry, it is the preference—thrown to their friends as you throw a plank into the river to a drowning man upon which he may get to shore. They met their friends here in solid phalnax as they came back from the country, after they had been preaching free trade for years, and they were brought face to face with the responsibility of making changes in the tariff according to their professions and their promises. Their friends said, we must have something, and the mountain was in labour and brought forth—a preference, that is all. And they threw it to their friends to get to shore upon, and they have been sounding its praises ever since. Now what has been the effect of the preference? England says it is very little benefit to her. Why does it give England very little in comparison to the small trade of Canada, it means very little to England, but it means a great deal to us. That is the reason.

And the effect of it has been to raise a squall with Germany. Germany takes the position she does to-day, because of that preference. When that preference was put upon the statute-book, although England had been previously urged to change the duties giving to Germany and other nations the favoured nation treatment, when that law was put upon the statute-book, England immediately notified Germany and those other countries of the abrogation of that treaty, under the notice. Germany blames the preference particularly for the present condition of things, and she retaliates, and will retaliate. This surtax that it is proposed to put upon German goods shows the extent of the wisdom of that undertaking; because of all the exports of Germany we only take about three-fourths of one per cent; in other words, for every $100 that Germany exports

Canada takes seventy-five cents. And, Sir, this surtax is the outcome of the mistake the hon. gentlemen opposite made in putting that preference upon the statute-book. They cannot withdraw it now, because if they do it will be misunderstood in England, and will do a great deal of harm. Much better if it had never been put upon the statute-book.

Now I wish to say that the government have failed to study the conditions and requirements of this country. Anybody who looks out into the history and commerce of other commercial nations will see that whenever one country is in a position to take commercial advantage of another country it invariably does so. As the outcome of that principle, we find Germany invading the English market, the United States invading the English market. And what about the position of Canada? Our conditions are such that we are left largely at the mercy of foreign countries. The government have failed to study our conditions, and to give to the people of this country that remedy which ought to be within the reach of any executive in this country.

Now, I wish to refer to another matter, and the strange thing about it is that not one of the members of this government has made any allusion to it. I refer to the statement made by the ex-Minister of Public Works, who charged certain men, with his knowledge and with his consent, and who were within the range of his eye in this House, with going behind the backs of the people to the manufacturers of Montreal, and making an agreement with them that their interests would not suffer, that they would be protected, if they would give them their support, and they did give them their support. Now, Sir, that statement is made of public men who go around the country preaching free trade as they did, and free trade as it is in England. I heard the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, in my own constituency, make the statement that the goal was free trade as it is in England, right in face of the fact that they had gone behind the backs of the people and made a direct bargain with the manufacturers of Montreal. Not one of their supporters on that side of the House condemned that sort of thing in a public man, not one minister has dared to get up and dispute that statement made in the House several days ago.

That is a condition of things that ought not to be possible at the hands of any government in Canada. That is why we have seen so much wabbling and swinging about on this tariff question. These hon. gentlemen are tied hand and foot to one set of men and they have promised the other set. We ought to have a stable tariff and a stable lot of men, not a set of men without a settled principle, or without any cohesion in their party, not men of the kind who get up and defend the policy that suits their own localities, men who get up and condemn protection and yet want it before they sit down. This government is all things to all men. This man and that man must be satisfied. They go back and tell their followers that it is all right that they made such and such a statement in the House and that the government did not dispute it. They will be able to go back and fool the people if possible, without any settled principle or policy, and Sir, if there is one thing more than another they want to get rid of it is their past history. I would if I belonged to them. If I had a past history like theirs there would not be anybody gladder to see the book closed than I. There will be no mile stone to mark the spot where it lies after the close of that book. The time ought to come in this country when public opinion will not condone such treatment at the hands of any set of public men. I wish to refer to a matter which implements the question we have been discussing. There has been a great deal said about the farmers interests and about the manufacturers interests and it is a strange thing that hon. gentlemen opposite hold up these two classes of men as being distinct in their interests and in their endeavours to do some thing for the country. The man who stands up and says that the interests of these two classes are one is, as a Canadian, doing his country more good than the man who tries to create discord and strife between them. The interest of the farmer lies in the success of the man who by his enterprise provides a market for the consumption of the farmers product. The city of Toronto alone consumes more of the agricultural products of Canada than Canada ships to the United States. If you take the western and south-western states you will find that where there are the largest centres of population, built up largely by the manufacturing interests, the farmers in the surrounding localities are more prosperous than in localities where there are not these centres of population. If we are to repeat in any sense the history of that country in opening up our west we must have a policy which will build up centres of population. I am quite willing to admit that the conditions are not exactly the same. They have factors in their make up in the United States which it is impossible for us to have. For instance, the great corn belt in the south western states never can be repeated in our own North-west but we have a soil the fertility of which has never been equalled in any country in the world. I refer to its capabilities, to its lasting qualities, not being exhausted by cropping, and while they have been able to build up the great business of the farmer of feeding his cattle and hogs and exporting them to the foreign markets of the world we ought to be in a position to largely repeat the experience of those people in our western country. I see no reason

why hon. gentlemen opposite, or some one who will take their places, should not have a policy to build up large centres of population in that country. The government are failing to see the importance of developing the great resources of that country and putting them solidly into national channels as they ought to do. What do you find when you go west of Lake Winnipeg ? Between Lake Winnipeg and the Pacific coast there are no less than eleven railways leading directly out to the United States. This question of transportation, a question which we should have some definite plan in order to carry out the development of this great country, ought to settled by the executive. It is impossible to overlook the fact that there is no settled policy in reference to the transportation of that country. Some hon. gentlemen may say, and some of them have said, that it makes very little difference in building up that country whether a railway runs through the United States or where it runs so long as it handles our business. That is not the proof of history. Take little Holland, for instance; the transit trade of Germany has made Holland what it is and if Germany were to divert that traffic Holland would be at her mercy. Little Holland cannot compare with our great west but this country ought to have a well defined plan in reference to transportation and this plan ought to lead to a general result in the interest of the people instead of a continuance of the practice of diverting trade to a foreign country. It is rather a strange thing but it is true that of every dollar earned by a railway seventy cents of that dollar goes back to the people in labour and material and thirty cents goes for other purposes. Will any one tell me that the carelessness of the government in allowing railways to have their outports in foreign countries is not injurious to Canada ? Most decidedly it is. Hon. gentlemen have no policy on that question nor have they any policy of the tariff except the Macawber like policy of waiting until something turns up.

There has been a great deal said about the cold storage business. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) ought to be here now. It is rather significant that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and the hon. Minister of Agriculture are out of their seats just now. The census business is not in a very satisfactory condition and the results of the cold storage system have not been so satisfactory as they might have been. If there is one thing more than another that should have been characterized by careful and judicious guidance it was the cold storage business. What ought to have been a great blessing to the farmers of this country may be easily made otherwise. To hear hon. gentlemen talk in the country you would imagine that every farmer in the whole Dominion had been made prosperous because there is cold storage controlled by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. They have frozen the poverty out of the poor fellows and they are all rich. I have taken the following figures from the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce. They show that the exports of poultry, dressed and undressed, were as follows :—

1900	$210,822
1901	145,158
1902	238,047

We heard a great deal about what was going to be done with small fruits. Well, here is the result of the exports of small fruits :—

1900	$ 59,412
1901	38,326
1902	26,311

I venture to say there will be less this year. It has not been the success it should have been. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, as reported in 'Hansard,' said a year ago that the bulk of the cheese went by ordinary freight and not in cold storage. Now why? One reason is that freights are higher. Another reason—and underlying this reason is a most serious question for the farmers of this country, and I in all honesty call the attention of the government to it, for I do not think the Minister of Agriculture is able to grapple with it—another reason is that they take our cheese comparatively green, but a few days old, and the government propose to put it into cold storage. If they put cheese in cold storage while the process of curing is going on they check that process by the too low temperature, and instead of the cheese curing as it ought to cure, the acid permeates it and the cheese becomes bitter. The cheese business in this country is in a very precarious condition on account of the manner in which they propose to handle cheese in this cold storage outfit. Any reasonable man would say that cheese of that nature should not be put in a too low temperature, but that it should be put in a higher temperature in order that the process of curing may go on. When it is sufficiently cured, then it is possible to put it in a lower temperature. That is the reason why the shippers of cheese are not willing to risk cold storage. Butter, of course, is in a different position, because that process has not the same effect on butter, but rather the contrary effect, because it stays the process of decomposition that takes place, and the butter is kept sweet. I want to call the attention of the government and of this House to the fact, that cold storage is not accomplishing what it ought to accomplish in the interests of this country. It is merely experimental. The government have no settled policy for instance as to what to do with apples or small fruits, or cheese, or butter ; and, Sir, the great increase in the revenue, and the great increase in the business of this country lies more at the door of the energy and dominant purpose of the business community of Canada than it does to the government.

Mr. FRASER. Hear, hear—or any government.

Mr. BRODER. Yes, or any government.

Mr. FRASER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. Particularly the government we have now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. Let me refer to what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said some years ago. It is a matter of history but you cannot stop us from reading history whether you like it or not. The hon. gentleman said that the government were flies on the wheel, and they are flies on the wheel now.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I was quoting Sir John Macdonald's speech in Halifax.

Mr. BRODER. You were in good company once in your life.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. We used to hear much about the exodus. The hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) himself used to talk about the exodus until you would think he belonged to the children of Israel.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. Yes, Sir, you would think he was Moses himself. Now let us see—that exodus is going on unfortunately. According to his own books last year there were $1,538,186 worth of settlers effects went out of this country. There were a good many times that came in, but if you turn to the returns, that was the case even when the minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) was saying that everybody was leaving the country. What are the facts? The facts are simply these: That the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Quebec largely go to the United States when they leave home instead of going to our North-west, and the population of Ontario, if it is depleted any has been depleted by the removal of the people from Ontario out to our western country. Now, the hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) used to take that as an argument against the policy of the government that he was opposing in these days. What has he got to say in justification of the policy that his own government has adopted. If what he said then was true; it is certainly true yet.

I want, Sir, to look this matter squarely in the face. What do we find? We find that notwithstanding what we are told the Minister of Agriculture and the government are doing for the farmer, that when the boy grows up he leaves the farm. I would be the last man to propose to proscribe the boy's liberty in that respect, or to check his ambition, but I say this: That if there is one economic question for this country more important than another, it is the question of keeping the people on the soil. The policy of the present government has not had that effect. There are less men on the soil to-day in Canada than there were when they came into power. We know that when people go into the towns and cities, they become more restless; more likely to leave the country or to change their position; and what we want to do and what the government should do, is to try and grapple with this question. I throw out the hint that the Department of Agriculture should take up questions of this kind; they should try to make the home of the farmer more attractive to the boys. Perhaps that more than anything else will cause the boy to stay at home on the farm if he finds there comforts suitable to his desires. The Minister of Agriculture should try and make the farmer's home more comfortable. I suppose the Minister of Agriculture does not know much about family affairs, but he ought to or he should not be a minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. It is serious to relate that enough people are scarcely staying upon the soil in Canada to attend to the ordinary avocation of agriculture. The tendency in this country is to send the boys to the professions. Perhaps the well to do farmer is anxious to have one or other of his boys in a profession, and having a little spare money, and that sort of thing, he wishes to educate his boy, and that leads to some extent to the present condition of things. But what I want to say is this: That if the Department of Agriculture takes up this question, and through an educational process makes the farm home more attractive, there will be less young men leaving the farm. We look too much at the farmer from the standpoint of whether everything pays or not. But there is this I will say on his behalf: There is no class of people who are as sure of employment for themselves and their families as are the farmers. That is the first great consideration. There is no other profession in which employment is so sure. And while our friend (Mr. Grant) yonder was talking about the farmer's income from his investment, and the manufacturer's income from his investment, he lost sight of this very significant fact: that when the balance of the account is made up the farmer has lived about the best of any man in the community. He and his family have lived well; they have had the best butter and eggs and cheese and bread, and the best of everything—they sell you fellows the rest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. That is a consideration that is too often lost sight of by our hon. friend and others. The farmer has had his living, and we cannot take that away from him. That is a very important matter, but

still we want to make the farmer's home more attractive. Encourage the boys to stay on the farm. The Department of Agriculture professes to instruct the farmer how to raise oats and wheat, and potatoes, and turnips, and cattle and all the rest of it, and when a farmer comes here and goes to the Experimental Farm he finds that our Experimental Farm looks just about as bad as the one he left at home. The drains are not much better, the cattle are not much better. The outcome of this is, that the old farmer begins to say: What does this mean; the government at Ottawa do not know very much more about this business than I do. I say to the government: Don't send a man among the farmers who does not know his business. There is no class of people in Canada that will find out his weakness as quickly as the farmers will. That is a piece of advice I am giving especially to the premier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODER. Now, I want to touch up our reciprocity friend a little. Last year he was after the Americans with a club in his hand; now he is after them with a feather. Last year it was retaliation, tariff against tariff, away up high; now he is waiting for reciprocity. Does any man pretend to say that under the conditions described by the hon. gentleman who took his seat a few moments ago (Mr. Grant), with the farmer and everybody else worse off in the United States than in Canada, reciprocity with such a people would be of any advantage to this country? You have to trade with somebody better off than yourself if you want to get any advantage. If there ever were conditions which would favour this country for reciprocity, they were those which prevailed under the reciprocity treaty from 1854 to 1866, because there was a war going on in the United States at that time, and enormous prices were obtained for agricultural products of all kinds. Yet what occurred? During the twelve years of the reciprocity, under the most favourable conditions, we traded with the American people to the amount of $150,000,000 more than they traded with us.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) We would do so again.

Mr. BRODER. Oh, I dare say you would make mistakes all your life.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Come again.

Mr. BRODER. In 1874, when there was a proposition made to bring about reciprocity with the United States, the late Hon. George Brown went to Washington, where he found American statesmen, no matter how prominent they might be, so ignorant of Canadian affairs that he undertook to give them some instruction, and he compiled a lot of figures from their own records, which were published in London, England, and I have a copy of the document in my possession at home—showing that during those twelve years we traded with the Americans to the amount of $150,000,000 more than they did with us. And in the black days of 1857, when our commercial interests were bound up with the American people, when the crisis of the year came in the United States, this country suffered beyond measure; and we should never be put in that position again.

The hon. gentleman is talking reciprocity because he sees a break in the clouds; he is likely to go to Washington again and have a bit of a time with the Americans. Well, Sir, you will not make any bargain with them unless you give them the best of it. These hon. gentlemen went over there before, and they were like the boy whose father sent him off to do business and learn something. He was a good-looking, well-preserved boy, and his father was well off. I am an advocate of a boy making some of his mistakes while his father is with him. We let our boys grow up and leave them to make their mistakes after we are gone. I am afraid that is the way with our hon. friends. This gentleman sent his boy away to look after a bit of business, and gave him some money. The boy was gone for several days, and the old gentleman got very uneasy looking for his return. The boy came back at last, and the old gentleman said to him, 'Well, my son, what have you brought back?' 'Nothing,' answered the boy, 'but I had a good time.' 'Well,' said the old gentleman, 'it costs a good deal of money, but if there is one thing I am glad of, it is that you did not do any business.' That is just the position of the Joint High Commission. The country had not entrusted them with any business before; it was the first business they had attempted to do. They went to Washington, where they were well cared for, and had a good time, and spent a good deal of money; and when they came back the people of Canada said, 'If there is one thing for which we are thankful, it is that you did not do any business.' Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is blowing his horn—he wants them to come to dinner again.

It is time we left this American business alone. Canada for the Canadians in the fullest sense of the word. Instead of letting any of our boys leave this country to better their condition in the United States, as hundreds of our boys have done who have been brought up by poor parents fighting the battle of life as best they could, and who are better fitted for the climate and conditions of Canada, let us spend a few dollars in keeping our own boys in the country instead of bringing out Doukhobors. There are many families in the north country who have followed the lumber business over the rocks and the sand hills, whose wages are now gone, and who are unable to get

away from that part of the country. The government had better help these men to go to the North-west and to create a Canadian sentiment which will aid in assimilating the masses of foreigners coming to our shores, and help to make this country what it should be, a country for Canadians to live and prosper in.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). Perhaps it will not be inopportune for me on this occasion to say that, having listened to a number of the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, it does strike me as rather extraordinary that, with the weakness of the present government, the state of feeling in the country which these hon. gentlemen describe, and the desire of the people at once to oust them from office, hon. gentlemen spend so much time discussing the ways and means of the present government. One would suppose, from what we have heard, that the country is now so instructed and so determined that when the time comes there can be only one result, the complete destruction of the government. Yet, day after day we have heard from these gentlemen, talking in dolorous tones, until the rather farcical effort of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Broder), who has just left the House—an attempt to give a backwoods, everyday election speech in the House of Commons, to provoke a laugh, when they could say nothing else.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, we heard something.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman would laugh if there was not much to laugh at, if it was a party matter.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is why I am laughing at you.

Mr. FRASER. I think it was rather unkind to the member who preceded him for him to say that North Ontario might have sent here a better man. I think a modest man would have said that he is a good man, at any rate. If I am not mistaken, the hon. member himself went to North Ontario to try to defeat the hon. gentleman and failed; and it is a commentary on the present state of the opposition that the ablest man in their ranks on financial questions, or if you believe them, on anything else——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—was buncoed out of the election.

Mr. FRASER. Was defeated, and was defeated largely because the hon. gentleman who has just spoken was there. I understand from good Conservatives that if he had not gone there, there would have been some chance for Mr. Foster. The fact remains that the ablest man they had, going into the constituency, with 518 in his favour and with all the power that was brought to assist him, including the leader of the opposition, and the mighty fighting colonel from Victoria, failed to break the vote of the electors. And I am sure that in the hon. member who has just spoken, the constituency of North Ontario has sent to this House a representative of whom it may well be proud. But the hon. gentleman mentions a particular district where he said the Conservatives had five majority at the previous election and now the Liberals have fifty. And this he charged to the account of alcohol. Are we to conclude from the hon. gentleman's statement that sixty Conservatives could be made to vote for the Liberal party by giving them rum? It seems to me we have in that an exhibition of the moral condition among the supporters of the hon. gentlemen opposite which is not very much to their credit.

I would like to know from hon. gentlemen opposite whether the present tariff is, in their opinion, the same as the tariff of the Conservative policy. Will hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is? I pause for a reply. Not one will venture to give an opinion. I want to know where we stand and where hon. gentlemen stand, because I want to be fair.

Mr. COCHRANE. You are on the floor.

Mr. FRASER. You are not an authority. Will hon. gentlemen opposite say that the present tariff of the Liberal party is the same as the tariff of the Conservative party when they were in power?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. FRASER. Of course it is not. Is it higher or lower? Again there is no reply. An attempt was made by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Broder) to show that the present tariff is higher than the former one, but if it be, I cannot understand why he had anything to say against it. He also spoke of the surtax as being all wrong, and yet before he sat down, he wanted a high tax imposed against American goods, which after all would be only going on the same lines as the surtax. For my part, I think that the surtax is economically wrong but politically right. It was the only thing the government could do. A gentleman will fight with his fists, and no man who is a gentleman will fight any other way, but even a gentleman, if he finds his opponent throwing a stiletto or dirk or using a derringer, will take the first thing handy and knock him down. And in view of the action of Germany against Canada, we had no other resource than to act as we have done.

Another thing the hon. gentleman said was that the conditions in Canada put us at the mercy of the foreign manufacturers. It seems to me that the reverse is the case. The manufacturer in Europe has in many cases to import the raw material before he can manufacture it, then he has to face an average duty of 17 per cent and pay the freight and other charges, and if a foreigner can do all that and still have the advantage

over Canadians, it speaks very little for the enterprise and energy of the manhood of Canada. What does the hon. gentleman think of Canadians who cannot compete under these conditions? Is it any wonder that before he closed, he should have suggested to the government, apparently in all seriousness, that one of the great duties of a government was to make the home attractive to the boys. How is the government to do this? By showing the wife how to keep it clean. By showing the farmer how many lickings he should give the boy? By showing the girls how they should dress in order to make themselves attractive to the neighbouring boys? What can be thought of an hon. gentleman, who, speaking in the interests of the farmers, gets up and says that the business of the government is to make home attractive to the boys? Is it any wonder that he should have followed this up by saying that you must trade with some one better off than yourself, if you want to make your business pay. Just fancy the absurdity of saying that before your trade can pay, you must trade with a man better off than yourself. A farmer, for instance, never can make farming pay unless he sells his products to some one richer than himself. And a merchant could not possibly make money, if he purchased from a farmer who was not as well off in this world's goods as himself. Why, Sir, trade knows no distinction. If it pays better to deal with a man who is worth $10,000 than with another who is worth $100,000, do you think he would not give the preference to the poorer man? The absurdity of these two propositions that the government should instruct the farmer how to keep his boy at home and that nobody should trade except with some one better off than himself, shows the depths to which a lack of knowledge of political economy will bring even a clever man like the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder).

I am sorry that the hon. leader of the opposition has gone because I wish to make a passing reference to him. This budget debate opened, so far as he is concerned, with a very funny incident. He spoke about certain ministers going to sleep while the Minister of Finance was speaking. That I thought was hardly a remark becoming the dignity of a leader of a great party. But swift judgment followed. Hardly had the hon. gentleman began his reply to the Minister of Finance, than that wide awake member of the opposition, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), fell sound asleep, lulled into somnolence by the sound of the voice of his leader right beside him. But I must, in justice to the leader of the opposition, say that he did not retaliate, but remained awake while his colleague from East Grey had the floor.

What does the amendment mean? First of all, the amendment declares the present tariff unsatisfactory. Why is it unsatisfactory? Is it because the tariff is not high enough or because it is too high? Why, Mr. Speaker, from one end of the Dominion to the other, during every election since the present tariff has been put into execution, we have been charged with stealing the clothes of the Conservatives. In this House, on the platform, in the newspapers, everywhere they say: 'You have stolen our tariff; you have made no change; you said you would but you did not.' Well, if it be the same tariff and is unsatisfactory in the present conditions, how comes it that it was satisfactory up to 1896, when our conditions were far worse? Let them explain how that tariff, which at that time they considered the acme of perfection, and an image to be worshipped, a juggernaut at whose shrine they should lay everything precious, should be unsatisfactory to-day. I appeal to any hon. gentleman opposite who reasons, how he can explain the two things? The first statement is that there is an unsatisfactory condition. Does that condition arise from the tariff? Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the tariff is unsatisfactory. I believe it is, and I am glad of it. It is unsatisfactory to some people who want to gain something for nothing at the expense of others. But, if the tariff is unsatisfactory, there is one point I would like some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to explain to me—is the tariff unsatisfactory as compared with the tariff in force under the Conservative government or is it unsatisfactory as compared with the tariff they would make if they were in power? There has been no explanation of this.

Mr. CLANCY. Ask the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes).

Mr. FRASER. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) cannot tell me. I am asking hon. gentlemen opposite. I am asking the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and it will not do for him to shoulder the question off upon some other person, because he finds himself in a dilemma. Reams of paper have been used in preparing speeches for this debate, and volumes have been spoken in it. But no hon. gentlemen opposite has shown why the tariff was unsatisfactory. They are only able to say two things. The first is: You made a promise that you have not fulfilled. And the second is: The prosperous condition of the country is due to the kindness of Providence. And when these two things fail them, they do as they have invariably done ever since 1895—aye, ever since 1891, when I first came here—they fall back upon one expedient, which they use with enthusiasm, they abuse the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Do not hon. gentlemen opposite see that they are but adding each year to the laurels of that distinguished statesman? The only effect of attacks made by every

one of them from the highest to the lowest—in ability not in character—is to convince the people that they themselves feel that if by a chance arrow they can hit this target of the hon. minister's reputation, it would bring them distinction and glory.

Now, for my part I am not so particular about being consistent as I am about being right. It is much better for a man to be right than to be consistent. Hon. gentlemen when in power, declared that they were going to reform the tariff. Were they inconsistent in that? I do not think they were; for, if they grew at all, I could well understand that they would grow wiser.

The second thing is that this is to be a declared policy. Well, dear me, is not everything declared that is said? Who is to 'declare' the policy? And when is it to be 'declared'? Hon. gentlemen tell us that the protection must be adequate. Here, it seems to me, is the crux of the whole question. Who is to say what is 'adequate' protection—is it to be the manufacturers or is it to be the leader of the opposition and his friends? I know very well that if it is left to the manufacturers, they will make it 'adequate' according to their own opinion. Herein is the whole of the amendment which we are discussing. It is an amendment to deceive; it is an amendment intended to hold out to every manufacturer the hope that if hon. gentlemen opposite get into power, they will give him adequate protection. And every manufacturer says to himself: 'Adequate,' that is just what I want. The manufacturer of cotton will say: 'Adequate' protection for me is so and so, and I am to have it, for here is the resolution; the party voted for it; and I have heard them say that they are the same yesterday, to-day and to-morrow—therefore, I am to have 'adequate' protection as I understand it. Will hon. gentlemen opposite tell us who is to be the judge of this adequacy? My own opinion is that they thought that by using this word 'adequate' they would gain the same end as their former leader Sir John A. Macdonald did in 1878 when he said that the change in the tariff that he proposed would not be an increase but a readjustment. That took. Surely, a lot of people who do not understand this phrase—'adequate protection' will be led to understand that it means something in their interest. I said that hon. gentlemen opposite must believe that the present tariff is either the same as or different from the last tariff. I believe it is different; I know it is different; and, if hon. gentlemen opposite would utter their true thoughts, I think they would acknowledge that it was different. If it were not different, of course, every speech made on the other side would be a waste of time and energy. The only thing for hon. gentlemen opposite to do, if they think the present tariff is the same as the last, is to show that they were wrong in their last tariff and that the present government is

wrong in the existing tariff and ought to have gone further, and that if they get the chance they will go further.

Mr. CLANCY. Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER. Surely that is as plain as anything in the world can be. But let me repeat it for the sake of the hon. member for Bothwell. If hon. gentlemen opposite say that the tariff of the present government is the same as the previous tariff, then they must show that this 'adequate' protection means to go further than the late government went and further than the present government has gone. Because, if the protection given by the present government is not 'adequate' and their tariff is the same as that of the late government, there must be something——

Mr. CLANCY. Nobody said that.

Mr. FRASER. Now, I have got my authority. So, this tariff is not the same as the tariff of the late government. Therefore, the present government has made a reduction. So, let us not hear anybody else say anything about our having stolen the clothes of the hon. gentlemen opposite. We have the hon. gentleman for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), for whom I have the highest respect, declaring that the tariff of the late government is not the same as ours. If the tariff is to be changed, is it to be lower than that of the present government, or is it to be as high or even higher than the tariff before 1896? We know pretty well that hon. gentlemen opposite do not propose to go back to the old tariff, for the manufacturers will not accept that, as they want more. Now, if this is a lower tariff than the former one, that matter is settled.

Mr. CLANCY. But it is not settled that it is a lower one.

Mr. FRASER. Well, I have heard of repudiation, but never of repudiation within so short a time. I never knew a man to repudiate himself within five minutes. I distinctly cited the hon. member for Bothwell as an authority. But now, when he sees the effect of his admission, he wants to go back on it. But I know he will not go back on it in quiet moments when he talks it over with me, but will feel as bad as any man can for the wretched position in which he finds himself. I wish to emphasize what the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) says. We had a crusade inaugurated by the manufacturers and assisted by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). But I venture to say that never was there a movement more ill-timed. Why, you cannot talk to people now of changes in the tariff with any hope of gaining their attention. They know, and all the statistics show it, that they never received as good wages before. I want to make the statement distinctly, and any hon. gentleman who lives in a place where it is not true can say so far as his locality is

concerned, that never in the history of Canada was labour so difficult to obtain, and never in the history of Canada did labour receive, one man with another, as high a wage as it does to-day.

Now, how are you going to help them to do any better ? Is the labourer, or the farmer, or the fisherman, or the lumberman fool enough, when he knows he is better off than he ever was before in this world, to go and take the plunge that hon. gentlemen want him to take in order to find something better ? Men take a plunge when they are so bad off that they cannot be any worse ; but sensible men who know that they are in a better position than ever before will let well enough alone, and will say : We are not going to take the plunge, even though these distinguished statesmen run the risk of being found shivering, cold and naked on a foreign shore, as they were up to 1896. The time is all wrong for any such a change. I read a letter the other day from a Mr. Wilson, I think his first name is Thomas, who sent me, with the letter, a paper that was designed to teach the farmers of Canada. He also wanted to teach me, because he said : Here was a paper he was issuing to teach the farmer. They start out to instruct the farmers. Very well, North Ontario gave them the first answer. We also had an election down in Yarmouth, where one of the most tremendous majorities ever given in Nova Scotia gave them another answer. Do you think, Mr. Speaker and hon. gentlemen, that we are to be taught the truth by men who believe in that which is not the truth universal ?

Now, protection may be a good thing for one man. It may be an admirable thing for me, if I am a manufacturer of hats, and if I can get the whole market for hats in Canada. That is only protection run mad. That is a good thing for me if I am making hats. But surely it is not a good thing for every man who has to buy a hat. The truth of the matter is that we are joined together in this country, as people are in every country, in such a manner that the interests of each must be respected and conserved, so that what I give to assist one man should be repaid to me from another man, or by any number of men that are assisted. That is equity. They never made a bigger mistake. They were going to give this information to the farmers, but the farmers were too busy at work, and laughed at them.

For myself, I want to say distinctly that the present policy must be maintained. It may require some changes. Taxation ought to be adjusted to suit all, and where one manufacturer has an advantage over another, or one consumer pays more than another, an equitable adjustment must be made. I care not whether we have a protective policy or a revenue tariff policy, no one manufacturer has a right to an advantage over another, and no purchaser has a right to purchase to the disadvantage of another. We must move, but no advance should be made to give protection to one class over another. We must move in an opposite direction. Let each man start fair in the race for life. As much as any other man, I want to see our manufactures increased, I want to see improvement in the character of their goods, in the enlargement of their output, but it must not be by making others contribute to that end. I would as strongly oppose the farmers, the fishermen, the lumbermen or any others getting an advantage over the manufacturers. We are building up a mighty west. This year a population as large as four constituencies will be added to this great land ; and I commend the words of the Minister of Finance to our energetic friends the manufacturers in that connection. If they spent their time in improving their method—increasing their skill—enlarging their outlay and securing every available market, instead of paying for costly delegations, illogical speakers and ineffective attempts to teach farmers wiser than themselves, they would find a better disposition among all classes to assist them and more tolerance for their just claims. They have, by their unwise course in raising this issue at a most unreasonable time, done more to discredit themselves than they can repair in the near future. Those who tell them, kindly but firmly, these truths, are their best friends, and have their and the country's interests at heart more than the men who seek to gain the impossible by loudly proclaiming that with the nearly 17 per cent advantage they have, they still must call on the country to implement, by subventions, what, if rightly utilized by energy and skill, would be able to meet every competition and overcome it. I am satisfied the crusade so loudly proclaimed had not the sympathy of a large number of our best manufacturers.

I know hundreds of these men who come up here thinking that this government could be imposed upon, and that their loud cries might be taken as representing the actual condition of things in the country. At the same time the largest manufacturers in the country were doing better than ever they did before, and saying as plainly as possible that this unwise method of attempting to rush protection at such a time as this would be fraught with the disaster that it met, and well met. Now, I am accused of being against the manufacturers because I firmly say what I believe is in their best interests. No such a thing. We have manufacturers in Nova Scotia and in all the provinces, but if after all the protection that was said to be given by the hon. gentlemen opposite, after eighteen years of that protection, and from 1896 to the present—take it as you will, either the same system or a very small change made, some gentlemen say a certain percentage of one per cent—if after all that time they have not gained

the experience, as I believe the largest number of them have gained, to conduct their business with profit to themselves, I do not think a large majority of the people of this country should be compelled to contribute to increase their gains. Why, Mr. Speaker, I was talking to one of the greatest manufacturers of Canada who was asked to go to a meeting of the men engaged in the trade in which he was himself engaged. He laughed and he said : Why, there will be nothing given. I am a protectionist, but they cannot get anything ; and do you know I have come to the conclusion that we ought not to get anything, and I will tell you why. Each one got up at that meeting and said : We want such and such protection. Immediately another gentleman sprung up and said : What, would you kill my business ? For that would kill my business. Then a third got up and said something else. We were all engaged in the same business, or utilizing the same article in different directions. Now, that showed me that these men are not agreed among themselves. I know nothing of what these delegations said or wrote. But I have a little evidence myself of a man who joined a delegation to come here to get protection and who, when he went home, wrote a friend of mine, not in this House, saying that the very thing he had to ask for by coming with the others, to make them think he was with them, would be the very thing he did not want. Oh, for a sensible condition of things, under which we would cease this attempt to make it appear that a country 4,000 miles in extent, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and running close to our neighbour's for all this distance, is going to become a greater country by imposing more duties. If we must impose duties, let it be to pay for the benefits we receive. I object, Mr. Speaker, and I will object so long as I live, that the government shall be asked to give its sanction to any other man, excepting our regular tax-gatherer, who pays the money into the coffers of the government, levying taxes on the people of Canada. I will object that any man should have the authority to, in his own interests, take that which belongs to the people. The amount of it makes no difference. It is worse, of course, as it gets larger, but even if it is only a cent, it is wrong. I know that no human being can make a tariff that is uniform. I know there is no government in the world that can be perfectly equitable, but there are lines upon which we can go. Just fancy the farmers, who are at least from 65 to 70 per cent of the whole population of Canada, going to be made rich by feeding less than 15 per cent of the population, which represents the whole number of manufacturers who are engaged in manufacturing in Canada. Is that not a nice proposition ?

The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), a farmer of the farmers, spoke the other day. Fancy sixty-five such men as that—practical, good farmers—becoming wealthy by feeding fifteen manufacturers. There is one thing certain; either the sixty-five farmers are not good farmers or the fifteen manufacturers eat too much—that is all. One or other of these two things must be true. Now, the hon. member who spoke last said that he wanted all Canada joined together, and he did not want one class to be against the other. Did he not see that the very position he was taking of calling for more protection for the manufacturers had all the elements of setting class against class ? Do you think the farmers, the fishermen, the lumbermen and the miners are going to sit down quietly and permit the government to grant benefits to one class which they belive are going to be injurious to them ? No, the present tariff has worked well. Frankly, I think we might have gone further.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Just explain about the $7 per ton on steel rails.

Mr. FRASER. Well, the explanation I give of that is this : If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) had heard the last speaker he would have got his answer, when he said he never thought it was intended to be given. I do not say that. But the hon. gentleman has his answer from his own side of the House. It ought to be a more satisfactory answer than I could give. I happen to come from a country where the people are largely fishermen, farmers, miners and lumbermen. I do not want for them special advantages and they do not want them. They have never asked me either individually or altogether to see that they receive protection for lumber or that their fish should receive special protection, or that their farm products should receive special protection. The truth of the matter is that the farmers themselves are to blame. If I were inclined to set farmer against manufacturer I could easily do it. I could say, for example, that if the farmer will permit delegation after delegation to importune members of parliament on both sides of the House while he sits still this clamour may be more successful than he imagines. I do not say that the farmers should come here, and they do not come here, and ask that there should be largely increased duties imposed upon the articles which they produce, but they should see that they should at least be treated so as not to be made to contribute a dollar more than they ought to in order to pay for carrying on the business of the country. The position of hon. gentlemen opposite is a marvellous one. Hon. gentlemen invariably say that the present tariff has nothing to do with the Liberal party's being in power and that the result is all due to Providence. I believe that it is largely due to Providence. I believe, that, except and in so far as the government can make the conditions of life such that the products of labour shall

receive the greatest reward, by the least possible tax, the government cannot bring about the condition of things that makes a country prosperous. But, must we go into ancient history, as hon. gentlemen have done, I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite speak about the time of Mr. Mackenzie, and I have noticed that they have gone back to the time of confederation and waded through the whole of our history. What about the time when they invariably described everything good in this country as being due to the national policy. The national policy was the only thing that made this country what it was, and if the national policy were destroyed disaster would result. Is there an hon. gentleman in this House who has not heard an argument of that kind ? I have been a little on the political platform and I do not remember ever having met with a Conservative who has not used that argument. One of the principal sinners is the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who took a leading part in that same direction. If it was not a good argument then it is not a good argument now, to say that the government does everything for the country and that everything in the country depends upon the government. I am down on that kind of paternalism, and I think we are weakening the respect for government by looking to it to do everything. Hon. gentlemen ought not to have said a word about the present condition of things, or they ought to have made a repentance worthy of the occasion. They should have said : We were wrong before and we are right now, or we were right before and we are wrong now. I care not which. If they say that the government has nothing to do with the large increase in the prosperity of the country they were wrong before and they should repent. I am glad that the government has withstood the movement for higher duties. Oh, the cheers that would have greeted us from the other side of the House if the government had capitulated and allowed itself to be stampeded into protection. Hon. gentlemen would have given us no assistance. If this is the same tariff that they had why should they be against the government ? What is the meaning of their opposition, of their attempt to defeat the government if the government has accepted their tariff and is carrying it out ? If hon. gentlemen opposite have settled the whole tariff and if the prosperity of the country is owing to their tariff why do they complain ? A more unsatisfactory state of things could never exist. If protection has been adopted by the Liberal party why should the Liberal party have their opposition ? Why not say : Now, you have been converted to our views, let us all join together because we all think the same as to the policy of Canada ? Will hon. gentlemen opposite say that ? Do they not perceive that the country must see through them ? Do they not see that they cannot impose upon the people by any artifice of that kind. One word more, before it is six o'clock. There was a good deal said about the surplus. Now, in a perfect condition of things, when there is no debt there should be no surplus, because if there is no debt and no interest to be paid, the people should not pay a dollar more than is required for the purposes of paying the expenses of the government. But a surplus in rich years such as we have had, when used by the government as it has been used, it is all right. Instead of borrowing six million dollars a year as the Conservatives did, this government is spending a great deal more money for the good of the country and they are using the surplus for that, so that we will not need to borrow that money and pay interest on it for all time. Another thing is that the government are paying off this year $5,000,000 of the debt and we will never have to pay it again.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that include the sinking fund ?

Mr. FRASER. The sinking fund goes on, but there is a difference. The present government put money in the sinking fund, but the late Conservative government was a sinking fund altogether, until they sank out of sight in 1896.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FRASER. At the risk of repeating myself, I wish to state distinctly again, in order that it may be answered by hon. gentlemen opposite, the difference between the present tariff and the tariff of the past. Is the present tariff the same as the tariff of the late government ? Is it less or is it more? If it is less, would the Conservatives bring it up to where they left it, or would they advance it further ? It is no use talking about what this man or that man on either side may have said ; it is the existing tariff that we are discussing now. Reference has been made to the United States, and surely if there is any country in the world which might indicate that prosperity can spring from a high tariff the United States would be that country. But here is a curious condition of things. What is the condition of things in the New England states, the home of manufacturing on this continent. I hold in my hand a monthly paper called the 'New England Illustrated,' published by George H. Chapin, of 257 Washington street, Boston. It gives a description of farms that are for sale in New England, the home of the highest protection that any country ever had. I will read this choice description of a farm which is 'No. 22,472' and the numbers go up to 40,000. Here it is :

Quarter mile lake front ; 160 acres ; 1,000 cords wood ; cuts 18 tons hay ; 150 apple trees; 25 varieties grapes ; pears ; plums ; cherries ; cranberries; aqueduct spring water ; good seven room house, newly painted and papered, piazza ; barn 40 x 40 cellar ; open and box stalls, double boarded ; carriage house ; blacksmith shop with bellows, anvil and tools ; good repair ; high location ; 400 sugar trees ; salmon and trout fishing ; could sell lake front cottage lots.

What do you think all that cost in the chosen home of protection ? Why $900 part cash. If there is any country in the world where you would expect farms to sell well, it is in New England, but the heading on this list is 'Abandoned Farms.' Where is the home market ? I may be told that the growth of the western part of the United States has made it impossible for New England farms to keep up, and there may be some truth in that, but in the older provinces of Canada the same rule would apply, for we are now being fed from the west. But do you think you can get a farm like that in any part of Canada for $900. Now what is the condition of the labourers in the United States ? John Burns, who is the highest authority on the question of labour in Great Britain, has recently described the industrial conditions in the United States as 'hell with the lid off.' Is that where the hon. gentlemen opposite want to go ? John Burns knows more about the labour question in Great Britain, and I think in the world, than any other man, and that is his idea of the industrial conditions in the United States. Every one knows who has read about the strikes, and the industrial wars and the trusts that there exist conditions in the United States which have made thoughtful men fearful of the future, and some of them have predicted that within a quarter of a century or less there will be such an industrial war as can be wiped out only by blood. We do not want such conditions in Canada.

The position which I take on reciprocity, Sir, is the position taken by this government. I believe that reciprocity would be a good thing under proper conditions. I am not going to seek reciprocity from the United States, or make them think by word or deed of mine that we need it more than they do. The truth of the matter is that the question of reciprocity is up to the Americans now. I remember being in Boston last fall addressing the lower province men's society, at which there were three members of Congress and two senators present, and I took the opportunity of telling them that they need not expect to have Canada, because we would not go with them, but that they could have reciprocity. I speak for the lower provinces when I say that we want reciprocity, but we do not want their wretched fiscal system which hon. gentlemen opposite want to copy. They forced us into looking for markets in other parts of the world by their treatment of our products, and now we have, by the British preference, these markets, and so they have to come to us looking for reciprocity. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) talked about our going to Washington to get a banquet. Well, two reciprocity delegations went from Canada to the United States, Joseph Howe, the brightest man that Nova Scotia ever produced, and probably one of the brightest men that Canada has ever produced, spoke in reference to the very thing the late government did as a 'comedy of errors.' Then, Sir John Thompson went. The hon. member said that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was going to a dinner. When the late leader of the Conservative party went there, he did not stay long enough to get his dinner, because he was only there three minutes.

One of the most amusing features of this discussion was brought out by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart), who joined protection and transportation together. Now, that is something that I cannot understand. How are you going to have very much transportation if you are going to exclude foreign goods ? You spend millions in providing the best means of transportation in the country to take goods out ; what are you going to bring back ? Are you going to bring back a shipload of money ? Every one knows that money will not come back ; every one knows that goods must be exchanged for goods. If you put a tariff wall high enough, nothing will come in, and if nothing comes in, nothing will go out. One of the most absurd ideas possible is to join protection and transportation. What is to become of the great granary of the west, which is to be Britain's future granary, be our transportation facilities ever so good, if we put up a tariff wall high enough to keep all foreign goods out ? Transportation goes with a moderate tariff ; transportation and a revenue tariff will go together, but never transportation and protection.

I need scarcely say that I was very much pleased with the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance. I was pleased with it for a number of reasons. I felt proud that he was able in so lucid a way to place the financial condition of the country before us, favoured as he was with conditions such as have never existed in Canada before I was proud of him as a Nova Scotian. I was proud of him as Minister of Finance, instead of having to apologize, as the late Minister of Finance had to do for our little business capacity, he was able to show what splendid things this country was doing. I may say also that my pride in him was increased by the fact that when our opposition friends found themselves in a dilemma, they had to go to Nova Scotia to get a man to save them from utter ruin, though I do not think that the high standing of even that hon. gentleman can prevent that ruin.

We are spending more than we did before —why ? Because we can afford it. Does any man blame the farmer whose condition

is twice as prosperous this year as it was last year, for spending more ? Is he not going to have a better house, provided with all those appliances which will make it a more comfortable home for his wife and family ? The merchant who makes 20 per cent this year, where he only made 10 per cent before, can make an addition to his house. As it is in business, so it is in the country. While we are spending more, the people can pay that much more easily than they did the lesser amount that was paid under the late government. The people know that, and they do not feel it ; and when the increased revenue is being applied to the building of great public works and to the reduction of the debt, the people are willing to contribute. But even while we are getting a greater revenue which we are spending in the interests of the country, the taxation which is producing that revenue is 10 per cent less than it was before, taking one article with another. The late Minister of Finance himself said that the tariff was only reduced one per cent, from 19 per cent to 18 per cent. That is not a fair way of putting it. The tariff rate was reduced from 18 per cent to 16 per cent, a reduction of two in the rate of duty, which is really a reduction of nearly 10 per cent.

It may not be out of place for me to say something about the present conditon of the country and the condition in which it was left by hon. gentlemen opposite. The marvel to me is that these hon. gentlemen do not consider the changed conditions. The present government found the country with deficits and almost in the throes of a revolution—class against class, religion against religion, and everything that would make for the worse condition of Canada rather than for its better condition What happened ? We are to-day exporting nearly $100 per head for all the people of Canada, besides living much better than we did before. These are the conditions that exist to-day, and every man sees them. I was told by a manufacturer not long ago, one who only wants what is fair, living in a city of 40,000 or 50,000 population, that he actually cannot get men to work. Is that not a state of things for which everybody should be grateful.

Mr. PUTTEE. What city is that ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Except the farmers would buy more.

Mr. FRASER. Of course they would buy more if there were more manufacturers ; but how does the ex-minister suppose that sixty-five people are going to be made rich by feeding fifteen people, the proportion between farmers and manufacturers ? I say that the more men you have consuming things produced on farms the better ; but I deny these things are going to be brought about by protection, because while admitting that you may aid a few men, you are hindering the great body of the people. Canada for the Canadians, I hear ; but every time it is Canada for the few. I am in favour of Canada for the Canadians. I am in favour of laying tribute on every country under the sun, in order that Canada may be made greater than it is. But I refuse to acknowledge that Canada for the Canadians means Canada for the favoured few. They wish to build up a wall by which the Canadians are fleeced. Is that Canada for the Canadians ? Give every man a fair show, and then the best conditions will be realized.

One thing I wish to say to the right hon. leader of the government, and I say it with all the more ease because he is absent. If he has done nothing else, he has since 1896 done more to cement together all the races and creeds in Canada than all the men in Canada before him. I venture to make this observation, that the Protestants of Canada understand our Catholic fellow-citizens, and have a better and higher idea of them than sometimes in our narrowness we had before, and our Catholic fellow-citizens, I think, understand us better and hold better relations with us than they did before. We talk of protection to help the few ; but the men who can bring Canadians together, whether they be English, Scotch, Irish, French, German, or any other nationality, and cement them together as Canadians, does more than any other man or combination of men can do by any other method. Is there not to-day a better feeling among our people ? I venture to make the statement, Mr. Speaker, that hereafter it will be impossible to raise the racial and religious cries that formerly prevailed in Canada. I think the good sense of the people of Canada will frown down any attempt of that kind. It may be that some would-be politicians will have to go out of business. Thank God if they do go out of business, when the general community is coming to understand better what will lead to the higher development of Canada. I wish to say this as a Protestant, that the right hon. leader of the government will leave a name for thus doing that will be green in Canada so long as men worship at different altars or trace their families back to the various nations of the world.

The hon. leader of the opposition made a western trip. I was not invited to go with him nor can I speak of what happened from personal observation. But four things followed, which we all know. We know that from the extreme west the first answer that came to that movement which was going to result in the defeat of the government, was the election in Burrard of a government supporter without opposition. The opposition there, even after this visit of their leader to the west, could not muster among them a candidate. Then there came an answer from central Canada, given in the election in North Ontario. Everybody knows the result of that election. Following that came the voice of the far east, in the Yarmouth election, where the Liberal majority

of 250 at the general election was raised to the overwhelming one of 800 or 900. These are the results which followed the preaching of the Conservative gospel by the leader of the opposition. But perhaps my hon. friend was unfortunate in his choice of the gentlemen who accompanied him and they may have spoiled the good he must otherwise have done. The hon. gentleman had occasion to attend a banquet in his own province in the town of Sydney. Here let me say that, and as a rule, Mr. Speaker, we run local politics in Nova Scotia on the same lines as federal politics. On his way to that banquet, my hon. friend passed through the county of Antigonish, where a local election was being held, and despite his presence the Conservative party there could not find a candidate to present himself in their interests. There are the four results which followed this remarkable tour. How can we explain these results? I would venture to suggest that the condition of the people was such that they were too busy to turn out and take part in politics. Go to a farmer, when he is busy gathering in the products of the soil or putting seed into the ground, and ask him to attend a political meeting and you will find that he will prefer remaining at home, where he is contented and happy, doing labour that is going to bring him in profits, than to go and listen to the arguments of hon. gentlemen who want to make him dissatisfied with his lot. With the sun shining, with the blessing of Providence in his work, with every man busy, he will take no chances, he will not seek to change his present condition, and that is why my hon. friend cannot get followers.

Mr. Speaker, this is a country of vast extent. The conditions that exist in one locality should not be allowed to colour our views of the conditions that prevail generally throughout the Dominion. I made the calculation, and was able to make the statement in Boston, which I now repeat. They were surprised to learn, but it is perfectly true, that neither in ancient nor modern times was there ever a people of the same population as the Canadians, who did as much trade per head as we have done in the last six years. No nation, not even the nation from which we have sprung—the land of all lands, Great Britain—can compare with us in that respect. We have discounted our neighbours to the south, for in those six years we have done 75 per cent more business per head than they. That is the condition of the country, and that being its condition, should not wise men draw from it the conclusion as to what is going to be best for this whole country. I heard an hon. gentleman opposite say: 'I know no west and no east.' I am glad of it, Mr. Speaker. I do not want any question interjected into the politics of Canada which will disturb our happy relations with one another, but so soon as you propose a policy which will give advantages to certain people in Canada at the expense of others, you break away from that policy, which recognizes no east or west but takes the country as a whole. But when we learn the important lesson that every interest in the east and every interest in the west are joined, that no man liveth to himself as no man dieth to himself, then we will have laid down the golden rule in Canada and will perpetuate a different order of conditions to that which exists in the country to the south of us.

Men on both sides ask where is all this prosperity we are now enjoying coming from? Even Liberals are surprised that these conditions should not only continue, but increase. Hon. gentlemen opposite are unable to explain, they are lost in wonder, and their wonder is no doubt mingled with regret. But the answer to the question is easy. All the prosperity we are now enjoying comes from the soil. Everything comes from the soil—God's only foundation for a country's wealth.

When we properly appreciate that fact, we will, irrespective of party, do what we can, not to hurt the manufacturers or any one else, but to increase the general prosperity of east, west and middle. We in the east must understand that the wealth of the country, as well as its population, is going in the next twenty-five years to be centred in that mighty west beyond Lake Superior. Shall we do anything that will injure the new settler going into that country or tend to make his burdens too heavy? Shall we not rather see that while he pays a fair share of taxation, he shall have every advantage that ought to be given him. The future is partly in our own hands, under the beneficient power which rules over all. But let us at least join in this sentiment, that while Canada remains as she is—and long may she so remain—that while Canada remains connected with the mother of heroes and lions we shall follow in the footsteps of our motherland rather than deck ourselves out in the wretched, effete garments worn by the republicans in the country to the south of us. I fear not for the future of this country. With better ideas of our relations to one another as fellow-citizens, with more moderate and broader views of the religious and racial sentiments of the people, with every man at work the best he can to make this country prosperous, Canada is bound to go ahead with greater strides even than in the past few years. We can never suffer, as other countries have suffered, because while there is not more than 5 per cent of our good agricultural land now in use, we will be always able to supply these products which men must have, whether times be good or bad. And as the good work and policy of the present government become more and more appreciated, as the beneficial effects of their administration become more and more felt,

our hon. friends opposite will find that not even the magic lantern displays of the hon. member from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) in an election campaign will enable them to lead the Canadian people away from their loyalty to that noblest Canadian, the right hon. Prime Minister, and those who are glad to follow his leadership, and who at the same time are quite ready to tell him when he is wrong. We have refrained from doing that, because there was no occasion. And join with all the members on this side—and I am sure that the members on the other side will join with us too in their heart's best sentiments—in believing that the interests of Canada are safer in the hands of the present government than they have been in the hands of any government that has ever held power in this country.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, in view of the amount of industrial unrest and strife in the country at this time, I think that one remark made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) should not be passed unnoticed. He has asserted that labour is harder to obtain in Canada to-day than ever it has been before, and that wages are higher in Canada to-day than ever they have been before. I will not deal with that saving clause, for we could come to no agreement on that, at all events. But I do say that labour is not scarce in Canada to-day, and that wages are not comparatively high. The man who earns wages estimates those wages by their purchasing power ; and to-day wages purchase far less than they did two years ago. This is not simply an assertion of my own, for financial concerns have declared it and proved it all over the country. Dunn & Co. published the fact last fall that, in the last two years, taking the country over, the prices of commodities—that is, the cost of living—had increased from 25 to 35 per cent. That is practically a reduction of the earners' wages to that extent. So far as the west is concerned, the increase in the cost of living is even higher than that, and with the influx of immigration and the general prosperity, it is no exaggeration to say that the cost of living is 40 per cent more than it was three years ago. Then, I say that wages are not relatively high. As to the matter of labour being scarce, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser), in his remarks on that point, simply voiced a general opinion in this country at the present time, an opinion which has been encouraged and generally accepted, but which is not in accordance with the facts. In this House we have had a proposition to increase the salaries of judges, the higher cost of living being recognized ; and in the other House, among other labour matters, they have been discussing the matter of raising the wages of the lieutenant governors. One of the senators, in urging this increase, gave it to be understood that he was not encouraging or promoting a strike on behalf of the lieutenant governors in Canada. Now, if that hon. gentleman should be unsuccessful ; if there should be a strike or a walk-out on the part of the lieutenant governors of Canada, this government will see whether the labour market is over-crowded or not. I am sure it will put them in a very different position from any they have been in before, if they have trouble in finding men to fill these offices.

In this debate, as in other similar debates in previous sessions, the question of what constitutes a surplus has been brought up. There seems to be a great variety of opinions on the subject. In some years there has been a question of whether we have had a surplus or not. Owing to the matter of bookkeeping it can be argued in either way. Sometimes our revenue has been less than our ordinary expenditure. But sometimes our ordinary expenditure has been less than our revenue, though the whole expenditure is greater than the revenue ; yet we are told on such occasions that we have a surplus, because some of the expenditure has been charged to capital account. For my part, I see no great objection to having a capital account for the Dominion apart from the consolidated account. But if we are to have a capital account, then the items that are to be charged to it in all the departments should be specified and known and thoroughly understood. It is now at the option of the heads of the departments to say what expenditures of their departments shall be chargeable to capital and what to consolidated account. And of course, the heads of our departments wish to make as good a showing in the House as possible. While this state of affairs exists we are bound to take the total expenditure of the country and call that the expenditure. Whatever revenue there is above that may be called a surplus. But, even on that line of reasoning, we have a surplus this year. I can see no room at all for arguing that matter. But there is one point I have not seen brought up before, and that is that if we have a surplus we have no proposal for reducing taxation. And this brings up the question of the government's fiscal policy. If it were a policy of high protection for the industries of the country, the matter of surplus would not make much difference, for surpluses would not often exist. But if we have a revenue tariff, then I say this matter of surpluses demands attention. There is one course for the coming year every time there is a surplus. The imperial government have had their budget brought down since ours. Finding that the war expenditure having ceased, they have a surplus, the announcement of that fact is immediately followed by statements of the reduction of taxation. We have not received any such promise as that. And I draw the conclusion from this that the fiscal policy of Canada is not in the future, even if it has or has not been in the past, to be

established on any principle either of protection or revenue tariff. That means that the government are going to be guided by the forces or influences that are brought to bear upon them in framing their policy. And that is why it seems to me very important that the members of this House, as representing the several constituencies of the country, should make their statements of where they stand on this question of protection or revenue duties. The hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), in speaking early in this budget debate, made this reference to the North-west :

> Now let me say one last word about the North-west Territories and Manitoba. One of the influences, perhaps the main influence, which has prevented the revision of the tariff comes from the North-west Territories. That I happen to know.

Mr. Speaker, I look upon that as a very valuable statement, and one that should be gratifying to the representatives and to the people of the North-west ; and I think the other parts of Canada can put that on the credit side when they are considering the matter of expense in connection with the North-west. I am free to say that last year when this subject was under debate, I feared that this year there was going to be a different story to tell, and that we were going to be face to face with a demand for higher duties ; and if the west has been the main cause, or a material cause, in restraining that sentiment, I think we can well be satisfied, and we can say that we have done something for the good of the country as a whole. That brings us to a consideration of the influences that are going to guide the policy of the government in the future. Naturally, as has been pointed out before in this debate, those influences and those interests which make the most profit out of a protective tariff are the very ones that are the most in evidence, and that are the most persistently and powerfully before the government. The producer, the farmer, the worker, naturally cannot get his views nor his influence easily before the government. In view of these facts, it seems to me more important than ever, for the sake of good government, in order that the sentiments of the whole people may be carried out, that representatives of the people who come here should get up and state exactly what they think themselves of this question, and what they hope for in the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were some announcements made in the budget speech which I cannot help looking upon but as of a protective character. I cannot form any other conclusion. I regret most that anything in the nature of a threat should be held out to Great Britain that probably the British preference may be repealed. Sir, I always was a supporter of that preference, I believed in it. I thought there was a good deal that was right and sound in that position. I did not consider the preference was made for Britain's benefit, though I knew it might have some effect there, that it might commend itself to the people of Great Britain ; but I believed that it was adopted primarily for our own benefit. I believed it had an effect beneficial to our own people. I believe that the operation of the preferential tariff with Great Britain has been a distinct advantage to this country, and that we should retain it, and retain it for that purpose alone. And it would seem to me somewhat ungracious now to make a threat to Great Britain to repeal it in certain eventualities. Probably there was not sentiment in the first place that dictated that preference, I prefer to believe that there was not. I accepted it myself as a Canadian business proposition, and as such I intend to stand by it.

Then, Sir, another thing of a distinctly protective character is the German surtax. I regret very much that its effect will be probably more disastrous in the immediate future to the Canadian consumer than it will be to Germany, though in the long run as a retaliatory measure, Germany will suffer the most from it. But in view of our considerable imports of sugar from Germany, and our rapidly growing imports of structural iron, the imposition of this surtax will not be to the benefit of the Canadian consumer in the near future. Both as regards sugar and structural iron, the surtax will have a protective effect. Then another announcement in the budget speech was that a duty would be put on steel rails. Two years ago the Finance Minister announced a bounty on steel. Previous to that we had a bounty on iron, and I believe that the bounty system is the most honest protective system. When the country deliberately hands over cash to any company or individual as a bounty, the people know what it costs, what it is, and what it is worth, and just how much the tax amounts to. To that extent I think a bounty system in regard to these industries is far preferable to an import duty, which becomes a tax to the consumers. But, Sir, I cannot see any warrant or any necessity for offering $7 a ton on steel rails. When the industry gets into a position that it can supply the market the duty will go into force, and the effect will be to increase the cost of steel rails to railways. Seeing that it has been the policy of the country to assume to a great extent the burden of the construction of railways by granting bonuses the result will be that we shall be asked to grant larger bonuses. It would have been a more honest and straightforward proposition to give a straight bounty. In regard to binder twine, which at first appears to be a protective proposition, I think there can be but little objection to that. I would myself have preferred to see the burden placed upon our binder twine manufacturers lifted by a straight bounty given to them, equal to the amount of the rebate

given in the United States on all twine manufactured there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the amendment that has been moved to the motion. It states that the operation of the present tariff has been unsatisfactory, and that what is wanted is a declared policy of such adequate protection in Canada to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures, and industries, as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians. There is a difference of opinion as to what is meant by adequate protection, mutual preference, and all these propositions that we hear so much of in this House. I see no need of quibbling over the meaning of the words at all. I think the men who make these motions give us clearly to understand what they mean. Of all the amendments that have been moved to the budget since I have been in this House, they mean this one thing, higher tariff, more protection to the manufacturers. I am bound to deal with it as such and I am bound to vote on it as such. This amendment states that it would give protection to the labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries, although it has been pretty fairly demonstrated on both sides of the House that protection to the agricultural industry is something that is beyond us and that it is an illusion. It is just something to talk about and nothing more. If the industries of this country were to be so much protected that from very shame an attempt was made to protect the farmer in the same way, I say that his last state would be worse than his first, I think the proposition to protect the farmer by absolutely debarring from this country all kinds of products that are in any way similar or identical to our native products is a proposition that is an absurdity. The fact that agricultural products are imported into this country means that there is some vital necessity for them in some parts of the country. Let us take the example of bananas and the like, for instance. They come into this country. Nobody wants to exclude them ; all we want to do is to cheapen them. If hay and the like is imported it must make for the benefit of the farmer, as the importation must be made to supply a shortage in some district at a particular time. The very fact that he needs hay badly enough to make it necessary to import it would indicate that he should be allowed to import it to the full extent required. Such an exchange of products must be a benefit to our farmers as well as to the people on the other side of the line who trade with them. Now, I come to protection as regards labour. I listen always very attentively in this House when I hear the apostles of high protection approach this subject. I have never heard them do more. I have never heard them go into the subject. I have heard them assert that protection does benefit the labourer. I have never heard them explain how or point to any instances where it has really done so. My conclusion is that it does not and that it is not calculated so to do. The statement though of all hon. members who stand for this policy is that protection is for the benefit of the labourer. It was perhaps put as pithily as it has ever been in one sentence uttered during the debate of last year by one hon. member who said :

> The basis of the national policy is to give our industrial classes work.

I am prepared to admit that, but that is very nearly its limit. What is there in this proposal merely to provide work ? Is it more work that a man wants ? We want, they say, to give him lots of work, and long hours of work. Apply that logic to the farmer and see how its suits his case. The protectionists say to the farmers : Work is a good thing, you want work, you are fortunate that you can work, what you want is work, go and work—work—work. You are fortunate for you do not have to get the permission of another man to work. You can employ yourself. Do not come here bothering about legislation, transportation and tariffs, leave that to us and go to work—we have given you lots of work. How does that sound as applied to the farmer ? It is just the same when you apply it to the workingman. When you tell him that all he wants is work he replies that it is the conditions, made to a certain extent by governments that affects the results that he gets from his work. He does not want so much work, he wants a better living and a better opportunity to enjoy life. After all that is the furthest extent that hon. gentlemen who support protection for the benefit of the worker can go. They say that the national policy provided work for the industrial classes. Then, they say : We want the reservation of the Canadian market for the Canadians. However, that sentiment may be approved, however nice the sentence may sound, what they mean when they introduce a protective resolution to that effect is to reserve the Canadian market to the Canadian manufacturer. What is there in that sentiment to appeal to the farmer ? He wants a great deal more than the Canadian market. This country needs a great deal more than the Canadian market. I have heard it said that without high protection it would be made a slaughter market. If this tariff wall is put up it will be a slaughter market for the Canadian farmer and the Canadian workingman all right enough. I am aware that in this country as well as in other countries there are some men who are entitled to and do speak for labour who believe in protection. I often wondered how this was so, and what reason they could give to themselves for their opinions. I have followed this cry in Canada for protection on behalf

of the manufacturers very closely. I have followed all their assertions that they are interested in the workers who work for them, and I have found that there is only one time when the manufacturer as a rule displays his interest in the workers, and that is when he wants more protection. Outside of that everything that the workingman goes into, that he puts time and his money into, in order to improve his own position, is looked upon coldly by the manufacturer and he has then no help or assistance or sympathy for the labourer. Yet, in this one matter that means so much to the manufacturer, the worker is told to believe that the manufacturer is looking after his interests. The story is not plausible enough to stand investigation. It does not stand the wear when it is on the statute-book. It is not in the interest of the worker to have high protection to give to the man who has to pay him practically absolute power to fix the price of all things he has to buy. It is not good logic and it is not good business for the man who works in the factory, or on the farm, or in the mine. But, the manufacturer is a wise man. He has two strings to his bow. It is generally supposed to be evidence of wisdom to have an alternative route. It reminds me of the darky whose business was coon-catching. He had traps set both ways and when asked the reason for this he said it was to catch them both coming and going. That is what the manufacturer does. He wants to catch the workers both coming and going. He wants protection for the article he manufactures and he wants the fullest freedom in the employment of his labour. He wants the privilege not only to bring in labour but he wants the government to spend more money yet to import labour. He wants the freest of free trade and he wants a bonused trade in the one thing he buys, the labour of his fellowman. He wants a bonus against the one thing the workingman has to sell; that is his labour, and yet he wants to have protection for the article he is going to make and going to sell. It is a scheme that works both ways; the traps are set both coming and going there, Mr. Speaker, and for my part I think that these extremes in both ways make for his undoing.

I want to deal for a little while with the form and extent and methods of our present immigration system. There is a great deal of immigration at the present time; there is a tremendous call for it; prosperity seems to need many immigrants. A few days ago, the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) prompted by the action taken by the Toronto Trades and Labour Council, put a question to the ministry, the gist of which was: Whether Mr. W. T. R. Preston the Canadian immigration agent in England stated that mechanics were simply unobtainable in Toronto owing to the great demand for skilled labour in that city. In reply to that question the acting Minister of the Interior (Hon. Sir William Mulock) stated: Instructions have been sent to immigration agents to confine their efforts towards promoting the immigration of agricultural classes. Now, Sir, I have been interested in this matter and I have gone to the minister, and I know that the policy of this government is to encourage the immigration from foreign countries of agricultural labourers and those who till the land. But I want to state most emphatically to the government and to the acting Minister of the Interior, that this agent in London is not in sympathy with that policy of the government to encourage only agriculturists to come to Canada. I know as a matter of fact that that is the policy of the government, this year, last year, and for years, and the minister has told us emphatically that the government would not adopt the policy of encouraging mechanics to come to Canada. I know as a matter of fact that instructions to that effect have been sent to the government agents in the United States and more especially in England.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these instructions ignored ?

Mr. PUTTEE. I do not know whether they are ignored or not, but I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that the government immigration agent in London is not in sympathy with that policy, and therefore he certainly exceeds the instructions if he does not go contrary to them. Since the question was answered in this House, I have noticed that Mr. Preston has answered it in London also, and it seems to me he has answered it in a way that is hardly respectful to the government and to the minister. Before the question was asked in this House and when the new government offices were opened in the centre of London, the newspapermen were invited to the opening and they got interviews with Mr. Preston. I quote from the London 'Daily Mail' of April 17:

> Already well over twelve thousand people have left England this year to settle in the far west. Mr. Preston declares that he can find work at once for 40,000 men, and that the rush, great as it has been, has not yet met requirements for labour there.
>
> The number leaving this country would have been much greater but for the fact that there are no assisted passengers.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is hardly in keeping with the government instructions to their agents, that these agents should be publicly regretting that there are no assisted passages.

> Thousands of people have applied and been stopped by the want of the eight or nine pounds necessary for the journey. If they can manage to get there, and land without a penny in their pockets, plenty of work is waiting for them, said Mr. Preston; 'but it would never do for the government to pay the passages of people who in a few months, if they settle, will have votes. Philanthropic agencies do a little, but

if I had £20,000 to-day I could spend it well in helping good people out—people who have little chance here and who are wanted and would do well there.'

Some of the stories Mr. Preston tells are pathetic.

I know, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, that Mr. Preston can tell pathetic stories.

One family, by selling everything, raised just enough to pay their journey from Liverpool. They bought their tickets, but then had no money for the fare between London and the seaport. Many manage to raise all but a pound or two, and then come to a dead stop. The experience of Canada in the past has shown that often enough the poorest men in the end make the best settlers. A party of prosperous farmers once compared experiences to learn how much each of them had on landing. It was found that the richest had three pounds.

The Canadian government is anxious to contradict the stories that have reached this country telling of congestion at Winnipeg. 'There is nothing,' Mr. Preston says, 'in the situation which should cause intending emigrants to postpone their departure.'

Now, Sir, I want to say that we should have no agents in London, in Britain or on the European continent telling the people that all they want to do is just to land on our shores. I say that it is nearly criminal to get families to leave their homes in England, to go on our prairies to encounter conditions which they know nothing about, and to induce them to do this by telling them that if they get to Canada without a cent, work is waiting for them. It is not a fact. It means suffering, it means loss to them ; it means a bad name for our North-west and for Canada, and it ought to be absolutely and instantly stopped. The only people that should be told that it is safe to come to Canada with only enough money to pay their passage or a little more, are the young people, and they should be young people from the farms. Whatever volume of immigration there is from the old countries a large proportion of it will go to our large cities, and this immigration comes into very serious competition with the labouring men in these cities. It causes wages to be broken down at the very time when prices are increased as they are in the city of Winnipeg to-day. And as to the prosperity why prosperity is simply a curse to the man who is earning the same wages as he did before and has to pay higher prices for the goods he consumes. A few years ago the city of Toronto used to be flooded time and again by immigrants, but now the mecca is Winnipeg and a large portion of the old country immigrants who come there stay right in the city. There is always bound to be a large portion of these immigrants in the cities when everything possible is being done in Great Britain to encourage the emigration of the knock abouts from the English towns who are unaccustomed to any kind of farm labour. It should be insisted upon at once, that our European agents should stop, and stop by instructions from the government, telling people that all they want to do is simply to have money enough to pay their passage. It is criminal to bring wives and families out here on such representation as that. A great deal of the immigration work done to-day is being done in large cities. I have never yet had a proper explanation of why it was that about eighteen months ago it was necessary to open up an emigration office in the city of Birmingham. Why there is hardly a green blade of grass within twenty miles of Birmingham; it is the centre of the Black country. To go there to secure immigrants is positively absurd. You might as well go to Whitechapel, and as a matter of fact they do go to Whitechapel. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) was curious to know whether the mechanics of other cities were protesting in the same way as were those of Toronto. I have here a circular that has been drafted for the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council, and instructions have been issued to have it sent out as widely as possible over Great Britain, to the large national organization headquarters, and to all the newspapers with a request that it should be published. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that this circular is substantially correct, and I had it in my mind when I referred to the remarks of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) when he said that wages were too high and labour too scarce in this country. This circular was drafted by men who, I admit, are right in the very hot spot of the circular that has been sent out :—

In view of the prevailing conditions in this province, the Trades and Labour Council of Winnipeg has decided to lay before the British public certain facts concerning the present 'boom' in immigration to Canada. The glowing and highly coloured statements and reports sent from this country give an entirely misleading, not to say mendacious, account of the prospects for immigrants, and mostly emanate from interested sources. The steamship and railway companies naturally desire passengers ; the business classes hope to profit by the influx of people ; the employers seek to intensify competition in the labour market, while the government itself is not above suspicion, as it is entirely representative of those various interests. There is thus a gigantic conspiracy to promote and welcome the tide of immigration that has set in towards this country.

More dangerous still is a certain class of individuals, of which the Rev. I. M. Barr is typical, who seeks to exploit the immigrants by forming colonies, &c. This reverend gentleman has just arrived with a 'colony' of 2,000 people, in the promotion of which he has amassed a tidy little fortune, variously estimated from $10,000 to $35,000, and is already being bitterly denounced by his disillusioned dupes, many of whom find themselves stranded, practically without resources or employment, in a strange land. What are the facts ? It is, no doubt, true that there is a prospect of success, for any man with a little experience, in farming ; but he must have capital. Any one intending to go farming, even on a homestead, should have not less than from £200 to £300. Young men are in demand for farm servants,

but the demand is now almost filled, owing to the enormous influx. In the cities the demand for artisans will be, in most cases, fully met by the supply, while there is over-supply of unskilled labour, except in cases where strikes are pending. Wages, no doubt, seem high, compared with those prevailing in England, but this is not because of any scarcity of labour, still less does it show that the labourers are particularly well off. It is due to the high cost of living, especially in the matter of rent and fuel. Living has gone up 25 per cent in the last year or so and numerous strikes are pending in all parts of the country in the attempt to raise wages to subsistence point.

Under the conditions we would advise intending immigrants to exercise the greatest caution before coming out, especially those with families, unless they have capital. With a view of preventing English workingmen from being duped or victimized, the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council send this warning and hope that you will give it due publicity.

It is signed on behalf of the council by the president and the acting secretary. Now, I submit, knowing some of the facts, that that is a fair and fairly moderate statement; but if the gist of that should be telegraphed across the ocean, it would be denied by the government agent in London to-morrow, as other statements have been recently.

Now, Mr Speaker, in connection with this question of protection, I wish to refer to the speech of the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte). It will be in the recollection of the House that he touched upon more really interesting matters than most of the other speakers have done since ; but at the same time, a most peculiar strain to be heard in a Canadian parliament ran through his whole speech. The greater portion of the speech was a glorification of the United States, and by the same reasoning a condemnation of the national policy of Canada. If his theory was right, what condemned the national policy was that it was just one-half too low down, so far as protective duties were concerned ; and he referred to some authorities on the other side of the line in justification of his remarks. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I in no way follow him in the deductions he draws from the policy followed in the United States in its effect on the workers. I say again, and he did not prove the contrary, that the protective tariff does not necessarily, and even does not at all, affect the standing or the standard of life of the worker. One instance of that is very pronounced in the United States to-day. Their cotton industry is protected by about 50 per cent. During the last two years there has been a great movement in that industry. Villages and towns in the state of Massachusetts and the adjoining states which depended entirely on the cotton mills, are now closed up. The cotton mills have gone What did they go for ? Not because they wanted more protection ; they got about all they could get. They went because they wanted cheaper labour, though it was as low as would maintain a decent standard of living in the northern states. They left almost in a body; but before going they sent their emissaries to several of the legislatures of the southern states, and secured the repeal of their laws against child labour and their factory laws. The cotton industry is now centered in the southern states, and in that industry there is to-day a condition of child labour that is almost incredible. All through the states as well as through this country there is quite a movement on against the dirty little cigarette ; but this question of child labour in the cotton mills of the south is not attracting the attention or getting the assistance of these people who are so interested in the children and the workers. The manufacturer does not necessarily seek protection for the sake of benefiting those who work in his factory ; not by any means. The hon. member for St. Mary's division referred to a speech made by Mr. Andrew Carnegie at St. Louis. I think it was very unfortunate for that hon. gentleman's argument having the object of commending protection to the worker of this country, that his first quotation should be made from a speech by Andrew Carnegie. That gentleman has profited well from protection in the United States ; but his workers cannot say the same. Industries that were under his control in the states not many years ago, under a tremendous protective system, were selling armour plate to build the American navy at three times its cost. That is the kind of protection Andrew Carnegie believes in. It has been wonderfully successful from his point of view, and the hon. member for St. Mary's division quotes his opinion in this House as an argument for Canada adopting as adequate protection as they have in the states. Mr. Carnegie says :

> The manufacturer on a large scale can afford to make many contracts in distant parts of the world, and even some at home, at a direct loss in times of depression, knowing that, upon the whole, the result will be less unprofitable by running full than running short time or stopping. Hence, those possessing the most profitable home market can afford to supply foreign markets without direct profits, or even at a loss whenever necessary.

That is a nice doctrine.

> Politicians give far too much attention to distant foreign markets, which can never amount to much ; and far too little to measures for improving conditions at home, which would increase the infinitely more important home market.

Yes, the home market bound up and delivered absolutely to men of this stamp. That is the policy of Andrew Carnegie. Even though you sell cheaper outside, even though you sell at a loss outside, take it out of your own people, take it out of your own workmen. Of course, where else could it come from ? Sell cheaper to foreigners and make all you can out of the people at home, and in this way, within the last thirty years, immense fortunes have been amassed in the United States by means of

the highest possible protective tariff. What has protection done in the United States during the last thirty years ? It has built up a plutocracy. It has enabled a few to amass fortunes, it has created an aristocratic class in that short time more powerful than the ruling classes in Great Britain. What it took centuries to do in Great Britain has been done in thirty years in the United States. High protection has taken from the American people the heritage of that vast continent which should belong to them. It has enabled the wealth produced by the people to be used for the enrichment of a class which is fast becoming all powerful, and which to-day is not only running industries, but owns the government from the bottom to the top. I do not know that we need that kind of aristocracy in this country. But that is what we have been developing, and what we would develop much faster, if we were to adopt the tariff of our prosperous neighbour to the south.

My hon. friend asked me what about the lead duty. I am glad he put that question, because I had omitted to refer to it, in dealing with the effect of the western settlement on this question, as it was put forward by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte). Of course in the west and other districts, there will always be some industry that wants protection. But I submit that, as compared with the mass of the people, those interests are very small, and this very item that my hon. friend has referred to is unimportant compared to the general interests. The lead men are asking for protection. What do they base their demands on ? That they cannot produce lead ? No, not at all. But they base it on this plea. They say : You have increased by protection the prices of everything we consume. You practically have burdened our trade, and we want equal protection with these other people. Sir, go on that line and you will never see the end. You will finally attempt to protect the farmers, and the farmers' last condition will be worse than the first.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of an increased duty on lead ?

Mr. PUTTEE. The hon. gentleman would not think I was a politician if I gave him a direct answer.

Mr. BLAIN. I am in earnest. And I ask the hon. gentleman if he is in favour of an increased duty on lead.

Mr. PUTTEE. All through this debate I have noticed that on one side of the House and the other, these straight questions have been put in order to try and get a man to commit himself. When I started to speak, I said that I did believe it was the duty of men representing constituencies to commit themselves on these questions, but they have not done so. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I am not in favour of the duty on lead and shall vote against it, if proposed.

Mr. GALLIHER. At the same time, you want your miners who mine that lead to be paid exceedingly high wages ?

Mr. BENNETT. He wants Chinamen.

Mr. PUTTEE. I have found out in my experience that it is not a protective duty which enables mine owners, any more than others, to pay higher wages. They do not pay higher wages on that ground. The workingmen and miners have found out that labour organizations alone have the power to increase wages. That is my answer to the hon. gentleman. That is a fact, and in view of the matters that are in the public mind at present, it would be well for hon. gentlemen to digest that fact. When certain Bills come down from the other House, that will be a good time to discuss those matters. Before I leave this question of the manufacturers double traps—traps that catch coming and going—I want shortly to refer to a further lesson which shows the whole-hearted goodness of the manufacturer when he comes to deal with the worker. I refer to the lesson we had during this last week in the city of Ottawa. I have heard the most extravagant, unreliable and unwarranted statements—as statements tending to make trouble between the workers and the employers, statements that should properly be called demagogic—made in Ottawa by men who want higher protection. I have been astounded at the statements and the speeches made and the spirit shown in this city by the Manufacturers' Association last Monday. They showed very plainly their attitude towards the workers, they told the government that they wanted free immigration. They want the government to spend more money bringing in more immigrants. They said : We want you to understand that we want an immigration policy for the cities. That was the statement made by these men who want protection for the benefit of the worker. Is not their pretension of interest in the worker a piece of hyprocrisy ? Not only are they desirous of having traps to catch both coming and going, traps that give them power to tax and power to intensify competition in labour, but they want to spike the guns of the labouring men. They are seeking to have our labour organizations practically outlawed. They are endeavouring to have these organizations divided in order that they may the better crush them. Why are they doing this ? Because we have the power to increase wages and the manufacturer, though he asks for protection, does not want to increase wages and does not intend doing so unless he cannot help it.

Now, I wish to deal a little more closely with the matter of protection to the workmen. Can it be done ? It has never been expounded by the men who ask for protection for their industries ; but can it be

done ? Now, I take it that as a matter of fact the imposing of protective duties is not a simple matter. Of course it is simple enough for a deputation to come to Ottawa and wait on the government with the request that the taxes be increased to a certain figure on certain articles, with a view to giving protection to that line of manufacture. But to actually fix the duties is not nearly so simple a matter as that. If you were to get the experience and opinions of those who have held the position of Finance Minister in this country, I fancy you would find that, in the matter of fixing duties they have to go very minutely into all these matters, they have to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with the details of the private business of the parties interested, in order to learn the proper and equitable way to arrange those duties. I suppose there was something of that in it when the Manufacturers' Association wanted to submit their schedules to the government in private. There were matters in connection with their business which they did not wish to make known to everybody. Now, can you protect the labourer with your protective tariff ? Well, yes, you can. Whether it is wise to do so, or not I do not discuss at this stage. But I for one will never believe in the honesty of the manufacturer or other person who asks for high protective duties for the benefit of the worker, unless he is willing to have included in the schedules a minimum wage in the industries concerned ; so much protection, so much wage ; so much increase in protection, so much increase in the wage. If protection is for the benefit of the people, let it be so arranged that the people shall secure that benefit. Of course there will be trouble in so arranging it. You will have to go thoroughly into the man's business. As I have said, a man does not object to it as interfering with his business when inquiry has to be made with a view to making good his demand for increased protection. But when you come to ask for a minimum rate of wage, either through the union or through the government, he wants to run his own business, and does not want to have outsiders prying into his affairs. But, in a protective tariff, it is only when there is a properly digested scheme providing that, in every industry which the tariff is calculated to protect, it shall really protect the people and give a minimum wage with an increasing rate according to the amount of taxation, that I would be prepared to say that you have applied protection to industry for the benefit of the worker. Then, we shall hear from the farmer in a different strain.

Now, the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) dealt with this question as widely and as fully as he could, and put forward his policy. He put forward a proposition that I knew him to have entertained in the past, and that is outlined in this excerpt from his speech :

> If we give cheap transportation between the west and the east why should we not supply the west with our goods ? We are prepared to increase our transportation facilities by rail and by water. Let us combine this Dominion solidly together. National unity follows commercial intercourse. We are settling the west with foreign elements. Let us have as much intercourse as we can with those foreign elements. Let us trade together, let us unite the country solidly together by a strong Canadian tariff and by a scientific system of transportation.

The hon. member takes his stand as an easterner, and speaks to the west and says : Help us to get absolute control of this market—Canada for the Canadian manufacturers—and we will give you railway facilities. What is the method adopted by the government of Canada in giving railway facilities ? It assumes a good proportion of the cost of construction by giving a bonus to the railway companies. So, what does this proposition mean ? It means : You give us power to tax you on everything you buy, then all of us will join to give money to the railway promoters, and then we shall all be better off. Certainly the people of the west will not be better off. There is nothing in that for the west. That is not a proposition that need be made at all. The west does not want transportation facilities as a gift or as a toy ; it has got to have transportation facilities for the benefit of the east, as well as for its own benefit. It must have transportation facilities, if this country is to progress. And so the question comes : How are we to get these facilities ? Are they to be provided by bonusing again ? Are we going to accept this proposition to give the eastern manufacturers the power to tax us on what we buy, and then all of us give more in bonuses to the transportation companies or rather to the promoters of transportation companies. No, Mr. Speaker. I believe with the hon. member for St. Mary's division, that the question of transportation is one that demands immediate attention ; I believe that it is high time that the government of this country should take hold of this question, no longer leaving itself to be the shuttlecock of circumstances, but with a firm hand direct the preparation of the channels in which the export and import business of the country is to run. I believe that this country would heartily endorse and support a policy that was inclusive, that was strong, that was wide and big enough to meet the whole circumstances, a policy of government construction and ownership of a transcontinental railway. I believe that the situation could be met now by the extension of the Intercolonial Railway through to the coast, or by the construction of an independent line, constructed, owned and operated by the government from ocean

to ocean, and with a policy for business purposes, and large enough to meet all the wants of the west in the matter of branch lines. And I am reminded that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) dealt with this question, speaking in the same way in this debate as he has dealt with it in the west. He has avowed himself in favour of the government road, if we could only get it. But he said that we could not get it, and proceeded to drop tears because our government is based on wrong principles and because we are not fit to own and operate railways. There is too much corruption. So, much as he regrets it, he has to part with his principles of government ownership, and, perforce, must favour the bonusing of other railways.

Now, I admit, I insist even, that this question of control must be attended to before we undertake a system of government ownership. That is necessary in the interest of the public undertakings we have at present in hand. It is a reflection on the power of the people of Canada to govern themselves that this question of patronage and corruption should enter into all our undertakings. The present railway system and other public utilities operated by this government would all be better operated if they were taken altogether out of the influence of members of parliament, so that it would be useless for any man to approach a member of parliament to get a situation on the government road or in any government enterprise. What could be accomplished has been shown in Great Britain, where there is no connection at all between members of parliament and patronage. We have had lately in this country one or two illustrations of how this matter could be arranged ; and, though I am no great admirer of the present party system, at the same time I believe it could be made a benefit to both parties in this country if they would get together and come to an agreement in the matter of a commission. Both sides of this House could get together and formulate a scheme that would put the Intercolonial, the customs, the post office, the printing bureau and every other public institution out of the influence of members of this House. I say that some such arrangement as that must be arrived at before we can undertake government ownership of railways. I believe that a system of government ownership could be successfully undertaken, and the more comprehensive it was the more heartily it would be supported by the people.

We are going to have more transcontinental roads. They are not going to be built for colonization purposes, but for purposes of profit as business enterprises. All sorts of statements will be placed before this government by the promoters of those roads who will ask for aid. I imagine that there are good grounds for believing that public moneys are paid to promoters that do not go into the construction of roads. But the roads that are going to be built hereafter will not be for colonization purposes, but for business purposes. Every cent of money that goes into the construction of roads in the North-west will return a profit as a business undertaking. Now, as the producers are going to pay the dividends on those roads, let them be owned by the government. We will have to pay the freight and the interest, why not take the operation of the roads into our own hands and guide this business for the public advantage ? It seems to me that once the idea was grasped by the people of this country that these great public services could be put beyond the reach of political influences, the people would eagerly accept the scheme. What would be better to overcome and end the many grievances that are recurrent in the North-west with this tremendous increase in the business of grain transportation, than for the government to own the roads and handle all the grain directly, doing away with the private elevator system altogether ? Last year the Minister of Railways expressed his regret that his best year had been spoilt by a combination of the coal mine owners, and that he had to pay exorbitant prices for coal. The surplus he expected had been reversed in consequence. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were lost through the combination of the coal men. You get a transcontinental road owned by this government, and you would then have your own coal mine in the east and your own coal mine in the west. I advocate this because these men who advocate higher protection tell me that they are doing it in the interest of the man who works, that they want to ensure him steady employment, good wages, a good standard of living. Well, this is the way to procure him those benefits. If you want to guarantee to the workers of this country steady employment, good wages and fair conditions, let the government take hold of the business for the general benefit.

Then, what about the binder twine question ? That has been up every session I have been here. I think it has been wisely dealt with at the present time. But why should we not manufacture all the twine that is going to be needed in this country ? It is going to be needed in increasing quantities, it is already a big item. We manufacture already a portion of it in the penitentiaries, but why should not the government take hold of the entire business ? We find the manufacturers telling the government this session that they are face to face with ruin. Buy them out, and put in plant extensive enough to supply the demand of the whole Dominion from year to year, and I will dare to say that the consumer will get it cheaper, and get it better in the long run, than the farmers get it in the United States. Mr. Speaker, these things are not impossible, they are not impracticable. We have some very good institutions already

in this country, but over in the old country these matters are carried on successfully. There is no better, and I think no bigger, institution in the world than the royal arsenal at Woolwich, carried on absolutely by the government, entirely divorced from political influences, with good wages and eight hours a day. It is not impossible for the people of this country to do the same thing if they take hold of it in a proper way and in a proper spirit. This is my answer to those gentlemen who want more protection for the sake of giving steady employment, better wages and better conditions to the working people.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I intended in the course of this debate to speak in my own language, but as the debate has been so protracted, I think I should not weary the House by a long speech in French, nor do I intend to speak in English more than a few minutes. I thought this evening, after hearing the very able speech made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), that I should reciprocate with him. After listening to the noble words which fell from his lips addressed to the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I thought I should thank him in English, from the bottom of my heart, for the very kind feelings he uttered. My hon. friend the hon. member for Guysborough said, in concluding his speech, that the right hon. Prime Minister had done more for the peace, union and harmony which should reign in a mixed community like ours than any other public man in the past. Indeed Sir, he spoke the truth. It was said a few years ago by that great statesman, Mr. Gladstone, that the Manchester school in England had given the world what was termed by a literary genius *Pax Britannica*—British peace. May we not say that with the conciliatory policy which has been pursued by the right hon. premier since 1896, he has given to the Canadian people what I may term *Pax Canadensis*—Canadian peace. I may add this, before referring to the questions which have been discussed at such length by the speakers on both sides, that no man in this country, no man in my province, and I am proud to say it before my English fellow-members, has done more to root firmly in our soil the love of British institutions than the present right hon. leader of the government. Now, I also pay my respects to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). We have been gratified with his visit during the last few months in the province of Quebec, and I am pleased to state that this distinguished gentleman has spoken with eloquence the language of the minority. It is a great example which he has set to his party and to our party, in fact, to all public men in this Dominion, by learning and speaking with grace the language of the minority. I have listened with particular attention to the speech made by my hon. friend the whip of the Conservative party Mr. Taylor). I was under the impression that the issue which he discussed had been settled long ago. For instance, he spoke of the Manitoba school question, and with no uncertain sound he raised his voice and addressing himself to the members of the government, he asked : Have you settled the school question ? Let me say that I have grave doubts as to the sincerity of my hon. friend. I well remember the attitude he took in 1896 when the Remedial Bill was brought before this House. The then whip of the Conservative party was very anxious that the Remedial Bill should not pass, although he was saying to his friends from the province of Quebec that he favoured the measure. Indeed, the question should not have been put to the members of the government. He should have turned to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and to the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and he should have asked my two distinguished friends, where since 1896, have the friends of the Manitoba minority been. They, in the province of Quebec have agitated that question year after year in the public press as well as in their speeches, in fact they made the whole campaign of 1896 on this question—and yet they have raised their voices in this House to ask the government for the settlement of that unfortunate question.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) allow me to ask him if he states that the Manitoba school question has been settled to the satisfaction of the minority.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will answer like a good Canadian. I will not speak as my hon. friend does, that is by stating one thing in the province of Quebec and another in the province of Manitoba. In the province of Quebec my hon. friend says that the question is not settled, but we hear of him speaking at a banquet in the city of Winnipeg in the presence of his leader and of his friends of the Conservative party there, and reading his speech as carefully as I can, I find nothing concerning the Manitoba school question. But I will now answer his question. To my mind the question is not fully settled, but I will add, and he knows I am speaking the truth, that in a mixed community like ours, life is made up of honourable compromises and honourable concessions. I will say further that time is a great healer, and if to-day, the Manitoba school question is not settled, at least from what I have heard with the exception of the city of Winnipeg the school law works fairly well. I trust that the majority in the province of Manitoba, when the time comes, and without any trouble, without raising any racial or religious issue, will bring a settlement that will satisfy the minority as we, in the province of Quebec have acted towards the Protestant minority, and as our friends in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince

Edward Island have acted towards the Acadian minority. But my friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) also raised another old issue. He spoke of the plebiscite and asked the government if they had settled the question of prohibition. I would be very sorry for one that prohibition should exist, because I believe with the majority in my province, that things should remain as they are. But, I wish to protest against the remarks which fell from his lips. The hon. gentleman stated that we in our province, had been brought to the polls under the dictation of two or three members of the cabinet and that if we had been left free, probably we would have voted in favour of prohibition. In the province of Quebec we are against all excesses, the vote which was taken on the plebiscite was the true expression of the popular sentiment. We do not believe in prohibition by the statute-books, in the province of Quebec. But, let me say this to my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor), and if he does not take my word for it, he can have the word of his leader from the province of Quebec (Mr. Monk). In Quebec, with the exception of the large cities, the municipal councils are at liberty to grant licenses for hotels and restaurants. and in three-fourths of the municipalities this privilege is not used, and though we are against prohibition by statute, we are nevertheless in favour of temperance by moral suasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the popular verdict is the criterion by which the policy of the government is to be judged, then, Sir, this government enjoys the full confidence of the Canadian people. Since the last session of this House, we have had by-elections in Maisonneuve, a manufacturing constituency, in Terrebonne, in Argenteuil, in Maskinonge, and in Two Mountains. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) made the fight of his life in these constituencies. He fought bravely, as he usually does. He came surrounded by his friends of the Conservative party and the issues or rather the 'issue,' for there was only one—was the tariff question. In these constituencies of the province of Quebec, as in the constituency of North Ontario, the electors declared themselves in favour of the fiscal policy of the government. Sir, I think that the defeat of that remarkable man, Mr. Foster—one cannot deny his ability, and he would have been an ornament to the House had he been elected—the defeat of Mr. Foster proves that this country is not in favour of any change in our tariff policy. The hon. leader of the opposition went to that constituency and he travelled from township to township making speeches, but notwithstanding all his efforts, in that Conservative stronghold, my young friend (Mr. Grant), whom I was pleased to listen to and to applaud this afternoon, carried the county by a very large majority.

We have been told that the Liberal party had played a mean trick on the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). We have been reminded several times during this debate, that we did not carry out the policy which we promised in 1896, and some one hinted—I think it was my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder)—that during the elections of 1896 some work was done behind the scenes by the leaders of the Liberal party, and that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte), together with the premier, went to the manufacturers and gave a pledge that the tariff policy then existing would remain in force. Well, I was perhaps too young to know what was going on behind the scenes, but I went around the province of Quebec with my leader and with the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and I can say boldly that they fully agreed on the tariff issues of the day. But let me refer to this book ; it is the report of the Liberal convention of 1893, and I find that so far back as 1893, the hon. member for St. Mary's was present at that convention, being sent there by his then electors of the county of L'Islet. Opening this book at page 71, I read this :

The Tariff—We the Liberal party of Canada, in convention assembled declare :—

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service ;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations ;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few ;

It has checked immigration ;

It has caused great loss of population ;

It has impeded commerce ;

It has discriminated against Great Britain ;

In these and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people.

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government.

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have greviously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy and now profess their willingness to make some changes ; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

To this programme, to this resolution, the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) assented, and the battle of 1896 was made under this resolution, which was approved of by the electorate. But, Sir, I do not blame the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) for what he will allow me to qualify as his inconsistency. There is such a thing as inconsistency in the world, and even my English friends have the well-known dictum : Inconsistency thou art a jewel ! Inconsistency is like opportunism, and opportunism in fiscal matters is honest when it is sincere. The philosopher has said, 'vita in motu ;' life exists in action, and I can well understand that on fiscal matters a man may shape his opinion according to circumstances. We find that in modern political history there have been many examples of inconsistency. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has only to read the book I hold in my hand—it is a book written on the many inconsistencies of a great modern parliamentarian and a British statesman, the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary. His adversaries have published a pamphlet entitled 'Before Joseph Went to Egypt ;' that is to say, before he became an imperialist, at the time he was a little Englander. He was inconsistent; still he makes no bones of it. We also find that Gladstone himself once belonged to the school of the stern and unbending Tories,' and afterwards became the leader of the Liberal party. D'Israeli himself, when he made that famous speech in the House of Commons in which he said that the day would come when he would be listened to, was a Radical amongst the Radicals; and M. Thiers began as a Royalist and ended as the chief of the Republican party in France. Therefore, inconsistencies are to be met with in political life, and again I do not blame the hon. gentleman who represents St. Mary's for having changed his opinion on this fiscal question.

But, Sir, if it is alleged that the Liberal party has not been faithful to the promises it made in 1896, I say that the people who make that assertion are not well informed. In 1896, when the hon. leader of the government was going around the country, preaching his political gospel, he received one day a letter from a good Canadian, who for some years sat in this House, and whom I am sorry not to see here any more. I refer to the hon. member who represented Centre Toronto, the late Mr. George Bertram. Mr. Bertram wrote to the hon. Premier, then the leader of the opposition, and I have here his answer to Mr. Bertram as to the tariff policy of the Liberal party :—

Whether a policy of absolute freedom of trade would or would not be injurious to the manufacturing industries of this country is a question which I will not stop to discuss here. There is no occasion for such a discussion, as the intention of the Liberal party is not and never was to establish free trade in this country. The question was discussed at Ottawa, but, after anxious consideration, while fully recognizing the superiority of the British system of freedom of trade as an abstract principle, the convention came to the conclusion that, under the existing conditions of our country, the fiscal policy best adapted to its requirements, its economic situation, its enormous financial obligations, is a revenue tariff ; that is to say, a tariff levying our revenue from customs duties, the basis of which would be the amount necessary to carry on the business of the country.

I submit also that, apart from the community as a whole, the manufacturers have not only not to suffer, but much to gain from the substitution of a revenue tariff for the present system. A revenue tariff, being based upon the fixed charges of the country, and not, therefore, subject to fluctuations and alterations made to suit and please now one interest and now another, would establish those conditions of stability and permanency which, experience has shown, are essential to the security and prosperity of manufacturing interests. Moreover, I think I can confidently appeal to the experience of the business community that, with the exception of monopolies and combines, all manufacturing interests would welcome a change of policy on the lines which I have indicated above.

I entirely concur with you in the hope and belief 'that the advent of the Liberal party to power would place political parties in Canada in the same position as political parties in England, who have no tariff issue distracting the country every election.'

The moment a tariff had been framed and enacted which would not be subject to variations, under which manufacturers would know that their invested capital would operate regularly, according to the conditions calculated upon by them ; under which their conditions with regard to foreign competition would not be arbitrarily jeopardized ; under which the burdens of taxation would be reduced to the lowest degree compatible with the exigencies of the revenue ; there is reason to hope that such a system would ingratiate itself in the confidence of the people, and that therein the manufacturing class would find the security, which it needs, and the consuming classes that relief which they must have.

This is the agreement arrived at between the leader of the Liberal party and one whom I may term the leader of the manufacturers of that time. This is the covenant, if I may use the word, which was made between the Liberal party and the manufacturers during the elections of 1896; and to that agreement the Liberal party have stuck firmly.

Well, Sir, after having entered into that engagement, the Liberal party came into

power. An investigation was held during the years 1896 and 1897, and the Fielding tariff was put into operation. Coming back to my hon. friend from St. Mary's, I find in the first volume of the debates of the House of Commons for 1897, the speech delivered by the Minister of Finance; and, Sir, I find no dissent from that speech by the hon. member for St. Mary's who was at that time his colleague. Therefore I say we have kept faith not only with him, but also with the country, with the manufacturers, and with the consumers as well.

Now, what has been the result of that tariff ? Has it brought good to our country ? I could take the speech delivered the other day by the hon. Minister of Finance, I could use his words, I could quote his figures. But I will not. I will quote another authority. I will take the words of the president of the Canadian Bankers Association, Mr. Clouston, who, at their last annual meeting spoke as follows :—

The year that has elapsed since our last meeting has witnessed a further remarkable expansion in all branches of Canadian trade and commerce, in which the business of banking has had its due share. It has been a year of no untoward incident in the domain of mercantile affairs. The prosperity enjoyed in bountiful measure since 1897 continues unabated, and no clouds are yet perceptible on the horizon, save perhaps an undue and speculative desire for financial expansion to anticipate the profits that still lie in the future. On the contrary, the signs from which encouragement and hope spring are abundant. A bountiful harvest has been safely gathered, particularly in our North-west, and is rapidly being carried to market, thanks to the liberally increasing facilities provided for its transportation. The last returns show that the amount of grain moved to date this year exceeds by nearly 40 per cent the total for a similar period in 1901. Labour is fully employed ; manufacturing industries are working well up to their capital ; immigration is increasing at a rate which prompts the hope that we are at last succeeding in solving the problem of populating the North-west ; new markets for our products are being exploited and old markets enlarged ; means of transportation are being supplied and improved. Indeed, were one disposed to dwell on the possibilities of the future in the way of material development and prosperity, the field would afford a vast scope. Railway earnings, clearing house returns, figures of foreign commerce, the failure list, bank statements, in a word, all the tests by which the material conditions of a country are judged, indicate that Canada is experiencing an exceptionally high degree of prosperity.

Sir, these are the words of a Conservative occupying a high position in a most Conservative institution, the Bank of Montreal; and we have from him the statement that this country, under its present tariff, enjoys a prosperity unequalled before.

Mr. Speaker, the government has announced a surplus of $13,000,000. I must congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance upon his intention to wipe out $5,000,000 of our public debt. Indeed, Sir, if we were going before the electorate, as has been hinted in the Conservative press during the last few weeks, we would make a splendid showing. What could our opponents say, when the Liberal party, after seven years of power, after having spent liberally for our transportation facilities and for our public works, after having passed through the expenses of the Transvaal war, and after having provided for all the public services, could thus go before the people with a clean sheet. But the elections are not at hand. The prosperity of the country is too great. There is no necessity to ask the people now if they are satisfied with the Liberal regime. The government, I repeat, has a large surplus. I hope that the government will continue to expend our revenues wisely in improving out transportation system. I think that the commercial future of this country depends largely on the betterment of our transportation facilities. I am a believer in this route which is marked, one might say, by the hand of Providence on the map of Canada, between the Great Lakes and the cities of Montreal and Quebec. I believe that it is the route of the future, over which will be sent all our grains and cereals to the European markets. Yes, we have a great future before us if we know how to solve this transportation problem. After all, the old French Canadian voyageurs who used this route to reach the vast prairies, which they were the first to colonize—and I would ask my hon. friends from the North-west never to forget that fact—knew its value. They were the first to bring the good news to the Indian tribes and to plant the flag of civilization and liberty in those fertile plains. But there are other ways in which this government can also make use of a surplus. While I approve the policy of the government in bringing to this country foreigners of all nationalities to settle on our unoccupied lands, I also am of opinion that they should not neglect to repatriate the Canadians who left the country years ago and now reside beyond the frontier, and who, if properly looked after, would come back in considerable numbers to their native land. I know for a fact that there are nearly one million French Canadians in the western and eastern states. Many of them would, I am sure, come back to this country, if given the facilities and opportunities which are afforded by the Department of the Interior to other immigrants. And although I have much admiration for the enterprise of my western friends and the great patriotism they display with regard to their own western country, I would respectfully ask the government to take into consideration the older provinces and not forget New Ontario and New Quebec, because after all, if we have confederation, we owe it to the old provinces. And when considering this surplus, I would also ask the right hon. the First Minister and his colleagues who took part in the conference of 1887 for the readjustment of the provin-

cial subsidies not to forget that the provinces to-day are looking towards the federal government to lend them a helping hand. If confederation is not to end in legislative union, we must give the provinces the ways and means to exist. It is admitted to-day, after the conferences which took place in 1887 and 1902 that the provinces with their present limited revenue are hardly able to meet both ends. I listened with much pleasure to my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) yesterday. He spoke of the preferential tariff and blamed the government for having given Great Britain a preference. Sir, let bygones be bygones. We, in this country, enjoy a responsible government. and the electorate is the supreme judge. We went before the country in 1900 and the country replied that it was satisfied with the preferential tariff. But my hon. friend says that if this government had been willing to accept the responsibilities which arise from naval defence and our participation in the wars of the empire we would probably have had the mutual preference which we were seeking.

Mr. KEMP. I did not say that I desired this country to participate in the wars of the empire outside Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understood my hon. friend to have said so, but of course I am ready to accept his word to the contrary. At all events, after the colonial conference which was held last summer, having read the manly answer given by my hon. friend the premier, to the proposals made by the colonial secretary, I think we should all agree that our representative did his duty. Sir, we are loyal to England. We give her the benefit of a preferential tariff. We have asked for reciprocal concessions. Whilst Mr. Chamberlain appeared to favour such a policy we find that in that respect he is somewhat isolated among the public men in Great Britain. If I were not afraid to weary the House I could quote Mr. Morley, Mr. Bryce and Sir Michael Hicks-Beech on this point. It is admitted to-day that we cannot have, on the basis of protection any reciprocal trade with Great Britain. If we cannot have that mutual preference, we must fully concur in the language used by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in his budget speech. If Great Britain will not give us a preference then we will consider what action we shall take in the interests of Canada. Again I say that we must all approve the answer given by my right hon. friend the premier at the colonial conference. We are not ready to accept all the burdens which Mr. Chamberlain and some of his friends would like to impose on this country. As I said a moment ago, we are loyal. We are ready to do our duty to the empire, but we shall do it of our own volition. We shall do it ' proprio motu.' We will never sacrifice any of our political rights and we will never barter our political independence to suit the purposes of some ultra-Britishers. In a word we are and intend to remain good British subjects, but before all we are Canadians, and I may add that Canada belongs rightly not to a favoured few, but to all Canadians.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). Before the hon gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) takes his seat, I wish to make a personal explanation. I know we would not wilfully misrepresent me. I understood him to say that I had opposed the Remedial Bill. I wish to inform the hon. gentleman that such is not the case. If he will read ' Hansard,' he will find that I both spoke and voted for the Remedial Bill. More than that, I stayed up night and day trying in every way to have the Bill passed. I always contended that the minority in Manitoba had constitutional rights, and that those rights should be recognized. By the settlement which has been made, they did not secure a recognition of those rights to which they are entitled under the constitution of our country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am pleased to accept the words of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor). He may have spoken and may have voted in favour of the Remidial Bill. But it is a fact well known to every one, that, while the whip of the Conservative party, he canvassed against the Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. That statement is not correct, and I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is probably to follow me to-night, so I shall not detain the House at any great length. I have been undecided whether to take part in this discussion, and notwithstanding your kind indulgence extended by request of hon. members permitting the whole broad subject to be discussed, taking in the financial as well as the trade question, I shall confine myself to a few words with reference to the amendment before the House. Had I desired to say anything with reference to the financial statement, I feel that it would be out of place. The statement speaks for itself. The concise, plain manner in which it was put by the hon. gentleman who delivered it, and the matter that was contained in it, render any enlargement on my part unnecessary. But if enlargement were necessary, it has been supplied by hon. gentlemen on this side who examined in more detail than did the Finance Minister the expenditures of the country. And I must say that there have been speeches delivered in this debate, and now to be found in ' Hansard ' which will be of the utmost value to me, as they will be to other hon. members, refreshing our memories for the discussion of public questions. I suppose we all feel, when we have to engage

in an election contest, after a period of rest and quiet, how very soon we seem to forget the questions that engage our attention here.

I proceed to consider, for a few moments, then, the amendment. And it is an extraordinary position in which I find the debate on this occasion. We have an amendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) which reads as follows :

> That all the words after 'that' in the proposed motion be left out, and the following substituted therefor :—'This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labours, agricultural products, manufactures and industries as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians ;
>
> 'And that the financial policy of the government should include a measure for the thorough and judicious readjustment of the tariff at the present session.'

Now, why do I say that it was a remarkable discussion that has taken place upon this amendment ? We are asked by the mover of this amendment to declare that the House regards the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory. I do not think that I can bring myself to vote for the amendment. But there are some hon. gentlemen in this House who can induce themselves to do so. Some of these hon. gentlemen have spoken, and have spoken at length ; but I have failed to hear any explanation as to how this tariff is unsatisfactory—not merely why it is unsatisfactory to the House, but why it is unsatisfactory to themselves. When the hon. member for West Toronto rises, I would like him to tell me what there is unsatisfactory in the working of this tariff. Is it unsatisfactory in that there has not been sufficient revenue raised to carry on the affairs of the country? The hon. gentleman will not say that, for there has been enough revenue raised under it during the years it has been in operation to more than pay the ordinary expenditure, and almost enough to pay, up to the end of the present year the ordinary and the capital expenditure. The tariff can not be unsatisfactory in that regard. Then, is it unsatisfactory in its effect upon foreign trade? I do not mean to give you many figures tonight, but I am trying to find out what is unsatisfactory in this tariff requiring the thorough revision and readjustment in all its parts called for by the amendment. Why, if the tariff requires this thorough and judicious readjustment throughout its hundreds of articles, is it not a strange thing that we have not had the defects pointed out by these hon. gentlemen. I have sat in my place patiently. The other night when the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was lecturing the ministers for not being in their places, I did not feel guilty. I have sat here patiently and listened to what was said. And now, when hon. members are asked to declare by their votes that this tariff is unsatisfactory and that it requires readjustment in all its hundreds and hundreds of articles, I say I shall expect the hon. member for West Toronto, who follows me, and whom I consider one of the ablest members on that side of the House, to state what has been lacking hitherto, to tell us the items in this tariff which are defective, and how they can be improved. I think we are entitled to ask that. I have asked the question whether it was unsatisfactory with reference to securing revenue and have concluded that no hon. gentleman will affirm this. Now I ask, has it been unsatisfactory as regards the promotion of foreign trade ? I have already said that I shall not give many figures, but I have here a short table in which I have divided into four six year periods the export of the produce of this country, and another in which I have divided into four six year periods the aggregate foreign trade of the country. Why did I take four six year periods ? Because, commencing with 1878 and running down through the eighteen years when the national policy came into operation, and into the six years when this tariff has been in operation. I propose to contrast the foreign trade and the progress made in building it up in three periods under the operation of the old tariff and the increase under the six years of the present tariff.

Now, the percentage of increase in the export produce of Canada for the four six-year periods between 1878 and 1892 is as follows : From 1878 to 1884 the increase was 17 per cent ; from 1884 to 1890 the increase was 7 per cent; from 1890 to 1896 the increase was 29 per cent; from 1896 to 1902 the increase was 78 per cent. Is the tariff unsatisfactory, I ask hon. gentlemen, through you, Mr. Speaker, who will follow me ? Is this tariff unsatisfactory in so far as its operations have had an effect on the exports of this country ? Well, what about the total foreign trade of this Dominion ? There are gentlemen in this House who would confine Canadian trade to Canada. They do not take views broad enough. We want Canada for the Canadians, but we want all the other countries in the world besides to sell our goods to. I do not understand that trade is a bad thing if we know how to trade. My hon. and genial friend, one of the merchant princes of this country, doing one of the largest businesses in this country, representing the city of Toronto (Mr. Brock), he does not conduct his own business on the principle that an extension of trade outside his own family would be a bad thing for him. He sends his travellers north, south, east and west. Possibly, if he confined his trade within his own family circle it might enrich the members thereof a little, but he would not do much business.

Mr. BROCK. That is an absurdity.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, I see the hon. gentleman is coming to take our view of it, that trade is not a bad thing. What is a nation but an aggregate of individuals, and if it is good for an individual to trade with his neighbours, must it not be good for a nation to trade with its neighbours? Will the hon. gentleman say it would be an absurdity? Now, what trade have we done with other nations? From 1878 to 1884 our total foreign trade increased 20 per cent; from 1884 to 1890 it increased 5 per cent; from 1890 to 1896 it increased 9 per cent; from 1896 to 1902 it increased 77 per cent. I ask my smiling friend opposite, when he rises to speak, to say if the tariff has been unsatisfactory in the way of promoting foreign trade.

Mr. CLARKE. What has the tariff had to do with the increase of the export trade of the country?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The tariff has had this to do with it, that when this tariff was introduced, and it was known that it was in the hands of a government who held, as one of their fundamental principles, that changing circumstances might require in time a revision of the tariff, and that they held as a fundamental principle that the greater stability you could give to a tariff the better, from that moment the country commenced to move forward. Then I want to tell him further that by reducing the burdens of the people, immigration was promoted into this country. I want to tell him that there are more people in his country. I want to tell him that the administration of government, combined with the operations of the tariff, have had much to do with the exports. The fact that you have a cold storage system has had much to do with it; for, say what you may, you had not a cold storage accommodation to compare with the Australian, under the Conservative regime. You have it to-day, it is well known, and the figures prove, that since this government came into power the article of cheese has taken its proper place in the English market. though I do not say that it had not a good place before under hon. gentlemen opposite. But I do say that butter and other perishable products have swollen the aggregate export of the produce of this country, so far as its money value is concerned.

Mr. BROCK. What did we do with our products before you came into power? What did we do with our grain?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A great deal of it was consumed by the people of Canada, and the balance was exported.

Mr. BROCK. We had poor crops.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, I don't know about that. I have spoken of the eighteen years under the regime of the hon. gentleman's party. Are we to understand that if the Tories came in again we are to look for another eighteen long years of bad crops?

Mr. BROCK. Whooping it up.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is getting a little irritated—

Mr. BROCK. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS—but I have not given him any reason; I simply point out a fact. He explains the difference by saying they had poor crops. Well, now, I say there were eighteen years when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and that the Giver of all good blesses Canada, whether under Tory or Liberal rule, we must not forget that. And during the eighteen years they were in power, Providence smiled upon this land, as Providence has smiled upon this land since we took control of its affairs. But if it be a fact that Providence blesses this country and has blessed it, whether under Tory rule or Liberal rule, if you find an increase so vast under the Liberals that you did not find under the Tories, the same Providence being equally kind to us all, what is the inevitable inference? Simply that while Providence blessed Canada under whatever rule it may be, the Liberals know best how to use the blessings of that Providence. That we claim for the Liberal party, and that we claim alone.

Now, Sir, I have given the facts. I have stated that there has been an entire lack of instances given us wherein this tariff is unsatisfactory. I again prefer the request that we be told how it has been unsatisfactory. It has struck me as strange in this debate that hitherto when we have had arguments upon the tariff, the old question of protection and free trade has been debated, which is not a question in actual existence in this country at all. We have been told that in certain lines the manufacturers were suffering. We had them venturing to say that certain lines were suffering, but this year, strange to say, with the resolution that these gentlemen, I presume, are about to vote for that declares that we should have a thorough and immediate revision of the tariff, we have heard very few complaints about the manufactures. What manufacturing concerns are suffering? What manufactures do you propose to lay a duty in favour of and how much do you propose to lay. I have noticed that, leaving the manufactures alone, hon. gentlemen opposite have centered their interest upon the farming community and that it is the poor farmer they want to protect. These are the parties to whom their sympathies are extended at the present time. We have had the whip of the party, the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), we have had the leader from the province of Ontario, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), we have had the hon. member for

Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and others appealing largely to the farmer and their whole argument seems to be this: The Americans send in here a few million dollars worth of farm products, crushing the farmers out of their market and therefore they say put up the tariff and shut the Americans out. If hon. gentlemen will bear with me for a moment I will read over the list of articles that our farmers are particularly interested in and I will show you that while the Americans do sell a few million dollars worth of their farm products, the American nation takes as large a quantity from our farmers and there is nothing to find fault with in that respect. I will just give the chief products that the farmers of this country are interested in. There are swine, horned cattle, horses, sheep, all other animals n.e.s., barley, beans, Indian corn for distillation, oats, pease, rye, wheat, bran, mill feed, &c., corn meal, oat meal, wheat flour, all other breadstuffs n.e.s., butter, cheese, hay, potatoes, turnips, vegetables canned, vegetables all other n.e.s. and eggs. Now, I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that I have gone over pretty much at any rate the important articles in which our farmers are interested and what is the result of that? While the Americans sent into our market $2,973,098 worth in the aggregate of these articles we sent to the United States, not to other countries, but to the United States, $3,917,878 worth. They bought a million dollars worth more from our farmers of farm products than this country took of the produce of their farms, or to be exact, $944,780. But hon. gentlemen opposite will say: You have left out Indian corn, and so I may as well anticipate that there may not be any side issue in reference to it. We will take in Indian corn which we hold is on the free list for the benefit of the farmer. We think that when the manufacturer gets his raw material free, when used in the goods which he exports, the farmer and the cattle man has the right to have free corn to finish their productions. But, if we take the ground that these gentlemen take that it is an interference with our farmers and if we look at the figures we find that there were $2,480,397 worth of Indian corn imported but there was exported of that $1,036,090 worth, leaving $1,444,307 worth, and if we take the $944,780 into account we have a balance of only $499,527 in favour of the Americans. Now, I say there is not much ground for our friends to appeal to the farmers with any degree of success in that. But, they have looked into the thing very particularly and they have discovered that there are some products of the farmer that ought to be protected. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) dwelt upon that. He gave us, the other night, a list of fruits that came in here and he was determined to have these fruits excluded. These Yankee fruits coming in here, monopolizing our market and lowering the prices of our own fruits was something that was not to be tolerated. He said that there was $765,771 in duty levied on these fruits that came from the United States. I had a little curiosity to look into that list and what do you think I found? Why, that on all kinds of fruit that are grown here at present there was only a duty paid of $157,204, instead of $765,771. What did he include in the list of fruits upon which he wanted a prohibitory tariff placed?—dried currants, dates, figs, prunes, raisins, almonds shelled, almonds, not shelled, pecans not shelled, shelled peanuts, walnuts not shelled, all other kinds of nuts, oranges, lemons and limes. Now, we must have a tariff placed upon these and it must be adequate. There is no use saying that oranges and lemons cannot be grown in this country. They can. I saw one in the hot house myself. It can be done and adequate protection, which means prohibition, if placed on oranges will tempt some people to grow a tree or two for the glory of the thing under glass. It is an outrage upon these farmers that they should be subjected to these Yankee importations of dried currants, dates, figs, prunes, raisins, almonds shelled, almonds not shelled, Brazil nuts not shelled, pecans not shelled, shelled peanuts, walnuts not shelled, all other kinds of nuts, oranges, lemons and limes. The farmers want to get even with these people and they are asking this government to put $15 more duty on the reaper that is made by the Yankee so as to get even with him in that way. That is the proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite. These Yankees send in pecans and limes and they send in some agricultural implements and it will benefit the farmer to have an additional duty of $15 placed upon his binder. Then, the hon. gentlemen took up the item of vegetables and he said that there was a duty of $86,074 laid on vegetables. He was right. That includes potatoes, tomatoes, and several other articles. I find that if it be a grudge we have against the Yankees that they took from us $327,046 worth of our potatoes while we only took from them $87,212 worth. If there is anybody who has a right to get mad about that it is the Yankees. The total value of the imports mentioned under that head were $417,407, while the people of this country exported to the United States altogether $994,410 worth, so that we sent $2 out for every one we brought in and yet this hon. gentleman is for having us engaged in a commercial war with the United States in reference to the matter, and he is going to see that these vegetables and fruits are produced in this country. Well now, if he asks my opinion, I will give him my answer. I see the smiling face of my late colleague the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) opposite me and he was good enough to say in the remarks he addressed to the House, that while he perhaps did not view me in every respect more friendly

than he did some others of his late colleagues that, at any rate, there was one question on which we were nearer perhaps than on some others.

Of course I cannot allude to these things, and I am not going to talk about ancient history. There was a speech of mine read here the other night by the member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) which I made away back in 1876, twenty-seven years ago. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) is ever here that long it will be an honour to him if he can have a speech of his quoted which is twenty-seven years old. I was pretty young in parliament in 1876, but it is significant that the sentiments expressed at that time are those embodied in this present tariff. I said then that I did not see how a duty on wheat would help the farmer much so long as he grew a surplus and exported it, but nevertheless I said that there might be perhaps a month in the year, if the farmers were sold short and before the new crop came in, when a home demand might be required and if the farmer could import wheat under circumstances like that, then he would get the benefit And we have a duty on wheat now, and there is a duty on other grain. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) will see, therefore, that even as far back as 1876 I had sound views on the tariff, and that ought to give him confidence in any tariff that I approve of. I do not know that I would pin much faith on arguments that were used years and years ago and under different circumstances, but it just happened that in this case I announced some views about the tariff, and those views are embodied in the tariff which is in existence to-day.

Just a year ago when the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) made his motion to the effect that it was in the interest of the country that there should be an increased duty placed upon certain vegetables, the hon. the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) replied to that motion, and I commend that reply to the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and other gentlemen on that side of the House. The hon. gentleman from Laval moved as follows :

> That it is greatly in the interest of the market gardeners and the farmers, that the duties on our Canadian garden products be so adjusted as to guarantee the Canadian farmer an effective protection against foreign competition.

I will read to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) the argument that was delivered upon that motion by my late colleague (Hon Mr. Tarte) and I think that answer will be sufficient ; I think it will show him how strange his proposition is that we should go on and increase duties on these articles because some of them are imported. The Hon. Mr. Tarte said last year :

> I entertain considerable doubts as to the increase of duties on those products imported from abroad being likely to result in something practical, if you take into consideration the fact that our farmers cannot supply that foreign market, because they do not produce those vegetables all the year round. Many articles, amongst those just mentioned by the hon. gentleman, are imported from the United States, to which country a little later in the year many similar products of our own are exported. If we raised the duties on those products as asked for by the hon. gentleman we should incur the risk of retaliation on the part of the United States as to products coming from Canada. We carry on, for instance, a considerable trade in melons with our neighbours, and our duty on that article is 25 per cent, whereas it is on the free list in the United States. What would my hon. friend say if the American government should decide to impose on that article a similar duty to ours ? At any rate, it is of public notoriety that the greatest number of the articles, upon which we are asked to increase the duty, are not produced in the winter months. We should thereby be increasing the prices of those products to the great mass of consumers without our market gardeners being benefited thereby. My hon. friend wants us to raise the duties upon lettuce, cucumbers, tomatoes, asparagus, celery, beets, onions.

I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is keeping in mind these articles, because they are the very articles which he has spoken about. The hon. gentleman continues :

> It is well known that in the winter months we do not grow cabbages nor cucumbers. We are also aware that it is extremely difficult to raise tomatoes in the winter season. We had to pay, last winter, 50 cents a pound for tomatoes of Canadian growth, whilst American tomatoes were being sold on the Montreal market at 20 cents a pound.

That is the condition of things which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) wants to bring about.

Mr. INGRAM. Read what Mr. Tarte said after that to the effect that he was no free trader.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) is following me, I have that very passage from the speech underscored here and it is curious that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) should think that I was going to miss it, because it is far more conclusive than what I have read. He says :

> I am no free trader——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is a pretty well known fact.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is true.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Now here is the point the hon. gentleman thought I was going to miss reading, and when I read it he will see that I certainly would not omit it, because it is one of the richest things in the whole speech :

> I am no free trader, but it is necessary to use common sense in our transactions in this world, and I declare here and now that I object to paying 50 cents a pound for Canadian tomatoes, when I can have American tomatoes for 20 cents. It is really going too far.

Mr. INGRAM. Read on.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will read on :

This shows conclusively that tomatoes cannot be grown here with advantage in the winter months. So with asparagus and cucumbers. We do not produce asparagus nor celery in the winter season. There is not to be found one single gardener in the whole island of Montreal, or around Ottawa or Toronto, who can grow lettuce as good as that imported from the United States in the winter.

Don't think you are going to get the ex-Minister of Public Works to vote for any such amendment as is before the Chair in favour of adequate protection, when it involves as the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says it does, the putting on of duties that will make twenty cent tomatoes cost fifty cents.

Mr. MONK. I ask the Minister of Customs, if the government is opposed to an increase of duty on these articles

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is no increase provided for in the tariff that is brought down this session, and as to future tariff changes of course we never announce them before the budget speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My ex-colleague (Hon. Mr. Tarte) continued to say:

It is idle to appeal to prejudices. There are enough people buying tomatoes and lettuce, for let it be known that I am speaking the plain unvarnished truth. Cauliflowers are not grown in the winter months in Canada. I agree that during a certain season of the year they can be kept, perhaps during two or three months. The cauliflowers we buy in the winter are imported from the United States.

Yet they want to put on a tariff of adequate protection to force you to pay a higher price under the circumstances which my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) describes and he seems to know whereof he was speaking :

The market gardeners around Montreal receive just as much protection as any other class of the community does, and I may further say that those gardeners are the most prosperous people in the country.

And yet it is demanded that we should have an immediate revision of the tariff in order to benefit those poor gardeners. Here is the testimony given a year ago by the ex-minister, that these gardeners were very well off, and I am sure they have not suffered this year. The argument used by the ex-minister is an argument to show that the Liberal party in framing the tariff looked upon both sides, whereas our Conservative friends, judging by their policy and their amendment, look at only one side. They say : Put the duties so high that it will be prohibitory. Prohibition is the principle of their protection. That is its essence ; that is its final result and our friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is not one of that kind because he looks at the other side of the question as we do on this side of the House. He says :

Should I be disposed, nevertheless, to add something to their happiness, would that be conducive to the happiness of other classes of the community much more numerous than the market gardeners are.

There is where he looks; there is where the Liberal party look. They look at all classes and all occupations; they have regard to the producer and the manufacturer, but at the same time they do not lose sight of the consumers :

To my mind, the consumers of Montreal should not be forced to pay extravagant prices for these products.

The consumers would be forced either to deprive themselves of vegetables or to pay exorbitant prices for them. Should we impose additional duties, consumers would have to pay 25 or 30 per cent more, nor could we hope thereby to increase the production of those articles which cannot be grown to advantage in this country.

Sound sense. If, in forcing an unnatural production in this country, it should be done at the cost of raising the prices of the articles above what the people ought to pay, there would be less of them consumed, and the whole benefit would be neutralized. My hon. friend saw that clearly. He says he sees eye to eye with me on many things. He goes on to say :

There are seasons when we must import vegetables from the United States, because they can there be grown more easily and much more cheaply.

Then the hon. gentleman, who moves the resolution, interjects this sentence :

There is this great difference, that the climate of the United States is favourable to the production of vegetables, whereas the Canadian climate is not so advantageous. And that is why our farmers ought to receive more protection than is given to the farmers in the United States.

To which the reply is made by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works :

My hon. friend knows very well that, even if additional duties were imposed on pease, tomatoes, cucumbers and other vegetables, that would neither improve the climate nor enable us to grow those vegetables to advantage during the winter months. The increase in the duties asked for by my hon. friend would only result in forcing the consumer to pay more for those products, without improving the condition of the Canadian producer.

He winds up by dismissing the subject in the following words :

To my mind such a proposition is preposterous.

Now, my hon. friend from South Leeds would do well to ponder over that answer. There is a great deal of sense and good argument in it. There is in it the grasp of a gentleman who is considering the question, sincerely desirous as we all are that all classes in this country should prosper. But

when asked to impose duties, which, if imposed, would be of doubtful benefit even to those for whose benefit they were asked, he insists that they might so enhance prices as to lessen consumption, but if not, they would be an unjust burden placed upon those who are forced to buy the goods.

Now, I pass on to notice very briefly that when hon. gentlemen opposite ask us for a thorough and entire revision of the tariff, we should have seen a spectacle of greater agreement among themselves. I do not want to be captious. I recognize that there will be differences of opinion among hon. gentlemen opposite as to a particular rate of duty that should be placed upon a particular article. Wherever men think, you will find such differences of opinion. But here is a case in which it appears to me professions and contradictory statements are made involving more than particular duties. For instance, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) say that they want the duty wiped off raw sugar. The hon. member for Halton said that, speaking over the head of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who has a refinery in his town that wants the duty on raw sugar increased. My hon. friend the leader of the Ontario opposition members in this House, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who I take it is nearer the fountain-head, if I may use that expression with reference to the hon. leader of the opposition, says that we ought to increase the duty on raw sugar, instead of taking it off. Will the hon. leader of the opposition tell us what he would do with his policy of adequate protection in that case?

Mr. SPROULE. I want to correct the hon. gentleman, and say that I have no knowledge of ever having made such a statement in the House. I understood that the beet-root sugar manufacturers desired to have the duty increased on sugar, but I did not specify raw sugar at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They came with a deputation asking it to be increased on raw sugar.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Here is what the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said:

> I am in favour of a duty on manufactured sugar, but not on the raw sugar. I am in favour of admitting the raw sugar free and giving our manufacturers a chance to employ labour in refining it. This is what I am in favour of.

Then, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) said:

> We have no right at present to take $2,000,000 per year out of the pockets of the people, by a tariff on raw sugar, when such a tax is not called for. But you may say: What about the beet-root sugar industry? That is calling for protection, and if you remove the duty from raw sugar, you will interfere very materially with that young industry started in Ontario more particularly, which province is especially adapted for the growing of beets. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest a remedy which, I think, will be far more effectual than any duty or increase of duty on raw sugar.

The proposal he makes is to wipe out the duty and give a bounty.

An hon. MEMBER. Read the whole of it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have given the sense of it. He said he advocated taking the duty off raw sugar and making that up by paying a bounty.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman ought to be fair enough to say that the proposal was to give it to the farmers.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Whenever a bounty is given by the Ontario government, they do not give it to the farmer in his own hand, but they so arrange it that the farmer through the manufacturer would get it; and I suppose that any government would take care that the grower of the beets would have the advantage. When the hon. member for East Grey came with that deputation, they did not ask, so far as I remember, that the bounty should be given to the farmers who grew the beets. Must I ask the hon. member if they did?

Mr. SPROULE. I said there were different ways in which it could be done.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What did the deputation ask?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know, because I was not present until the interview was pretty well over, and therefore I did not hear many of them speak. But I said that there were two or three ways of arranging the bounty. One was by providing that the farmers should get so much a ton for their beets. Another was that there should be a bounty paid on the sugar produced according to a sliding scale: for instance, one cent per pound the first year, three-quarters of a cent the second year, one-half of a cent the third, one-quarter of a cent the fourth, letting it run out in that way. I was not aware in what particular way the deputation wanted the assistance, but I said that the government should help them in some way, because the farmers were very much interested in the matter.

Mr. COWAN. You made a speech three years ago advocating a bounty to the manufacturers.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. gentleman will bear me out in this, that while he suggested that the bounty might be given, he did not suggest that it might be given in the way of wiping out the duty on raw sugar. He wanted the duty kept on raw sugar at the same time.

Mr. SPROULE. No. I pointed out that the American manufacturer had a higher

duty on his sugar than the Canadian manufacturer, and therefore it was unjust to the Canadian manufacturer. I did not say in what way I advocated help, but I advocated that it should be given in some way.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am only pointing out the difficulties incident to all tariffs, when you come down to particular items. Let me give the views of the hon. gentleman. He said :—

> But those engaged in that industry want an increase in the tariff on sugars coming into the country, and for the want of this, they are handicapped in carrying on their business. We are told that unless they get some consideration in the tariff——

Mark you, Sir, this. Not by way of bounty.

> —their industry is likely to go down instead of becoming one of the great established industries of the country.

That is very plain. The hon. gentleman wants an increased duty on raw sugar. You do not give bounties in the tariff.

An hon. MEMBER. Why not ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Because you must have a separate Act of parliament in order to do it. You do not do it because you cannot. I shall not take up longer time on this point. I merely wish to show that you cannot expect unanimity with respect to the various items in the tariff. Hon. members opposite may be able to point out that some gentlemen on this side, giving their individual views, have thought that the duty on some particular item might be raised or lowered. But those are merely personal views with regard to particular items, and these men, when asked to pronounce themselves on the tariff legislation of the country, will declare in favour of carrying out our present policy. Each hon. member recognizes that he is only one in this House, that others have their views, and he judges the tariff, not from any particular item, but taken as a whole.

Let me now say a few words on the surtax on German goods, concerning which there are as many differences of opinion among hon. gentlemen opposite as there are on the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition. Some hon. gentlemen opposite commend us for taking the power to levy the surtax and say that it is right. Others condemn us and say that it is wrong. Others say that we should have done it a year or two ago. Well, I hold that we were right in not doing it a year or two ago. We stand now in this position, that we have made representations to the German representatives of the German government, that we have made personal representations through our Prime Minister to the representatives of the British government, and having waited years, having given the German government ample time to turn the matter over, and they having continued to treat us as they have done, then we put on the surtax. And the civilized world recognizes that it is a just act on the part of Canada, done at the right time.

With regard to the preferential tariff, hon. gentlemen opposite say that my hon. friend the Finance Minister, after having granted a preference, now proposes to abolish it. My hon. friend has done nothing of the kind. He has not said that he would abolish the preferential tariff. He is aware, as is every member of the government, that that is a large question in which great interests are bound up, and concerning which no hasty action should be taken. But what my hon. friend pointed out was that when in England, conferring with Mr. Chamberlain, he pointed out that while we gave a preference to Great Britain, we hoped, on the other hand, that Great Britain in return would give an exemption from the corn tax then in existence, to the colonies, but that if British statesmen continued to view our preferential tariff as of no value in itself, except as a sentiment, then we should be free to guard our own interests or to take such action as might be in our interest. There is where the preferential tariff stands.

My hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) has put in my hands a resolution in which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) moved that there should be a bounty given to free sugar. In that resolution I find the following :

> And also to encourage the establishment of beet sugar factories, a bounty should be offered for all beet root sugar manufactured in the Dominion during the next ten years and that the machinery necessary for such plant, not made in Canada, admitted free of duty.

But he forgot about the farmers there.

Mr. SPROULE. That is exactly what I said when I was with the deputation, and that is still my opinion.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman has given so many contradictory opinions, some of them must be right. I say that the preferential tariff is not interfered with. There is no proposition from the Finance Minister for the abolition of a preference, but my hon. colleague has put himself in the position, as did my right hon. friend the First Minister, in that note to Mr. Chamberlain, that in view of the fact that the corn tax is now abolished, and it will not be competent for the British government to make an exception in our favour, we are at liberty to take what course we may think proper. As my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has said, the English people recognize this and would have no reason to complain if we should come to the conclusion, in our own interest, to modify, alter, amend or change that preference. There are several reasons which might prompt us to do this. We have not considered propositions from other nations. So long as the preferential tariff is in ex-

istence, if any nation should demand equal preference with Great Britain, we would not consent to give it, but if Great Britain does not consider the preference of any value to her she could not complain seriously if perhaps we desired to place ourselves in the position of being able to obtain trade preference from other nations.

My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) spoke in rather a scoffing way of the little we had accomplished when we went over to the mother country and asked for the preference. He seems to think that the position taken by this government on this question had something to do with our failure in that respect. At any rate he spoke in this strong language with reference to it:

> But they gained nothing. But, while they gained nothing in the way of better markets, they humiliated Canada by declaring that Canada would not consider the question of imperial defence. And Canada stands as the laughing stock of the world, because, notwithstanding our wealth and position and loyalty and everything else, our premier, who was in the band wagon of the great jubilee of our late beloved Queen in 1897, refused to even discuss, on the lines desired, the question of imperial defence. They said Canada was not prepared to pay her share for the defence of the empire. I say this is a humiliation to Canada. We are doing less than we ought to do and are the laughing stock of the world.

There he commits himself. He says that our Canadian representatives humiliated themselves by not acceding to the views of the imperial government on the question of imperial defence. If he feels that this country was humiliated because the Prime Minister and his colleagues took that stand it is upon him now—and I call his attention pointedly to this—to bring up a motion in this House censuring the ministers for not having committed themselves to a policy of imperial defence upon the lines suggested by the imperial government. Now, I emphasize that, and call the attention of the country to it. The hon. gentleman as leader of the Ontario section cannot afford to say that the country is humiliated, and leave it there. We want to know where the members of Ontario are upon this question ; we want to know if they feel in that position, and we can only ascertain it by a vote. The hon. gentleman may smile, but he may be in a very awkward position if he does not propose such a motion.

Now, I turn to speak of another matter and I am very glad that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has done me the honour of being present while I am speaking, because I wish to ask him, in all sincerity, some questions. For it has been intimated that our Conservative friends are about to bring on an election this fall. If there is an election, it is possible I may speak in one or two places, and I would like to know where we are on this question. I know where I am and where the government are, and hon. gentlemen opposite know, and so does everybody else, for the tariff and all its items is printed, so there is no mistaking where the government stands on that point. But we have not the views of hon. gentlemen opposite; we have only this resolution which speaks of 'adequate protection.' Now, if it is not wearying the House and if the hon. leader of the opposition will not consider me unduly inquisitive—for it is in the interest of the country and of fair discussion on the platform that we should understand one another—I would ask, and ask in no carping spirit, but in all sincerity, what this means ? He will not be offended, for he has asked as direct questions across the floor. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) read from the report in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of a meeting in Morden, where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was asked what 'adequate protection' would signify in reference to agricultural implements. I have no doubt that what appears in 'Hansard' is a correct copy of what appeared in the 'Telegram,' which, I believe is the organ of the Conservative party in Winnipeg. This is what is given :

> Question : What about free agricultural implements promised by Mr. Macdonald ?
>
> Mr. BORDEN. I will answer my friend's question before I sit down so definitely that there will be no question about it. I will answer on behalf of the Liberal-Conservative party which has no Sifton at one end and Tarte at the other.
>
> Question : Will you raise the duty ?
>
> Mr. BORDEN. We will make the duty adequate and if it is now high enough, 'as I believe it is,' to enable manufacturers to make implements in Canada, we will not increase it. I am informed that implements are as cheap in Canada as in the United States. So the duty seems high enough.

There is a definite item on which the mover of this amendment has spoken and I ask him, in all sincerity, if that is the view he expressed at that meeting—for he has told us that he has spoken the same in Manitoba as elsewhere.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) like me to answer now ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman pleases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the first place I would like to ask the Minister of Customs a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that if questions are to be asked at all, they are fair on both sides. Has any application been made to the government to raise the duty on agricultural implements ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Now, I will tell the hon. minister what I stated. Two questions were asked me on that occasion, and not one only. I was asked, in the first place, whether or not I proposed to abolish the

duty on agricultural implements, and I said that I did not, because I regarded the manufacture of these implements as a great Canadian industry and I believed the duty imposed upon implements of that character had not had the effect of increasing the price in Canada, that I had been informed by gentlemen who had investigated the subject that the price of agricultural implements was no higher—at least was not materially higher—in Canada than in the United States. I was asked another question—whether or not, if the Conservative party came into power, they would be prepared to raise the duty on agricultural implements; and I said that if it were necessary to preserve that great Canadian industry, I would be prepared to raise the duty on agricultural implements. I am not responsible for any report which appeared in any newspapers. I noticed the next day after the meeting that it was not reported as I have stated, and I spoke to the gentleman who represented the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of the imperfect report of what had taken place at that meeting. The questions were proposed to me in writing, and I made exactly the answers I have stated to the House to-night.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. So, we have that statement, and I think it is well that I gave the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) the opportunity to make it.

Mr. BALL. You know where you are now.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If hon. gentlemen opposite are taking the position that a statement appearing in their organ is to be treated as untruthful, that may be all right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) will pardon me—I am not attributing any untruthfulness, but merely saying that an imperfect report of my remarks was made, and am not casting any reflection either upon the newspapers or upon the reporter. Every one knows that where one's remarks are not written down in shorthand, they are sometimes reported in such a way as not to convey the exact meaning given. But I may tell the Minister of Customs that there are probably six or eight gentlemen here to-night who heard my remarks on that occasion and who would be prepared, if he has any doubt about the accuracy of my version, to inform him that I have stated exactly what took place. Further than that, if I had adopted the argument of the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) I might safely disregard the report of this meeting, because it had not appeared in the 'Canada Gazette.'

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I certainly shall not appeal to the hon. gentleman's colleagues who were with him, for I accept the statement he has made. But he will pardon me if I say that I do not quite understand where he is now. Has he ascertained whether these implements can be made in Canada or not? He is asking for a thorough revision and readjustment of the tariff, and must have given close consideration to this point. Is this one of the items that he wishes to have amended?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think that is a fair statement. Hon. members are going to vote on this and they want to known what they are voting on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is perfectly right that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) should ask across the floor of this House what the policy of the opposition is. That is his position, as I understand it, that it is perfectly fair to ask what the policy of the opposition is.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, let me tell him his own colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), took an entirely different position years ago, because he said that a physician should not be asked to prescribe until he had been called in to attend the patient. And Mr. Chamberlain, whom my hon. friend recognizes as a pretty high authority, took exactly the same view. Now, I am not going to shelter myself behind any such consideration as that, and I have not done so to-night. The hon. gentleman seems to think that he cannot understand our position. Well, perhaps that may be more his misfortune than his fault, I am not sure about that. I thought I had made myself pretty plain. I said that I would not take off the duty on agricultural implements, and I said further that if it were necessary to preserve this great Canadian industry I would be prepared to raise it. Now, is that not plain? Sir, if it is necessary that an opposition should announce its policy to the country, surely it is ten times more necessary that the government should announce their policy. Now, we have in the House to-night the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs. The Minister of Customs has the floor, and he has the confidence of his colleagues. Will he answer as frankly as I have done what the policy of the government is with regard to agricultural implements? He has told us that an application has been made to the government for an increase of duty on these implements. The government have therefore had this matter under consideration. Will the Minister of Customs now, speaking for the government to-night, tell this House and the people of this country what the policy of the government with regard to that matter is? It will not do, Mr. Speaker, to put this answer in any evasive language. Here is a government charged with the duty of giving a tariff to this country, and I invite my hon. friend the Minister of

Customs to declare to this House and to this country, as he has seen fit to introduce this question, what the policy of the government is with regard to this application respecting agricultural implements, which he says has been under the consideration of the government ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not the slightest objection to tell the hon. gentleman, and I will tell him in such definite terms that I think his own supporters will admit that he has failed to answer my question. He has not told us whether it is necessary to preserve this industry or not. I want to tell him that the propositions that the Finance Minister proposes to make are on the Table, those with which he proposes to supplement the present tariff, in which agricultural implements, binders, &c., are at 20 per cent duty, and they remain at 20 per cent. Now, that is the kind of answer he ought to be able to give me on one item out of hundreds in the tariff ; and the evident evasion, this trimming, this cutting round, are made to enable the opposition, so far as it can, to go to the country and to say one thing here and another thing there. To say 'if it is necessary to preserve the industry'—that is not the language of gentlemen who sit behind him. It is not necessary to have more duty on to preserve the industry in the country, because there are firms making these articles.

Mr. PRINGLE. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? The constituency which I have the honour to represent, being vitally interested in the woollen industry, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he considers that the protection now afforded the woollen industry is sufficient or adequate protection ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is evident that the conclusion at which the ministry have arrived is that it is sufficient, as there is no change in that respect, except the German surtax. Now then, let me go on, if I am making this speech. An hon. gentleman who offers a resolution declaring that there is a necessity for an immediate and thorough revision of the tariff, when one particular item of that tariff is brought to his notice, and he is asked to give a statement, his answer was that it was dependent upon circumstances. He seems to have had that question ringing in his ears ; he must have seen that that was a question in which the people were interested, and he should have his mind made up on it and ascertain whether that industry could be maintained in this country or whether it could not. If he has made up his mind it cannot be maintained in this country under the present tariff, then he would say that 20 per cent on agricultural implements is not adequate protection. But I point out to him that the member for Peel (Mr. Blain) the other night read a list of iron goods that were imported from the United States amounting to some millions in value, and when he finished reading it I ventured to ask him : Why do you not read the importations of agricultural implements ? He was too wise to do that. He had heard, I fancy, something about the conversation that took place in Morden, therefore he left that out. But the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), honest soul that he is, blundered right into it ; he read all these, and showed where there had been an increase of nearly $2,000,000 in the importation of these articles, and he said that their policy was to make the tariff so high—and in response to one gentleman he said he didn't care if it was 100 per cent—he would make the tariff so high that every one of these articles would be made in this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Ought to be.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He did not say that, because when I called his attention to what his leader said he replied : I don't care what my leader said, I am not responsible for that. The hon. gentleman is going to have a duty put on so that every one of these $2,000,000 worth of agricultural implements should be made in this country. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. member for Peel tells us—and I think these are gentlemen who accompanied the leader of the opposition in his trip west—have laid it down that adequate protection means that such a duty shall be put upon whatever articles that are produced and made in this country as will shut out every single article of that line coming in from another country. I want to tell the leader of the opposition that if he reads the utterances concerning the meaning of adequate protection as defined by the speeches of his lieutenants, it is beyond cavil that adequate protection means a prohibitory tariff, and nothing else. It will not be a question on the platforms of this country, if we are going to the country this fall—it will not be a question as between protection and no duties. The Liberal party never proposed to do away with all duties. The platform that was read by the hon. member to-night distinctly states that we were to raise our revenues by a tariff of customs duties. Have a tariff, but have a tariff adjusted in such a way as to weigh less heavily upon the people, and do not adjust it in such a way as to do any injury to any class. We framed our tariff upon these lines, we carried it out, and what is the use of hon. gentlemen talking about having violated our promises and our pledges ? We went to the country, and what was the result—50 of a majority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. What about Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I want to tell hon. gentlemen that to-night we are insisting that we shall have the information. Unless the hon. leader of the opposition gets

up now, as this is the time when this question is to be settled, and says that those were not his views that were given utterance to by his lieutenants behind defining what 'adequate' means, then, Sir, they are committed to it and what do these hon. gentlemen say? The hon. member for South Leeds was asked a question and he said:

Sufficient protection to secure to the manufacturers, to the agriculturists, and to the labourers of this country the work of manufacturing or producing all the articles that we can produce and manufacture in this country by our own labour and keep the money in our own country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (reading)—

Make your tariff sufficiently high to do that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Now, by inference and by what they have said I have a kind of idea what the duty will be on agricultural implements when they come in. They are all to be made in this country. Nearly $2,000,000 worth were imported last year; that $2,000,000 worth of agricultural implements is to be made in this country and this is to be brought about in this way. There is $20 of a duty on a binder coming into this country now. Prior to 1895 there was a duty of $35 instead of $20, or $15 more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There was $15 more duty on binders at one time and therefore we have positive proof of what is required to keep these implements or some of them out of the country, and mark you, every one is to be kept out. Binders came in and ploughs came in under a 35 per cent duty. Put the duty at 50 per cent and perhaps it will do but I question if 50 per cent will do it. They stand pledged to that. That is where they are.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) allow me to ask him a question?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Does the hon. gentleman claim that by raising the duty on an article he would raise the price of that article by the amount of the duty?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I want an answer from the hon. Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says he knows my mind as well as his own. In all cases he might not do so, but he knows as well as I do what the object of raising the duty is—and he is leading away from the question we are discussing as to what adequate protection means.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. This is on the question.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Do not take me off this. In the case of agricultural implements 35 per cent would not shut them out of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Answer what?

Some hon. MEMBERS. The question.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I answered the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I answered the question.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to get a straight answer. My hon. friend has understood me. I have put to him that question to which he has given an answer already many times in my presence. Does he claim now that by raising the duty on agricultural implements we will raise the price of agricultural implements?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not making that argument at all.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If my hon. friend does not contend that I have not one word to say.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not arguing that now, but I will say this to him that in many cases circumstances come in. These circumstances arise in individual cases and they modify—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If hon. gentleman want to laugh they may think that they can discuss this question a great deal better than I can. I have been in business myself since I was a boy. I have been actively engaged in business all my life either as an employee or an employer. I have been in this House for thirty-one years and for twenty-seven years I have heard this question discussed, and I claim to know as much as some hon. gentlemen upon the subject. But, from the position I occupy through the kindness of the right hon. the Prime Minister in the Customs Department where I am brought into contact with the active working of the tariff and where I am brought into contact with business men I would be utterly unfit for the position, and I venture to say it myself without any egotism on my part, if I did not understand the workings of the tariff as well as any other hon. member of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has asked me a question. I want to tell him this: When you impose a tax you have to be very care-

ful that the incidents of that taxation is not going to be put upon the people. I am free to tell you that, and I do not hesitate a moment to say it, that there are people in foreign countries who, in their desire to sell their goods, will sell them in this country, as they will in any other country, at a lower price than they will sell to the people in their own country. That will happen to us here and happening in this way if you have a tariff the money goes into the revenue, but, that will only go so far, but if you levy too high a tax then the consumer must pay.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We know all that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well then, why do you ask me ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have just asked a question that the hon. Minister of Customs has answered over and over again. He said a minute ago that by raising the duty on agricultural implements we would raise the price of agricultural implements. He is wrong.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not say that. I ought to tell the hon. gentleman that he never heard me speaking that I know of anywhere in any different manner to that in which I am now speaking.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. minister will not deny that publicly—I do not speak of cabinet secrets—he has advocated the raising of duties on many things and the hon. gentleman cannot stand in his place to-night and say that he is not anxious to have a higher tariff.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says that he is not speaking about something that transpired in the Privy Council.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, no.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly not. If we were, of course, I would be utterly precluded from saying either yes or no, because, inferentially, I would be divulging the secrets of the cabinet and I would be unworthy of occupying a position in the cabinet if I violated my oath. I think I would not so far forget myself as to violate my oath, because, if I did, credence would not be put in any statement I made. Now, he says that I did it openly and publicly, and if I said it openly and publicly every one knows what I said, and I stand by what I said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I stand where the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) stood in reference to that fruit matter. We stood in a great many other things together.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We don't stand together now. I stand, but my hon friend (Hon. Mr. Paterson) does not stand where we stood formerly.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, my hon. friend did stand a good long time. I don't want anything personal, but I may say that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was able to stand it a long time. I am standing it a little longer apparently.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am standing by the principles on which we were elected.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not want to have any words with my hon. friend, but if he desires any personal encounter he will find me perfectly willing to meet him either on the platform or on the floor of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I grant that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has some views on the tariff. Yes, and when he was under my tuition he got on pretty well, but when I was taken by the Prime Minister to England, he must have got playing with some bad boys in my absence—Georgie Taylor, for instance, and they must have been reading Willie Maclean's paper and so he got a little off the track.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I was playing with my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Ross) and some of my friends all around the government benches. I see a lot of them there, and I played with them. They would like to play again the same game if they were free to do so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What is the matter ? Some persons seem to be uneasy. I do not interrupt any one. However, Sir, I think it is desirable that we should keep close to this question and know what this 'adequate protection' is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. minister does not wish to be interrupted of course we will not interrupt him from this side of the House But he will be good enough to bear in mind that he began this game of asking questions.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not finding fault. I am pointing out to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that while he is a little indefinite in his own speech, and while his resolution is indefinite, he does not come out as clearly as his lieutenants have done on this matter. He heard what some of them said ; he perhaps did not hear what they all said, but unless he repudiates what was said by his lieutenants, then he must accept the responsibility of having his term 'adequate' interpreted by the speeches of his followers. I want to know what 'adequate protection' is, and what it means. I have pointed out that the chief Conserva-

tive whip (Mr. Taylor) has taken the ground that every agricultural implement should be made in this country, and that he would put the tariff up so high as to secure that. I put it that there was a greater increase in the imports of that particular manufactured article than in anything else, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) apparently has not been able to satisfy himself whether that industry could get along or whether it could not get along. But carrying out the policy announced by his lieutenants, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) ever has to put his 'adequate protection' policy into operation, he will have to put the duty on agricultural implements so high that every one of them will be made in this country and none come from the outside. I have told the hon. gentleman (Mr Borden) that we had 35 per cent on agricultural implements for years, and still they came in. Thirty-five per cent may not be adequate; it will take more, probably 50 per cent, and I question if even that would do. You take any other industry you like, and if you were to produce every article in this country then you have to have a rate of duty that would give adequate protection; adequate protection being the prohibition of the entry of these articles into Canada. Mr. Taylor says:

My hon. friend was willing to go as high as 35 per cent.

He said that to a Liberal member who intervened in the debate.

Now I am willing to go to an amount sufficient to protect the industries of the country even if it is 100 per cent.

Then speaking of the imported agricultural implements he said:

Thus, we sent to the United States last year nearly two million dollars to purchase these implements. In a very few years there will be nothing left of them but a heap of iron, and the Americans will have our two million dollars, whereas if we had a government that would have given adequate protection, every one of these articles would have been made in this country, employment would have been given to our workingmen, Canadian farmers would be supplying the home market, and we would have these two million dollars in Canada as a national capital to help on our progress and development.

Then, according to the chief Conservative whip, under this term 'adequate protection' there is to be a duty on agricultural implements sufficient to exclude every single one of them from being imported into this country. I pointed out that the former 35 per cent duty did not accomplish that, and he says he is willing, if it be 100 per cent, to go it. I say, Sir, that the leader of the opposition sitting there, who has assumed the responsibility of asking this House to pronounce upon this amendment, must accept that interpretation of the words 'adequate protection' or else he must denounce it and disclaim it now. He cannot escape from it. We must know where we are in this thing. We have an open policy; our policy is printed; it is in the hands of the people; it is to be changed somewhat by the resolutions laid upon the Table, but the people know all about it. They have the right to know, if we go to the country this fall, that that will be the policy followed by us. The people know what our policy is, and they are entitled to know what the policy of the Conservatives is. Now then, there are some other gentlemen amongst the Conservatives who have put an interpretation on this amendment. If I mistake not the member for Peel (Mr. Blain) accompanied the leader of the opposition in his journeyings west The member for Peel says:

A considerable quantity of these commodities come in under the present tariff, from the United States, and I submit that adequate protection should be applied to these articles that in accordance with the principles enunciated in the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition, the tariff should be placed sufficiently high so that the United States farmers could not send to this country one dollar's worth of goods in competition with the products of our own farmers.

Mr. BLAIN. Hear, hear. I believe that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, but the hon. gentleman said more than that. He said:

That is in accordance with the principles enunciated in the amendment that Mr. Borden has moved.

Mr. BLAIN. Hear, hear. I stand by that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There now, we have it. The leader of the opposition has seen his lieutenant rise in this House and say: I have declared that the principle enunciated in the amendment of the leader of the oppostion when he declares for adequate protection, is a duty so high that not one single dollar's worth shall come into the country. The leader of the opposition must either acknowledge that or requdiate it. If he does not repudiate it it stands there as an explanation that the policy of the Conservative party is a prohibitory tariff.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) asking me a question.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I am making a statement. When I am through the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) can rise and say whether or not he repudiates the statements of his lieutenants.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want the hon. gentleman to understand that I am ready to answer any question he puts.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Very well. The hon. gentleman does not require any question to be asked. I have read what the hon. member for Peel has said in regard to certain articles coming from the United States, of which he holds that not a single dollar's worth should be allowed to come into the country, and he says that is in accordance with the principle of the amend-

ment which the hon. leader of the opposition has moved. Therefore we are forced, in view of the vagueness of the language of the hon. leader of the opposition, to learn the meaning of this adequate protection from the speeches made by his supporters in the House.

Then, the hon. member for Halton is one of the old members of the House, one of the staunch old Conservatives. He told us in his speech last night:

> But we say we will put a Chinese wall right round this country, and we will not allow these Americans to come in here and monopolize the markets of this country.

That is what he understands by adequate protection—a Chinese wall around this country that will admit none of those products.

Thus we have arrived at the real meaning of adequate protection; we have learned what the policy of the Conservative party under the leadership of the hon. gentleman is to be. If not, it must be denied. It is not the old national policy; not at all. It is to be an adequate policy that will exclude everything from this country. It is to be a prohibitive tariff as interpreted by the speeches of hon. gentlemen who are following the hon. gentleman in the House, one of whom at least in his presence has reiterated his belief that that is the true meaning of the term.

But why go to the trouble of framing a tariff with hundreds of items in it to accomplish their purpose of prohibiting the importation of foreign goods? Why not at once pass a simple Act and say: It shall be illegal from this time henceforth to introduce into this country any goods of which a like kind are produced in Canada. They have not thought of revenue; there is no expression in the resolution with reference to revenue. The only thing is protection—adequate protection—which is defined to be protection high enough to exclude everything, even if it should require a duty of 100 per cent.

Well, I am glad that we have been able to have this discussion. My remarks have been a little broken up by the friendly interruptions which we have had, but I, of course, must share the responsibility of that. The hon. leader of the opposition was courteous enough to give me an answer when I asked him a question, and I endeavoured to return a like courtesy when any questions were asked of myself. I have my views on the tariff, and perhaps, like some other members in this House, I may not get what I think the very best duty on every one of the 600 or 800 items in the tariff. I am quite sure that when the hon. gentleman forms an administration in the far distant future, he will find among his supporters, possibly among his colleagues, a difference of opinion on some items, because of different interests, and so on. But we are now getting down to a principle. Hon. gentlemen are not fighting for the old national policy. What they are fighting for is away beyond that. It is for a prohibitive tariff that will shut out everything, while we on this side stand where we always have stood, for a revenue tariff, and a revenue tariff is what is now enacted. It is the kind of tariff that we were instructed to frame by the great Liberal convention in 1893. We were to raise our revenues by means of a tariff, and in arranging the tariff we were to take care to do injustice to no class. We have endeavoured to do that. It is a mere play upon words to talk about protection and free trade in this country. Where you have a tariff with hundreds of items produced in the country, where you have a constant tariff on these items, you of necessity have protection as an incident of that tariff. It cannot be otherwise, unless you put a corresponding excise duty upon the articles manufactured in the country, which no one has ever proposed. What we have contended is, that under that tariff so aranged, we had to care for every interest. We have secured a tariff for revenue. We have obtained money from the people which I believe the people have not felt the burden of to any great extent. You do not hear murmuring in the country. We are carrying on the public business, developing this country at a rate never before known. The manufacturing and farming industries especially are prospering under the operation of that tariff, as they never prospered before. And this is the time, when the country is in that prosperous condition, that you are solemnly asked to declare that it is the bounden duty of the government to have a thorough revision and readjustment of the tariff, and to have it this session.

As the hon. Finance Minister has said, under the operation of the tariff, under changing conditions, which change very fast in our time, not shutting our eyes to what is being done in the course of legislation in other countries, tariff changes may be necessitated. When the time comes when, in the opinion of the government, those changes should be made, they will be made, I believe, in such a manner, as will promote the best interests of the people of this country; and I think the vast majority of the members of this House, and the majority of the people of this country, will feel that when the revision of the tariff becomes necessary, either in whole or in part—I believe the manufacturers themselves will feel so—that it will be safer to leave that revision in the hands of the men who completed the last revision, than to entrust it to the hands of men whose only policy, as enunciated in their speeches, is to put the duties so high as to shut out every article the like of which is produced in this country. It would be ruin to the manufacturers as well as to all other classes in the country. Every person conversant with the intricacies of a tariff levied on such a vast multi-

tude of articles as our tariff comprises, knows the interdependence of trade, the relation of one article to another; and in the framing of that tariff it is necessary not only to provide for securing revenue, but to see that you are not crushing out one class of manufacturers, while unduly helping another class. It is no simple matter, and I venture to express the belief that the manufacturers of this country would feel that it would be safer to have the revision of the tariff, when the time comes for it to be made, whether in whole or in part, accomplished by the men who six years ago, with the aid of their supporters in this House, put in force the tariff that has stood from that day to this, without any material change; and during those six years there has been such prosperity in this country as never existed in it before. I have not spoken about that prosperity. It has been alluded to; but every one knows the prosperity of this country. Our Conservative friends admit it, and claim credit for admitting it. What credit is due for admitting that the times are good? Do we not know that hon. gentlemen opposite are men of truth, and being so, how could they say anything else, than that times are good? We could not have maintained that character if we had said that the times were good when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power.

The hon. leader of the opposition has told us that we have not done a single thing to promote the prosperity of this country—that this prosperity is outside and beyond anything we have done—that it is simply an incident of the prosperity of the world at large. Well, if my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, thinks that the policy of a government has nothing to do with the prosperity of a country, if that is his view of the action of government, why does he want any change? Why does he propose any change of policy? But the very fact that he proposes an amendment to the policy of the government, of necessity indicates that, in his opinion, a change of policy would produce greater prosperity and advancement, otherwise his resolution is meaningless. If it be true that under our present tariff policy, the country is prospering, as it never did before, surely some credit is due that policy. But if governments have nothing whatever to do with the prosperity of a country, then my hon. friend is singularly inconsistent in advocating a change of policy. When pressed to explain what really his amendment meant my hon. friend sheltered himself very jocularly, on one or two occasions, behind what other hon. members had said. He was evidently unable to explain what the word 'adequate' in his resolution means. He has replied more than once by saying: Well the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine), down in Montreal, said that he was in favour of legitimate protection. He seemed to think that 'legitimate' and 'adequate' are synonymous terms, and that we must ask my hon. colleague the hon. Minister of Public Works to explain them. Well, I do not agree with my hon. friend. I do not consider the two expressions synonymous. 'Adequate protection,' as defined by the speeches of the lieutenants, as I have pointed out, and as one of them re-affirmed in his presence, means a tariff that will exclude from this country the importation of every kind of article that is manufactured in it. I would call that illegitimate protection. That is a protection which the government have no right to impose. Legitimate protection is not my phrase, but I accept it as a very good one. It is such a protection as, by a judicious arrangement of the tariff, gives the requisite encouragement to our industries and at the same time furnishes the revenue required to carry on the business of the country. Such a protection we now enjoy, and if my hon. friend's predictions should be true, and we should have an election this fall, the issue will be between legitimate and illegitimate protection. If that be the dividing line, I am for legitimate as opposed to illegitimate protection. I am for a tariff so adjusted that it will secure the requisite revenue and give every legitimate industry in this country the assistance it requires, as opposed to a tariff prohibitory in its nature, and which would exclude every article of foreign manufacture from the country.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I ought to apologize to the House for rising at this very late, or rather early hour, to attempt to follow the speech just delivered by the hon. Minister of Customs. It seems to me that I am displaying a good deal of temerity in attempting to follow him at this hour and in the present circumstances. I had not the privilege of being in the House when he began his speech, but I came in very soon after, and the first words that caught my ear were his statement that there was no dissatisfaction with the tariff at present, and his invitation to us to point out when any dissatisfaction existed. Why, has the minister been asleep during the past twelve months? Has he been dozing during the past two weeks since this discussion began? Has he turned a deaf ear to the statements of several of his own followers as to the amendments they thought necessary? Has he forgotten what was said about salt? Has he forgotten what his hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) said about lead, and what an hon. member, heading a deputation of his constituents, said not long ago about vegetables? Has he completely lost recollection of the statements made by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) with regard to the necessity of protection against servile labour? Have the statements made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia regarding the necessity for fur-

ther protection against inferior horses coming into this country passed from his recollection ? And the statement of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) regarding the necessity for protecting lumber and lead ? Has he forgotten the statement of his own colleague from Brantford (Mr. Heyd) as to the necessity of revising the tariff with regard to the duty on binder twine ? When the hon. minister challenges hon. members on this side to point out where the dissatisfaction exists with regard to the tariff, we need only refer him to his own followers. I am astonished that the hon. gentleman should ask such a question because 'Hansard' bears the indubitable evidence that, not only from this side but from the other side, since this debate has begun, again and again objections have been taken and amendments pointed out and changes suggested with the object of making the tariff more suitable to the needs and interests of the people. Let me recall to the hon. gentleman the statement made by an hon. member who takes second place to no man in this parliament as an authority on trade questions. I refer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Has the hon. Minister of Customs forgotten the statements made by that hon. gentleman twelve months ago in this House when the budget debate was progressing ? Has he also forgotten the reasons he gave the other day why a tariff revision could not now be entered upon ? Has he forgotten all these things ? If he has not, I fail to understand how he can rise in his place and invite hon. members on this side to point out where dissatisfaction exists with regard to the tariff.

Sir, the hon. gentleman referred to the wonderful progress which has been made during the last few years, and he pointed with pleasure to the increase in the export trade of this country. We join in the congratulations offered the people of Canada on the substantial increase which has been made in our exports during the past five or six years. But to what is that increase due ? Will the hon. gentleman say that the tariff has had anything to do with giving us the bounteous crops with which Heaven has blessed Canada during the past five or six years ? Would our exports have increased, as they have done, if Canada had been cursed with meagre crops instead of being blessed with abundant harvests ? Will the hon. minister have the temerity to say that the tariff, the particulars of which he has at his finger ends, has had anything to do with the increase in our export trade ? When I took the liberty of asking that question, what did he attempt to say ? He attempted to say that the perfecting of the cold storage system under the benign influence of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) had helped to promote the export of our surplus products. And when I asked how much of our products had been exported under this cold storage system he did not answer. He was not frank enough, I regret to say, when he referred to cold storage, to admit that that system had been introduced by the predecessor of the present Minister of Agriculture in order to carry the perishable products of our country across the ocean. The markets of the United States being closed to them, our farmers were enabled by their industry and perseverance and pluck to find across the sea a better market than that of the United States; and the administration of that day, realizing the importance of favouring that trade and giving every facility for carrying it on, made provision for cold storage so that these perishable products might be placed in the markets of the old land in the best shape. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite take credit for the increase of our exports that has resulted from the cold storage system it is surely not unreasonable for us on this side to expect that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) would have done simple justice to his opponents by pointing out that they and not this government were the originators of this system, and that if it has been an advantage to the exporters, they as well as this government should receive some credit. The hon. gentleman went on to discuss duties on beets, tomatoes and other vegetables, and to lay down the policy that the Liberal party intend to follow with respect to the tariff on these products. He explained the position of the Liberal party, and quoted from the speech of the late Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) stating that that speech contained common sense ideas. Was it because that hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) gave utterance to these common sense ideas that he was compelled to separate himself from the present cabinet ? And if his speech declaring against additional protection to the market gardeners of this country enunciated the policy of the government, what does the hon. gentleman think of his colleague from West York (Mr. Campbell) who appealed for the suffrages of the people of West York and the market gardeners who are an important element in that constituency upon the ground that he would advocate and strive for a change in the tariff which would give additional protection to the men whose suffrages he sought ?

Sir, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) wants to know every particular of the policy which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would adopt if they were called upon to administer the affairs of this country. Has he any right to ask for that information in view of the experience which the Liberal Conservative party has had during the last six or seven years ? I do not think it would be advisable for the leader of the opposition to give further particulars. 'Once bitten twice shy' is a good old adage. The gentlemen occupying the treasury benches coming into office six or

seven years ago, after denouncing the national policy which had been established by their predecessors in 1879, realized they could do nothing better than leave the national policy as they found it, and the only change, practically, that they made in the tariff was whatever change resulted from the introduction of their so-called British preference. And why should they expect hon. members on this side, who are not charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of the country, to give particulars of every change which they would make in the present tariff if they were called upon to assume the responsibility of carrying on the affairs of Canada? The hon. minister is very anxious to ascertain the position of the leader of the opposition respecting the duty on agricultural implements. He dwelt long, he even laboured to get this information, and challenged the statements that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was alleged to have made in his recent tour in the North-west. It was my good fortune, Mr. Speaker, to accompany my leader on that tour, and I well recollect the meeting at which these questions were asked him. It is unnecessary for me to corroborate the statements that the hon. gentleman has made, for the word of the leader of the opposition will be taken anywhere throughout the Dominion. But if it were necessary I could corroborate every word that has fallen from the lips of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) tonight. It seems to me that it was most unfortunate for himself that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) should bring the question of the duty on agricultural implements before the House in this debate. It was fresh in the minds of many of those with whom we came in contact during our recent tour in the west that when the Liberal party were appealing for their suffrages to that particular portion of the Dominion, their rallying cry was 'vote for McCarthy and free agricultural implements.' Was that part of their policy in 1896, and if so, has it been carried out? Have they fulfilled the pledges they made to the electors of that part of the Dominion, and given them free agricultural implements which they declared would be such a boon to that portion of the country? No, they have not; but, on the contrary, they have increased the protection which the manufacturers enjoyed. They have given them additional protection by minor changes which they have made in the duties on articles coming into this country which enter into the manufacture of these implements. The hon. gentleman declared that since the Liberal party came into power they have been fulfilling their pledges of reducing the burdens resting upon the people. By what method or policy have they succeeded in reducing the burdens of taxation which they found resting upon the shoulders of the people? I shall not weary the House at this late hour by reading many figures. But let me draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the increased taxation imposed upon the people, the taxation derived from the customs and excise, during the past six years, as compared with the previous six years has been equal to twenty-six per cent per annum. And the end is not yet. If we compare the taxation of the people in the first year of the Liberal administration, 1897, which amounted to $28,648,626, with the taxation levied during the last year, 1902, which amounted to $43,308,111, we find that the increase of taxation in these five years, notwithstanding the pledges which these hon. gentlemen made again and again to the people of this country, has been no less than the enormous sum of $14,740,485, equivalent to an increase of fifty-one per cent. And this is the way the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have fulfilled their pledges to the people and reduced the burdens of taxation. I shall not follow the example which has been complained of by the hon. gentleman by quoting from statements which he made as far back as 1876. But, with his permission I will make a quotation from a speech delivered by him in this House in 1894. I need not apologize for making a quotation not quite ten years old. The quotation is valuable because it clearly proves that the hon. gentleman had then some idea how best to measure the taxation which was being imposed upon the people by the government of that day. He is reported in the 'Hansard' of 1894, volume one, page 356, as follows:—

> The hon. gentleman said that the taxes we had in 1878 were heavier than they are now. That is a very strange statement for any one to make. I want to give hon. gentlemen opposite what I consider is a true way of measuring this, because the mere assertion made on one side of the House or the other will carry no weight. I would ask those hon. gentlemen to turn to page 11 of the Trade and Navigation Returns, prepared, not by Mr. Laurier or by the member for South Oxford, but prepared by the government themselves, and what is that statement. One of the columns shows the amount of customs duties paid per head of the population. That is the way to measure your taxation. Take the taxes of 1878 and see how much was paid by the population then. You will find it was $3.13 per head. Take the sum this last year, and it was $4.26 per head.

That is the statement made by the minister as to the best method of ascertaining what burden of taxation was being laid upon the people by the imposition of the customs and excise duties. In 1893 the customs taxation was $4.26, as the hon. gentleman then stated, but in 1896 that taxation had fallen to $3.90. What has been the record since then? The taxation under the administration of these business gentlemen has increased, in customs from $3.90 to $5.90 per head; and in excise from $1.56 to $2.05 per head. Sir, the average taxation per head per annum during the past five years shows an increase

of no less than 17½ per cent. The taxation per head in 1897, the first year of the Liberal administration, amounted to $5.57; the taxation per head last year, 1902, was no less than $7.95, an increase of $2.38 per head, or 42½ per cent. This is one of the ways in which hon. gentlemen have fulfilled their pledges and have relieved the taxpayers of this country of some of the burdens which they found resting upon them.

I do not know that there is much more to refer to in the speech of the Minister of Customs except his reference to the preferential tariff, and also to the German surtax, which I will refer to a little later on, with the permission of the House.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will you finish with me now, as I wish to go out ?

Mr. CLARKE. No, I want to come back to the hon. gentleman later on, I want to keep the good wine and the best wine until the last. In making his budget speech, the Minister of Finance congratulated the country upon the prosperity which exists at the present time. We do not dispute that prosperity, we congratulate the hon. gentleman upon being able to make such a good statement, and we hope that that prosperity will continue for a great many years to come. But there was one statement made by the Minister of Finance in his opening sentences to which I would like to draw the attention of the House. He said :

> Two years ago, after several years of rapid progress, there was anxiety in the minds of many observing men. Some indeed, thought we had already entered upon a period of depression. Others, and among them I count myself, felt that while we were not likely to have any period of severe depression, we might reasonably experience a check upon the very great prosperity of recent years. However, as it turned out, all these fears were unnecessary.

Sir, if these gentlemen can lay any substantial claim to credit for the creation of prosperous times in the Dominion, would they not be grossly derelict in their duty to the people of Canada if they did not perpetuate a policy which would give us a continuation of that prosperity for years to come ? Why did the hon. gentleman hesitate ? Why did he fear that there might be a set-back, why did he fear that this prosperity might not continue ? He intended to make no change in his tariff when he made that statement; and if that tariff was the perfect instrument he claimed it was, if that tariff has contributed to the prosperity of this country, if it has been one of the main causes which have promoted its prosperity, why should the hon. gentleman have any forebodings as to a period of depression following in days to come ? The position which we have taken, which we have had no hesitation in taking, is that the splendid, the phenomenal prosperity, if I may use the word, which has obtained in this country for the last six years, has been due primarily, and practically speaking, entirely, to the revival of business the world over, notwithstanding what the Minister of Customs has said, and also to the abundant crops with which Canada has been blessed during that period.

In the course of his speech, the Minister of Finance made reference to what has been accomplished by the Postmaster General in his administration of the Post Office Department. We have no desire, certainly I have no desire, to rob the Postmaster General of any credit to which he may be entitled for his administration of the affairs of the Post Office Department; but I have this to say, and I say it without hesitation, that in no department of the public service to-day is there so much dissatisfaction existing among the employees, in none does a feeling so strongly prevail that they are not getting fair-play or justice, as in the department of the Postmaster General. I say, Sir, that occupying the dual position which he does, the position of Minister of Labour as well as that of Postmaster General, he is especially bound to see that every grievance, every reasonable complaint which has been made to him, and which is being constantly made to him, shall be inquired into and redressed. It is a matter of greater importance to the people of Canada that we should have the benefit of an efficient postal service, than that the hon. gentleman should be able to make the two sides of the ledger balance to a cent at the end of the year. If the hon. gentleman has accomplished that feat, if he has made the receipts balance the expenditure, how has that been done ? It has been done, as has been pointed out, by special efforts ; it has been done also by the enormous increase which has taken place in the correspondence of this country, due to the general prosperity which has obtained. But the hon. gentleman has not hesitated to levy upon the newspaper proprietors of this country a new tax. He has compelled them to pay a tax which was not in existence when he assumed office. That tax, which is certainly a burden upon the readers of newspapers as well as upon the makers of newspapers, has undoubtedly been a reactionary measure, and a burden upon the people of this country. He has also lessened the privileges which the people enjoyed by raising the parcel post and the book post. Where four ounces were formerly sent for one cent from one part of Canada to the other, now only two ounces are sent. So when the Finance Minister gives credit to the Postmaster General for the administration of the affairs of the post office, we ask him to state how it has been accomplished, and we ask him to tell frankly the story of the additional burdens which have been placed upon the shoulders of the people to enable the Postmaster General to do what he has done.

The Minister of Finance made a reference in the course of his budget speech, to the prosperity which obtained on the railway

system of the Dominion. He referred to the fact that there was a small credit balance in the operating expenses of the Intercolonial for the past twelve months. Sir, during the past five years every railway in the Dominion of Canada, every railway on the continent of America, has substantially improved its position. Every railway company has been practically at its wit's end to find power and to find cars to handle the freight which has been offering. Notwithstanding the fact that the times have been propitious, notwithstanding the fact that business has largely increased in the maritime provinces owing to the development of the steel and coal industries, what is the position of affairs in regard to the administration of railways by hon. gentlemen opposite? Is it one that the hon. Minister of Finance can point to with any degree of pleasure or satisfaction, notwithstanding the fact that there is a small credit balance at the end of this year's operations ? Let me make a comparison, Mr. Speaker, of the last six years of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway with the operation of these roads during the six years previous. The past six years have been fat years ; the previous six years were lean years Yet, notwithstanding this fact, these roads were operated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the showing which they make at the end of these six years' operation is one that hon. gentlemen ought not to take any credit for. It is one that they ought to be heartily ashamed of. What are the facts ? From 1897 to 1902 inclusive, the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial road reached the enormous sum of $13,041,282, and on the Prince Edward Island railway the capital expenditure for the same period amounted to $849,260. The expenditure on both these roads on capital account during the past six years amounted to $13,890,542. What were the operating results of these railways ? From 1897 to 1902, the net loss on the Intercolonial Railway was $487,971, and on the Prince Edward Island Railway $398,792, making a total net loss for the past six years in the operation of these roads of no less than $886,763. Notwithstanding this period of prosperity, notwithstanding the enormous increase in the traffic during the past six years, these two roads did not earn enough by $886,763 to meet the operating expenses. Is that a condition of things that the government can felicitate itself upon or compliment the country upon ? I repeat that it is a most disgraceful condition of things, and one that ought to be put an end to as soon as possible. Compare the figures of the previous six years with those which I have just presented. From 1891 to 1896, the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway was $2,827,391, and on the Prince Edward Island Railway $8,300, making a total expenditure on capital account for that period of $2,835,691. The operating results were a net loss on the Intercolonial Railway of $519,287, and on the Prince Edward Island Railway of $430,497, or, for the two roads, a net loss of $949,784. The country was burdened by an additional debt through the operation of these roads and through the expenditures made on capital account during the period from 1891 to 1896 of $3,785,475. What is the net result to the people of Canada from the operation of these two roads for the past twelve years ? We have an indebtedness placed upon our shoulders of no less a sum than $18,562,780, and four-fifths of that burden has been laid on the shoulders of the taxpayers of this country by the hon. gentlemen opposite. Is that a satisfactory condition of affairs ? I say it is not and that it is one which the hon. Minister of Finance cannot derive any pleasure from or compliment the country upon. That is one phase of the transportation problem which these hon. gentlemen have not attempted to solve. That question appears to have dropped out of sight notwithstanding the fact that it is one of the most important problems awaiting solution at the hands of the people of this country. Since the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) abandoned his colleagues, practically they have given up the idea of making an attempt to solve that problem, and some statements have recently been made that they propose to refer the matter to a commission. They have not attempted to solve it, or they are not capable of solving it, or they would try to solve it ; but they are appointing a commission to try and solve it for them. The suggestion was made two or three years ago from this side of the House, and made in all humbleness and respect, that there should be a commission appointed at that time to make a thorough examination as to the best means of perfecting the transportation facilities of the country and report to the government upon it. Nothing has been done up to the present time, except to make the announcement that the government propose to appoint a commission, which means practically that they cannot solve this problem, that they have not the ability to deal with it, and so they have asked a commission of gentlemen to take the matter out of their hands, to relieve them of the responsibility of dealing with the transportation problem and of making a report to them as to what is best to be done in the interests of the country. That is the way this question is being solved by these hon. gentlemen. They had a solution of the fast Atlantic project in their hands when they assumed office in 1896. They abandoned the contract which was then awaiting their signature. They refused to sign it. They refused to call the fast Atlantic line into existence. They told the people that they were going to give them a new type of vessels, bottle-nosed or bottle-necked vessels which would be much steadier boats and by which they were going to save to the people $250,000 per

annum in the subsidy to this line. But what have they done towards giving the people the benefit of this fast line across the Atlantic? Nothing. I believe there was an announcement made two or three months ago that the government proposed to call for tenders for this fast Atlantic line; but, I presume, a commission will need to be appointed to tell these hon. gentlemen how they should establish the line.

But, they have some desire to pose as a naval administration. They propose to do something to establish their record as men of light and leading respecting naval affairs; for the announcement has been made that, instead of giving a reasonable and moderate contribution towards the maintenance of the imperial navy whose ships are on every sea to protect our commerce, they propose to establish the nucleus of a navy on their own account. They propose to place cruisers on the lakes and on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. If they do not succeed better in the administration of this naval force than they have done in carrying on the business of the country it will be a very serious matter; and the taxpayers will look with alarm if the affairs of the proposed naval department are placed under the control of my Lord High Admiral Préfontaine, who occupies the position of hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The hon. Minister of Finance took credit to himself for the enormous surplus which he hopes to have on the credit side of the ledger at the end of the present fiscal year. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) very naively and very suggestively asked if it is a revenue tariff that is in force in this country, why it is that no suggestion is made, nothwithstanding this enormous surplus which the government will have at its credit at the end of the fiscal year, for reducing the burdens of the people? Surely, when this business administration have a surplus of $13,000,000 at their credit the taxpayers of this country have a right to expect some reduction in the burden of taxation which has weighed so heavily upon them during the past twelve months and as a result of which this enormous surplus has been raised. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had something to say in days gone by regarding surpluses. The hon. gentleman is quoted in 1900, as follows:

> I ask how it (the surplus) was got? $1,000,000 was derived from two of the most odious and oppressive taxes which were ever imposed in any civilized country before, under similar circumstances at least—the taxes on breadstuffs and fuel. If he really wants to relieve the people let him remove the taxes on breadstuffs and coal.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce and his colleagues have an opportunity of proving that they meant what they said when they declared that the tax on breadstuffs and fuel was the most oppressive and the most odious tax that coulld be imposed on a civilized community. From the report of the Trade and Commerce Department of last year, we find that no less than $437,496 was raised by a tax on breadstuffs, and that $1,652,993 was raised by a tax on coal. Of this $13,000,000 of surplus, not less than $2,090,490 was raised as a result of the tax on breadstuffs and coal, and yet not a suggestion has been made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) or by any of the ministers that this odious and barbarous tax should be removed and that the consumers of this country should get the benefit of its remission.

This afternoon the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) was told by one of the ministers that by reason of the increased duty put upon tobacco in 1897 by this Liberal government, no less than $1,335,753 additional taxes were collected from those who use the weed during the past twelve months than would have been collected had the Conservative tariff remained in force and the same quantity of tobacco been consumed. Tobacco is solace and comfort and consolation of the working classes after their hard day's work, and would it be an unreasonable thing for them to expect that a portion of this extra tax which this government (whose pledge it was on coming into office to make Canada a cheap country to live in) placed upon tobacco, should be remitted to them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister of Customs made reference to the enormous expansion that is taking place in the trade of this country. I do not admit for one moment that the fact that the imports and exports have increased, is of itself an infallible test as to the prosperity of a country. It seems to me that if we manufactured some of the goods which we import and thereby reduced the volume of our imports; and if we exported less than we did, because of a market for our produce, the prosperity of the country would be greater although the volume of its trade might not be so large.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. And if the trade of this country has increased, we may also remember that the trade of the United States has increased, that the trade of the other colonies has increased, that the trade of other nations has increased, and that the trade of the motherland has substantially increased during the past six years. Again I ask the gentlemen on the treasury benches: What changes have they made in the fiscal system which they found in operation in 1896, which have caused this large development in our export and import trade? Sir, the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in his eloquent advocacy of the policy of protection to our legitimate industries, made a statement on the floor of this House that has not been answered;

a statement that the Minister of Customs has not attempted to answer; a statement that no minister who was a colleague of the Hon. Mr. Tarte has attempted to answer; a statement that no member supporting the government has attempted to answer; a statement that they cannot answer, and will not answer, because it is known far and wide to be a fact. This is the statement of the Hon. Mr. Tarte to which I refer:

I say it openly, I say it from the bottom of my heart, that I fully expected that the Liberal party, with which I have been connected during the last ten years, would carry out the policy it was understood in 1896 they would carry out.

I draw the attention of the Minister of Customs to this language of the ex-minister:

I am weighing my words. I know what arrangement, what understanding took place between some public men. I know what took place. I do not divulge any secrets. I know what we did in the election of 1896 in Montreal. I see within the radius of my eye public men who, at our request, came to the city of Montreal, went to the manufacturers, with the knowledge of the leaders of their party, and told them not only would the tariff not be disturbed, but it would be changed in the right direction when the proper time came. There was no secret about that. I shall not give names. There are men who hear me—I am sorry there are not more on those benches—who know that I am perfectly right.

Has any hon. gentleman who has been a colleague of the ex-Minister of Public Works during the past six years anything to say about that statement? Is any one of them prepared to contradict it? Are they all dumb? Is that statement a fact, or is it not? I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. I say that the same tactics which the ex-minister tells us were adopted in Montreal, were pursued in the manufacturing centres of the province of Ontario. Were these the tactics of honourable public men; were they the tactics we would expect to see adopted by gentlemen who made the professions which these Liberal ministers made? What has the Minister of Customs to say to the allegations of his late colleague? Are they correct? Is it a fact that the men now on the treasury benches who rung the changes from end to end of this Dominion, denouncing the national policy, declaring that the people of this country were being bled white as a result of this policy—is it a fact that these men went into the centres of industry throughout the Dominion and taking the manufacturers to one side, gave them assurances, that should they come to power no changes would be made in this much maligned national policy; but that instead, in the course of time, additional protection would be given them if they only voted for and supported the Liberal party?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. They appealed to the people as the great tax reducers, and they pledged themselves to the people that if they came into power they would wipe the last vestige of protection out of the tariff that was placed on the statute-book in 1879. Has the Prime Minister or his colleagues anything to say regarding this allegation which has been made in parliament by an ex-minister, respecting their laches, respecting—shall I use the word—their perfidious conduct towards the great body of the taxpayers of Canada?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. Was it not a perfidious course to pursue, to tell the horny-handed sons of toil from one end of Canada to the other, that the national policy was inimical to their best interests; that they were groaning under the burden of taxation which that policy imposed upon them; and, at the same time, that these Liberal statesmen should go from factory to factory and pledge themselves to the captains of those great industries, that if they got on the treasury benches no change would be made in that abominable tariff which would in any way hurt the manufacturing industries of this country?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. And, Sir, if this government can take credit to-day because our industries are prosperous, is not the secret of this prosperity found in the statement made by the member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte)? And if our industries are prosperous, it is because the government forgot or ignored the pledges they made to the people of Canada. They declared in favour of free trade; they declared in favour of the abolition of protection, while in the same breath they gave assurances and pledges to the manufacturers, pledges that they have since fulfilled to the letter, namely: that the manufacturing industries would have their first consideration. If our industries are prosperous, Mr. Speaker, surely then it is because these hon. gentlemen, if they had any convictions, had not the courage of their convictions, and were afraid to destroy that principle of protection which they found in the tariff and which they denounced as the national policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. But the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) went further. He said:

The revision of the tariff in 1897 has placed it about 2 per cent less than it was before.

That tariff averaged about 30 per cent in 1896 and these gentlemen who were to cut out every vestige of protection, had the temerity to reduce it to 28 per cent:

The revision of the tariff of 1897 has placed it about 2 per cent less high than it was be-

fore. We did not do more than that ; and when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was this afternoon denouncing the former tariff, the tariff that I supported myself, when he was telling us that the tariff enacted in 1879 and kept on the statute-book up to 1897 had simply allowed the manufacturers to pocket the money of the people, I was saying to myself, if it was so, I do not know what it is now, because there is not much difference in the two tariffs ; the present tariff is about the same thing.

And the hon. member for St. Mary's is right, because the duty collected on dutiable goods in 1896 was 30 per cent, while the duty collected last year was 27·33 per cent ; and this reduction of 2·67 per cent includes the goods brought in under the so-called British preference. Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery ; and these hon. gentlemen, while professing to be revenue-tariff men and free traders, paid the greatest possible compliment to their predecessors by adopting their tariff as soon as they had the opportunity of doing so.

If I may trespass on the indugence of the House a litte further, I would like to say a few words on the operation of the British preference and as to its effect on our imports. At the opening of the Colonial Conference in London last summer, the Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain made the following statement in reference to the British preference given by Canada :

> So long as a preferential tariff, even a munificent preference, is still sufficiently protective to exclude us altogether, or nearly so, from your markets, it is no satisfaction to us that you have imposed even greater disability upon the same goods if they came from foreign markets, especially if the articles in which the foreigners are interested come in under more favourable conditions.

Was Mr. Chamberlain justified in making that statement, or was he not ? What are the facts ? In 1902 all imports from Great Britain entered for consumption in Canada had a duty of 17·12 per cent levied on them. In the same year all the imports from the United States entered for consumption had a duty of 12·54 levied on them. In other words, the duty levied on all goods imported from England was nearly half as much more as the duty levied on all the goods imported from the United States. The duty levied on dutiable goods imported last year from Great Britan was 24·02 per cent, while on dutiable goods imported from the United States it was 25·18 per cent. That is all the advantage the British manufacturer got in the markets of Canada, while he had the disadvantages of distance, insurance and time. That is the extent of the preference which these hon. gentlemen have made so much ado about during the past five years ; and I have shown the appreciation in which the preference is held by the gentleman best qualified to speak on it. The officials of the British Board of Trade also made a statement respecting the operation of the preference in which they endorsed the position taken by the Colonial Secretary. This is what they said :

> The period which has elapsed since the first application of the preferential tariff has not been long enough to enable any certain inferences to be drawn as to its effect in encouraging or diverting trade, especially as the period has been an abnormal one, marked by great general revival of trade throughout the world, accompanied by large oscillations of prices of some of the principal articles which figure in the Canadian import and export tables—notably coal, iron and steel, and corn. There has also been a rapid growth of gold production in the north-west of Canada, practically the whole of which, so far as it is exported, goes to the United States.

The hon. Minister of Customs, in the course of his speech to-night, flippantly referred to the statements that had been made about the general revival of trade throughout the world ; yet here is a high authority on that matter, which I think he will hardly dare to call in question. Further, Sir, this remarkable statement is made by these same officials :

> We may look at the figures in another way, i.e., by comparing the percentages of the total import trade of Canada which came from the United Kingdom before and after the introduction of the preferential tariff, respectively. The result is to show that the continuous decrease which has been taking place in recent years in the proportion of imports from the United Kingdom into Canada has not been arrested by the operation of the tariff. The percentage proportion in the year 1900-01 (during which the preference of one-third was in force) was 23½. In the three preceding years 1897-8 to 1899-1900 (during which there was a preference of one-eighth, to 30th June, 1898, then one-fourth), the percentage was 24½.

These are statements which have not been, and I think, cannot be gainsaid by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, Sir, let me go back into what my hon. friend the Minister of Customs would call ancient history. I do so merely to show that history is repeating itself. In the first years of confederation, during the period from 1868 to 1874, inclusive, our average imports for consumption from Great Britain amounted to $50,709,791, and from the United States they averaged $34,759,154. During the five years that the Liberal party were in office, from 1874 until the introduction of the national policy in 1879, what was the trend of our trade as between Great Britain and the United States ? The imports from the United Kingdom decreased during their period of office by no less than 17½ per cent per annum, while the imports from the United States increased 38 per cent per annum, as compared with the imports from those countries during the period from 1868 to 1874, prior to their coming into office. Now, take the whole national policy period, the period about which so much has been said in the course of this debate, and what is the fact ? Taking that whole period of seventeen years, from 1880, when the

national policy came into force, until 1897, when it was abrogated by hon. gentlemen opposite and replaced by their tariff, the average annual imports from the United Kingdom were $40,826,435, as compared with $41,805,689 for the period when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, and the imports from the United States had increased from $48,089,257 to $50,123,811. Taking the entire national policy period, from 1880 to 1897, inclusive, the imports from the United Kingdom declined 2⅓ per cent, while the imports from the United States increased 4¼ per cent, as compared with the imports from those countries during the period from 1875 to 1879, when the Liberal party were in power. In this connection it may be pointed out that the average decline in imports from the United Kingdom and the average increase in imports from the United States, both occurred during the years from 1894 to 1897, inclusive, a period of unusual depression in Canada and the United States; for from 1880 to 1894 the average annual increase in imports from the United Kingdom was almost 3 per cent, while the average annual increase in the imports from the United States was less than one-sixth of one per cent, as compared with the imports for the years from 1875 to 1879.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be said that Canada was not making any very great progress, if its progress was to be measured by its imports from the United States and from the United Kingdom respectively. But, Sir, Canada was in a formative period at the time. The national policy had been pronounced the policy of the Conservative party and placed on the statutes; and if our imports from the United States and England were practically stationary during that period of seventeen or eighteen years, we were consoled by the fact that we were laying the foundation of great industrial institutions, and that during that period the yearly output of those industries had increased some $200,000,000 or $300,000,000. If our imports from the United Kingdom and the United States were stationary, I repeat we had the consolation that we were establishing permanently our industries in Canada, that we were developing our own resources, and providing, to a certain extent at least, a home market for our agriculturists, and giving steady employment at good wages to an ever-increasing body of artisans from one end of Canada to the other.

Now, look at the record of the last five years since this so-called British preference has been on our statutes. From 1898 to 1902, the average of our imports from the United Kingdom was $41,314,999, and from the United States, $102,571,378. From 1898 to 1902, the period during which the so-called British preference has been in force, our imports from the United Kingdom have increased 1·18 per cent while those from the United States have increased 105 per cent as compared with the period 1880 to 1897. That is the record which the tabulated statements of the Trade and Navigation reports present. Is there anything in that picture which the hon. gentleman has any reason to proud of? Does the increase of 1·18 per cent in the imports from the United Kingdom justify the statements made from year to year on behalf of the government, as to what they have accomplished in arresting the decline in our importations from the United Kingdom, especially when we consider that in the same period our imports from the United States increased by more than 100 per cent? Whatever consolations hon. gentlemen can take from the figures I have quoted from the public documents, prepared by the officers of the government, they are certainly welcome to them. If time permitted, I could make statements respecting the exports of British and Irish produce during the last fifteen years, which would show conclusively how misleading it is for hon. gentlemen opposite to make comparison between the trade of Canada in the period from 1896 to 1902 and the preceding period from 1891 to 1896. The condition of things which existed in the Dominion and throughout the world from 1891 to 1896 was an abnormal one. It was a period of general depression practically world wide. In 1894, the magnificent country to the south of us, the United States, was in the midst of a commercial upheaval—a commercial revolution and depression—and we had the spectacle of an army of unemployed men marching on the capital to endeavour to get some relief by legislation. Is it fair to take the trade of the country during such a period of depression and compare it with its trade during the period of buoyancy, expansion and prosperity now existing, not only in Canada, but throughout the civilized world? I am sorry that time will not permit me to refer to the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) regarding the necessity of our seeking privileges in the American market by a renewal of reciprocity negotiations with our neighbours to the south; but I wish to refer for a moment to the question of preferential trade. Let me remind the House that those who are competent to speak on the subject—the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) who has been a consistent protectionist all his life—have both declared that the only change made in the old tariff by the present government amounted to not more than 2 per cent, and that was accomplished by the granting of the so-called British preference. The hon. Minister of Finance said in the course of his budget speech:

> Hon. gentlemen opposite have frequently endeavoured to assure themselves and others that the imperial authorities were ready and willing to give us a preference.

That is what the hon. Minister of Fin-

ance said in his budget speech, and he went on to say :

We remember how it was stated that Mr. Chamberlain practically offered us a preference and that we had declined to have it.

If that view was entertained by the people of Canada, who was responsible for it ? If that was a misconception, upon whose shoulders are we to lay the blame ?

Let me quote three or four sentences from what was said by the right hon. the First Minister, at London, Ontario, in June, 1896, which will explain, better than I can do it myself, how this misconception arose :

Now, the statesmen of Great Britain have thought that the governments of the colonies have come to a time when a new step can be taken in their development. What is that ? That there shall be a commercial agreement between England and the colonies. That practical statesman, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain has come to the conclusion that the time has come when it is possible to have within the bounds of the empire a new step taken, which will give to the colonies in England a preference for their products over the products of other nations. What would be the possibilities of such a step if it was taken ? We sell our goods in England. We send our wheat, our butter, our cheese, all our natural products, but there we have to compete with similar products from the United States, from Russia, and from other nations. Just see what a great advantage it would be to Canada, if the wheat, cheese and butter, which we would send to England, should be met in England with a preference over similar products of other nations. The possibilities are immense.

In the paragraph just read Mr. Chamlain is called a practical statesman. In this one he is called the new and progressive secretary of the colonies :

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the new and progressive Secretary of the Colonies, has declared that the time has come when it is possible to discuss that question. But, Sir, if England is going to give us that preference, England would expect something from us in return. What is it she would expect ? England would expect that we would come as closely to her own system of free trade as it is possible for us to come. England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade, such as she has it ; but I lay it before you, that the thing the English people would expect in return is that, instead of a principle of protection, we should adopt the revenue form of tariff, pure and simple. These are the conditions on which we can have that boon.

I repeat that if there is any misconception in the public mind as to what the situation was with respect to the mutual preference between the colonies and the empire, the responsibility rests entirely on the right hon. gentleman, who made statements such as I have quoted when campaigning throughout the country in 1896. He went to England, but unfortunately got no preference. We gave a preference to England in our market but got no preference in the English market in return. This is his explanation. He said:

There is a class of our fellow citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for quid pro quo. The Canadian government has ignored all such sentiments. We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade which has done so much for England. The colonies had already granted certain concessions to the mother country, but they asked for no quid pro quo, no pound of flesh. What we give you by our tariff we give in gratitude for the splendid freedom under which we have prospered. It is a free gift. We ask no compensation. Protection has been the curse of Canada ; we would not see you come under its baneful influence—for what weakens you must weaken us.

Again the right hon. gentleman said :

It would be a boon for a time, but how long ?

He was referring to a mutual preference.

But how long will it last? Would it be an advantage in the long run ? That is what men who think beyond the passing moment have to ask themselves. Suppose England did such a thing and abandoned her free trade record. She would inevitably curtail the purchasing power of her people and do you not think we should suffer from that, we who alone have natural resources enough to feed your millions from our fertile lands.

I have too great a belief in English common sense to think they will do any such thing. What we have done in the way of tariff preference to England we have, as I said, done out of gratitude to England, and not because we want her to enter upon the path of protection. We know that the English people will not interfere with the policy of free trade, and we do not desire them to do so. We know that buying more goods from England she will buy more from us and so develop trade, and the moment the trade is developed Canada is benefited.

So, after all, the First Minister believed—for he would not make a statement he did not believe to be true—that notwithstanding the fact that we got no direct benefit as a result of this preference, we got a substantial indirect benefit and Canada, after all, would be the gainer by giving the preference. I am trying to interpret accurately the statement the right hon. gentleman made. He emphasized that statement in Bowmanville in 1899, after the preference had been two years in operation. This is what he said :

The merchants of England, the men who have to buy articles in the markets of the world, no longer go to the United States to make their purchases. They come to Canada, and this is the direct result of our preferential tariff.

Now, we have good reason to compliment hon. gentlemen opposite if this statement can be borne out, if our trade has enormously increased and Canada has been benefited. But we have the right to hold them to account, if that preference has brought us great benefit, if, for no good reasoa, they have abrogated it. The government claim to have shown that this preference was beneficial to Canada, and, that being so, they must give good reason why they have decided, as shown by the statement of the Minister of Finance, to absolutely abandon

that policy—for that is what the resolution of the Minister of Finance means, if it means anything. Having quoted the First Minister, I am going to take the liberty of quoting somewhat extensively from a speech delivered by the Minister of Labour, the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock). This speech has been very nicely printed, and I believe it was sent by thousands through the mail under frank during the by-elections in the different constituencies.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). That speech was never franked through the mails except during the session of parliament.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. minister say that the speech to which I have referred had not been sent through the mails under frank before this session of parliament?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite deny it.

Mr. CLARKE. I accept the statement. I am bound to do so, and I do it unreservedly. But I have had information that it was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is absolutely wrong.

Mr. CLARKE. Let me draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir William Mulock)—who plumes himself upon doing so much for the working classes and who is now passing through this parliament a Bill to give recognition to the union label—to the fact that I have examined this pamphlet containing his speech delivered on the 4th November last in the city of Toronto, and, from cover to cover, I cannot find any trace of the so-called union label. I shall have to call the attention of the fair-wage officer to this omission, for it would be unreasonable to suppose that such an omission would be made by the Postmaster General intentionally. Let me give some extracts from the speech the hon. gentleman made referring to the British preference:

In framing that tariff it appeared to the government that a preference to Great Britain would not only lead to the advantage of Canada but of the mother country as well. (Hear, hear.) Here was our country, of vast, illimitable yet undeveloped resources practically without a neighbour in America willing to trade with her on fair terms, whilst across the ocean was our mother country that has ever been Canada's true friend and whose market was open to us. True, we were selling to her, comparatively little for Canada's resources were little known in the old land. Still, it appeared to us that our trade with her was capable of great development if we proceed the right way about it. (Hear, hear.) Aye, more, there was the opportunity of setting an example which, if followed, might yet secure to us on preferential terms the markets not only of Great Britain herself, but also of her world-wide possessions. (Applause.) Surely, Sir, when every foreign nation was and is hedging itself round with a tariff wall in order to shut out the produce of all other countries, our manifest duty was and is to lay foundations for devoloping our trade in the only profitable market likely to be accessible to us—the great British world-empire of four hundred millions to which we are so proud to belong. (Cheers.)

I wish the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who made such an elaborate argument for renewing negotiations for reciprocity with the United States, had listened to the statement made by the Postmaster General that the British market was the only profitable market likely to be accessible to us. I quote further:

In this spirit, Mr. Chairman, we inaugurated a policy of that nature in 1897, when we placed our British preference on the statute-book of Canada. (Hear, hear.) Our opponents say we should have dickered for value in return. (Oh! oh!) It is true we did not dicker for value in return. When did Great Britain ever dicker with us about getting value in return, when on many occasions she was prepared to pour out her money and her men in defence of the sacred soil of Canada? (Hear, hear.) No, Mr. Chairman, we adopted another and higher course, treating Great Britain not as an alien country, but as our mother country—(cheers)—and with that liberality which she has ever shown us, conscious that ingratitude is not one of her faults and with some hope that as changing conditions admitted of it, our example might by degrees be followed by Great Britain herself, and by other portions of the empire, until at last each portion might enjoy throughout the whole empire trade advantages not shared in by foreign nations. (Loud cheers.)

How has Great Britain treated us since we granted her this preference? Till then our produce was little known or appreciated in her markets and much was sold under the name 'America.' Now it no longer enters that market under an alias, but under its true name 'Canada.' (Hear, hear.) That name is now popular, respected and beloved in England, and sells our produce and wins for it a preference, thus increasing the demand for Canadian products. (Cheers.) In consequence, since the establishment of the preference five years ago our farmers have sold more and more of their products in the British market, the total value having increased from about $47,000,000 in 1896-7 to over $80,000,000 in 1902. Nor have our manufacturers been less favoured, for in the same period their sales to Great Britain have increased over 100 per cent. (Applause.)

This was a doubled-barrelled advantage we were getting. We were vastly increasing our sales of agricultural products and also increasing our sales of manufactures by 100 per cent under the preference.

Sir, these results are not accidents, but the direct result of our British preference, which our opponents wish to repeal. With such magnificent results as these within the short space of five years, what may we not reasonably expect as the years roll by? Nor does it seem an idle dream to hope that our example may be followed by the rest of the empire. Already the leaven appears to be working, for, as you are aware, a resolution was unanimously adopted by Australia, New Zealand, Cape Colony and Natal, at the imperial conference held in London three months ago, favouring an inter-imperial tariff prefernce and suggesting action in that direction by the mother country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Take it as read.

Mr. CLARKE. Let me read it for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell), and I hope it will do him some good :

The Liberal party is seeking to build up Canada in political as well as commercial alliance with the rest of the empire, to that end establishing, as fast as circumstances permit, steamship lines with South Africa, Australia and the mother country, promoting with them trade and interchange of sentiment by improved mail and cable services, rejoicing at the completion of the Pacific cable, the thin, all-red line now connecting together the great self-governing colonies.

I have taken the liberty of reading that, because I thought hon. gentlemen opposite would like to hear it. Now, Mr. Speaker, that statement was made on the fourth of November, 1902, the other statements which I read were made by the Prime Minister in 1897 and 1898. The Colonial Conference was held in London from June to August last, four months before the Postmaster General made the statements in the city of Toronto which I have read. Let me draw the attention of this House to the fact that on page one of the official report of the conference proceedings it is pointed out that these gentlemen absolutely declined to have the statements they made at that conference published ; they declined to allow their constituents, the people of Canada, to know what statements they made in discussing these matters of prime importance to Canada, with the Colonial Secretary and those associated with him. They absolutely refused to allow their utterances to be published in this blue-book, and we have only the utterances of the imperial ministers and those associated with them, and the tabulated statements which appear at the end of the book, to guide us as to what took place at that conference. I turn to page thirty-seven of the report of this conference, and I find the following significant statement :—

From the beginning of the proceedings the Canadian ministers have claimed that in consideration of the substantial preference given by Canada for some years to the products of the mother country, Canadian food products should be exempted in the United Kingdom from the duties recently imposed. Representations to this effect previously made through the High Commissioner for Canada were supplemented by the ministers, both in writing and in the personal interviews with the imperial ministers. . . . . The Canadian ministers desired to have it understood that they took this course with the strong hope and expectation that the principle of preferential trade would be more widely acepted by the colonies, and that the mother country would at an early day apply the same principle by exempting the products of the colonies from customs duties. If, after using every effort to bring about such a readjustment of the fiscal policy of the empire, the Canadian government should find that the principle of preferential trade is not acceptable to the colonies generally or the mother country, then Canada should be free to take such action as might be deemed necessary in the presence of such conditions.

Mr. CLARKE.

Sir, the hon. gentleman who made the speech from which I quoted was present when this conference was being held, he was present when these memoranda were being prepared and presented to the imperial authorities by himself and his associates; yet three or four months afterwards in the city of Toronto he says :—

In this spirit, Mr. Chairman, we inaugurated a policy of that nature. Our opponents say we should have dickered for value in return. It is true we did not dicker for value in return.

Yet he makes it a sine qua non that unless the British government give them something in return for the preference, notwithstanding the statements which the hon. gentleman made of the advantage this country was deriving, the Canadian government felt itself free to withdraw the preference and to deprive Canada of the advantages which it was obtaining. Was that statesmanship gone mad, or what would you call it, Mr. Speaker ? This preference that was rapidly increasing the volume of our sales, this preference out of which the Dominion was reaping such substantial advantage, which was developing the imperial spirit which the hon. gentleman so much commends when he is addressing audiences in the province of Ontario, this preference is now being wiped out by the hon. gentlemen because of the action of Germany respecting the admission of Canadian products. Sir, it was unworthy of the Postmaster General, when he was addressing an audience in Toronto, not to have told that audience that three months before the Canadian government had given notice to the imperial authorities that they held themselves absolved from continuing that preference any longer, and they were prepared to break it unless they gave Canada a quid pro quo.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. CLARKE. Unless Great Britain would make a dicker with them and give them something in return for the preference we were giving, they held themselves absolved from continuing that preference to Great Britain, thereby destroying the reputation which some person had given them of being empire builders. Sir, I leave it with the hon. gentleman and his friends to explain why he declined to take the people of Toronto, in November, 1902, into his confidence, and tell them that this government had given notice to the imperial authorities that unless the imperial authorities made a dicker with them the preference would have to go by the board.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Never gave any such notice. Don't state what is not the fact.

Mr. CLARKE. Let me read it again, lest I should have made a mistake, as my eyesight is not as good as it used to be :—

The Canadians ministers desired to have it understood that they took this course with the strong hope and expectation that the principle of preferential trade would be more widely accepted by the colonies, and that the mother country would at an early day apply the same principle by exempting the products of the colonies from customs duties. If, after using every effort to bring about such a readjustment of the fiscal policy of the empire, the Canadian government should find that the principle of preferential trade is not acceptable to the colonies generally, or the mother country, then Canada should be free to take such action as might be deemed necessary in the presence of such conditions.

Yet it is asserted that there is no dickering there, no attempt to get something in return for the preference which we had given, because of our appreciation of that splendid liberty which Britain had given to us. We had our compensation, yet we had our eye on the main chance; and in addition to recognizing the advantages which we enjoyed from that liberty which Britain had secured for us, we were reaping a substantial benefit from the preference by an enormous increase in the sales of our products in the markets of the United Kingdom. Sir, the hon. gentleman took great credit to himself and his friends for that matter. Let me draw attention to the fact that not many years ago when he and his political associates were fighting for unrestricted reciprocity, were fighting for continental free trade, those who then were charged with the administration of public affairs pointed to the market of the old land as the best, the safest and the most permanent market for the surplus products of this country. Did they receive any encouragement, any support, any countenance from the Postmaster General when they were trying to impress upon himself and his colleagues of the Liberal party that they should abandon the attempt to give the United States a preference in the market of Canada, and that they should endeavour to develop a trade with the mother country that would make Canada independent of the United States, and not the vassal she would have been if she had adopted the policy of commercial union ? When his attention was drawn to the fact that this policy of commercial union meant giving an advantage in the markets of Canada to the products of the workshops of the United States over the products of the workshops of the United Kingdom, did he ever raise his voice against that policy ? No, Sir, but he now asks the people of Toronto and the people of Canada to give him credit because the government are now assuming the role of empire builders, and are giving Britain an advantage of 33⅓ per cent on her products in the markets of Canada. Let me read what the late Sir John Thompson said with regard to the policy which should prevail in Canada :

We believe that the markets of Great Britain are the greatest markets for the products of this country, and whether or not a preference is given to our products in the British markets, we will not not submit to a policy by which our people shall jeopardize that market, and which shall exclude the products of that country from ours.

Sir, that was not the policy which the Postmaster General was supporting then ; that was not the policy which those who are now associated with him in the administration of the affairs of this country were promulgating and supporting. The hon. gentleman is not frank enough to give credit for the splendid increase of our exports to the mother country, to those who established that policy, and who propounded it and worked for its accomplishment. But if the hon. gentleman and those associated with him had been sincere, if they had pursued a straightforward course when they came into office, they would have gone manfully to the United States and asked for unrestricted reciprocity, because they said we could never become prosperous unless our farmers had access to the markets of the United States. They had not the courage of their convictions, and it is a good thing for Canada that they had not. Our farmers were forced to send their surplus products to the markets of the old land and compete there on equal terms with the products of other countries. The expansion of our export trade to Britain has gone on steadily. The hon. gentleman has done nothing to promote it except to give that sentimental advantage of the British preference, and yet he asks the electors of Toronto and the electors of Ontario to give himself and his colleagues all the credit for the wonderful development in British trade that has taken place. What did his colleague, the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, say when the statement of Sir John Thompson, which I have just quoted, was made in his presence ? He said :

The hon. gentleman has indulged in a very absurd misrepresentation of the real value and importance of the English market to Canada. He makes a tremendous mistake if he believes that the English market is likely to be available to us for all or more than a portion of our products. There cannot be found any market in the world to compare for one moment with the market offered by the United States.

His colleague was a false prophet, was he not, according to the speech of the hon. gentleman himself, because the sales of our products in the markets of Great Britain are increasing enormously ? The right hon. gentleman was a false prophet six or seven years ago. He added :

They alleged to us the superior value of the British market. That market, at the best, is a second rate and second best market and the only true and really valuable market is that along our southern border.

The hon. Minister of Customs, whose speech we listened to so patiently to-night, said :

We heard the Minister of Finance boasting because our trade with Great Britain increased.

He added :

I feel that there is a little drawback to the joy which we experience in the expansion of our trade with Great Britain, because it has resulted from the fact that another and a better market nearer by has been closed to us for much we have to sell ; and our products, being shut out from the United States, had to find the market that is open to all the world in England.

The hon. Minister of Customs could take no consolation in years gone by out of the increase in the sales of our products in the markets of England because he said they were barred out of a better market and that they found the market in England in competition with the products of the world. Is that not the condition to-day in England ?

One word more in regard to the surtax and then I shall apologize and take my seat. I must apologize again for having taken up so much of the time of the House when hon. gentlemen are anxious to get away. The relations of England with the German fatherland are being imperilled as the result of this curious piece of statecraft on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. We cannot forget that these imperial Houses are closely identified, we cannot forget that the august sovereign of the German Empire is a grandson of our late beloved Queen Victoria and that he is the nephew of our most gracious Sovereign King Edward VII. We all recognize the power, the influence and the virility of the German people. I wish we had more of these people settling in the Dominion of Canada. They have been among our best settlers ever since settlers sought the shores of Canada. There are two counties in the province of Ontario to which we can point with pride which are settled by Germans, and which, as a result of their industry, integrity and self-denial, have bloomed and blossomed as the rose. These people are endowed with qualities that go to make the very best citizens, but the result of the action of hon. gentlemen opposite may be to divert the stream of German emigration from Canada towards some other country. When we look back to the heroic struggle of the German people to obtain that precious liberty which they now enjoy, we cannot but admire them. We recognize the proud position that the German empire occupies to-day among the great powers of the world and we must attribute to the vital energy of her people the wonderful strides and the grand position which she occupies to-day. If hon. gentlemen opposite had made friendly representations and explanations to the German authorities there would have been no occasion to adopt such a drastic measure as they have proposed. The German emperor apparently was not aware that he was dealing with resourceful politicians. If an increase has taken place in the export of goods from England to Canada during the last five years, that increase is due almost entirely to the importation of German goods and goods made on the continent coming by way of England under the British preference. Two years ago I took the liberty of asking the hon. Minister of Finance a question about the imposition of taxation on goods made partially in Germany or made from German raw material. I asked this question :

Is it the intention of the government to so amend the tariff Act as to debar from the advantage of the British preferential clause articles partly manufactured in Germany, or manufactured from raw material grown or produced in Germany ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In answer to the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) I beg to say : No, ... but if it can be shown that the intention of the British preferential trade is evaded we shall be glad to consider the facts when presented to us.

In the following year I took the opportunity of pointing out to the hon. Minister of Finance how the preferential tariff was being evaded by quoting from one of the most influential papers published in the United Kingdom, as follows :

How Foreigners Rob Canada.

Since Canada granted a preference tariff to Britain, tons upon tons of German and other foreign textiles have been brought over to England and reshipped to Canada, after a so-called process of 'finishing,' in order that they may be classed as goods partly of British manufacture. In some cases this 'finishing' in England consists simply in taking off the German, French or Austrian labels, doing the goods up again, and then giving them a British name or label. There is no branch of trade in which this style of smuggling is caried on to the extent that it is in the textile trade.—(Belfast 'News,' January 23, 1902.

The hon. gentleman desired information two years ago and now what do we find as the result of representations made from this side of the House ? We find in the resolution introduced by the hon. Minister of Finance the following :

Articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of any foreign country which treats imports from Canada less favourably than those from other countries may be subject to a surtax over and above the duties of Schedule A, such surtax in every case to be one-third of the duty as fixed by such Schedule A.

Such surtax shall apply to any article, the chief value of which was produced in such foreign country, although it may have been improved or advanced in value by the labour of another country, notwithstanding the provisions of the British preferntial tariff and regulations thereunder.

What does that mean ? It means that by the passage of this resolution these gentlemen are abrogating the British preferential tariff, and I will prove it in a minute. In replying to my question as to the intention of the government in regard to debarring goods partly manufactured in Germany, or manufactured from raw material grown or produced in Germany, from the advantage of the British preference, the hon. Minister of Finance said :

In answer to the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) I beg to say : No. Such provision would practically destroy the British preference inasmuch as British manufactures are largely produced from foreign raw materials.

The surtax which the hon. gentleman now proposes therefore practically destroys the British preference, for it imposes not only the maximum tariff on goods coming from Germany, but also an additional tax of 33⅓ per cent on goods coming from England which are partly made or manufactured from raw material grown or produced in Germany. In this matter of trade policy, we find ourselves, by the abrogation of the British preference, just where we were in 1896 so far as the tariff is concerned. That is the result of six years of government by this business administration. Those gentlemen who were going to change the tariff ; those gentlemen who were to give us a tariff altogether different from the Conservative tariff, have been compelled to accept the tariff of the Conservatives. The interests at stake were so great that they were afraid to interfere because of the consequences that might ensue. What is the resolution which has been proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and for which he asks the approval of the House ? It embodies a policy which means that adequate, sufficient, protection shall be given to every legitimate industry in this country. It means that there shall be some fixed principle embodied in the tariff law of this country. How can we expect our natural resources to be developed as efficiently and as speedily as otherwise they would, if those who have capital to invest have no idea as to what principle there is in our tariff ?

We believe that a pronouncement in favour of a tariff of protection, legitimate protection for legitimate industries, would lead to an enormous extension of our manufacturing industries from end to end of the Dominion. We believe that as a result of the development of our unlimited supplies of raw material, great as has been the progress of Canada during the past six years, our progress for the next ten years, yes and for many more years to come, will be far more extensive and satisfactory than it has been. For that reason, the leader of the Conservative party has placed this resolution on the Table. It is to be voted upon by the House. We have no fear as to what the verdict of the people of Canada will be when the opportunity is given them to decide this matter. We believe that the great bulk of the people of Canada have faith in the policy of 'Canada for the Canadians.' We believe that the desire of the people throughout the Dominion is to adopt a policy of sufficient protection to enable capital to be invested and labour employed. We believe in a policy which will exploit our great natural resources, and give employment to hundreds of thousands of hardy workmen in developing every part of Canada so as to make our country great and strong and independent. We believe in a policy which will cause Canada to occupy even a more prominent position than Canada occupies now in the eye of the world. We believe, Sir, in a policy which will make Canada a more important part of the empire than she is to-day.

The resolution of the leader of the opposition may not carry in this House, but it will appeal to the judgment, to the patriotism and good sense of the Canadian people ; and when they have an opportunity of giving their verdict upon it, I believe it will be found that the majority of our people are in favour of our policy as pronounced in the amendment, and against the policy of the present government.

Mr. GEORGE BALL (Nicolet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would be failing in my duty, as a representative in this House of the French minority, were I not to say a few words before the question is put. For the last fortnight I have followed with much interest the discussion which has taken place in connection with the budget. Barring the speech, or financial statement, made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, barring also the able criticism of that statement offered by the leader of the opposition and two or three other addresses on either side of the House, very little remains of the debate which has been going on. It is not, therefore, my intention to take up the time of the House for any length of time.

We listened with interest this evening to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson). He dealt for about an hour with tomatoes, onions and other truck. Truly, one would have been led to believe that the cabinet was made up of market gardeners.

The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) also spoke briefly. He dwelt at some length on by-elections, giving, even, a full list of them. I shall not follow him on that ground, but shall refer only to the one which took place in Maskinongé. Previous to that election there was one man in this House with only one arm. Likely the government envied the opposition on that account, and they chose as their candidate a man in the same predicament. I was so pleased at this that I managed to have him elected by acclamation.

The hon. member for Gaspé referred also to Mr. Foster. He stated that the hon. gentleman had gone up for election, but had been defeated. The member for Gaspé did not say what had brought about Mr. Foster's defeat. Well, I shall tell you. Mr. Foster was not returned because he had opposed the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company; and the same thing will happen to you should you obstruct the company's Bill. You will be defeated at the

next election. You may think I am joking, but I am in earnest.

I shall not deal with the tariff; enough has been said on that matter. At this late hour, I prefer cutting my speech short, and allowing the question to be put. No doubt, you will be pleased; on seeing me rise, you said to yourselves: Ball will take up our time for a whole hour. I am going to disappoint you.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Borden (Halifax).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Ingram,
Avery,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Ball,	Kaulbach,
Barker,	Kemp,
Bell,	Kidd,
Bennett,	Lancaster
Birkett,	LaRivière,
Blain,	Lavell,
Borden (Halifax),	Léonard,
Boyd,	Maclaren (Perth),
Brock,	McIntosh,
Broder,	Monk,
Bruce,	Morin,
Cargill,	Pope,
Carscallen,	Reid (Grenville),
Casgrain,	Richardson,
Clancy,	Roche (Marquette),
Clare,	Rosamond,
Clarke,	Sherritt,
Cochrane,	Smith (Wentworth),
Culbert,	Sproule,
Earle,	Tarte,
Fowler,	Thomson (Grey),
Gilmour,	Tolton,
Hackett,	Vrooman.
Haggart,	Wilmot,
Halliday,	Wilson.—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archambault,	Lewis,
Bazinet,	Lovell,
Béland,	Loy,
Belcourt,	Macdonald,
Bernier,	Mackie,
Bickerdike,	MacKinnon,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Bourassa,	Macpherson,
Bourbonnais,	McCarthy,
Brown,	McCool,
Bruneau,	McCreary,
Bureau,	McEwen,
Campbell,	McGugan,
Carbonneau,	McIsaac,
Carroll,	McLennan,
Champagne,	Madore,
Christie,	Malouin,
Costigan,	Marcil (Bagot),
Davis,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Delisle,	Martineau,
Demers (Lévis),	Matheson,
Demers (St. John),	Mayrand,
Desjardins,	Meigs,
Douglas,	Mignault,
Dugas,	Mulock,
Emmerson,	(Sir William),
Erb,	Murray,
Ethier,	Oliver,
Fielding,	Parmelee,
Fitzpatrick,	Paterson,
Fortier,	Power,
Fraser,	Préfontaine,
Gallery,	Proulx,
Galliher,	Puttee,
Gauvreau,	Reid (Restigouche),
Geoffrion,	Riley,
Girard,	Robinson (Elgin),
Gould,	Roche (Halifax),
Grant,	Ross (Rimouski),
Harty,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Harwood,	Rousseau,
Heyd,	Russell,
Holmes,	Schell,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Scott,
Hyman,	Smith (Vancouver),
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Stephens,
Kendall,	Stewart,
Lang,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Talbot,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Tobin,
Lavergne,	Tolmie,
Law,	Tucker,
LeBlanc,	Turgeon,
Lemieux,	Wallace—107.

PAIRS:

Opposition.	Ministerial.
Messieurs	
Calvert,	Taylor,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Cartwright, (Sir Richard),	Tupper, (Sir Charles Hibbert)
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Morrison,	Gourley,
Ross (Ontario),	Hughes (Victoria),
Thompson (Haldimand),	Henderson,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Gibson.	Kendry,
Cowan,	Pringle,
Blair,	Osler,
McColl,	Ward,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Beith,	Maclean,
Fisher,	Calvin,
Copp,	Hale,
Ross (Yukon),	Roddick,
Farquharson,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Monet,	Ganong,
Turcot,	Seagram,
Angers,	McGowan,
German,	Lennox.

Amendment negatived, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Committee rose and reported progress.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 2.40 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 1, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 139) respecting the St. Mary's River Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 140) to incorporate the Cardiff Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 141) respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Company.—Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 142) respecting the Elgin and Havelock Railway Company.—Mr. Fowler.

DRY DOCKS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I beg to move that on Tuesday next the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal section 1 of chapter 9 of the statutes of 1899, and enact, in lieu thereof, the following section :—

If any company or body corporate, approved by the Governor in Council, as having the ability to perform the work, enters into an agreement with His Majesty to construct a dry dock, with all proper and necessary equipment, machinery and plant, for the reception and repairing of vessels, at a place, and according to plans and specifications approved by the Governor in Council, on a report by the Minister of Public Works, as sufficient for the requirements of the public at such place ; the work to be completed within a time to be limited by such agreement. Then, provided the company performs the work, according to such agreement, and to the satisfaction of the Minister of Public Works, under the supervision of whose department the work shall be done, the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of the unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, of a subsidy not exceeding three per cent per annum on the cost of the work during twenty years from the time of its completion and acceptance by the said minister ; provided that such subsidy shall not exceed thirty thousand dollars per annum ; and that the cost on which it shall be calculated shall not be greater than the value of the work as estimated by the said minister. Provided also, that the subsidy shall not be payable for any portion of the said twenty years during which the dock is not in complete repair and working order.

I beg to say that His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC HARBOUR—PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the government, and particularly the hon. Minister of Public Works, to the following item contained in the newspaper 'Le Soleil' of the city of Quebec :

TRAVAUX IMPORTANTS DANS LE PORT DE QUEBEC.

M. Etienne Dussault reçoit le contrat pour la construction de nouveaux quais.
$200,000 seront dépensés cet été.

Le public de Québec non seulement de la ville mais de toutes les régions apprendra avec plaisir que M. Etienne Dussault, le grand entrepreneur de Lvis, a reçu un télégramme, ce matin, du gouvernement, l'informant que le contrat lui était accordé pour les améliorations projetées dans le port.

Il recevra $200,000 pour construire de nouveaux quais dans le port durant le cours de l'été.

Ordre lui est donné de commencer incessamment les travaux.

C'est une manne pour nos ouvriers. Il n'y en aura pas un seul sans ouvrage d'ici à longtemps.

I will translate it for the information of the hon. gentleman :

The public of Quebec, and not only of Quebec, but all this region, will learn with pleasure that H. M. Dussault, the great contractor of Lévis, received this morning a telegram from the government informing him that the contract had been awarded him for the projected improvements in the port. He will receive $200,000 for putting in new wharfs in this port during this summer. He has received an order from the government enjoining him to proceed with the works without delay.

I would ask the minister if this item is correct, if the contract has been granted, and, if so, were tenders called for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). If the article which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) has read refers to the extension of the pier or wharf at Quebec, I may say that tenders were advertised for and quite a number were received. If I remember well, the name the hon. gentleman has read was one of those in the firm—Dussault & Lemieux—who were the lowest tenderers. I have no further information at the moment, but I have no doubt that the contract was awarded to them in the regular way. They may have been notified by this time of the contract being awarded to them. The commissioners have waited on myself and the officers of the department several times, and they and other representatives of Quebec have urged that this work was necessary. We have taken every means to facilitate it, and intend to get it done as quickly as possible, so that the public may have the benefit of it during the coming season.

DISASTER AT FRANK.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I would ask the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has received any further word with regard to the disaster at Frank. Now that the accredited officials of the government are on the ground, no doubt the government is aware of the actual extent of the disaster, both as to loss of life and loss of property ; and I think it would be satisfactory to every one to have whatever information the government may possess made public.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may inform my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that we have received

further information from our officials on the spot, but I am sorry to say that that information is not exact. It is sufficient, however, to show that the damage is of an extensive character. They are proceeding with the excavation, but are not yet able to reporte exactly the damage done. I have two telegrams from Mr. Pearce. One of them is very long, and I need not read it all, as the information it contains is mainly covered by the other. The other telegram is as follows :

Frank, N.W.T., April 30, 1903.

Jas. A. Smart,
Deputy Minister of the Interior,
Ottawa, Ont.

No Welshmen killed. Reported death of Welshmen incorrect. Canadian-American has all works excepting probably tunnel destroyed. All their machinery installed and new machinery not yet in place, tipple power house, stables with horses, fire houses and all works totally wiped out by rockslide. Whether tunnel 6,000 feet in length will be available for future operations remains to be seen, only damage to other mines being Lille Collieries, French Company, of Grassy Mountain, having one and one-half miles of railway knocked off. Space and site of same covered with rock to average depth of sixty feet.

(Sgd) WM. PEARCE.

As I have said, it will not be necessary to read the other telegram, which is very long, but I can give some parts of it which may be material.

The following is probably more nearly a correct estimate of loss than any yet : Thirty-four men, eight women, twenty children, killed; eleven injured, probably only two or three dangerously. have good attendance. Only two killed in or near mine. Ten dead recovered, remainder nearly all buried under many feet of rock, possibly a few near edge of slide may be recovered. Killed, miners, twenty-one, balance ranchers, merchants, liverymen, engineers, railway contractors, labourers. Six cottages totally destroyed by rock, swept away like feathers and broken into match wood. One partially ruined. Ten habitations of ranchers and others outside Frank destroyed. All machinery installed and large amount of new machinery near tunnel mouth totally destroyed. Tipple scales, engine-house and all other plant destroyed. Uncertain whether or not tunnel materially injured, probably not.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it possible to give a list of those who have been killed ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no doubt it will be forwarded as soon as possible. So far I have received the name of one man only.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 13) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—The Minister of Justice.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). This Bill was under consideration some time ago, and the leader of the opposition then suggested an amendment to the effect that when the application was made for a change in the place where the trial was to be held, the application should be supported by affidavit. I have considered the suggestion, and now move to add, after the word ' or ' in the third line of the first subsection, the following words : ' Upon cause shown, supported by affidavit.'

Section as amended, agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time, and passed.

MILITIA PENSIONS.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 78) to amend the Militia Pension Act of 1901.—The Minister of Militia and Defence.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir F. W. Borden). When the House was in committee recently on this Bill, I endeavoured to explain the object of the Bill, and I discovered that the language of the proposed Bill did not correctly express my intentions. The committee rose and reported progress. Since then I have had the Bill redrafted, and it will now read as follows :

Section 3 of the Militia Pension Act, 1901, is amended by adding thereto the following subsection :—

7. Time served in the civil service as constituted for the purpose of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, which would be reckoned in computing his period of service for the purposes of that Act, may also be included in the term of service of an officer for the purposes of this Act and in such case the yearly deduction to be made under said subsection 2 of section 5 shall be reduced by the average yearly deduction from his salary as an officer, clerk or employee in the civil service under and for the purposes of the Civil Service Superannuation Act or any amendment thereof.

The Bill simply provides that a civil servant who afterwards becomes an officer of the permanent force, or of the headquarters staff, and who has contributed to the civil service superannuation fund, shall get the benefit of the amount of his contribution if a pension is granted to him as an officer under the Militia Pension Act. That is the object of the Bill, and I believe that it is sufficiently met by the language of the proposed new clause.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you propose to give a pension and superannuation both ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Only one.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the payment into the civil service fund is just the same as the deduction from his pay would be as a military man for the same time ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Just the same.

Bill reported ; read the third time, and passed.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Bill (No. 82) respecting and restricting Chinese immigration (The Prime Minister), was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This section is exactly the same as in the existing law. I will indicate the sections in which there are alterations.

On section 5,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the Prime Minister any objections to let this Bill stand? We have not had an opportunity of looking at it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public Works—Quebec, harbours and rivers—general repairs and improvements, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). This is a general vote for repairs and improvements to harbours and rivers in Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. There was a request made when this item was up before that the hon. minister would furnish us with a list of the harbours owned by the government and those owned by private individuals upon which we are expending public money. Is that list ready yet?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have made inquiries two or three times in regard to it and I have just given instructions that further inquiry be made. We have gone into Committee of Supply sooner than I expected we would. I have telephoned over to the deputy to come and to bring among other things the list to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) refers. It ought to be ready to bring down now.

Mr. SPROULE. There was another request for the papers in regard to the Grande Vallée pier. I understand the hon. Minister of Public Works was to make inquiries as to whether there were any further statements or further correspondence in the department—first as to who made the application for the expenditure of this money, second as to the deed the government had of the harbour property, or any other papers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I ordered the most careful inquiry to be made. There seems to have been no petition from the residents of that locality as I am informed by the officials that there is no petition now in the department. Neither have they any record of any petition having been received. Therefore, there are no other papers to bring down. In regard to the deed, as has been stated, the land belonged to Lovell & Co.—I think the name is —and the company entered into an undertaking to give us the right of way over the property. The matter has been referred to the Department of Justice to be put in shape.

Mr. SPROULE. There was no deed given at all then; so that what was said about there being a deed was not correct?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is an undertaking to furnish the deed which is practically the same thing.

Mr. SPROULE. It has not been brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it has not been brought down. It was referred to the Department of Justice to be carried out. There was a question as to whether the company had been dissolved or not. It is in the Department of Justice and it is clearly an undertaking to give us the right of way.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why is it that you will require $5,000 more than you asked last year for these general repairs and improvements?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have asked for an increased sum in the various provinces, because I found that for some years past there has been a deficit. There has not been sufficient money for carrying on these needed repairs throughout the country. The country is losing a great deal of money for the sake of a few dollars. Whether from storm or some other reason damage occurs to public works and there is no money to repair it. This goes on from time to time till the whole work is seriously injured and then it costs many thousands of dollars to repair the work, whereas, if we had had $200 available at the time a great deal of expenditure afterwards would have been saved. I find from the reports of the officials that this is the case almost every year and I thought it would be better to increase the amount by a few thousand dollars, because I believe that in the end it will effect a great saving to the country.

Isle aux Coudres—repairs to wharf, $1,800.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is this and what will the work cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Charlevoix county. This money is required to make repairs to the wharf there which is reported to be in very bad condition. Horses cannot reach it at the present time owing to the condition in which it is.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What did this wharf cost, where is Isle aux Coudres, what was the total amount expended and will this finish it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total expenditure was $17,522.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will this finish it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is finished; this will repair it.

Lake St. John wharf—repairs, &c., $2,500.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for improvements and repairs to wharfs and piers on Lake St. John for which there is no special parliamentary appropriation.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It seems an enormous sum for repairs to wharfs on a fresh water lake—$2,500 last year and $2,500 this year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are a great many works on that lake. The importance of the district is growing very much and industries are being established there. This appropriation is asked on the report of the local engineer of the department.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Upon what principle do you give money for wharfs on lakes ? Any person might have a wharf on Lake Ontario or Lake Erie just as well as on Lake St. John.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This money is only expended on government works, not upon private wharfs. It is perfectly true, as discussion has shown during this session, that there are a number of wharfs in this country upon which public money has been spent for many years that are really owned by private individuals, or corporations. That does not apply in this case at all. These are works that were built by the Dominion, they are owned by the Dominion and must be maintained by the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why do you erect public wharfs on a small lake like Lake St. John ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Perhaps I may be allowed to say a word upon this point. These wharfs were begun when I was in office. The Lake St. John district is one of the most important parts of this country now and I am only sorry that more attention has not been given to it in the past. I certainly think that more money should be voted for immigration purposes for that part of the country. It has been neglected in the past by the government. I take this opportunity of ventilating the very large grievance that I tried to have redressed in the past. This government has neglected that part of the country so far as immigration is concerned. Now, I want my hon. friends on both sides of the House to understand the question thoroughly. This is one of the most important and one of the most fertile districts in the country. There has been a large immigration promoted by a colonization company which has been working without having help of anybody. They had received about $3,000 a year from this government and that is all. We are building wharfs in Manitoba, and in the maritime provinces to help trade and settlement, and these wharfs are being built for the same purposes in that district. The Lake St. John district is one of the most fertile parts of Canada, and I take this opportunity of urging on parliament the necessity of giving more attention to that part of Quebec, and to other parts of that province also. It is well to settle the west, and I for one am always ready to vote all the money that is legitimately required for the development of the west, but there are other parts of Canada that ought not be neglected.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Lake St. John is a very large lake. The government is dredging the mouth of the river to allow settlers to get in, and these wharfs which are around the lake are comparatively small, costing in the neighbourhood of only $1,000 each.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have here the report of the Colonization Society to which my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) refers and I see that they have been greatly helped by the Department of the Interior during the last year. In 1901 they brought in 2,108 settlers, and last year 2,891, an increase of 783 over the previous year. I fully concur in the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that this district should be well looked after by this government.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many wharfs are there on Lake St. John ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are six or seven.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have been down in that section of the country and I agree with the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) as to the fertile district that is being opened up, and I would be glad to see done all necessary work for the purpose of developing that section. But when we were on that side of the House we were always asked by the Liberals, on what principle we made expenditures on wharfs in inland waters. We abandoned the principle altogether of building wharfs which were merely local in their utility. We know that from one end of the St. Lawrence to the other, along the great lakes and up as far as Port Arthur, there are some expenditures for harbours, but I am not aware of any expenditures for wharfs. On what principle is the minister going here ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know any principle except that it is for the general development of trade and commerce. What has been said with regard to this district is perfectly true. Lake St. John is at the head of a very important system of communication by water and railways. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is somewhat mistaken when he says that the Conservative government abandoned this principle, because these very works on Lake St. John were vigorously commenced in 1894 for the development of that part of the country. We are all pleased to know that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) can speak from personal knowledge of the resources of the Lake St. John region. It is not only becoming a first-class agricultural district, but large and important mills are being established there. The principle, so far as I know that would apply to this is, that it affords accommodation for shipping the produce of the farmers and the manufacturers of that district.

Mr. GIRARD. Perhaps I could give some explanation as to the principle which my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) refers to. If I remember well, the last budget which was submitted to this House by the Tory government, had included in it many items for the building of these wharfs. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) who was a member of the then government probably knows more about the principle on which these items were based than I do. The principle pursued by the present government is probably the same principle that guided the late Conservative government. I may say that the local government has built a special boat for the navigation of Lake St. John to help on colonization, but the local government has nothing to do with the building or amelioration of wharfs in these inland waters, and that is probably why the federal government came to the help of the local government in order to contribute its share to the development of colonization in that district. I hope that this explanation will be satisfactory to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart).

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will be able to give us the principle upon which these expenditures are made. I remember that when I was in the government I was hauled over the coals for stating in the House that in a country where we made large expenditures for the building of canals and the Canadian Pacific Railway, particular sections of the country which were only very indirectly benefited by that expenditure required some balancing compensation as it were, from the Dominion treasury, and that small works which might be of importance only to a particular community had a right to a certain amount of consideration. However, I think that the time has passed for that. The Conservative government was of opinion that it had jurisdiction over these inland waters, but by the decision of the Privy Council the control over them is now relegated to the different provinces. I think we should now call a halt in the expenditure of large sums of money on works which are of parochial or municipal or at most, of provincial importance. Our expenditures in the future should be on works for the benefit of the Dominion at large. We should confine ourselves solely to expenditures of that class.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No more Tay canals, for instance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That was a work like the rendering navigable of the Napanee river, both leading to alleged mills, one owned by me, and one owned by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, but I had to pay for the work.

Lake Témiscamingue, improvements, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay for operating a dredging plant during the season of 1903-4.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this to purchase the dredging plant ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. The dredge was built by the Department of Public Works, and this vote is for the maintenance and carrying on of the work.

Mr. INGRAM. What amount of work has been done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No work has been done. The dredge has just been finished, and we are to put it in operation for the first time this year.

Mr. POPE. Is this dredge being operated by contract or by day work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is owned by the department, and is being operated by the department.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Does the minister know at what part of the lake that dredging is going to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that he has reported in favour of starting at Ville Marie on the east side, and working around the public works. The next place of operation will be at the bar or delta formed by the River Blanche at the head of the lake.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that I made a tour of inspection on Lake Temiscamingue last year. A good deal of attention has been paid to that part of the country, and I had very nearly come to the conclusion that it would be wise to dam the lake. My hon. friend will find, if he follows his work with care, as I am sure he will, that although a dredge

will be a useful implement there for small work, it will not answer all the purposes of the improvements that are required. During the fall months the water is very shallow, so shallow that the steamers which ply on the lake are obliged to anchor in the middle of the stream ten or twelve acres from the shore. The dredging which my hon. friend will carry on cannot remedy that state of affairs; no dredging will remedy it. It would not cost a large amount of money to dam the outlet of the lake, and this would afford a uniform depth of water at all seasons of the year. The Lake Temiscamingue district is one of the most important sections of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and by damming the outlet of the lake, the government would serve both provinces. There are very large settlements in both provinces, especially in the province of Ontario. The Blanche river district is being settled in a splendid way. It is one of the finest parts of this country. There are no better colonization lands than those around Lake Temiscamingue. They are very easy to settle and to clear, and the only trouble is that there is no depth of water in the lake in the fall of the year, when it is necessary to have communication. I hope my hon. friend will kindly take note of my remarks. I have been on the spot myself on two occasions, the last time being last fall. I have given a great deal of attention to the question of the improvements to be carried out there, and I think my hon. friend will find in the department reports which he can use for his guidance. Although the small dredge that has been built will be useful for opening the mouths of the rivers and removing sand bars, it will not answer the purposes we should try to accomplish in view of the large settlements that are going into that part of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. What depth of water will you get after the dredging is done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Ten feet. I may say that this vote is for carrying out the policy of the department in regard to the dredging. With regard to the work which my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has referred to, I certainly will give it my serious consideration, and look into the reports.

Mr. POPE. Has there been any report made with regard to the construction of this dam ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I understand that there is a report in the department and that the view of the engineer is that this work will be beneficial to the district. I will ask for a report on the cost of the work between now and next session.

Mr. POPE. Do you not think it would be wiser, if you are going to deepen the water by the construction of a dam, that you should proceed, first with the necessary work, which will give a greater depth of water and avoid the necessity of dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It may be that the best policy would have been to have built the dam first. However, the other policy has been adopted, and even if the dam were built, considerable dredging would be required at places where shipping is done and at the mouths of the rivers. This dredge has been built for that district, and I believe will be of good service.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the intention of the department to build the dam as well as to do the dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the proposition.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that the information which I have had from a friend who was in that district last year is just in accord with what the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works says, that even if you do the dredging, the boats will not be able in the fall of the year to get near the wharfs. There is another question involved in the proposal to dam. What land would be submerged ? I am told that a great deal of valuable land would be submerged that otherwise would be useful for agricultural purposes. That would have to be taken into consideration also.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I ask for a report on the cost of the work it will be necessary to ascertain what overflowing of that kind it would cause.

Mr. POPE. I would like to ask the hon. minister what has been the development in that section—its quantity, volume and character ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am unable to give any particulars of the trade carried out in that district, but there is a considerable amount of trade done there.

Mr. POPE. What is the size of the lake ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Several hundred miles—an interior sea.

Mr. POPE. Has the vote of last year been expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Laprairie—Ice piers and protection walls, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to be applied towards the completing of a section of cribwork in connection with the retaining walls built in 1877-8. This is a breakwater and cribwork.

Mr. POPE. Is the money spent on the report of the engineer of the department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is it to lengthen the protection wall built in years gone by ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is only for repairs to the present work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has there been any accident caused by the ice ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Something like over $8,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is that to be built in concrete or in what ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is intended for repairs to the cribwork.

Mr. POPE. Is that all protection to cribwork ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is all cribwork.

Mr. POPE. Are we to have this expenditure each year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It appears so, judging by the experience of a great many years.

Mr. POPE. I should recommend putting up something stronger, and avoiding that yearly expenditure.

Le Tableau—descente des femmes—Wharf on River Saguenay, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the work begun by day labour.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Who is in charge of the work now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. J. C. Taché.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why did you not let it by contract ? I see that the total sum is $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My predecessor began the work by day labour, and we are continuing it in the same way.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We have often discussed that question in the House. In certain parts of the country I think it is well to carry out the work by day labour. Provided you get good foremen it is all right, but otherwise there is trouble ahead. That work was begun by day labour, and has to be completed in the same way. In Mr. Taché you have a very careful engineer. Who is in charge of the work now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The same man as before.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I hope that the promise of the department will be carried out, and that all expenditure over $5,000 will be let by contract. It may be that in some cases, as the ex-Minister of Public Works says, it would be more economical to do the work by day labour, but it is not the business of the minister to go against the instructions given by parliament, which are that all work involving an expenditure of over $5,000 should be let by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said distinctly, when the matter was under discussion, that there were some cases in which it would not be advisable to call for tenders. For instance, when serious damage has been done to a public work it is very difficult to prepare specifications and let the work by tender, and it is better to trust to the judgment of our engineers and foremen as the work goes on. Under other conditions, I am in favour of carrying out the policy of calling for tenders.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When the member representing the district wants to do the fair thing and does not look first to political patronage at any cost, there would not be any great objection to have public works done by day labour, but when he yields to the pressure of unworthy people, which is often the case, and the resident engineer has not the backbone to insist on the right thing being done, it is a dangerous system indeed. After six years of close experience—because I always endeavoured to follow my work closely—I have found that when the member representing the district is an honourable and good business man and does not want to use political patronage, the system of having work done by day labour is not a bad one ; but, of course, on every occasion, the minister must be very careful to stand by the resident engineer if he has confidence in him. If he has not, let him dismiss his engineer.

Mr. FOWLER. We had a case brought before us the other evening illustrating what has been said by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). This was a case in British Columbia. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that the resident engineer had appointed a person as foreman of a work, a man who had done satisfactory work under him on a previous occasion. But the employment of labourers by the foreman, it seems, was not entirely in accord with the idea of the member for the district. Consequently we find the member writing to the foreman that he would see to it that the foreman had not the opportunity of hiring or discharging men inside twenty-four hours. So he telegraphed to the Minister of Public Works, and the minister speedily dismissed the foreman.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No. If my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) will allow me, I will explain the matter as it happened. This foreman had been appointed without permission being asked of the department. Mr. Keefer, the resident engineer, had appointed him because, in the previous year, the man had

done good work. I understood from a telegram sent to me that the foreman had not taken the advice of the sitting member so far as the employment of labour was concerned, and the member had complained to the resident engineer. I simply referred the complaint of the member to the resident engineer, who then dismissed the foreman, and appointed another man. That is all. I never gave any order to dismiss that man, but he was dismissed under the circumstances I have explained.

Mr. FOWLER. The fact that the man had been employed the previous year and had given satisfaction led the resident engineer to believe that the proper thing was for him to appoint the man again. Evidently, he thought it was not necessary to make these appointments from year to year, and, as a matter of fact I suppose they are not made from year to year. It seems an unfortunate practice and I trust the Minister of Public Works will be guided by the obvious public interest in these matters.

Mr. POPE. I regret that the new occupant of the position of Minister of Public Works is not willing to give us a better guarantee that, in the future, contracts will be let after tenders publicly called for. He has put in a qualification so large, so elastic, that it can cover any amount of money. In what he stated, he did not even limit himself to items of $5,000 more or less. He has left himself quite open, if he finds any difficulty in preparing specifications, to spend the money voted by this House by day labour. Now, I have always taken strong ground against the expenditure of public money in this way: and, after having listened to the little story told us by the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tarte) I have not changed my view on the subject. I have not learned a lesson in this committee to-day that would in the slightest degree affect my opinion on the question. I still think that my judgment was absolutely sound, and that public money should be expended by public tender and in no other way. The ex-Minister of Public Works stated that if we could get a member of parliament representing the constituency who would close his eyes to the voters' list, and leave out of consideration any effect that it might have upon him when he sought re-election—in other words, if you could get a man so framed that he would give up his chance of re-election, that is, a man from whose make-up human nature had been eliminated—it is possible that the system of day labour might be carried out. Still, the hon. gentleman intimated that, even under these circumstances, it would be a difficult task. I think that in view of the lesson thus taught us, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) might well be more explicit. In the public interest it would be well for him to say frankly that he is determined to spend money only under contract after tenders publicly called for. I know, as everybody knows who is doing business, that there may be inconveniences. But I agree with the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that it would be better for us to bear those inconveniences even if they cost us something. It is better for the government of Canada, for the public life of Canada, for the reputation of Canada, and it would be far more satisfactory to the electors of Canada, to pay something if not, in order that we may be sure that the public money is being expended without injury to the public interest, and I know of no way except by public tender. I regret, therefore, that the minister, in entering upon his work as the head of this department, one of the largest spending departments of the government of Canada, has not seen fit to give us a more explicit statement. I trust that the hon. gentleman, for the sake of his reputation, and, I believe, to the great advantage and satisfaction of the country, will reconsider what he stated to us a few moments ago, and will say that he will, in the future, expend all public money by public contract. And I am sure, that, if there are any exceptions to these rules, through some unforeseen catastrophe or anything of that sort, parliament will always be prepared to stand by the minister in taking any special action that the special conditions may demand. But, outside of that, I do not think the hon. minister should assume the responsibility of any latitude whatever beyond the expenditure of public money by contract after tenders publicly called for. Not by letters written to favourites —I do not admit that the government should have any favourites in these matters. We have seen a great deal of that sort of thing since the hon. gentlemen opposite have come into power. We have known of letters written to favourites asking them to tender, and ministers speaking in this House defending such action on their part on the ground that these parties were their political friends, and declaring that when public money was to be expended they were justified in asking for tenders only from their friends. I repudiate that. Let tenders be publicly called for, and let the man who will do the work cheapest and will give the necessary guarantee that he will carry out his contract faithfully—let him and no other receive the contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) misunderstood my remark. I made the reservation I did, only so that if there was urgency which, in my judgment and in the judgment of the officers of the department, made it impossible to prepare specifications without sacrificing the public interests, I should be free to take the responsibility of ordering the work done without public tender. But I may explain that since I became Minister of Public Works no work has been done without contract after tenders pub-

licly called for. Of course, it is hard to have a theory or a law that will not work out disadvantageously in some cases. If we were obliged to accept the lowest tender in every case, we might be obliged to give contracts to irresponsible people, even at prices for which the officers of the department know the work could not be done. That entails great dissatisfaction and very often loss on the work. However, as long as the law exists as it is to-day, I intend to carry it out to the fullest possible extent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am glad to hear the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works, and I am sure he will carry it out. I understand him to except only cases in which it would require a special Governor General's warrant for the expenditure, that is, cases like the breaking away of a canal bank where it is absolutely necessary that repairs should be done at once. Cases of that kind may occur to justify the government in proceeding at once, and there is provision in the statutes for an Order in Council in such cases. There is a provision that the Governor General may in cases of that kind authorize the expenditure of money. But except cases of that kind, I understand the minister to promise to this House that all expenditures over a certain amount shall be made under contract awarded to the lowest tenderer, if the lowest tenderer is found to be satisfactory and can perform the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are cases where damages have occurred and specifications could not be made up until a part of the work had been torn off, which often uses up a good part of the expenditure. But, practically, I think the hon. gentleman agrees with me on the class of work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not know what the Auditor General thinks now. But, when I left office he had made up his mind that every piece of work would have to be let out by contract, because he claimed that he had legal advice on the point, and that the Order in Council, which was adopted ten or twelve years ago making it obligatory to call for tenders for works costing over $5,000, was illegal, ultra vires, and he declined to abide by it. In point of fact, when I left office there were several works required for which he had declined to pay because he was under that impression. I would like to know how the matter stands at present. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance might tell me how the Auditor General views that question now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the Auditor General is behaving very well.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to know if the Auditor General is standing by his guns, or if he has become milder.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During the short time I have been in office I have not done, apparently, anything wrong, because he has not censured me yet. Perhaps after I have had more experience, I may do something contrary to law, and he will call me down.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is not a clear answer. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Finance, who follows these things closely, whether the Auditor General is still of the opinion that all work for which money has been voted has to be done by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not understand the hon. gentleman's question. The Auditor General did take that position and still holds it, and I believe he is endorsed by the opinion of the Department of Justice. It may be a question whether the House should be asked to pass legislation in regard to that matter before the session is over.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Then he wants every work, whatever it may cost, to be tendered for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He was within the law. The law had been violated for twenty years, and he determined to abide by it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Oh, well, the violation of the law has not been as bad as they say.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am glad to hear from the hon. Minister of Public Works a confirmation of my opinion as to what the law was. Some time ago I thought that the hon. Minister of Justice held a contrary view, but I am glad to hear now that he agrees with the Auditor General that all works for which the parliament of Canada has voted a sum of money must be done by tender and contract, after open competition. I am sorry to hear from the Minister of Public Works and from the Minister of Justice that there is any intention of bringing in a Bill for the purpose of amending the law on that subject.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend does not understand the point. He himself has stated, even during the present session, that he thought the department ought to have power to expend the money without tender where the sums were less than $5,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, that is the Order in Council ; but the Act is strict in reference to the matter, that all sums of money which are voted by parliament for the purpose of doing any particular work must be expended by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman would not say that a

case in which the public interest required it, the department should not have the power to do what has been done for many years under that Order in Council, and to spend small sums of less than $5,000 at the discretion of the minister. I think that was the change I suggested. If the Auditor General, backed up by the Justice Department and by the action of my hon. friend when he was in the government, thought that the expenditure was ultra vires and that a former government were acting illegally, as well as the present government, then I say that it is better we should understand where we are, and if it is in the public interest, that we should ask for an amendment of the law. That is what I referred to.

Hon. Mr. ROSS, (Victoria, N.S.). I think the rule should be invariable that all new works for whatever amount should be let by tender and contract. That has been my own rule in every case, and it relieves members of parliament from being troubled. People come to them and say: You give this man work and he voted against you at the last election, and a lot of stuff like that. If you let out the work by tender and contract invariably, you relieve yourself from all trouble of that kind. But there are cases like repairing an old wharf where you do not know when you commence, what amount of work will actually require to be done. You may find that the covering is gone, and some of the logs have gone, and you find that you will require to expend a larger amount than you at first supposed. There are some exceptional cases of that kind where it is absolutely necessary to have the work done by day labour.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. During my term of office, if I have not seen fifty members of parliament who have come to me and asked me not to award the contract to the lowest tenderer because he was a political opponent, I have not seen one. Now, I may just as well let out the truth. It is not a question of party, but it is a fact that members of parliament do not like to see public works going to their opponents, even when they are the lowest tenderers. On many occasions I have seen men who were thoroughly honest, but who were members of parliament——

Mr. POPE. Human nature.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Human nature, as my hon. friend from Compton (Mr. Pope) says, and he knows all about it. Of course, the lowest tender system is the only feasible one when you ask for public tenders. If you get away from that beaten road you do not know where you are at all. Human nature comes even into that.

Mr. POPE. In asking for the lowest tender the guarantee of the man is a sufficient safeguard that he is a bona fide tenderer. I agree with the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and I rose to say that I am very much pleased to hear from the hon. Minister of Public Works that it is his intention, so far as it is possible, to carry out the law, and also to know that it is not his intention to have the law amended to such an extent——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, oh.

Mr. POPE. The hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) should not laugh.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I beg your pardon.

Mr. POPE. I will not do it again, but I have these serious moments in my life, and this is one of them. When I relapse into one of them I am entitled to respect and a sad reception, and I should not be laughed at. I ask for your protectin, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I right in understanding that the hon. Minister of Public Works has said that the Auditor General would allow no expenditure on public works, either repairs or original work, unless the work is let by contract?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Or purchase of any kind.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is the law.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe he says that is the law.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a very inconvenient law in my judgment, because there are many repairs in regard to which it would be a saving to the country if they were made by day work. I know that when you have to advertise for tenders for small repairs, there will be more money spent in advertising than would do the whole work. There is a great deal of delay as well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) express that opinion. That is the position I have taken. It seems to be ridiculous and absurd to say that where a public work has been damaged to the extent of $30 or $300, and when the department has an appropriation for the purpose of repairing the damage, it cannot prevent much greater damage by spending that money under the direction of one of its engineers or other official of the department. It is held now that under the law this cannot be done. A break might occur in a public work, and perhaps two pounds of nails, if properly driven by a man, would preserve the work from great damage resulting. The Auditor General would not pay for the nails or for the day's labour required to do the work. The thing is absurd and after consideration as to what would be the best amendment to make, I have referred the question to the Department of Justice for an opinion, because this interpretation makes the department unwork-

able. It is ridiculous to say that the department cannot make an expenditure for $20 or $30 worth of work without advertising in five or ten newspapers, costing far more than the work itself. There must be some limitation to this provision of the law. Generally speaking, I agree with my hon. friend, no matter what the defects may be, that the only way we know of is to advertise and let the work by public tender.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What amendment do you propose to make to the Act ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have referred the matter to the Department of Justice, and I have asked them to consider it. If that is the law, we will have to have some amendment to it. I should say that an amendment on the lines the hon. gentleman spoke of would be quite sufficient ; that is, that this provision of the law should not apply to works costing less than $5,000.

L'île d'Alma—removal of rocks, $1,500.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the removal of rocks at the discharge of Lake St. John, to prevent overflowing.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is L'Ile d'Alma ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is at the discharge of Lake St. John.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has it been fully decided to blast these rocks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer informs me that it has been decided to continue this work. The work has already been commenced.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the cost of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will complete the work now proposed.

Lower St. Lawrence, removal of rocks, &c., $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the removal of rocks and obstructions in different places along the St. Lawrence. Reports are coming in continually, so I am informed by the officers of the department, of the existence of rocks in harbours and other places.

Mr. POPE. Where do these rocks come from ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know ; they are brought down by the ice probably.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is it that you intend to make the expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the various harbours along the River St. Lawrence, not at any particular place.

Mr. INGRAM. This amount appears to be voted every year. Is it to be continued every year ? Is there any way of stopping it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe the experience of the engineer to be that this is a necessary vote from year to year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the money expended every year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In some years it is not fully expended. Last year there was only $422 expended up to the 31st of December.

Mr. POPE. Where is the rest of the money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is perfectly safe in the treasury of the country, and will not be expended unless it is necessary.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You expended $3,000 last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was speaking of the current year. I spoke of the expenditure up to the 31st December last. There was only $2,082 spent last year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I really think the country can do very well without that vote. Of course, it is in the estimates, and I suppose it will have to go, but the department will be a great deal better off without it. During the last year or two I was very reluctant to put it in again. This is a vote that does not do much good.

Mr. SPROULE. They will do something to earn the money.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not say that it would not be useful at times to remove rocks for the fishermen, but we should not remove anything else but rocks. I would impress upon the hon. minister the necessity of supervising carefully the employment of that money. I had a good deal of trouble myself, and I think it is just as well that I should help the hon. gentleman with my experience. Let him give strict instructions to his resident engineer, and by the way, who is the resident engineer now in that part of the country ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Bertrand.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Do I understand that the engineer has been removed from his position ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. There was so much work going on in that district that Mr. Bertrand was put specially in charge, but Mr. Breen has not been removed.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Where is Mr. Breen located ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has always been located at Quebec.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What district has he in charge at present ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me, the counties of Portneuf, Lévis, Quebec and Lotbinière.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has Mr. Bertrand's salary been increased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not ask the question because I make any complaint, but simply for information; he is a good employee.

Mr. POPE. I thought the works on the lower St. Lawrence and the expenditure in connection with them, had been transferred to the gentleman who came from Montreal to take the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries. Under what system is this money expended now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been no change that I know of. The money is expended under the supervision of the chief engineer.

Mr. POPE. Am I to understand that the crop of rocks is increasing to such an extent that it is necessary to have a special engineer to take care of them. If we pay this extra man $1,800 a year out of the $3,000 voted, it will be one way of getting rid of the money that is supposed to be devoted to the rocks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is labouring under a little delusion. This is one of his serious days and we know that when he gets serious he sometimes labours under delusions. There is no new engineer appointed and no change in the organization whatever. As to the crop of rocks they seem to continue about the same from year to year, and have for a great many years past. Obstructions form and these require to be removed, and it is only a very small incident in the work of the resident engineer to oversee the expenditure of that money.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister says that the expenditure was only $2,000 last year. It would appear from the estimates that the whole $3,000 has been expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Auditor General's Report shows that the expenditure of last year was $2,093.22; the balance lapsed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then the department intends to expend the money up to the 30th of June next. There was a vote of $3,000 last year, no revote is asked for, and the minister intends to spend that $3,000 up to the 30th of June next. This $3,000 is for next year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This item of $3,000 has been in the estimates since confederation, and has been voted each year. Some years the amount is not spent at all, and I would be much surprised if the Auditor General's Report would show that more than five or six hundred dollars was spent last year out of this item. This money is usually spent in the counties of Rimouski, Bonaventure, and Gaspé. The object of the vote is to remove obstructions which form in these small harbours which are utilized by the fishermen. It is a very useful vote indeed for the fishermen, because this part of the coast has no protection whatever and when the entrances to the rivers or creeks are blocked these obstructions are removed at a small expenditure of $100 or $200. This vote has always been spent with a great deal of caution during the last few years. I have myself refused to recommend the spending of any part of this amount whenever it was not really required.

Mr. BLAIN. This is an item that may very well engage the attention of the minister, because the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) suggests that it should be struck out of the estimates.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Not quite.

Mr. BLAIN. We have the further explanation from the hon. gentleman from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) that he himself has refused to recommend the expenditure of this money.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When it was not necessary.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I understood him to say that he had refused to recommend the expenditure of money. It looks as if these items were given for the support of the representatives of the people in the different counties along there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, no.

Mr. BLAIN. I am just taking my hon. friend's own words.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You misunderstood me.

Mr. BLAIN. Then what did the hon. gentleman say ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I said that I myself had refused to recommend to the minister the spending of any money out of this vote when it was not required. I say that for a few years the money has been spent in a straightforward and honest way. It would be a sad thing indeed if the fishermen along the coasts of Rimouski, Gaspé and Bonaventure were deprived of the opportunity, when the entrances to their harbours were obstructed, of having some of this money used to remove the obstructions. This is the only money that could be used for that purpose.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. On many occasions, as my hon. friend knows very well, most

preposterous applications have been made to the department for the expenditure of this money. Unless the resident engineer receives most positive orders to spend the money only for the removal of rocks, there will be trouble in the future, as there has been in the past. On one occasion especially money was spent in an improper manner without my knowledge, and from that point of view this is a dangerous item. But if the resident engineer is a firm man, and does not allow money to be spent right and left without reason, it will be all right. I know that my hon. friend is right when he points out that sometimes, after a storm, for instance, a small fishing harbour may be closed. In such a case some of this money should be immediately used to remove the obstruction. But I had so much trouble and misery about this item that I had nearly made up my mind not to apply for it again. But if my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works gives his attention to the expenditure of that money, I am sure it will be spent properly. All the officers of the department who are cognizant of the facts will tell my hon. friend that he has to be careful, because people in that part of the country do not always understand what the removal of rocks means. They may understand it to mean the building of a road or something of that kind, and they will apply for the expenditure of some of this money for the purpose. May I ask if Mr. Bertrand is the only engineer for that district, or has he an assistant under him ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, he is the only engineer.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has he charge of the Magdalen Islands as well ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. INGRAM. The remarks of the ex-Minister of Public Works bear out what I have said. All the representatives may not be as honourable as the hon. member for Gaspé in regard to items of this kind. If we have a resident engineer, he should perform his duties, irrespective of any recommendation made by any representative or by any defeated candidate. The Conservative party, when in power, no doubt had the same experience to some extent; but I know from my own personal knowledge that they refused to be guided by representatives supporting the government and relied on the officers of the department. I think no representative should have anything to say about the expenditure under an item of this kind, but it should be left solely to the officers of the department.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would suggest, for the safety of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, that no money be spent without the sanction of the chief engineer of the department. That is the only safe way of doing the right thing. I know the pressure that is brought to bear on the resident engineer, and my hon. friend from Gaspé will share my views, I am sure.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may say, in answer to the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) that I do not claim to be more honest than himself or any other member of this House; but I say that in the past as at present the representatives of the people have been obliged to correspond with their electors. I receive many more letters about the county of Gaspé, and my hon. friend receives many more letters about his county, than the department or the officials of the department receive; and the member is obliged to go to the department and make the demand or present the petition. In this particular case several petitions were sent to me during the last five or six years, and I could not take it upon myself to order the expenditure of the money. I appealed sometimes to Mr. Breen, who was the resident engineer, that is to say, on paper, because his residence was in the city of Quebec; but invariably Mr. Breen received his orders from the Minister of Public Works, or during the ministers absence, from the acting chief engineer, Mr. Lafleur; and I repeat again, never in my life would I think of myself giving permission to any of my constituents to spend the people's money without an order of the Department of Public Works. Really, I know more than that.

Mr. INGRAM. If the resident engineer wanted to perform work there, and the hon. gentleman took it into his head to say, 'no, you will not do it,' would he be justified ? If the engineer's attention had been drawn to some rocks in the river, and he felt disposed to remove them, surely the hon. gentleman would not undertake to say that he should not do it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I thank the hon. gentleman for his lesson; but surely he does not think that I would take such a position. When the resident engineer recommends a certain work, what have I to say ? He has no orders to receive from me. He receives his orders from the department. But, I repeat again, the member of parliament sometimes receives letters or petitions from his constituents, and he is obliged to communicate them to the department. That is how the member of parliament comes in.

Mr. INGRAM. I believe the member of parliament is doing his duty then, but when he does that his duty ceases. The moment he steps beyond that and interferes with the officer of the department, he goes beyond his right.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Who says that the member of parliament interferes with the resident engineer ? From what does the hon. gentleman infer that ? Does he find interference in the county of Gaspé or anywhere else ? I think my hon. friend is at sea.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman made the statement in this House that he had refused to recommend certain expenditures.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, which were asked by some people, but which were not recommended because they were not wanted.

Mr. INGRAM. By what right or authority does the hon. gentleman take upon himself to refuse to recommend any expenditures ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I received information from interested parties and it happens sometimes, as the hon. member for Compton says, that expenditures are requested which should not be made.

Mr. INGRAM. What I wish to point out is that when an hon. member receives such communications he should turn them over to the department and have the departmental officer investigate and make his recommendation, and the department would be held responsible. Otherwise the department may be misled by representatives supporting the government. Misrepresentations of that kind have been made to departments before, and votes have been passed which if, the minister fully understood the details, he would never have allowed to pass.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps the hon. minister will tell the committee in what counties the money was spent last year and under whose recommendation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The money is only expended on the report of the departmental engineer. There is no law or custom against any hon. member of this House, either Liberal or Conservative or any other citizen, making representations to the department, as to what work they consider should be done, but the money is only expended on the report of the resident engineer, approved by the chief engineer of the department. If it should be found that any resident engineer has reported in favour of an expenditure which should not be made, then the only thing the minister can do is to dismiss him. There has been only expended some $400 during the present year, which shows that the resident engineer only recommended expenditures which are in the public interest.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would invite my hon. friend to call for the records for the past year on this expenditure before spending any more money. These will teach him to be careful. I must say that the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) never recommended to me, when I was Minister of Public Works anything wrong, but there has been a good deal of trouble connected with the expenditure and there will be more in the future, unless great care is exercised. The riding is a very large one and its representatives cannot possibly know all the details and may just as well be imposed upon as any one residing 300 or 400 miles from the riding. The only safe way of spending public money is to have an examination by the resident engineer and have his report sent here to Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will do that.

Mr. SPROULE. This debate has brought out the fact that there is a misappropriation of public moneys.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That there was.

Mr. SPROULE. And it is now being continued. According to the hon. member representing that riding, a portion of this money is used for the purpose of opening up small streams.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, to remove obstruction.

Mr. SPROULE. In these streams, but not in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Flowing into the St. Lawrence.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but not the St. Lawrence, and this is an appropriation for removing rocks from the lower St. Lawrence. Therefore there has been an improper expenditure. Certainly the explanation given by the ex-Minister of Public Works and the member of the county is to the effect that applications at least have been made for improper expenditure, and there is a good deal in the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works that the item should be struck out. It may be said that there has not been any improper expenditure, but the fact that there have been applications for such expenditure and that they were refused, would imply that there have been improper expenditures from time to time, and it would be better not to vote the money.

Magdalen Islands—breakwater and piers, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are four different places where this money is to be expended.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman cannot expect to complete the works at these places with the money he is asking. Does he propose to ask another vote in the supplementaries ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer says that this is the full amount that can be expended on those works during this year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much will be the expenditure at each place?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Grindstone the estimate is a little over $8,000. At Pointe à Elie, $4,000, and at Grande Entrée a little less than $1,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What is the length of the work which is being built at Grindstone ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is the work nearly completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer thinks that the appropriation out of this will complete the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Altogether 365 feet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for piers at the various places.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are they to be built at towns or ports of any size ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The population of the Magdalen Islands is about 6,500. Before 1896, there was no wharf, pier or breakwater.

Mr. POPE. Were there any people before that time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, a great many. The late government had spent about $80,000 for a pier at a place called Etang du Nord, but it was carried away in a storm. The various works that have been made within the last few years have been very useful to navigators and fishermen. The Magdalen Islands, as you are aware, Mr. Chairman, are the first land passed by the vessels coming from Europe. Those vessels will now find here ample protection from storms.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is the Etang du Nord work altogether gone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer informs me that it is completely gone.

Mr. POPE. Are the people scattered over the islands, or do they live at one centre ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are five islands, all inhabited.

Maria—Pier, $21,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract, and the present vote is to complete it.

Mr. POPE. How much has it cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract is for $24,700. The total cost is estimated at $26,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Bonaventure county.

Mr. POPE. Is this a very large place ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). According to the last census the population of the parish of Maria is 2,460. It is the second largest parish in the county.

Mr. POPE. Is there any other pier accommodation ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). None whatever.

Mr. POPE. Is this the first they have had ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Yes.

Mr. POPE. How have they got along hitherto ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). They ran the risk of losing their lives and their goods landing on the open coast, as they do generally on the Gaspé coast. They are a hardy race of people, as the hon. gentleman knows. Still, lives are often lost. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) would visit Gaspé and Bonaventure, not only during the fine season of the summer, but early in the spring or late in the fall, he would see the great disadvantages these people have to overcome and the dangers they have to face.

Mr. POPE. I would rather go in the middle of summer.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Does the hon. minister intend to continue the work to the shore or will he leave this as it is, an isolated block ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is an application before us to continue the work to the shore. But there is not enough money in this vote for that purpose.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Has the minister a report as to the cost of the extension to the shore ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. POPE. How far would the extension be of this pier or block ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About one thousand feet.

Murray Bay—increasing height of wharf and extending same, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote of the appropriation of last year, and is to make provision for the carrying out of projected improvements on the upper south-west side of the west block of the Murray Bay wharf.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Was any work done last fall on this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this work owned by the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. POPE. Why was not the money expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is now being commenced, and probably, about half this amount has been spent.

Mr. POPE. There must have been some urgency for this work last year, the money having been voted. Why were not the repairs made then ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. As I know the place, perhaps the hon. minister will allow me to say that the reason why the money was not expended probably is that when the House rose after last session the passenger traffic was on and it would have interfered with the passenger traffic to carry out the work then. As my hon. friend (Mr. Pope) knows this is a summer resort, and the passenger traffic is heavy.

Mr. AVERY. What was the amount of wharfage received last season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is in control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. AVERY. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) is present, and perhaps he can tell us.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not the returns here. We can furnish the particulars if the hon. members desire it.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that this should be brought down. With the minister and the ex-minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries present, we ought to be able to get this information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) will refer to the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, he will find the returns of this and other similar works, and these figures will be more reliable than any given from memory by the minister.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries acts in a sort of double capacity, according to the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister. He is a sort of deputy assistant Minister of Public Works, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned. Therefore, I think, we are justified in asking this information from him, and it should be given us before the vote is passed, so that we may judge whether this appropriation for the Murray Bay wharf is a commendable one.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) will excuse me if I tell him that that information was furnished him before the estimates were brought down. It is rather unreasonable to complain of information not being given when the information was placed in his hands before the vote was asked for.

Mr. FOWLER. But the minister is supposed to be there to answer questions. We have not the public accounts before us.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine.) According to the Auditor General's Report the receipts for 1901-2 were $163.69. Further details are to be found in the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FOWLER. Can the hon. minister tell us what the receipts were the year before, so that we may be able to strike an average ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I doubt very much whether the amount now asked for is sufficient. Of course, the chief engineer must have looked into the matter. But I would call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to the importance of equipping this harbour well. There are several thousand tourists summering there, many of them Americans, and some of them are from Toronto and the province of Ontario. It is becoming quite a large town, and it is important to encourage that summer trade. I would advise him to keep the harbour in good shape so as to give accommodation to the large travelling public who summer there.

Mr. FOWLER. As the minister was not able to inform the committee how much the earnings were for a year, I may say that according to the Auditor General's Report they were $217. That was a considerable falling off from the previous year. I would like to have an explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was a loss of traffic, I suppose.

Mr. BENNETT. Since we are on the question of docks, may I ask what amount is derived from the government docks at Midland, Ontario, and the storehouses thereon, and how many applications, if any, have been made for the use of the buildings ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will wait until I come to my estimates, I will give him all the information I can. I am not in a position to give it now.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that a sum of $6,000 was voted last year for Murray Bay, and one hon. gentleman suggested that some of this money was spent in connection with the Richelieu Navigation Company. Would the hon. gentleman say whether this property belongs to the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The government own the property. The province of Quebec owned it before confederation, and it cost them $50,000 or $60,000. Since confederation $40,000 or $50,000 more have been spent on it. It is a very important point, and is owned by the Dominion. So far as I know, none of this money has been expended for the benefit of the Richelieu Navigation Company. Of course, their boats stop there daily and use the property. Otherwise, I do not think that there is anything irregular in the expenditure of this

amount. It is simply to complete the improvements and repairs that are going on.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may add that this county is deprived of railway communication, and this is the only means of communication they have in summer. The Richelieu Company, which is controlled by the friend of my hon. friends, give, I may say, a very good service, which is a credit to the St. Lawrence river. I may also add that Murray Bay is the great summer resort of the lower St. Lawrence, and is mostly inhabited during the summer by some of our good people from Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the item for this purpose last year was $6,000. Evidently $2,000 of that has been spent, or will be, at the end of the current year, because $4,000 of this is a revote. The item says: 'Increasing the height of the wharf and extending the same.' What kind of work have you going on there that only requires an expenditure of $2,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an extension of the wareroom, and provides for increased accommodation for handling the freight. There has been a great increase of passenger traffic at Murray Bay, and there is a great deal of baggage, as well as the freight that comes for other people.

Mr. FOWLER. The Deputy Minister of Public Works reports that the traffic at Murray Bay is falling off, hence there is a loss of revenue, not only in the last year, but the year before. Now, the Minister of Public Works states that the reason why this money is required is for the purpose of extending facilities for the increase in the traffic. How does the department settle this question ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The traffic might increase without affecting the revenues of the Marine department.

Mr. FOWLER. It certainly should not fall off.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not fair to say there is any inconsistency. Every member knows that there have been great improvements, and since that splendid hotel was built, which is a credit to Canada, a large number of tourists go there, and the passenger trade has considerably increased.

Mr. INGRAM. When the ex-Minister of Public Works left that department and the present minister assumed the position it was reported throughout this country that the department was divided, and that a portion of the duties were transferred to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what portion of the duties of the Public Works department is under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, so that we may know to whom we should address our questions ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no division of the duties.

Mr. INGRAM. Then the statement in the public press was not correct, and the department is under the administration of the hon. gentleman the same as it was under the ex-Minister of Public Works. Is that correct ?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think this is outside the question before the Chair.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not think it is, Mr. Chairman. We are discussing the items for the province of Quebec. The rumour went abroad that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had control over certain works in the province of Quebec in connection with harbours and rivers, and I think it is quite in order for us to inquire whether that is the case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think I gave the hon. gentleman a very definite answer.

Mr. FOWLER. These statements with respect to the division of the office were supposed to have emanated from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself. As he is here, we would like to hear from him as to whether there is any foundation for these reports in the papers. And would he tell us whether he made any such statements anywhere in the province of Quebec about the time he was elevated to the cabinet ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The minister said there was no division of the duties, and the hon. gentleman is bound to accept his statement.

Mr. FOWLER. I think a similar statement was made by the Prime Minister himself, and I am sure I read in the press that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries also had made that statement. It was remarked at the time that there was some little disappointment throughout the province of Quebec on account of him losing the cabinet position of Minister of Public Works, which had been held in that province for a great many years.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) is out of order.

Mr. FOWLER. I beg pardon.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, with all deference, I do not see how the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) are out of order.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What reference have they to the subject ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They have this reference to the subject; we have the right to know whether or not particular items which the committee is asked to vote are to be expended under the direction of the hon. Minister of Public Works or under the direc-

tion of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That has been answered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The information has been given.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know it has been answered, but we are pointing out that other things have been said on the subject by the hon. gentleman which are somewhat inconsistent——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know the difference between a statute and a few loose remarks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. Postmaster General desires to apply to the observations of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the term 'a few loose remarks' I have no objection, although I would not be prepared to apply an expression of that kind to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I am ready to give his remarks a little more weight than that. Every one knows, indeed it has been generally stated in the province of Quebec, in the public press, and there is no repudiation by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries so far as I know, that he announced to the people of that province that a considerable portion of that which previously was under the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Public Works is to be under his jurisdiction as Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It was announced during his election campaign—I saw it over and over again in the public press of the province of Quebec, and I have a perfect right to ask how it is that the hon. Minister of Public Works makes a statement now that is absolutely inconsistent with the statement made by his colleague in the province of Quebec at the time he was running his election. It is due to the committee, that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries should state his understanding of the situation in view of the observations which have been made by the hon. Minister of Public Works to-day, or that he should state to the committee that the announcement credited to him in the public press was credited to him improperly and without authority from himself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the item be adopted ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, it shall not be adopted until we get more information upon this subject.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is the information which the hon. gentleman desires ? I understand him to say that the committee have a right to know whether this item, which is now presented, is to be expended by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the hon. Minister of Public Works ? That is a perfectly proper question, and it has been answered. There has been no division of the departments. If there is to be a division of either of these two departments legislation will be brought down for that purpose, and then, and not till then, will the House have a right to criticise such a proceeding.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries have the authority of the government to make the announcement which he did at that time that there was to be a change in the policy of this government ? That such an announcement was made by a member of the government in that province is beyond doubt. Did the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries have the right without authority from this government to make that announcement to the people of the province of Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Whether he had or whether he had not may be properly the subject of a question put before the House after notice in the proper way, but I do not admit that the hon. gentleman has any right to level a question across the floor of the House and demand an answer categorically—yes or no. The policy of the government in this matter will be indicated by legislation proposed in this House, and then, and not till then, will the hon. gentleman have the right to criticise it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, that means, if it means anything, that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had no authority from the government to make the announcement which he did. I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance, that it would be proper that any policy of this government in regard to the matter should be first announced to this House when this House is in session. But that is not the case which we have before us. We have had the important announcement made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries during his election campaign in the province of Quebec, we have had this House in session for more than six weeks, and we have not had one single word from the government about it. The hon. Minister of Finance takes the ground that the government want notice about a matter which was announced two months ago by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We want to know if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had the sanction of his colleagues for this statement, or if he had not. It seems to me a very proper question for me to ask across the floor of this House, whether or not the hon. gentleman in making that announcement to the people of the province of Quebec had the authority or sanction of his colleagues.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has the right to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in proper

and regular form whether he made that announcement, but he has not the right to assume that such an announcement has been made, or to require an answer in the manner in which he has brought the matter before the Committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have made my statement in what I supposed to be a courteous way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not questioning the courtesy of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have stated two or three times that I, myself, have seen this announcement in the public press credited to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I have also said that I have seen no repudiation by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries of this statement so attributed to him. Then, I heard from the hon. Minister of Public Works something which I regard as somewhat inconsistent with this announcement so made. The hon. Minister of Finance takes refuge in this that he says the policy of the government should be announced to the House. I agree that it should be announced to the House, but, if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries acted properly and with the sanction of his colleagues, why was not this policy announced to the House long ago? This House has been in session for six weeks. Surely, the House, after the announcement which was made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is entitled as a matter of courtesy, if for no other reason, to hear what the policy of the government is in regard to this matter. Surely the hon. Minister of Finance sees the position in which his colleague is placed. That was an announcement made to the people of the province of Quebec in an election in which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries sought the suffrages of his constituents in that province, and whose confidence was somewhat shaken. It was publicly stated that there was some disappointment among the followers of the government there, that an important department like the Public Works Department had been allotted to a gentleman from another province. It was not only in the public press, but privately as well, that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries made these statements. Surely it is not asking too much to know at this stage, six weeks after the session has begun, and two or three months after the announcement was made, whether or not this is the policy of the government, or whether the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in making the statement he did make, acted entirely without consultation with his colleagues, and entirely without their sanction. I regard it as a very important thing whether or not the Department of Public Works is to be cut up in the way in which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries announced it is to be cut up. It is a matter that concerns very much the public interest of this country to know whether this announcement is true, and I do not think we are departing at all from our rights as an opposition in this House in asking that this information should be given to the people as to the policy of the government in regard to this question.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say that I think the proper time for giving this information was when the ministerial changes were announced to the House. Since it was not given then, it cannot be out of place for any member of this House to make an inquiry, especially as the two departments have been so intermixed, if we can believe what we have seen in the press. I have no doubt that the Minister of Marine (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) gave that information to his constituents so as to get their endorsation. Now, as to the item, the Minister of Public Works tells us that it is for erecting some kind of a shelter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the extension of buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the item is improperly described, for it would read as if it were for extending a wharf and not a building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is right. It does extend the wharf, but, it is also for the building of a freight shed on the wharf.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know this place very well. The wharf is too low and when there is a strong wind the spray comes over the wharf and inconveniences the passenger trade at this place which is a summer resort. The wharf is to be made higher and wider and the shed is to be improved. Am I venturing too far in asking whether this item will be spent under the Department of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is no doubt whatever that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) stated during his election campaign that the Department of Public Works would be divided. I could never understand what portion of that department would be divided. Of course this is not the time to discuss the policy of the government on that point, but as having contributed to the best of my ability to organize the Department of Public Works as it is now, I would be very sorry indeed to see it divided. I suppose we will have the pleasure of hearing the policy of the government announced very soon.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Auditor General does his duty he will allow this money to be expended only for the purposes set forth in this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a small extension of the wharf which gives more space, and the criticism of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is right that the words in the estimates are somewhat misleading.

Mr. INGRAM. The reorganization of the department was mentioned in the speech from the Throne, and on that account I thought it perfectly right to mention the matter now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I take no objection at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). While it may not be a desirable time to discuss the question of policy, I do not see why the government should not be in a position to make some announcement to the House as to its policy on this matter, it now being six weeks after the opening of the session and two or three months after the announcement was made by the Minister of Marine (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine); an announcement which in many parts of the country at least is regarded as largely affecting the public interest. I would like to know from the First Minister when he will make an announcement as to the policy of the government on this matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) agrees that this is not a convenient time to announce the policy of the government, but I have no objection to state that it will be announced at an early date.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will mean Monday I suppose ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). It has been announced in the speech from the Throne that this division would take place.

Mr. POPE. Oh, yes, it was announced in a far more important place than the speech from the Throne ; it was announced during the Maisonneuve election for a special purpose.

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). And many more details were given during the Maisonneuve campaign than my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) will find in the speech from the Throne. We are anxious to know whether the details given by the minister (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) during his election campaign represent the policy which the government has decided on.

Mr. FOWLER. In justice to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine)—

Mr. BENNETT. Who has fled.

Mr. FOWLER. Who has gone out of the chamber, I should say that he appeared very willing to give us the information, but for some reason or other the hon. gentleman who at the time was leading the House declined to allow him. We do not know why this was.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We do.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose the Minister of Justice does know. Perhaps they were a little afraid of the discretion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that he might say too much.

Mr. POPE. He has been doing that.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps this is why the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) made the announcement in Maisonneuve. The newspapers in Montreal at that time described him as a prospective candidate for the portfolio of Public Works and not of Marine and Fisheries, and he felt that his importance would vanish if he did not get some of the public works to administer. He was referred to in no very complimentary terms by the Montreal 'Witness,' that great Liberal exponent in the province of Quebec, which is widely read in Ontario and throughout the Dominion. I have not under my hand any of the statements that were made by the Montreal 'Witness,' but they are matters of public notoriety, and I must congratulate the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on being so vigorous a fighter that he has been able to break down all the opposition of the 'Witness' and bring himself to the front. When it was found that the hon. gentleman's nose was to come under the wire, so to speak, another opponent arose in the person of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and perhaps that may be another reason why the hon. Minister of Agriculture is not here. It may be that he has gone away in order to cover up his disappointment and discomfiture at having to sit in the cabinet with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is well known that the Minister of Agriculture is one of the largest stock holders in the Montreal 'Herald' company ; that is common report, and he has never denied it. It goes without saying that the Prime Minister must have a heavy task on his hands in reconciling these two warring elements in the cabinet. The Minister of Agriculture poses before the public as an exemplar of all that is good and proper, and yet through the columns of his own journal he assails the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the strongest terms. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to be congratulated on the fact that he prevailed on the Prime Minister to accept him despite all the violent attacks that had been made upon him by the journal owned and controlled to a great extent by the Minister of Agriculture. Reflections were made upon the hon. gentleman not only as a parliamentarian or as an old member of the House; but he was assailed by the Montreal 'Herald' in terms so strong that I think he had fair ground for an action for libel against that journal. He was assailed while chief magistrate of the city of Mont-

real as having always acted for his own private interest instead of for the interest of the city. And this is such a wonderful cabinet, that its members can war against each other outside, and can placard each other in this way before the world, and yet be bound together in happy union by the cement of salary. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a bonny fighter, and I congratulate him on having come to the front despite all these attacks. But he owes something to himself; he owes something first to his own self-respect, because he has made the statement publicly in the city of Montreal that while he was not to receive the Department of Public Works which had been assigned to the province of Quebec, I may say almost since confederation—

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 30) to incorporate the Federal Oil Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 40) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the International Railway Appliance Company.—Mr. Brock.

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 129) respecting the Crown Bank of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 132) to incorporate the Père Marquette International Bridge Company.—Mr. Cowan.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Mr. BENNETT. When you left the Chair, Mr. Chairman, I was making some remaks with reference to the statements made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) as to the division of the work of the Public Works Department. But as that hon. gentleman is not in his place, I do not propose to discuss the matter further. I may perhaps do so on some future occasion.

Newport breakwater—extension, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to provide for the completion of a breakwater on the west side of the entrance of Newport river, and extending the cribwork 200 feet to a depth of 15 feet at low water.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a revote. Why was the work not gone on with ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They could not prepare the timber. A portion of the work was done in 1901. For the extension, it is proposed to call for tenders and let the work by contract.

Nicolet River—dredging, &c., $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to cover the expense of riprapping and repairing the jetty built at the mouth of the Nicolet river at Lake St. Peter. The dredging is to secure a depth of 8 feet at low water.

Mr. SPROULE. This is not all for dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend will notice, he will see that it is for 'dredging, &c.' The estimate of the engineer is $8,000 for dredging and $4,000 for riprapping and other work.

Pointe aux Esquimaux, wharf—headblock, $5,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister say what the department paid for this in the first place ? I see 'Lavoie, Elie, interest due on purchase price of his wharf,' appears in the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work was built by the department in the first place at a cost of a little over $10,900.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the extension of the work.

Mr. SPROULE. I might ask a general question, the answer to which may obviate the necessity of repeating the question on each vote. I understand the minister to say that in future the department will let these works by tender.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the clear intention on all works in which that can be done. I have mentioned, with regard to the last vote, that though in the past part of that work has been done by day's labour, we have changed the system and are letting it by contract.

Pointe St. Pierre—breakwater, $22,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is now under contract.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the amount of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is $22,000. The estimated total cost of the breakwater is $24,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that last year when there was an item up for this breakwater, the minister stated that the total cost would be $14,000, and that it was let by contract at that time for the sum of $14,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That must have been a mistake, because I find on reference to the papers of the department that the contract was let on the 4th of September, 1902, for the sum of $22,000.

Mr. BLAIN. It is reported in 'Hansard' that the Minister of Public Works said, '$14,000 is the estimate, and it is let by contract.' Would the minister state whether the engineer recommended the increased amount, or why the statement was made last year that $14,000 would complete the work, and now such a large increase is required.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot account for the statement. It must either have been made under a misapprehension, or else misreported. Because the report of the engineers was that it would cost over $20,000, and the work could not have been under contract then, because it was only let last fall.

Mr. SPROULE. You spent on this work last year $2,000. Did you commence the expenditure before you let the contract? I see that of the $10,000 voted last year you spent $2,000, and you have revoted the $8,000. That will make the whole work cost $24,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimate is that $2,000 will be spent before the 30th of June next, and we revote $8,000 of last year's vote.

Rivière aux Renards—breakwater, pier, $14,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the purpose of extending the pier to a point on the east side of the harbour at the north of Fox river. It is now 300 feet long, and is to be extended to a length of 600 feet and to reach a depth of eighteen feet at low water. The total estimated cost of this work is $48,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it an old work or a new work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This extension is a new work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Tenders are being called for now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some time ago this work was started by day labour and 300 feet of it was built. The intention is to extend that, and tenders have been asked for.

Mr. FOWLER. What county is this in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Gaspé. The whole work is to cost $48,000. The contract is not yet let for the balance of the work. But tenders have been advertised for.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have not much information as to the necessity of the work.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may tell my hon. friend that this is the only harbour of refuge on that coast. The county of Gaspé is a very large county, with 250 miles of shore. Boats and schooners coming from the Labrador coast on the north shore, and from the Gulf of St. Lawrence, find there the only refuge on the Gaspé coast. It is the most important of all the works now being carried on on that coast.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the size of the place where this is built?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The population of Fox river is about 1,000. There is considerable shipping there.

Mr. POPE. It is principally a place of refuge, I suppose?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Rivière Batiscan—To continue dredging of channel at outlet of river, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Champlain county. It is to continue the navigable channel at the mouth of the river Batiscan to a depth of five feet at low water. This work is being done by contract.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the government no dredges down there of their own?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not at present.

Mr. POPE. What is the advantage of this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that large milling operations are carried on there.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The International Paper Company have an establishment there.

Mr. POPE. What mills have they there?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mills for pulp wood. The Price Bros. have very large limits on the Batiscan river. Formerly they had their mills up at a place called Ste. Gènevieve, and they used to manufacture their logs into lumber at that point and then float the lumber down the river and load their ships off the Batiscan river. But recently they have found it more convenient to bring their logs down to the entrance of the river and have abandoned their place at Ste. Gènevieve. The result is that they now bring their vessels into the Batiscan river as far as possible in order to load near the mills.

Rivière Chateauguay—dredging, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to continue the channel dredging commenced in 1898 at the mouth of the Chateauguay river.

Mr. POPE. What does this serve?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to improve the general navigation of the Chateauguay river.

Mr. POPE. I would like to know something of the advantage to be obtained by expending this money. I am not very familiar with the district although I know something of it. I do not know of anything that could warrant us in making such an expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that I am able to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) any statistics as to the amount of trade done there. The department has been doing the work for a great many years of improving the navigation of that river. There is a sandy bottom and the river bed fills up often. I am informed although I have no personal knowledge, that there is quite a little shipping.

Mr. POPE. Can the hon. minister give us any idea from his engineer what amount of money has been previously expended at this place ? It seems to be new to me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be very pleased to have a statement made up.

Mr. POPE. We will let this item stand, until the information is obtained.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Stands.

Item allowed to stand.

Rivière du Loup—wharf, improvements and repairs, $3,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to cover the cost of building a new slip on the east side of the head lock of the Riviére du Loup pier.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity of a new slip on the east side of the head lock of the Rivière du Loup pier ? I think the business of the House and particularly the consideration of items in regard to public works would be expedited, if, upon placing an item before the committee, the hon. Minister of Public Works would in the first instance give us some reasonable amount of information to avoid the necessity of asking so many questions. I would suggest that he might always tell the committee when the particular work is to be undertaken, where it is, why it is necessary, when and why the work has been commenced, what are the objects and advantages of the work, when it is to be finished, whether it is being done by contract, the amount already expended, the total estimate of what it will cost and the population to be benefited. Information of this kind, I think, if given, would expedite the work of the committee.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition is quite a proper one. Even if I have information on hand it would perhaps not be given so fully in regard to a place like this as almost every hon. member is familiar with the locality and perhaps in regard to these main estimates the great majority of the items deal with the continuation of works that the House was committed to not only last session but during previous sessions.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, that may be true, but we cannot be expected to carry these facts in our minds in the same way as the hon. minister does.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree with the suggestion which the hon. gentleman has made. In regard to the Riviére du Loup wharf I think we are all familiar with the locality. I suppose that it is not necessary for me to take up the time of the House in referring to the importance of Riviére du Loup as a shipping point. The chief engineer informs me that the fixed slip there has been of no service on account of the movable tides and it is proposed to build a new movable slip.

River St. Francis—ice piers at Richmond $11,000.

Mr. POPE. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a vote of $11,000 to provide for the completion of the projected four ice breaking piers to be built under contract in the River St. Francis a short distance below Richmond, the object being to prevent as far as practicable, the recurrence of the destruction that is caused by ice jams in the narrows between the town and the Grand Trunk railway bridge, about a mile and a quarter below. This work is under contract. The amount of the contract is $11,317 and the total estimate of the cost of the work is $12,000.

Mr. POPE. When we are expending $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 in this country perhaps it is inopportune for me to criticise the expenditure of $11,000 as this item has reference to my own immediate section of the country. I suppose that the people in the eastern townships should congratulate themselves that the government have recognized that St. Francis river is worthy of their attention. There is no shipping on the St. Francis river. It is not navigable. This is entirely beyond what I think even the most elastic sort of kindly dispensation on the part of the government would consider within the realm of financial assistance from the central government. I am surprised and it only indicates, Mr. Chairman, that we are running extremely wild in the direction of offering assistance when we look at this item. It is quite true that the raising of the water in that section, as in many small rivers in all parts of Canada, occasionally takes away a bridge here and there which the municipalities have more or less borne the burden of replacing. Such was the case in Richmond, such was the case just above Richmond at the town of Brampton where they lost a bridge. We have had such an experience in the com-

munity where I live but we have never thought of coming to the Dominion government to construct piers to guard these peculiar flows of water and ice in extraordinary seasons in these small streams and I must say that if this item is voted it is a precedent without limit, because, we could not consider any loss by water anywhere on any stream in the Dominion of Canada that would not result in a demand on this parliament to vote assistance for preventing the recurrence of such mishaps. I am perfectly astonished at seeing this item here and I cannot conceive that the hon. minister has been put in possession of all the facts of the case. He has been asked to do what is purely a municipal work and if not a municipal work, if it is to receive the slightest aid from any other direction than the municipality, it must come from a provincial source. I can scarcely believe that the Dominion government could consider this work for the general benefit of Canada. I think the minister must have been misled. I do not believe that if he knew the circumstances he would ever have established such a precedent because it leaves him open to all sorts of demands whenever trouble arises on any small unnavigable stream in Canada. If we were in the local legislature and this imposed an extraordinary burden upon the municipality, there might be some ground for considering it under unusual circumstances but to come to the Dominion parliament to ask money for such a purpose is really absurd. It is a dangerous precedent and should not be sanctioned by this House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman must remember that parliament committed itself to this expenditure last session. There may be a good deal in the statement that he has made, but I assume that a full explanation was given a year ago as to why the money was appropriated.

Mr. POPE. Has the work been done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is under contract and parliament is pledged to carry it out. I must be frank in saying that I have not gone into the details as to why parliament undertook this work in the first place.

Mr. POPE. There does not seem to be any way of condemning the department for an expenditure like this. Although the minister is a new Minister of Public Works he is not a new member of the cabinet and he has to share responsibility with his colleagues for this kind of thing. I am surprised that the present minister, or the ex-minister, or no minister at all should have sanctioned a thing like this. In fact an ordinary member of parliament drawing the magnificent salary of $1,500 a year would have been more careful before entering into such an expenditure. If this item should pass every municipality in the country would be justified in presenting bills to the Dominion government in connection with the improvement of small rivers. That is a fact, Mr. Minister, and whether it is you or your predecessor who is responsible, or both of you combined, you are pledged for all time to bear burdens which ought to be borne by the municipalities interested. I wish to enter my protest against this. I suppose it is not necessary that I should move that this item be struck out in order to emphasize my protest, because 'Hansard' is here and it will be known in future that I have protested. I here and now enter my protest. I am pleased and displeased at this. I am pleased because I know the locality and can speak with knowledge when I protest against this vote, and I am displeased that such an expenditure of Dominion public money should be made in that district upon works that are absolutely and purely municipal.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a dangerous precedent and we cannot too soon protest against it. You might as well go down to the Rideau river here and help the municipality to build the bridge which has been swept away two or three times. As the hon. member (Mr. Pope) has well said, this item is for a purely municipal work and if the burden is too heavy for the municipality then the provincial government and not the Dominion government should come to its assistance. It turns out now that this river is not navigable, and that this bridge is just for the convenience of the travelling public.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Pope) is mistaken; this is a navigable river.

Mr. POPE. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No part of it?

Mr. POPE. No navigation on it whatever, except perhaps at the mouth.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are many navigable rivers on which they have no boats running, but I am told this river is navigable. As I have explained, this vote is not for a bridge but for an ice breaking pier. The engineer of the department informs me that representations were made that a great deal of valuable land was flooded at times. Of course, as a member of the government I have to assume responsibility, but we are all responsible to a certain extent for commencing this work because it has been approved by parliament.

Mr. POPE. As the minister knows, I have never had the extreme honour of being a member of a government, and I would like to know how it could come about that such an expenditure as this would be considered by a Dominion cabinet sitting to consider

national affairs. What have they to do with municipal matters ? Who petitioned for this expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The information in the department is that there was a petition from the town council of Richmond to the Minister of Public Works and he no doubt recommended it to council and council was responsible for recommending it to parliament.

Mr. POPE. I suppose some official was sent to report as to whether or not this work was of national importance.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that the only report asked for was as to the effect this work would have on the flooding of these lands, and the cost of the work.

Mr. POPE. Am I to understand that the construction of these piers is going to stop the flooding of that river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the opinion of the engineers.

Mr. POPE. I can understand the petition of the municipality, and I am very sorry I had not known before of the parental character of this government, because I know of many instances in which they could have had petitions for local works from municipalities in the part of the country where I live. It would relieve us of a great deal of taxation. We have laboured under the misapprehension that the moneys of Canada were for the special work of Canada ; but we are now face to face with the fact that this government is not only Dominion in its character, but that it has even gone beyond the bounds of the provinces, and has become a municipal organization. That is a kindly disposition and an encouragement to men to live in Canada. We can say to the municipalities that they need not be too careful in their expenditures, for in adversity they can come to the Dominion government for relief. I am pleased to get this much information, for we live in a mountainous region where the currents run swiftly and the waters rise rapidly, and where we have to contend every year more or less with floods, and I shall be pleased in the future to recommend to the municipalities in my section that they need not further consider extraordinary expenditures, for they have a right to appeal to this government. Every river in our section is as navigable as this River St. Francis. In August or September you could not take a boat up the St. Francis river unless it had a flat bottom. It is not a navigable river at all. I do not believe the members of the council ever considered this item, and I am astonished that the Dominion parliament should be spending its time voting money for municipal purposes. It is an absolute and positive disgrace.

Rivière St. Maurice, between Grandes Piles and La Tuque, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for operating the government dredge on this river.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year, out of a vote of $8,000, something like $5,955 was expended. Do you propose to perform the same work again this year ?

Mr. BUREAU. It is estimated that 3,000,000 logs will be floated down that river this season. This dredging is to remove the sand bars which have formed, and which would otherwise prevent the logs being floated down.

Mr. SPROULE. How many yards is that dredge supposed to take out in a day, and what is the estimated cost of operating it ? That will give us an approximate idea of the difference between dredging by government and dredging by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told by the engineer that it will take out about 300 yards a day, and its maintenance will cost about $25 per day.

Rivière St. Maurice—dredging eastern channel, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for further dredging in the eastern channel.

Rivière Touladie—improvement of, $2,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What kind of work is the department carrying out there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for the improvement of the navigation of the upper reaches of the river by the construction of a flat dam.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much of the work was done last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None was done last year. There was a survey.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much will this work cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer says he has not had time yet to estimate the total cost of this work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I think it will cost a pretty large amount of money. It is an important river in a section of the country where considerable settlement is going in.

Mr. POPE. Is there any water in the river ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not know the depth of the water. I have not the report under my hand, and I do not think the survey was in when I left office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are petitions from the settlers for this improvement. Unless it is found that this money can be expended to the advantage of the district, in accordance with the

petitions of the settlers, and without incurring too heavy an expenditure, I should not feel bound to expend the money at all. If, on the other hand, the vote of $2,000, which was given last year, will give navigation for the benefit of the district, there should be no objection to making these improvements.

Mr. CARGILL. What is the object of making them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To overcome the rapids that exist.

Mr. CARGILL. Is the stream navigable?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, for small boats.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Settlers are going into that district. I am stating what is represented by the petitions which are in the department. This is in the riding of Temiscouata, about fifty or sixty miles from Fraserville. It is a very fertile district, and there are important groups of settlers in it. They made representations that it would be useful to them to have the river made clear for navigation. When the item was put in the estimates last year, we had no information, but we ordered a survey and the report should be in now. We were told that the river could be improved a distance of forty or fifty miles by wing dams, removal of rocks and so on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty seems to be that the hon. minister has not the slightest idea what the work will cost when completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That seemed to be the position when the vote was taken. I have said that if an expenditure of $2,000 will remove the obstructions and make this stream navigable even one-half the distance represented, instead of forty or fifty miles, it would be a very desirable expenditure. On the contray, if the report shows that this expenditure will not be of any service and that it would cost a large sum to make this stream navigable, I would feel pledged not to spend the money.

Mr. CARGILL. I would infer from the discussion that it is apparently the policy of the government to improve small streams running through any section of the country, whether these streams be navigable or not, in order to accommodate settlers and enable saw mill owners to run their logs down them. If that be the case, we have several small streams in the province of Ontario, in which some of my constituents are very much interested, and where the expenditure of public money for the purpose of improving them would be very desirable. If it is the policy of the government to do this work in the province of Quebc, we would like to have it turn its attention to the province of Ontario. I have been lumbering on a stream for thirty-one years and have built my own dams in order to run my logs down that stream. The provincial government of Ontario sold the lands there, thirty-one years ago, at ten times the price which they receive for the best agricultural lands in that section. They have received the money for those lands, and a stream runs through them, down which I have been floating my logs. It is not a navigable stream but may be called navigable for the purpose of running logs. It is certainly not navigable for boats or steamers for the transportation of agricultural products. A requisition has been made by the residents in two of the municipalities to the provincial government for a grant to enable them to remove the obstructions from the stream and to enable the farmers to drain their land. Requisitions and petitions have been presented from the municipalities and the councils of the different municipalities, but apparently we have not approached the proper authorities. I have received notice to attend a meeting next Wednesday to interview the premier of Ontario, and I expect the corporations of two or three municipalities to be present. If we do not succeed in bringing sufficient influence to bear on the provincial premier to make us a liberal grant, I shall certainly advise the municipality to apply to this government.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is another side to the story. On several occasions I was induced to promise large improvements on rivers like the one under discussion. It was represented to me that the improvement would help settlement in these districts. We are spending a large amount in bringing out foreign immigration, especially to the west. The older provinces do not get much to help them in their immigration policy. It was represented to me in this case that by improving the river, we would give means of communication to a number of new settlers. It is a part of the country which is now being settled step by step. Is the federal government justified in carrying out improvements on rivers in such cases ? I believe we are.

Mr. POPE. It is very doubtful.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know it is a debateable question, but we are spending a large amount of money in order to send the settlers to the west——

Mr. POPE. Canada.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Touladie is also Canada. Suppose we spend a few thousand dollars and the result will be to have 500 settlers there, that will be money well invested. Of course, I am speaking now in a general way. The question is worth debating and it is a very interesting one. I fully grant that on many occasions we are led into making expenditures, that, perhaps we should not make. But I call the atten-

tion of the Committee to this other side of the question. When the government, by improving the rivers or building wharfs around the lakes, as in the case of lake St. John, can help in settling the country, I think the expenditure is justified.

St. Alexis Baie des Ha Ha—pier, $4,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is that under contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work, so far has been done by day labour. It will require $8,000 according to the estimates of the engineer to complete the work. The amount expended is $20,000.

Mr. POPE. That has been spent by day labour ? Is that to be continued ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it will be better, if practicable, that we should let that by contract.

Mr. POPE. What is the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work when completed will cost $22,000, of which $20,000 has already been spent, the work being done by day labour. If, on looking into conditions, I find that it is practicable, I would prefer to let the balance by contract.

Mr. POPE. How much was done last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Work to the value of $3,994.

Mr. INGRAM. The Auditor General's Report says that over $4,000 was spent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the amount spent last fiscal year. I was giving what was spent up to the 31st of December last, which was $3,994.

Mr. POPE. What is the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Building a wharf.

Mr. POPE. And does the hon. minister mean to say the department has been five or six years in building a wharf at a cost of $32,000 ? It seems to me that if the community for whose use this wharf is intended did not want it any sooner than that, they did not need it at all.

Mr. BLAIN. The attempt is sometimes made to justify such an expenditure as this by saying that settlers are coming into the district. Are these settlers coming in from another country or only from another part of the province ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. So far as that part of the province is concerned, I am glad to say that most of the settlers are coming from the United States—some of them, of course, from other parts of this country. But there is a good stream of immigration from the United States going in just now. The Quebec Colonization Company is doing a very good work indeed. I quite grant that it may seem surprising that works of this kind have been started by day labour. Let me say that, right or wrong, I have been induced, on several occasions, to carry out such work by day labour, to help the settlement of some parts of the country. I am sure that when you can find a good local engineer and foreman, you can carry on works as well by day labour as by contract. Of course, my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has made up his mind to have such works carried on by contract. I do not blame him, for that will relieve him of a great deal of trouble.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that, under some circumstances, you can get good value by day labour. But, where a work covers a period of five or six years, the cost of overseeing, etc., is so high that I think it is better to let the work by contract.

Mr. POPE. I can not understand what they were doing if they occupied five or six years in spending $32,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am sure that if the hon. minister looks into it, he will see that it was not intended to take so much time as that. I fully expected it would be completed within two years. It takes one year to prepare and bring out the material——

Mr. POPE. And another year to put it together. That is enough, if the work is necessary, and if it is not, it would be better to abandon it.

Mr. AVERY. It seems to me that if the timbers were got out six or seven years before being used, they would be rotten, and it would be necessary to get out another set.

St. André de Kamouraska—to complete repairs to earth approach to pier, &c., $750.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the repairs. The earth embankment or approach to the wharf was commenced in 1892-3. These repairs were begun last year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. This is an old wharf.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, but these repairs were begun last year.

St. François—pier on south shore of Isle of Orleans, $9,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for building a government pier to be constructed under contract on the south shore of the Island of Orleans.

Mr. POPE. When was this begun, and how much is it to cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was made on the 7th February last, for $11,800. The total estimated cost is $13,000.

St. Irénée wharf—construction of headblock and repairs, $3,600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract, made on the 24th January last for $10,399. The total estimated cost of the work is $12,900.

St. Jerome (Lake St. John) wharf, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the extension of the wharf under construction. The object is to reach a depth of six feet at the lowest water of Lake St. John.

Mr. POPE. When was the wharf on Lake St. John built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1889. There is three feet of water, and the idea is to have six feet of water for a distance of 170 feet. This has all been done by day labour.

Sorel, deep water wharf, $47,000.

Mr. POPE. What is this, Mr. Minister ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the payment on the contract for building this work at Sorel. The contract was $255,632.43. The contractors are Poupore & Malone. The estimated cost of the work is $273,500. This $47,000 will complete the payment of the present contract.

Mr. POPE. This is a very large amount of money for a place like Sorel, and I think it is worthy of the consideration of this Committee. Of course, I am willing to admit that perhaps I come in a little late in criticising this item, since this expenditure has been going on for a year or two. I know the town of Sorel somewhat.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The city of Sorel.

Mr. POPE. I am much surprised to find we are spending this amount of money there. I would like that item to stand over until we can have the fullest possible information with regard to it, if the minister has no objection. Some of the information we require might take a little time to get. I don't think we should be called upon to pass this item without knowing all the conditions and circumstances connected with so large an expenditure of money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What conditions and circumstances does my hon. friend refer to ?

Mr. POPE. In the first place, I would like to know the business to be done at this wharf, I would like to know what is going to take that business away from there, because it is not an expenditure that the town of Sorel needs in particular. This is one of the few things that is not colonization. Nearly all the time this afternoon we have been expending money on behalf of the poor settlers, who are always taken up as an escape valve by any government who want to get out of difficulty, because they can pawn it off on the back of the poor settler. I don't know of anything that comes more readily to the hand of Ministers of the Crown when they want an excuse, than to plead that the poor settler demands it. We have been poor-settling all the afternoon up and down the valley of the St. Lawrence. We have put them in where there are rocks, where the poor settler can never get a living in this world. We have provided ways for them to get in and ways for them to get out, because they will want to get out some day. We have been expending hundreds of thousands of dollars for the poor settlers down along the Gaspé coast.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You are hard on the poor fishermen.

Mr. POPE. No, I am not, in fact my heart goes forth unto the fishermen, and to my hon. friend who has to represent them. I sympathize with him also, because it is fortunate for him that his county is 250 miles long, or we would have had it piered all round. In fact I think he has no peer in this House in getting piers. But, Sir, this town of Sorel is an old settled place in which I would really like to know the amount of business that is being done, the tonnage, and all those particulars, before I think we can proceed with this matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand an explanation was given at the time this large vote was made. Perhaps the tonnage at the present time is not very large, but a new railroad is being built, and then the building of this wharf to get a deep draught will create a large trade.

Mr. POPE. What railroad is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The United Counties railway.

Mr. POPE. Has it been running all this winter ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think it is running daily.

Mr. POPE. No, nor weekly either.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am responsible for the presence of this item in the estimates. My colleagues are just as much responsible as I am, because it is not a departmental question by any means. The question was considered with every possible care. It was represented to the government that there would be a large trade for that town if that deep water wharf was built. Dr. Seward Webb and his associates were often in the country in those days. They had large schemes.

Mr. POPE. And private cars.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. They are not the only ones who have private cars. However, it

was represented that it would be a good thing if they had deep water communication. The question was discussed last year, and I stated the facts which I am stating now. Unfortunately, all these promises have not materialized. The South Shore railway is running occasionally.

Mr. POPE. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The United Counties railway has been closed. I do not know what the future of these two railways will be. But there were strong influences behind the project, and the government thought it was a reasonable thing to do. The Prime Minister from his seat last year defended the item from the standpoint of the general development of trade. The work is under contract. I hope that things will be better in the future than they have been during the last year or so, because these two roads are in a bad shape indeed, to the great detriment of the people in that part of the country.

Mr. POPE. Well, Mr. Chairman, we do not seem to elicit—well, not tremendous applause from the ministers who are representing this department at the present time. I have listened to the minister who draws the salary and I have also listened to the minister who did draw the salary, and when I combine the voices of both of them I do not see that cheerful prospect for the future of a great trade for the great town of Sorel.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Sorel is a city.

Mr. POPE. I apologize—the great city of Sorel, and the great United Counties railroad that runs now and again from one point to another when it has a carload of stuff to take. Such items as these, I suppose, are legacies which have come down to the present hon. minister. I feel sorry for him. I feel sorry for the hon. ex-minister, because I do not think that the hon. ex-minister, or the present minister, is responsible. I think we will have to go to the government themselves and I think we will have to proceed further to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the man.

Mr. POPE. And I think we will have to proceed to the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) of St. Hyacinthe in which place there is a bank. I wonder where that hon. minister is. There is a bank at St. Hyacinthe that is seriously involved in this railway. They have put a good deal of the money of this bank into this railway, that is the railway that does not run with any time table, that does not run anywhere at any particular time and that has never been known to get anywhere at any time you wanted to get there. In the great city of Sorel we are spending $200,000 to build a wharf to provide for the traffic to be expected from the railway that never runs anywhere at any particular time. I think this committee on this occasion should feel sad. I do. I think it is really a committee of mourning.

Mr. BENNETT. It was yesterday.

Mr. POPE. It is to-day. It is said too that in order to save the bank and in order to save a member of the government, the government should feel that they are warranted in spending $200,000 upon a city that cannot get its railway to run once a week. That railway has been shut up pretty nearly all winter. I do not know whether it is open yet or not. I do not believe that hon. members are aware of the conditions, or the small amount of tonnage handled. I am anxious to get that information. The hon. minister has not given it to me. If he has listened to the hon. gentleman who preceded me I think he ought to see that we should have this tonnage. I think we ought to get all the information in regard to this matter, and of course, if this committee has to swallow the pill, if it is necessary, in order that the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue and other members of the government should be happy to vote this money, if these hon. gentlemen will confess that there is no business for this wharf, that there is no business to maintain the railway, that it is not a legitimate expenditure, but that it is to save their credit, I suppose this committee will accept it, but this committee cannot accept it as a business proposition. No, we must have the information. If the hon. Minister of Public Works asks us to accept of this expenditure on a business basis, on the ground that there is sufficient trade to warrant the construction of the wharf and that the roads that run from that wharf to the centres of the world carry a trade which warrants us in the construction of the work, I say that I cannot accept such a justification for the expenditure and I ask for the information as I have a right to ask for it. But, if the hon. minister says that we are doing this out of the kindness of our hearts in order to save some of our colleagues, or save some of our banks, we will have to take into consideration that view of the question. I must either consider it from the business point of view, or I must believe that these hon. gentlemen have some other motive than a business motive in proceeding with that work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid I have not much more information to give the hon. gentleman than that which I have already given him. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) recommended this work. My hon. friend (Mr. Pope) asked me for information in regard to the trade connected with this wharf. Up to the present I am sorry to say that it has not grown as fast as the ex-Minister of Public Works expected in connection with the building of this road

and other enterprises in that locality. The people may have been disappointed in the expectations which they formed at the time. When parliament committed itself to this expenditure three years ago, at which time the cost was known, and especially last session when $170,000 was voted to carry on the work, my hon. friends would have perhaps been more timely than they are now. I hope the picture is not quite so dark as he has painted it. While this has been a somewhat expensive work, this is an important district and there is a good deal of trade still to be done. The vote now under consideration, $47,000, is to complete the payments for work that was done some years ago under contract.

Mr. POPE. In so far as my not making serious objection last year to this work is concerned, I have the same plea to make as the hon. gentleman offered. I was not criticising last year. He avoids responsibility for that vote last year and for the organization of the work by saying that he was not the minister then.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I say that I assumed my responsibility with the hon. gentleman and with other hon. gentlemen in regard to this work.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. Minister of Public Works charges the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) with the inauguration of this work. I differ from the hon. gentleman. The ex-Minister of Public Works was away at the time this money was first granted for this work. There was $25,000 granted for it during the absence of the ex-Minister of Public Works. He is not responsible for it any more than the present hon. Minister of Public Works is responsible, but the gentleman who really assumed the responsibility of making this an ocean port, was the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Last session he said that they proposed what was entirely a new work in 1899 or 1900 when they voted $25,000 for this work, and that they had surveys and estimates showing that it would cost to complete the work, something like $175,000 in order to make this an ocean port. That was the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister. Therefore, that being true, it would appear that the government as a whole undertook this work of making an ocean port at this place.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have no intention of disclaiming the responsibility that is incumbent upon me. I am responsible for every item of expenditure that appears in the estimates of last year. I am perfectly prepared to take my share of it, but I think the hon. Minister of Public Works might have avoided saying that I inaugurated that work. I am responsible just the same as my former colleagues are. If there is any blame I will stand the blame manfully, but I have no more personal responsibility than the hon. gentleman has. I know he did not mean to put it in that way.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say so. I distinctly on several occasions assumed responsibility for the work. It is not right to say that I said so, because I neither insinuated it nor stated it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am responsible for that work, but the question was considered by the government as a whole. My colleagues who discussed the situation with me will remember that the whole thing was carefully considered. I am responsible just as much as any other member of the government. We expected that things would turn out better than they have done. Strong representations were made to us and we yielded to these. Perhaps I was not here when the first amount was placed on the estimates, but that fact does not relieve me in any way. I am fully responsible and I do not disclaim that responsibility, but I do not want to be singled out as the one person responsible any more than any other member of the administration.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no reason to doubt what the hon. gentleman says, although I was not a member of the government at that time. A full explanation was given to the House as to what the cost of the work would be. If that work had been undertaken without giving the information to the House it would have been a different matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The responsibility is of course with the government. It is not with an individual member of the cabinet even as at present constituted, and much less is the responsibility with the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who has ceased to be a member of the cabinet. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Public Works that as the Minister of Finance wants to put through three items which are rather urgent, we might let this vote stand for the present.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection at all, but as we have spent several sittings on this one resolution, I would like as a compromise suggestion to put the remaining items through and let this one stand with another which already stands, on the understanding that they can be discussed if necessary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Let us see what the other items are.

Three Rivers harbour—additional deep water wharfs, $100,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote of $100,000 is to make provision for carrying on during the fiscal year 1903-4 the works let by contract with a view of affording the additional deep water wharf accommodation called for by the Three Rivers Harbour Commission. This wharf

gives accommodation for handling coal, sulphur, and other bulky materials which are brought in for the use of railways and manufacturing establishments in the city and surrounding country. The amount of the contract was $280,500, and the contingencies will make the estimated total cost about $300,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How much of that work has been carried out ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that very little of this work has been done, and not much has been paid on account. The contract was let on the 10th of June, 1902. The engineer of the department informs me that the contractors were not able to procure the timber and materials in time to get much work done last year.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. When does the hon. minister expect that the work will be completed ? Is there any hope that the contractors will now go on with the work with some vigour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract provides that the work is to be completed on the 10th of June, 1904, and the chief engineer informs me that they have started now. I have no personal knowledge about it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Who is the engineer in charge ?

Mr. BUREAU. Mr Lefebvre is the local engineer in charge of the work.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that this wharf will be used for importing coal and sulphur. What kind of industry do they intend to start there ?

Mr. BUREAU. There is more than that in it. Twenty-one miles north of Three Rivers is situated the manufacturing centre of Shawenegan Falls. There is the Belgo-Canadian Pulp Company, which manufactures pulp and paper ; and the carbide works, manufacturing aluminium and carbide of calcium. Eight miles further north, and twenty-nine miles from Three Rivers, is the Laurentide Pulp Company. To show you the increase of traffic in this locality, I may say that in 1898-9 there were taken down the river one and a half million pieces of timber, and in 1901-2 there were 3,272,-261 pieces of timber which were manufactured in these localities. The trade is not all done through Three Rivers now because we have not the dock facilities, but it will be when the dock is built. As I have said before in this House, I do not think that money could be better expended, because I do not believe there is a more ideal spot in the whole Dominion of Canada for a national harbour than is Three Rivers. We have all these industries north of the town that I have mentioned, and we have also important industries in the city of Three Rivers. All these manufactured products, and all the deals made from these logs are shipped across the ocean, and we have also the raw materials : Brimstone, coal, clay for the manufacture of aluminum, coming through Three Rivers. In past years we have not been able to take care of more than 20 per cent of the traffic which is within twenty-one miles of this deep water dock, because we did not have wharf facilities. This work will give us 2,020 feet additional of new dock. It will help transportation in the way, that now you have to haul from or to Quebec, and the only railway that goes through Shawenegan and Grand'Mère is the Great Northern, and they have the worst piece of track between Shawenegan and Grand'Mère and Quebec that there is. When we are able to use this dock it will shorten the haul to twenty-one miles in lieu of a hundred miles. I may say also that when these docks are completed they will not be even then ample to accommodate all the traffic that is necessary for the country within a radius of twenty miles from Three Rivers.

Mr. POPE. I congratulate my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) on having something to ship from this wharf.

Mr. BUREAU. Thank you.

Mr. SPROULE. It is refreshing to know that we are expending money where there is trade to be done. There is no desire on this side of the House to object to any expenditure where there is justification for it, but what we do object to is making large expenditures in places where there is no trade and no necessity for expenditure.

Mr. BUREAU. Last year we loaded ninety-six ocean steamers at Three Rivers.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Montreal, Three Rivers, and Quebec should be equipped without delay.

Valleyfield—dredging, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for keeping open the channel in Valleyfield bay. There has been some $15,-000 spent there, and I am informed by the engineer that this will complete the work.

Mr. FOWLER. There is some dredging going on by the dredge 'St. Pierre' which is paid $7 an hour. This Valleyfield dredge gets $8 an hour. What is the cause of the difference ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that this dredge has been improved, and has reached the standard of dredges that get $8 an hour.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the name of the dredge used in Valleyfield ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no name that we have in the department. It is a dredge owned by the Canadian Construction Company of Montreal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Before the Committee rises, perhaps I may be allowed to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he has read in 'Le Soleil' of Quebec a despatch from Ottawa to the effect that the contract for the Quebec harbour works had been awarded to a gentleman named Dussault. As no new tenders have been asked, I was very much surprised to read the telegram.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know why my hon. friend should be surprised. This work was advertised several weeks ago, and, as Dussault & Lemieux were the lowest tenderers, I have no doubt they were notified by the department that their tender would be accepted.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What work is that? Is it the same work that was advertised last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Part of the same work—the same location. It is an extension of the wharf for about 500 feet.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. But not the same plans.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand not the same plans.

Immigration—further amount required, $100,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In this sheet of supplementary estimates, which perhaps is not in the possession of all the members, though it was distributed some days ago, there are three items, and, if the Committee will permit me, I will speak of them all together. The items are: Further amount required for immigration, $100,000; further amount required for services of North-west Mounted Police in the Yukon Territory, $150,000; and miscellaneous expenses in connection with the Alaska boundary tribunal, $50,000. After consultation with the hon. leader of the opposition, I am asking the Committee to agree to vote to-night the items for immigration and the Alaska boundary tribunal, with the understanding that both these matters will be open to discussion on other items which are still to come before the House. If the Prime Minister were in his seat, I would ask also that the item of $150,000 for the North-west Mounted Police be voted; but that may stand until he is present. The items for immigration and for the Alaska boundary tribunal are urgent. That for immigration is required in consequence of the very large amount of work being done this season, the evidence of which we have in the great influx of people into the North-west Territories. For the expenses of the Alaska boundary tribunal $10,000 was taken by Governor General's warrant to start the proceedings, but that will only go a short distance, as there are heavy expenses connected with the employment of counsel and other matters in the preparation of the case. I should be very glad if the Committee will vote these two items to-night with the understanding that at a later stage the whole matter will come up for discussion under other items.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to immigration, I think it is not indicative of very good business management that the government come down and ask for such a large item to close the financial year, in view of the fact that we gave them last year $445,000 or $450,000, which was the largest vote for immigration in a great many years. We were assured that there would be a great influx of immigrants this year, but you would think those who had the business in charge would be able to make a closer estimate than one which leaves them one dollar out in every four. It is not evidence that they are men of great business foresight or judgment. With regard to the class of immigrants which are coming in, while it is pleasing to note that the great mass of them are of the most desirable class, it is a fact that cannot be overlooked that there are a great many coming in who are not the most desirable people.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the next government business to be taken up, whether on Monday or Tuesday?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think we shall probably continue the supply for the first day. If we get through with other business on Monday, we will go on with the Public Works estimates, and if there is to be any change for Tuesday, the hon. gentleman will have an intimation of it on Monday.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, May 4, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 143) respecting the Canadian North-west Irrigation Company.—Mr. Oliver —By Mr. McCreary.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call attention to the order of business of the House. For the last two or three years, when the government have taken all the days in the week

but one, if the day not taken was other than Wednesday, the order of business for Wednesday was adopted for the day so left free for business introduced by private members. I understand that we have but one day devoted to business introduced by private members under the resolution introduced by the right hon. leader of the government, and that day is Monday ; and I see by the Order paper that the regular Order for this day is retained—that is, we have first, questions to be put by members, next notices of motion, and next public Bills and Orders. Now, notices of motion may occupy the day and so public Bills and Orders be entirely excluded from consideration. Under the regular order of business we have Monday devoted, as under the Order now before us, to questions to be put by members, then notices of motion, then public Bills and Orders; Wednesday to notices of motion up to six o'clock and public Bills and Orders after half-past seven ; and Thursday to public Bills and Orders up to six o'clock, and notices of motion after half-past seven. This divided the time as equally and fairly as it is possible to do between these classes of business—notices of motions and public Bills and Orders. I presume that it is an oversight that the custom of the last two or three years has not been followed and the order of business for Wednesday fixed for Monday. Now, we have on the Order paper nineteen public Bills. If the Order is retained as it stands, we are in danger of not reaching any of these. Some of them are Bills of importance, among them the Bill with regard to the cigarette question.

Mr. CLARKE. The government will take that up.

Mr. CHARLTON. The government may. But then the government may not. This House has affirmed by an overwhelming majority that a certain line of action is desirable with regard to that matter and here is a Bill introduced by the gentleman who introduced that resolution—

Mr. SPEAKER. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) intends to conclude with a motion.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will conclude with a motion, if necessary, Mr. Speaker, though I was merely calling attention to the Order of procedure. Here are nineteen public Bills which, under the Order laid down, if it is not amended, will not be reached or taken into consideration during this session. I was pointing out the importance of one of these Bills, that respecting the cigarette question. I think the country will be very much dissatisfied with the course of this House, if, through inadvertence, no action is taken upon that matter. For this reason, I suggest to the government the course that has been adopted for the last two years certainly, and, I think, for the last three years—that the order of business for Wednesday shall be made the order of business for Monday, making the Order first, question put by members, then notices of motions up to six o'clock, and public Bills and Orders after half-past seven. I move that this House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may explain to my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) that there has been no oversight this year in the motions made to take Wednesday and Thursday for government business, for the reason that all the public Bills to which my hon. friend has referred have been called, not only once or twice, but three times. If they have not been disposed of, it is by no fault of the government.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the Cigarette Bill been called ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, because it is placed on the Order paper for the first time to-day, and it cannot be called to-day because it is not printed. I doubt very much if the notices of motion on the Order paper will not be exhausted before six o'clock. In all probability we shall get into public Bills and Orders before this evening's session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). An understanding was reached under which two Wednesdays were to be reserved, this being done for the reason suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) that there were a number of Bills on the Order paper. At the time, I drew the right hon. premier's (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's) attention to the fact of these Bills being on the paper, and so the two Wednesdays were reserved. But these proved of no value for the purpose intended, because both were taken up by the budget debate. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman would consider that point and let us know at a future time—

The PRIME MINISTER. We will see what progress we make to-day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). After that time, the matter might be considered, and, if necessary, some opportunity for the consideration of these Bills be afforded.

CORRESPONDENCE RE SOREL WHARF.

Mr. R. POPE (Compton). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to remind the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) that on Friday last I asked for reports, correspondence and general information in connection with the wharf at Sorel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). I gave instructions to the officials of the department to have any information brought down. It will probably be here this afternoon.

STRIKE OF SECTION-MEN ON CANADA ATLANTIC RAILWAY.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL (Glengarry). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the government if they are aware that the section-men on the Canada Atlantic Railway are on strike. In fact, I believe there are no section-men at work upon that railway at the present time. I think probably it would be in the interest of the public to have some inquiry made in reference to that matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The government is aware that there is some misunderstanding, probably in the nature of a strike, perhaps an actual strike, on the part of the section-men of the Canada Atlantic Railway. On Friday, a committee asked the intervention of the Department of Labour, and the department has offered its services. But no communication in respect thereof has been received from the Canada Atlantic.

WAGES OF CANAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair). I understand that the employees on the Cornwall canal and the dock labourers have received an increase in their pay amounting now to $1.50 a day. I wish to know if that increase of pay also affects the labourers on the Williamsburg canal, or only those on the Cornwall canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). It will be general. I know no distinction between the labourers on the canals.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CANADA PERMANENT AND WESTERN CANADA MORTGAGE CORPORATION.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 54) respecting the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. Osler.

On section 1,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This clause is amended by adding after the word 'means' in the last line, the following :

Before such change of name shall take effect, a general meeting of the shareholders of the said company shall be called for the purpose of considering it, and a resolution accepting and approving thereof shall be passed by the shareholders present, or represented by proxy, at such meeting, and certified copy of such resolution shall within fifteen days after the passing thereof said meeting be published in the 'Canada Gazette' and such change of name shall take effect upon the date of such publication.

Mr. CLARKE. When this Bill was being considered by the Banking and Commerce Committee it was amended by adding the clause just read by the Chairman, the committee not being satisfied that the shareholders authorized the name of the company to be changed. I have received a number of documents from the solicitor of the company, respecting the matter, which I have submitted to the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), and I am satisfied from a perusal of them that there will be no objection from the shareholders—that, in fact, they desire the change to be made. I therefore move that the additional clause be struck out. I am satisfied it is not at all necessary, as there is no opposition to the desired change of name.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). There was a question in the Committee on Banking and Commerce as to whether this proposed change had the approval of the shareholders, and this clause was put in to make assurance doubly sure. However, since that time such representations have been made by hon. gentlemen in the House and by persons outside as have satisfied me, at all events, and I think will satisfy the committee, that the shareholders will be satisfied to have this change made, and as the insertion of the clause might cause some embarrassment, in view of the representations that have been made, I have no objection to the motion made by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) to have the clause struck out.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 65) respecting the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Bruce.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved :

That section 1 be amended by inserting after the words 'section 2' in the third line of the section, the words 'chapter 112.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported ; read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Royal Trust Company.—Mr. Casgrain.

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Colonial Bank of Canada.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 115) to incorporate the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Tobin.

Bill (No. 105) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Standard Car Truck Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 131) to incorporate the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. McIsaac.

Bill (No. 134) to incorporate the Erie, Ontario, Power Company.—Mr. German.

RELIEF OF WILLIAM FRANCIS SCHOOLEY.

Mr. BOYD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 128) for the relief of William Francis Schooley.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). This Bill seems likely to go through with the facility which usually attends the passage of Bills of this character through this House. I have had my attention called to this Bill for the first time by seeing it on the Order Paper. It is a Bill entitled 'An Act for the relief of William Francis Schooley.' The Bill sets forth the allegation that this man's wife left him some years ago, went to the United States, obtained a divorce there, is married and is living with the person whom she married in the state of Michigan; and he applies for a divorce and the privilege of marrying again. Now, these circumstances undoubtedly warrant the issue of a decree of divorce. But the question which faces me in this matter is: What do I know about these circumstances? I am called upon to act, as a member of the House of Commons, which either gives or withholds this decree. The decree can be given properly only upon the substantiation of these grounds. If the grounds alleged do not exist, the decree should be withheld. I know nothing about the trial, nothing about the evidence. I am not aware whether there was a cross-examination, whether the evidence was properly brought out, whether there is collusion, whether the allegation is well founded. Under these circumstances the Bill is presented to this House for its ratification. I wish to call attention, as I have done repeatedly before, to the fact that, in my opinion, this whole proceeding is wrong. If cause exists for divorce, that cause should be ascertained by judicial process, and for this purpose the case should be referred to a properly constituted court. There should be no doubt resting upon the mind of any individual who is called upon to register a decree with reference to such a matter. But, in this case, I feel that sense of doubt. I do not wish to do injustice to one party; on the other hand, I do not wish to do injustice to the other party. Yet, in a broad sense, I know nothing about the case except the representation that is made here, that a commitee of the Senate has had the matter under consideration and has seen fit to report favourably upon this Bill. I protest against this line of action. I protest against being called upon as a member of this House of Commons to record my verdict in this matter. The whole system of granting divorces in cases outside the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick is based upon a fallacious arrangement. I repeat that this is a judicial case that should pertain to a judicial tribunal; that the Act should issue only upon evidence which, under the law would warrant a divorce. As soon as possible we should get rid of this expensive, this antiquated, this absurd system of granting divorces. We should establish a divorce court, set forth clearly in the law the conditions under which a divorce may be granted; then, let it be ascertained by the tribunal whether the circumstances as established by the evidence, are such as to warrant the granting of a divorce under the law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

QUESTIONS.

SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY LAND COMPANY.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked:

By what arrangement with the government has the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company acquired the even, as well as the odd, numbered sections, in the district in which the land was granted to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I notice that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche, Marquette) has an Order on the Paper, which, if granted, would answer all the purposes of this question. Perhaps, therefore, the hon. gentleman would prefer the documents themselves which he has moved for. I suggest that he let the question drop.

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL AND CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. DOUGLAS—by Mr. Davis—asked:

What means have been taken, if any, by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to fulfil its agreement, made with the government three years ago, as to the building of sixty miles on the Great North-west Central Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on 29th June, 1900, filed plans for 20·20 miles of Great North-west Central Railway, and constructed it, from Hamiota to Miniota; and on the 10th of November, 1902, they filed plans of the line from Forest to Lenore, 41·41 miles, and constructed it.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. WILSON—by Mr. Ingram—asked:

What amount of bonus or subsidies, voted by parliament, have been paid to railway companies, in the following years:—1901 and 1902, and up to the 1st of April, 1903?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Amount of

bonus or subsidies, voted by parliament, paid to railway companies: For the year ending June 30th, 1901, $2,512,328.86; for year ending June 30th, 1902, $2,093,939.00; from July 1st to April 1st, 1903, $1,363,480.34.

RAILWAY LAND SUBSIDIES — MANITOBA AND NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. SCOTT asked:

1. Of the lands voted for railway construction, what is the area reserved at this date for each company, (a) in Manitoba, (b) in the North-west Territories?

2. What area has been patented to each company, (a) in Manitoba, (b) in the North-west Territories?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). (1)

IN MANITOBA.

	Acres.
Canadian Northern Railway	5,432,000
Canadian Pacific Railway	690,000
Manitoba and North-western Railway.	41,000
Manitoba South-western Colonization Railway	313,403
Total	6,476,403

IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

	Acres.
Alberta Railway and Coal Company.	22,048.42
Calgary and Edmonton Railway	304,288.90
Canadian Northern Railway (Of which 22 million acres is along proposed line between Manitoba and Hudson's Bay.)	24,898,000.00
Canadian Pacific Railway, Souris branch	8,615,738.00
Canadian Pacific Railway, main line	2,119,350.00
Canadian Pacific Railway, Pipestone extension of Souris branch	200,320.00
Manitoba and North-western Railway	1,460,000.00
Manitoba South-western Colonization Railway	1,044,685.00
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company	3,777,410.00
Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company	322,500.00
Total	42,764,340.00

(2.)

IN MANITOBA.

	Acres.
Canadian Pacific Railway	1,939,843.90
Canadian Northern Railway	5,692.75
Great North-west Central Railway.	5,736.74
Manitoba South-western Colonization Railway	212,887.74
Manitoba and North-western Railway	535,069.74
Total	2,699,230.87

IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

	Acres.
Alberta Railway and Coal Company.	1,092,319.58
Calgary and Edmonton Railway	1,139,539.59
Canadian Pacific Railway, main line	8,645,644.47
Great North-west Central Railway.	314,263.26
Manitoba South-western Colonization Railway	72,187.99
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company	328,042.02
Manitoba and North-western Railway	523,377.13
Total	12,115,374.04

A TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Did the Postmaster General, or any other member of the present cabinet, declare, at Toronto, or elsewhere, that in face of the rivalry which existed between the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern, and the Trans-Canada, to build a transcontinental railway, the Laurier government had immediately set to work to study the project of itself building a railway, connecting Quebec with Winnipeg, by way of Lake St. John and James Bay?

2. If said declaration was made, when and to whom was it made?

3. Was it made in the name or with the authority of the cabinet?

4. Is it really the intention of the government to build, itself, and at its own cost, another railway, crossing the continent, and connecting Quebec with Winnipeg, by way of Lake St. John and James Bay?

5. When will this important work be begun?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No member of the government has made any announcement of policy upon this question.

MAIL SERVICE—CUTLER, SPANISH MILLS, &c.

Were tenders asked for mail service between Cutler, Spanish Mills, Little Current and Wekimagong, for 1903? If so, who was the lowest tenderer, and was his tender accepted? If lowest tenderer was not accepted, who is now performing the service, if performed, and on what terms?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock):

1. Yes.

2. William Fraser ($1,800). His tender was not accepted.

3. Sims Bros. at $1,500 per annum.

MAIL SERVICE—CUTLER, GORE BAY, &c.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

Were tenders asked for the mail service between Cutler, Gore Bay and Kagawong, for the season of 1903? If so, who was the lowest tenderer; and was his tender accepted? If lowest tenderer was not accepted, who is now performing the service, if performed, and upon what terms?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock):

1. Yes.

2. Herbert Cleland ($2,000). He was offered the contract, but declined it unless also given the contract for the Cutler, Span-

ish Mills, Little Current and Manitowaning service.

3. William Fraser ($1,800).

PRIVATE CARS ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. How many private cars are there now in connection with the Intercolonial Railway ; what are their names, and what was their cost to the country during the past year ?

2. Were any new cars purchased by the Railway Department last year ?

3. Where is the private car usually used by General Traffic Manager Tiffin, at the present time ? What is the object of the present trip upon which it is being used ? And what did it cost to provision and fit out the said car for this trip ?

4. How many trips have been made by this car during the month of April, 1903 ; where to, at what cost, for what purposes, and who were the occupants ?

5. What was the total cost of this car last year ?

6. Is it ever used for the private purposes of members of Mr. Tiffin's family or friends ? If so, when and how often ?

7. Is it usual for officials of the Intercolonial to have private cars maintained and run at the expense of the country, with which to make trips, either for pleasure or on private business ?

8. Is General Manager Tiffin out of Canada now ; and if so, who is performing his duties in his absence ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. There are three official cars connected with the Intercolonial Railway.

2. No.

3. He is in the western states en route to the Pacific coast, returning through British Columbia and the North-west of Canada. The object is for the restoration of the traffic manager's health, who occupies the car. As the traffic manager pays this himself, I am not able to answer the question.

4. In the traffic manager's absence, it is not possible to answer this question.

5. Five hundred and sixty-one dollars and twenty-one cents.

6. The department is not aware that it is, although it is possible some members of his family may occasionally accompany him on his official trips. In the traffic manager's absence I am not able to say when or how often.

7. The official cars are as it were offices on wheels, in which to transact official business ; private business of course can be transacted in them without detriment to the public service.

8. The traffic manager is in the United States now, but is within telegraphic communication with his staff whenever such communication is desired in the interests of the service. He may be, therefore, said to be performing official duties during his absence on the ground of ill health, the officers under him reporting to him and receiving his instructions.

IMMIGRANTS REFUSED ADMISSION.

Mr. WILSON—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1. How many immigrants have been refused admission into the Dominion of Canada, and for what causes or reason, for the years 1901 and 1902 ; and up to 1st of April, 1903 ?

2. How many immigrants have been deported to the country from which they came, and at whose expense, and for what cause ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The preparation of the answer to this question involves considerable time, as it is necessary to communicate with immigration agents in different parts. Therefore it will not be possible to answer it to-day, or for some days.

Mr. SPROULE. Stands.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

IMMIGRATION FROM JULY, 1902, TO APRIL, 1903.

Mr. WILSON—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

How many immigrants arrived in Canada from the 1st of July, 1902, to the 1st of April, 1903 ? What were the nationalities of said immigrants ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). The total number was 61,678, of whom 27,171 were from the United Kingdom ; 24,487 from the United States ; and 10,020 from other countries. Total 61,678. The following are the details :

VIA OCEAN PORTS.

Arabian	43
Armenian	109
Austrian	385
Australian	34
Bulgarian	5
Belgian	148
Bermudian	1
Bohemian and Moravian	144
Bukowinian	1
Crotian and Slovenian	1
Dutch	35
Doukhobors	7
Egyptian	1
French	449
Flemish	5
Finnish	1,226
German	1,012
Galician	1,663
Greek	122
Great Britain—	
English	13,634
Welsh	227
Scotch	2,203
Irish	1,107
West Indians	11
Hebrew	1,669
Hungarian	767
Italian	2,263
Moldavin	1
Maltese	2
Mennonites	24
Newfoundlanders	196
New Zealanders	2
Polish	149
Persian	40
Roumanian	294
Russian	2,999
Servian	1

Slovak	24
Spanish	7
Saxonians	12
Swiss	39
Syrian	765
Scandinavin—	
Danish	141
Icelandic	326
Swedish	1,082
Norwegian	477
Prussian	5
Turkish	34
United States citizens	96
Nationalities via ocean ports.	34,524
Returned Canadians	2,468
Tourists	199
From United States at Winnipeg and outports	24,487
Total	61,687

BINDER TWINE.

Mr. HEYD asked :

1. What was the quantity used, and average cost per pound, respectively, of manilla, sisal, or other hemp, in the production of binder twine, in the Kingston penitentiary, 1901-2 ?

2. What was the cost, or allowance, for labour, and also for any material other than hemp, used in the production of said twine ?

3. What was the average price per pound at which the twine was sold ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1. 28,376 pounds of manilla; average price $6 per cwt ; 122,000 pounds of sisal ; average price, $6.28 per cwt.

2. Convict labour, $896.32; other material, $839.68.

3. 5¾ cents.

TRANSLATORS OF DEBATES.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. Who is the owner of the building, No. 461 Sussex street, Ottawa, used as an office by the translators of debates ?

2. What is the rent paid therefor per annum?

3. How long have the translators occupied the said building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. The property in question is rented by the government from Mr. D. V. Ranger.

2. $420.

3. Since 1893.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—ADDITIONAL CAPITAL.

Mr. McCREARY asked :

1. Has the government any information of the manner in which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has applied the sum of nine million dollars, which, under the terms of the Act of last session, 2 Edward VII., chapter 4, was to be expended for rolling stock ?

2. Has any part of that sum been expended in pursuance of the Act ; and if so, how much ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. Yes.

2. Yes. The following amount has been expended in pursuance of the Act referred to, according to a statement furnished by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company,—

First. Rolling stock actually acquired and paid for.

Locomotives	116	$2,143,068.85
Sleeping, dining, parlour, official and pay cars	20	250,798.77
Passenger, tourist and colonist coaches	30	248,237.66
Baggage, mail and express cars	14	62,600.91
Conductors vans	133	113,623.47
Box, stock, refrigerator and furniture cars	3,839	3,484,578.67
Flat, coal and ore cars	546	434,925.86
Other cars, snow ploughs, &c	50	223,785.22
Total		$6,961,619.41

Second. Rolling stock now under contract and in course of construction and which will be delivered during the ensuing summer.

Locomotives	120	$2,593,048.00
Sleeping and dining cars	14	273,465.00
Passenger coaches	39	396,050.00
Box, stock and refrigerator cars	357	422,875.00
Flat, coal and ore cars	1,455	1,048,200.00
		$4,733,638.00
Grand total		$11,695,257.41

LIGHT-KEEPER—PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX COUNTY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. Has George Swinehammer, of Peggy's Cove, Halifax county, been dismissed or relieved from his position as light-keeper ? And if so, for what reason ?

2. For what length of time has he occupied the position of light-keeper ? And does the government propose giving him any retiring allowance, or other compensation, in view of his advanced age and long service ?

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

1. George Swinehammer, keeper of the light at Peggy's Cove, Halifax county, was relieved from his position as light-keeper on account of his advanced age, and loss of activity consequent thereon. At the time Mr. Swinehammer was released, he was 74 years of age, and the department was informed officially that on account of the want of physical activity and intelligence consequent upon his age he was not adapted to act as keeper of a light of that order. It appears that lighting apparatus of a very improved character was adopted at this station, and that for the want of the qualifications mentioned an explosion occurred, and the apparatus was partially destroyed. The department was forced to the conclusion that in the interest of the public service it was necessary to appoint a younger and more active man.

2. Mr. Swinehammer had been in the public service since 1883. He was not eligible for superannuation on retirement. The salary was $300 per annum, and no compen-

sation or allowance has been made him as he could not receive the superannuation allowance on retirement. The department, might, if necessary, consider, after gathering information on the matter, whether it would be expedient to make some allowance in this case.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. H. A. WARD (East Durham) moved for :—

Copies of all engineers' reports, specifications, estimates and correspondence in reference to surveys made between Rice Lake and Lake Ontario, in connection with the Trent Valley canal.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in moving for the papers mentioned in the notice now in your hands, it is with the same object in view as when two years ago I brought before the House the question of the southern outlet of the Trent Valley canal. My aim was then, as it is now, to bring such facts to the attention of the government as would convince the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and I trust the members of the government generally, that it would be wise, in the interest of the country, before proceeding with the completion of the southern end of the canal, the connection between Rice lake and Lake Ontario, to have an exhaustive survey made with the view of determining between the rival routes by the Trent Valley and Port Hope by a thoroughly competent engineer and one who would be entirely independent of any question involved in the construction of the canal. In view of the fact that both political parties have undertaken the construction of this work, it is not necessary for me to say anything as to its importance or non-importance ; but I will content myself with referring to one fact, that is, that all the inner stretches of the canal have been completed, with the exception of a gap between Lake Simcoe and the Georgian bay and that between Rice lake and Lake Ontario. As the canal stands now, it is only of local importance ; and until these gaps are filled in, it will never amount to anything as a through route for grain and other produce. The question, as far as the completion of the canal is concerned, resolves itself into one of expense as between the two routes and a question of expediency ; and I will endeavour to show, as far as I am able, that the circumstances are all in favour of the construction of the southern end of the canal, via Port Hope. In moving for the reports of the engineers and the estimates, I may as well say that I am already in possession of some of these reports ; but others are lacking which might throw considerable light on the question, notably a report of Mr. Rogers, which I have not so far been able to obtain, as to the Hoard's creek section of the canal, between Rice lake and Trenton. That portion was estimated by Mr. Rubidge, one of the government engineers, to cost about $1,200,000, whereas Mr. Rogers' estimate is that it will only cost $750,000. I would call attention to this fact, that in making the estimate Mr. Rogers has evidently not considered the fact that Mr. Rubidge estimates the rock excavation alone to cost $385,000, leaving a little over $300,000 for the other work on that section. I do not intend to refer to that report just now, because I have here a report from which I intend to read a few extracts.

It is the first report of the Port Hope route, with which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is no doubt familiar. I refer to the report of Mr. Maingy, made in 1833, to Sir John Colbourne, and I simply read these extracts in order to show that as early as 1833, a comparative survey had been made of the two routes, and the statements of Mr. Maingy, in connection with the Port Hope route are decidedly in its favour. He says :

Having satisfied myself on the point of following the ravine, my attention was next directed to the choice of a place at which the canal should commence at the Rice lake, and finding that Orton's creek possessed not only the advantage of being an excellent harbour for sheltering of canal boats, &c., but also that the entrance into the before mentioned ravine, could be effected from this point with a less sacrifice of directness and expenditure of money, I made choice of it in preference to any other, and immediately commenced taking his levels.

Upon an inspection of the accompanying ground plan and longitudinal section, your Excellency will be able to form some idea of this highly romantic and picturesque district, as also the superior advantages Port Hope possesses over any other line for the termination or outlet of any proposed communication between Rice lake and Lake Ontario, either by canal or railway.

Again he says :—

The route of the canal as surveyed by the reporter, and delineated on the ground plan by the red line commencing at Orton's creek, follows the natural passage before mentioned, in a southerly direction ; after crossing the Cobourg road the land rises very rapidly until it arrives at the summit of the ridge, distant from the lake one mile and a quarter and sixty-three feet and fifteen-hundredth part of a foot above its level ; on the north and south sides of which summit (at a few yards as under) two springs take their rise, one sending its overplus water into Rice lake through Orton's creek, the other running south from the head of Howe's creek, and discharges itself into Lake Ontario—both, however, are very insignificant ; from this point the route continues in nearly a straight direction, and it crosses the Cavan road at the corner of Howe's inn, and enters a ravine running in a due west direction to Moon's clearing, the termination of the first section, and three miles distant from the place of starting, the fall of the land from the summit is very rapid until at Moon's, where the route is once more level with the waters of the lake.

My object in reading that portion of the report is to compare it with the report of

Mr. Rogers from which I will quote more extensively later on. Mr. Maingy makes the distance three miles until the land comes upon a level with the waters of Rice lake, and then there is a constant descent to Port Hope. Rice lake is at four or five feet of a higher level now than it was then, and consequently that would very much shorten the distance to where the land comes upon a level with Rice lake. Mr. Rogers places that distance at four and a half miles. I call attention to this because I am afraid he could not have taken his levels very carefully, or he would have found that the descent commenced but a distance of two and a half miles instead of four and a half miles to the point where the land is again on a level with Rice lake. Again Mr. Maingy says:

The whole distance from Orton's creek in Rice lake to the wharf at Port Hope is fourteen miles within a fraction, and the difference of level between the two lakes is 361 feet and 32-hundreth parts of a foot as per annexed estimate, which has been carefully made; the amount required for completing the communication will be £101,426 6s. 6d.

In taking leave of this subject so intimately connected with the prosperity of a rich and populous district, the reporter would respectfully press upon the attention of your Excellency some four important considerations. The ultimate success of any measure for facilitating the communication of Rice lake with Lake Ontario depends wholly upon its connection with an accessible harbour. The reporter considers that he has sufficiently informed himself of the localities of the shores of Lake Ontario, to be able to say with confidence that Port Hope from its position is not only the natural, but the most accessible point of communication to the chain of navigable lakes by which this section of country is everywhere intersected. Its natural disadvantages are very few, and capable of being greatly improved, the harbour when completed (which it will be this summer), will be one of the safest and most convenient ones between this and Quebec, and capable of sheltering any number of ships that are likely at any time to be found on those waters. . . . .

That the position of Port Hope is particularly favourable for the termination of such work, must appear evident to every impartial observer; it is not only the shortest possible distance from Lake Ontario to Rice lake, possessing a safe and commodious harbour, but its eminence present every facility for defence in case of war, and the communication from Lake Ontario to Rice lake up to Lake Simcoe, can by this route be completed for a sum not greater than is necessary, merely to open the navigation from the mouth of the Trent to the Rice lake. These are facts that cannot be refuted and which the reporter sincerely hopes will induce its being adopted and undertaken by the province, in lieu of the roundabout and expensive route by the Trent.

A great many hon. members of this House are quite familiar with the situation as far as this canal is concerned, but there are no doubt a number who do not understand the geographical situation, and a few facts with regard to that may be of interest. Rice lake lies midway between Peterborough, to which point the canal is now completed, and Port Hope, and the western end of Rice lake is only between nine and ten miles from Port Hope, and a distance of about five miles to the mouth of the Otonabee river, by which the canal is connected with Rice lake from Peterborough. The lake extends about eighteen miles from a point immediately north of Port Hope in a north easterly direction and the River Trent, running out of the east end of Rice lake, still goes on in a north easterly direction, probably nine or ten miles, and then strikes in a southerly direction towards Trenton. I wish to call attention here to the distance from the mouth of the Otonabee river to Trenton, as compared with Port Hope. The distance is fifty-nine miles from the mouth of the Otonabee to Trenton and only nineteen miles to the town of Port Hope by the proposed route of the canal in that direction. That is a difference in favour of Port Hope of about forty miles. In addition to that fact, there is this to be said also, that in going down by the River Trent there are five railways to be crossed and going by Port Hope—although Mr. Rogers has made a crossing on the Midland railway—I am informed by an engineer, who has also examined the route, that it is not necessary to cross the Midland division of the Grand Trunk railway at all, and it is well known to all those who know anything about Port Hope that there is a space of thirty eight feet clear above the water under the viaduct of the main line of the Grand Trunk railway. So that with regard to these two routes, the disadvantage of having to cross railways would be entirely eliminated in the case of the Port Hope route.

With regard to the expense of construction of these two rival routes, I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to this fact. Taking it for granted that Mr. Rogers must be mistaken in his estimate of the cost of the Hoard's creek portion of the canal by the Trent river, the cost of the canal would be, according to Mr. Rubidge's estimate, $3,397,502, namely, $1,218,749 to Hoard's creek and $2,098,585 for the lower portion of the canal connecting with the town of Trenton. But I would call the attention of the minister to this fact, that there are several very expensive portions of the construction not estimated for at all. There is, for instance, the fact that Chisholm's dam has to be raised about two feet, and that will entail, I am informed, the flooding of about 10,000 acres of additional land. So that not only the construction of that dam has to be provided for, but a settlement with the proprietors of the land which will be flooded. There are already 20,000 acres flooded by Chisholm's dam and other dams on that section of the canal, and it might be well for the government to consider, in estimating the cost of these two routes, whether going by Port Hope would not release that 20,000 acres, as well as do away with the necessity of flooding 10,000

acres more. In addition, there is a portion of the Central Ontario Railway, I think about 3,000 yards in extent, which has to be diverted and built over again. That naturally will add to the cost of the canal. I say, therefore, that the comparison instituted by Mr. Rogers with regard to these two routes is altogether unfair, and he has not in any way taken into consideration the same matters when estimating for the Port Hope route as he has in estimating for the other.

Now, to show some of the discrepancies with regard to these two reports, I will first take what Mr. Rogers estimates for concrete. I think the minister will admit that there would be about the same number of locks to overcome the fall between Rice lake and Lake Ontario, no matter which route is adopted. Mr. Rogers estimates the concrete for the locks on the Port Hope section at 71,000 cubic yards, costing $426,000. Mr. Rubidge, on the other hand, estimating for the same number of locks, only puts in concrete required for the first section, the Hoard's creek section, at 5,283 cubic yards, costing $26,440 ; and for the other section connecting Trenton with the canal, only 10,147 cubic yards, costing $51,715. Mr. Rogers' estimate for the concrete alone for the Port Hope section is $426,000, whereas Mr. Rubidge can put in all the concrete required for the locks in the other two sections for $78,000. There is therefore a difference against Port Hope of about $400,000. That seems to be an absurdity on the face of it ; for if the concrete can be put in one section of the canal for the same number of locks for about $78,000, surely the concrete required for the Port Hope portion of it will not cost that enormous sum over Mr. Rubidge's estimate.

Then, again, Mr. Rogers estimates that the earth excavation of the Port Hope route will be about 5,500,000 cubic yards. Mr. Maingy estimates for the same canal, but for four feet instead of six feet, about 2,000,000 cubic yards. So Mr. Rogers makes a difference in the earth excavation alone of considerably over 3,500,000 cubic yards. That seems to me another great discrepancy that requires to be looked into, and requires, I should think, some other engineer to examine both routes in a comparative way. Of the rock excavation, Mr. Maingy makes only 2,600 cubic yards ; and Mr. Rogers puts in a lump quantity of rock excavation of 175,000 cubic yards, or a difference in cost in that respect alone of nearly $120,000. Therefore, taking the rock excavation and the concrete, they are manifestly absurd, it seems to me, if you take the reports of the other engineers and compare them with that of Mr. Rogers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). There is a good deal of difference in the width of the canal as well as in the length. Mr. Rogers calculates upon a width of 50 feet at the bottom, and Mr. Maingy upon a width of only 22 feet.

Mr. WARD. I am quite aware that there is a large difference in regard to the size. At the same time, it seems to me that this difference does not justify in any way the enormous discrepancies in the estimated quantities of earth and rock excavation. I happen to know that only at the town of Port Hope is there any rock excavation whatever, and Mr. Rogers, in his report, simply expresses a doubt as to whether there would be any large amount of rock excavation to be done in getting rid of the height of land a short distance from Rice lake. It is mere guess work, so far as I can see. I do not think he could have made a careful survey, or his quantities would have been expressed in a different manner. If the Minister of Railways will examine Mr. Rogers' report in regard to estimates, he will find that they are lump sums in every instance ; for instance, 175,000 cubic yards for rock excavation, and 5,500,000 exactly for earth excavation. If you follow the estimates all through you will find that they are just lump sums. On the other hand, if you take Mr. Maingy's report or Mr. Rubidge's report, you will find they are figured right down almost to cents. So I think in that regard also there ought to be some inquiry made into that report.

Now, there is another matter which I would like to bring to the attention of the minister, and that is the levels of the great lakes. It seems to me that is one of the most important matters to consider before finally completing this canal. I have taken the trouble to obtain from the Marine Department a chart of the lake levels during a large number of years, particularly of Lake Ontario ; and I also have in my possession a chart of the levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron. In examining the one issued by the Marine Department, I find the levels of Lake Ontario almost exactly corresponding in the years I have mentioned. Now, the lake levels have been going down almost steadily since 1838, until in 1895 the lowest level was attained by the great lakes that probably ever existed in the history of the country, so far as the memory of man runs, at any rate. In 1895 the level of the great lakes went down about six feet below the level of 1838. In the chart furnished by the Marine Department I find that during the last four years, up to 1901, the level of Lake Ontario has been almost exactly the same, being one and a half foot above the level of 1895, which was the lowest that was ever attained. The low levels of 1899 and 1900 were only six inches above the level of 1895. Now, a gentleman from Port Hope who examined the Trenton harbour last year found that there were only seven feet of water in that harbour, so that if the level of 1895 were to be again attained by Lake Ontario, you would only have

about six feet or six and a half feet of water in the harbour of Trenton. I think the hon. minister knows that the harbour of Trenton has a rocky bottom, and that a great deal of blasting and dredging would have to take place and that in all probability the canal would be perfectly useless if the level of 1895 were to come again. I just call this fact to the attention of the hon. minister because it seems to me that it is a very important thing ; if he does grant this survey, and I think he has given us a good deal of encouragement in that direction, that the lake levels should be taken and that the harbour of Trenton should be most carefully examined. At Port Hope we have a harbour with about fourteen feet of water—perhaps not that depth all through the harbour, but there is a depth of from twelve to fourteen feet all through the harbour. It seems to me that, taking all these things into consideration, we are asking very little in requesting that this comparative survey should be made, and I trust the hon. minister will take it into his most serious consideration and do what I at least think is manifestly in the interests of the country.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the question of the construction of the Trent Valley canal is one of very great interest to the county of Simcoe and to the different counties that abut and adjoin Lake Simcoe. I am not particularly concerned from a local point of view as to whether this canal shall be built, by way of the route suggested by the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Ward), or whether it shall follow what has in the past been discussed as the probable route, namely by way of Trenton, but, what we wish to see, in the county of Simcoe, is the work speedily taken up and pressed with greater dispatch than it has been since its commencement. I think in this House a great deal of prejudice has been engendered against this work owing to the fact that hon. gentlemen are not conversant with the details of it and I think it is to be regretted that the people of Peterborough and those living along that portion of the route where work has been done to a considerable extent have not interested themselves in having other hon. members of this House to go over the route as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did a few years ago, and become thoroughly conversant with the wants of these localities and see how they will be met by the construction of this canal. This system of waterways, extending from Lake Ontario to the waters of Lake Huron, is some 200 miles in length and of this great distance of 200 miles, as I understand, some fifteen or twenty miles only call for what might be termed actual canal work. Along the line of the work there are very many large lakes, one of which is Lake Simcoe. Then, above Peterborough there is Stony lake, Pigeon lake and other lakes, the names of which I have not on the tip of my tongue at the present moment, but I know from having been on them that they are also waters of considerable size. One protest that has been made against the expenditure of money on this canal has been based upon the fact that the boats that would ply on it would be too small to be successful from a business point of view. I may say that the report of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, containing the report of the engineer who is in charge of the work, proves that there is, to-day, over the sills, a depth of six feet of water and when it is considered that boats built with flat bottoms and having a depth of six feet will carry from 20,000 to 25,000 bushels of grain it must be plain that it would be a considerable factor in the carrying trade of the country. I know that a few years ago an American company that had the choice of erecting an elevator at Buffalo or at a Canadian point, erected an elevator at the town of Midland, where I reside, having a capacity of a million and a quarter bushels and one of the most modern elevators on the great lakes. As a proof of this I may say that it elevates 20,000 bushels per hour which is a fair indication that it must be a very modern concern. I have it from gentlemen interested in the erection of that elevator that one fact that induced them to place their business at Midland was that they would ultimately have water competition from Midland to Montreal. We have spent an immense amount of money on our canal system, and while I am not going to say a word against the amount of money that has been spent on the St. Lawrence canal system, it must be remembered that this Trent Valley canal will be a great feeder to and factor in the St. Lawrence canal system, because, whether the outlet on Lake Ontaro shall be at Trenton or Port Hope, the ultimate destination of the grain carried in vessels will be the port of Montreal. Now, let us look at what has been the effect already of the construction of the locks that have been completed so far. I find from the report of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals last year that no less than 5,185 lockages were made by vessels doing business on these upper lakes. It must be remembered that so far they have not yet had the advantage of being able to go out on Lake Huron or Lake Ontario and that therefore no through trade has been done. Yet, these figures show an increase of 857 lockages over the preceding year. I may say that the hon. minister, when he went up there a few years ago, and I had the pleasure of being present when he was on that trip, we were surprised to find the class of boats engaged in the trade on the system because there are steamers plying in those waters that will accommodate as many as 400 passengers. It therefore goes without saying that if these locks can accommodate boats of that size, they can also accommodate vessels carrying a considerable amount of grain.

As a local work for the counties of Simcoe, York and Ontario, it will be of great interest, and let me, in passing, refer to one fact. I am informed that the large cereal concern which has been established at Peterborough was to a certain extent attracted there owing to the fact that it has that magnificent water route which will ultimately give it connection with the waters of the Georgian bay and enable it to bring the vast quantities of grain that it consumes from the upper lake ports to Peterborough and when I say that at that point this one concern is consuming no less than 15,000 bushels of grain per day, and that the expectation is that it will double that in a few years, the importance of this work will be appreciated.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). What amount did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) say it was consuming ?

Mr. BENNETT. Fifteen thousand bushels a day, and it is estimated that with its capacity it will consume in a very short time no less than 30,000 bushels per day.

On the basis of 30,000 bushels a day, the aggregate would be 10,000,000 a year, which gives a very considerable amount. At present the bulk of that grain is being brought from different points in Ontario, and I know that in the towns of Barrie and Orillia they are purchasing quite a lot of grain and carrying it down by rail. If the canal were constructed they would bring that grain by barges through to Lake Simcoe and the farmers would get the benefit of the decreased rate of transport by water route. At Peterborough there has been established a very large cement concern, and I am told that in establishing these works at Peterborough the company anticipated the construction of this canal. Last year some 15,000,000 bushels of grain arrived at Midland and let me ask, what would it mean to the carrying trade of the whole Dominion if the canal were constructed clear through to Lake Huron ? It would mean that at Midland they would have the benefit of competition between the canal and the railways, and instead of having two large elevators at Midland other elevators would be erected to the great benefit of that town and district. There has been a great deal of delay in the work on this canal. I notice from the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals page 168 that some of these sections have not been dealt with in a very energetic or businesslike manner. The report says :—

Section 2, Peterborough—Lakefield Division.—The contract for this section was awarded to Messrs. Corry & Laverdure on May 21, 1896, and the time for completion was November 1, 1897, nearly five years ago. As I reported last year that from the mode of operation adopted by this firm it is difficult to say when the work will be completed. There was only about a month's work to be done by an ordinary force of men at the beginning of this season, but at the present date it will still take three months or more to complete the work at the present rate of progress. There is still a considerable amount of concrete to do in connection with the hydraulic lock, as well as excavation in the prism of the canal below the hydraulic lock ; finishing up the sodding, protection lining, trimming slopes, &c. . . . .

The steel work of this hydraulic lock (No. 1, Peterborough) was awarded to the Dominion Bridge Company. Owing to the delay caused by the contractors for the concrete work of the lock not being completed no steel work (except some of that which is to be embedded) has been put in place. A rigid inspection of the main hydraulic presses by tests have been gone on with for some months. Considerable trouble was experienced in getting the cast iron ram sections cast of the proper consistency and compactness, but this was finally accomplished. Nearly all the steel work has been prepared and stored on a lot adjoining the bridge works, which has been leased to the government for that purpose.

During this summer while passing along there, I have noticed that the work was much further advanced than last year, and I am told that probably by the first of September the large steel lock will be in running order. When that section is completed boats will be able to go from Balsam lake clear through to Heely's Falls, a distance of about 130 miles. Another feature, and not an unimportant one, of the completion of this canal, is, that it will make that district probably one of the most frequented tourist resorts on the continent of America. At first sight it may not look a business proposition to spend government money for the purpose of improving the facilities for tourist travel, and if that were the only object I would not commend it. At the same time those who live in districts which are frequented by tourists from year to year, know what a profitable trade results. One has but to look at the Thousand Island resorts to see that. In the district of Muskoka, which is not by any means a fertile district, no less than 20,000 people annually visit the beautiful lakes that abound in that region, and these tourists being transient and the number being constantly replaced during the season by others, there is in consequence an enormous outlay of money for the advantage of the proprietors of hotels and of steamboats, as well as the farmers who sell their products for the supplying of these tourists. I would point out to the minister that the different counties that adjoin Lake Simcoe are greatly interested in this work, particularly in view of the fact that this large concern at Peterborough to which I have referred uses a great deal of grain, and if the farmers had the opportunity of shipping to Peterborough by water it would be of considerable benefit to them. But the great benefit this canal will confer on the Dominion at large, is that it will be an important feeder to the St. Lawrence canal system. Millions of bushels of grain would be shipped by this route. At the present time the merchants and shippers in Barrie,

Orillia, and other towns have only one competing line to ship over on that division of the Grand Trunk Railway. The section of the Trent canal which is now under contract from Balsam lake to Lake Simcoe, has apparently not progressed with much celerity in the past. I understand that the construction of the high level bridge at the crossing of the Midland railway division of the Grand Trunk Railway near Gamebridge has been undertaken by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The work of filling in has been going on pretty fast during the spring and winter and I have noticed that the contractors have a dredge on the ground which I assume will facilitate the work. I would point out to the minister that all along this system of lakes and rivers the movement of freight will be fairly rapid, because I am informed by those who profess to be conversant with it, that three or four of these barges each carrying from 20,000 bushels can, with the aid of powerful tugs, be moved at the rate of six miles an hour. That will be a great improvement over the locomotion in vogue on the Erie canal, and the evidence goes to show that the Erie canal has been a great factor in reducing the rates between New York and Buffalo, and that it has had the effect of compelling the railways to carry freight at a much cheaper rate than they otherwise would. I hope that during the present summer the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) will press to a conclusion the contract for the section between Balsam lake and Lake Simcoe. I understand that the lock at Kirkfield is similar to the hydraulic lock near Peterborough, and in regard to the lock at Lakefield I trust that the work will be proceeded with more expeditiously than at other points. Perhaps, when the minister replies, to the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) he will let us know as to the prospect of an early completion of the work at the different points to which I have referred. With reference to the motion made by my hon. friend from East Durham, I can only say that while we in the county of Simcoe are not greatly concerned which route shall be adopted, whether the outlet shall be by Port Hope or by Trenton, we are concerned in this, that there should be a rapid completion of the work connecting the waters of Lake Huron with the waters of Lake Ontario. When the work is completed, and it is bound to be, in view of the money already expended, and in view of the fact that the minister looks with a kindly eye upon it, we should have the satisfaction of seeing vessels carrying from 20,000 to 30,000 bushels of grain loaded at Midland and passing through this canal and in due course to Montreal. I have noticed this year, what has been most annoying to me as a Canadian, and must be equally so to other gentlemen, that day after day large vessels have been leaving Fort William and Port Arthur and going to Buffalo. That means that American vessels, American lines of railway, and American steamship companies are to-day carrying Canadian grain from the North-west; and it is due to the fact that when the grain arrives at Buffalo, it has not only the advantage of competing lines of railway going to New York, but the additional advantage that they are kept in check by what I must call the almost obsolete system of the Erie canal. Yet that system will not be able to compete with the Trent Valley canal system, either as to the size of vessels or as to cheapness of carriage. I hope to hear from the minister that these works which I have referred to will be proceeded with more rapidly than in the past, and that we should have the satisfaction of seeing an early completion of this important work.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). Those of us who have been advocating a speedy construction of the Trent canal for a number of years are delighted to find such places as Port Hope, represented by my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Ward), and other important places on Lake Ontario, entering into competition to secure the terminus of the canal. We had a somewhat uphill fight for some years to convince the hon. members of this House of the advantages of this canal, not only to the localities through which it passes, but to the whole of Canada. That day, Sir, has happily gone by. We now find our good friend the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) thoroughly impressed with the necessity of pushing the construction of this canal to a speedy completion; and not a voice is raised on either side of the House in opposition to the construction of this great work. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has ably placed before the House and the country many of its advantages; but I may be permitted to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to this fact as an incentive to hasten its completion. At present the farmers of western Iowa can land their grain in Liverpool at five or six cents a bushel less than the farmers of the Midland district of Ontario, owing to the difference in freight rates, by reason of the water route from Chicago to the seaboard via the Erie canal, keeping down the rates on the railways. I can assure the Minister of Railways and Canals that when the Trent canal is completed, if in the immediate future we will erect monuments to him and his predecessor.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One will be enough.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not mean post mortem monuments; but we will put up tablets in his honour all along the route of the canal, for pushing it through to speedy completion, and increasing the value of the grains raised by the farmers of that district at least five cents a bushel. We have a number of important towns along the route of the

canal. Bordering on Lake Simcoe we have the magnificent towns of Barrie, Orillia and Beaverton, all of which will be greatly benefited by being provided with communication with the outer world. Passing on, we come to the village of Kirkfield, the village of Fenelon Falls, and the town of Lindsay, in the county of Victoria, and the fine little town of Port Perry, in the county of Ontario. Then, in the county of Peterborough, we come to the village of Lakefield and the town of Peterborough, and in the county of Northumberland, the village of Campbellford. All these towns would be greatly benefited by the construction of this canal. Then, there are many water powers along the route of the canal, which would bring in new industries now unthought of. It has been very properly stated that this is not a canal in the ordinary sense of the term, but rather a series of inland lakes connected by locks. Beginning at Midland, there is a cutting of a few miles to Lake Couchiching, where we have open water across Lake Simcoe. From Lake Simcoe the route is already under construction by the Talbot river to Balsam lake, with little cutting, and one hydraulic lock at Kirkfield. Across Balsam lake we have a stretch of open water for about eight miles to Cameron lake; and across Cameron lake for three miles brings us to Fenelon Falls. There are two locks already constructed connecting Cameron lake to Sturgeon lake, through a river about half a mile long. Across Sturgeon lake there is open water for twelve miles to Bobcaygeon, where a lock is already constructed. Then we come to short river about half a mile in length, with rocky banks, so that the speed of vessels need not be retarded. This brings us to Pigeon lake, where we have another stretch of open water for about twelve miles through Buckhorn lake. Here there is a lock already constructed in a rocky cutting leading to Deer lake and Lovesick lake. Thence, by two locks at Burleigh, we come to Stony lake; and through Stony lake we have open water for five miles, until we enter the navigable waters of the Otonabee river, connecting, by a magnificent hydraulic lift-lock at Peterborough, with the waters of the lower Otonabee and Rice lake.

My hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Ward), I regret to say, seems to consider that Mr. Rogers has given a report to the minister which is not based on most reliable data, in that opinion I am satisfied my hon. friend is entirely mistaken. I am convinced that any report which Mr. Rogers would give will be found absolutely correct. Following the Trent river route, which is the natural waterway, it will be found that the main difference between the estimates of Mr. Rubidge and Mr. Rogers consists in the fact that Mr. Rogers proposed following the waterway itself, damming the river and utilizing its shores for locks, while Mr. Rubidge intended to cut the canal right through the solid rock all the way. Mr. Rogers' proposition is that the waterway itself should be utilized and locks should be built here and there at the end of the dams, as they might be required. My personal sympathies would all lie in favour of the Port Hope route, and I would be very pleased if its advantages were such as to commend that route for adoption, but while my hon. friend points out that it is fifty miles from the mouth of the Otonabee river to Trenton by the river way and only nineteen miles to Port Hope, he leaves out of consideration the fact that it is thirty miles from Port Hope to Trenton, and that at least twenty-six of these are along the open waters of Lake Ontario, where you would be storm-tossed by every wind on the lake. That, however, is a matter of detail, which I am satisfied will be settled by the engineers. I shall not dwell at length on this proposition, but confine myself to stating that from the point of view of the benefit to the counties through which this canal will pass, it cannot be equalled by the construction of any railway that could be proposed, and for the benefit to the Dominion, as a through route for the output of the grain of the North-west, it would save a distance of three hundred miles as compared with the route away round by the river Detroit. In this respect it should commend itself to shippers. No doubt it has to meet the opposition of shippers who already have their lake barges constructed to ply between Kingston and Montreal. The Montreal Transportation Company do not favour this project because their steam barges are constructed for the purpose of navigating the Welland canal, but there is ample freight for all our western and eastern ports.

Mr. WARD. They are going to Buffalo now.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes. Even when this canal is constructed there will still be ample employment for these enormous barges, each carrying from 200,000 to 250,000 bushels of grain from Port Arthur to Fort William and even from Duluth and Chicago. Even by this canal the barges could transport that grain right to the city of Montreal. The same barges that load the grain at Midland could carry it without breaking bulk, directly to Montreal. It is a fallacious notion to my mind—it has been so proven by the best engineers—that canals, in order to be successful and profitable should be of enormous depth. We had a fad in Canada a number of years ago, in favour of twenty-one feet canals. That is a very fine theory, but when you consider the enormous cost of constructing such a canal and of constructing the necessary steel barges required on a canal of that depth, and then consider that the return trips will, in all probability, be light, you will find that the most profitable canal—the one that will carry the greatest quantity of grain barges and any class of freight at good prices—is the average canal. Why the Erie

canal had a depth of only four and a half feet on the sills and has not yet much improved on that. Yet that canal has built up immense cities all along its route and proved of such value to the farmers and business men of the state of New York that they would not sacrifice it for the enormous sum of $30,000,000. Although the railway companies have made all sorts of efforts to obtain control of that canal and remove it as a competitor, the people of the state of New York will not give it up and are taxing themselves annually enormous sums to preserve its integrity. Until recent years, it was only four and a half feet deep and eighteen feet wide. Now, the Trent canal will have a depth of eight feet of water on the sills and will carry barges capable of carrying from twenty-five to thirty thousand bushels of grain each over its entire route. A steamer from Midland harbour, carrying 250,000 bushels of grain, could unload its cargo in ten barges which could be towed down to Montreal, without any trouble, by one or two tugs. It is not necessary that any argument to point out the necessity of building this canal should be advanced. Our only desire is to urge on the Minister of Railways and Canals, the necessity for the immediate completion of this great work. I know that his mind is now thoroughly seized with its advantages. It would be good enough to put in the supplementary estimates, a sum which would complete the route between Lake Couchiching and Midland harbour, in order that in another year there may be ingress to and egress from the waters of the western lakes, and in another year put in a sum to complete it to Port Hope, I am satisfied that he would confer on the Dominion in general, and the province of Ontario in particular, one of the greatest benefits that can be imagined.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I have no objection at all to offer to the passing of the motion moved by my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Ward), provided it be passed subject to the understanding that we shall only bring down such papers, reports and documents bearing on the subject as have not already been laid before parliament. My hon. friend is naturally interested in the particular locality he represents and anxious that when a final selection of the route be made for the outlet of this canal into Lake Ontario, Port Hope may be the one chosen. And in urging upon the department and the House his conviction that Port Hope is the proper point, my hon. friend is only discharging his duty to his constituents. But I am not sure that he has done quite justice to the engineer of the department in the criticism he has cast on that engineer's report. If I understood him correctly, he pointed out that Mr. Rogers, the engineer, had made a very much larger estimate of the quantity of earth excavation than would be required than had been previously made by the engineer who first made the survey. I think he said that Mr. Rogers' estimate was something over five million, while the other was not much in excess of two million. I think the hon. gentleman had not present in his mind the fact that the locks which would be required along that work are very much larger indeed than were contemplated when the first survey took place. The first lock was seventy feet in length, thirteen feet in width and four feet in depth. The present lock would be one hundred and thirty three feet in length, thirty-three feet in width and six feet in depth.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). With a possibility of eight feet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not say that. I am speaking of the engineer's estimate, and his calculation was based on six feet. But the hon. gentleman can see that there is room for probably all the difference he pointed out and because of which he criticised the report of the engineer. I cannot say that the engineer may not have a preference in his own mind for the Trenton over the Port Hope location, but I think it would not be fair to assume that such judgment is based upon other than a conviction reached after proper inquiry. He may or may not be right. Other engineers may or may not agree with him. Still, all parties who may have made different reports may have reached their conclusions after exercising their best judgment and brought honest minds to bear upon the problem. I do know, however, Mr. Speaker, that there is admittedly some considerable difference between what would be the probable cost of construction by the Port Hope route and to the cost of construction by the Trenton route. But there has always been the objection raised by the officers of my department, that after getting to the lake, you are obliged to travel a considerable distance—some forty odd miles—along a very exposed shore of the lake, with these small barges.

Mr. WARD. May I correct the hon. gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I speak now, of course, of barges going to Montreal.

Mr. WARD. May I correct the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) on one point ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. WARD. It is only twenty-six miles to the Murray canal—that is, to the headland going into the Murray canal—from Port Hope—not forty miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The fact that there is a further distance before you get to the islands is a fact that cannot be ignored. There is

exposure there, and this ought to be considered in the opinion of some of our engineers. They do regard it seriously, and it is a fact that has to be allowed for in determining which of these two routes should be chosen. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Ward) that a delegation waited upon me in the department some weeks ago, and after I had heard, I must confess, a very businesslike presentation of the whole case from these gentlemen, I felt it was my duty to consider it. I have been led to the conclusion that an officer of the department should be sent, separate from any who have heretofore gone, and I have already made the selection of the officer, and he has instructions to make this survey, a survey that will cover not only the Port Hope route but the other, so that the judgment of the engineer who made the one survey may be applied to the other as well. So, I hope my hon. friend will feel that the question he urges upon us has not been overlooked.

My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has glanced at the subject generally but has made particular reference to the progress of the work now under contract, and has asked me to indicate, if I could, how soon these works will be brought to a conclusion. I may say that I did not supply myself with data as fully as I should have done this afternoon if I had known that the whole subject of the Trent valley canal was coming up in this debate. But I am in a position to say that, while the works have not been prosecuted by the contractors as speedily as we would have desired, and as we expected, I think there is some justification and excuse for the delay. I am quite certain that the works remaining to be finished will be carried forward with all possible despatch. My hon. friend intimated that it was two years since I visited the canal. I made it my business to pass along the route of that portion of the canal where works were in progress last fall, and I saw the contractors who were working and heard their explanations as to the delay. I am bound to say there was some excuse for the delay. But I have been given to understand very positively that so far as the Brown & Aymer contract is concerned that the work to Lake Simcoe, will be done this fall. As to the other part, the only thing that remains to be completed is the hydraulic lift. We are pushing that forward, I think, with a great deal of despatch, and we hope that, inside of a couple of months, we shall have the lift in operation. We think it necessary to have that lift in operation before we enter into a contract for the erection of the second—in fact, before we make any plans of too definite a character. There may be some improvements which will be suggested by the actual operation of the lock. The hydraulic lift is a new thing in Canada. I understand there are only two or three in operation anywhere. We hope to have the one at Peterborough in such shape that it can be tested and ready for operation inside of two months. Then, if its operation is generally satisfactory, we shall be in a position to call for tenders for the one at Kirkfield, and we will do so without any delay. The completion of the work through to Lake Huron will involve quite a little expenditure of money. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) appeals to me to ask for money and have this work prosecuted, I would like him to give us credit, which we are certainly entitled to, of having carried the work on with a moderate degree of despatch, at all events, as compared with the methods adopted by our predecessors.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we have spent a great deal of money every year, more than was spent previous to the advent of the present government to power. Money we spend very reluctantly, and always in fear that the volume of our expenditure will be criticised by our friends in opposition. When an appropriation is asked the government have to have in mind that hon. gentlemen on the other side will add all these sums together and will claim that our outlay, capital and consolidated, should be lumped together and that these large figures should be presented to the country as showing how extravagant and wasteful we are and how utterly indifferent to the adoption of economical methods.

Now we must have all these things present in our minds. My hon. friends, if they do not succeed in doing anything else, may succeed in alarming us by their strictures for making these large outlays. Now, having all these things in mind, seeing that we have done so well in the past, and that we are struggling along moderately well at present, I hope my hon. friends will not press us too strongly to make too large expenditures in the future. I shall be glad to see the work go on with the customary speed. When it is completed, I think that, though it may not in some respects fulfil all expectations which have been formed by some hon. gentlemen opposite, still I am satisfied that it will turn out to be useful, and will prove valuable to the locality through which it passes. I agree with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that a more attractive, a more charming section of the country for tourists could not possibly be found than that which will be traversed by this canal.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I hope the conscience of the Minister of Railways and Canals will not check him any more in any other expenditure he makes, than it does on this expenditure on that Trent canal.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Allow me to say, as one who visited the town of

Peterborough and vicinity last year, that I had occasion, with some of the citizens of the town, to examine the lift lock and to hear a great deal about this canal. From the information which I gathered I became convinced that the completion of this canal will not only be very useful to the locality through which it passes, but it is likely to become an important feeder to the trade of Montreal. Taking that view of it, I wish to say that so far as we are concerned in the east, we will be ready at any time to vote the necessary money for the completion of that great and important waterway. I am sorry to hear the Minister of Railways and Canals express so much fear of the criticism which might result from that expenditure. We are always ready to approve an expenditure of that kind made in a proper manner. During the election in Maisonneuve a short time ago, I heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tell us positively on many occasions that the whole question of transportation, to use his own expression, from the Yukon to the Atlantic Ocean, was going to be placed under his immediate control and taken out of the other departments. When I heard this declaration I felt the greatest confidence that the qualms of conscience which are moving the minister would not appear in the case of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who was then coming forward for election.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Perhaps it would be only right for me to say, in view of the fact that I have always opposed this work, that I have changed my mind since I have had an opportunity lately of examining a portion of the canal and ascertaining more about the local conditions, and the value of it, than I have heretofore known. My judgment of the canal now is that it will be a much more valuable highway of commerce than I was ever inclined to give it credit for. It is true that the depth is not great, and is not intended to be, when it is completed. That is the reason why I always supposed that it could not be much of a highway for the purpose of carrying through freight or grain. I still think that as a through line it will not be of any great use in carrying grain, for instance, to Montreal or other eastern markets, because I think that the transhipments in two different places will increase too much the cost of carriage, and it might be carried a much greater distance around without transshipment at about the same cost. But it will be a valuable highway of commerce, for the locality in bringing in grain which could not otherwise be brought in. I need only refer to the one industry at Peterborough, which is to my mind of great importance to the country, that is, the cereal food mill they have established there, and which is destined to use a large amount of grain when running to its fullest capacity, which it cannot do to-day on account of the inconvenience in bringing in grain. I was told by the manager of this mill that when running at its fullest capacity they would use 10,000,000 to 13,000,000 bushels of grain per year, and they could even increase it to 30,000,000 bushels of grain yearly if they had the convenience which they ought to have to bring in grain and tranship the products with the greatest facility and at the least cost. That is only one of many establishments along the route of that canal that would be served if the canal was finished, as it ought to be. Now the fact that Ontario does not supply the grain required for the needs of this establishment, a large portion of it must come from the North-west. As it comes down the lakes and reaches the nearest port on the lake, there is only one transhipment before it gets to the mill. At the mill it must be unloaded and manufactured there, and of course the products must be reloaded again. Whether the wheat is being converted into flour, or whether the wheat, oats or barley are being converted into the other cereal foods that the institution is intended to manufacture, the grain must come largely from the North-west. It has to be laid down there and manufactured and transhipped, and to do that cheaply this canal is very much required; and until it is finished these industries are much hampered in carrying on their important operations. I have always opposed it because of the heavy expenditure; but I believe there would be a compensation and a return for that expenditure. I believe the country would be amply justified in making the expenditure at an early date because we cannot get these industries established a moment too soon, otherwise trade will drift into other channels.

There is to my mind another important advantage which will accrue from the completion of that canal. All the heavy lines of goods, the metal lines, such as nails and machinery of every kind that are taken from Montreal westward, could be carried through that canal much cheaper than they could be carried by railway. The canal will not only be a valuable highway for the various towns along the route of the canal, and on the Georgian bay as well, but it will be a great aid in keeping down the freight rates of the railways. If it was built at the present time it would reduce the freight rates on the railways to those inland towns to a very large extent, and the saving upon the cost of freight would be an important item, not only to the people handling the goods and to those establishments that are manufacturing grain as well, but to the consumers in the locality where these goods must be used. Another respect in which I think it will be valuable is in that it furnishes us with an example of the utility of these lift locks. Although that may not be a new invention in Canada, it has

hitherto been an untried thing in Canada, and it seems to me that this lift-lock at Peterborough is going to solve many important canal questions for Canada. It seems to me that it will work all right and if you can lift a vessel forty-five feet you can just as well lift it sixty-five, or seventy feet. We ought to have it tried to ascertain whether it will do all we expect or not, so that we will know whether it can be used on other routes as well. For these reasons I am in favour of finishing that canal. I think the government would be amply justified in making the expenditure necessary to finish it and I for one feel that they would be doing a good work not only for the locality but for the country generally by the expenditure of money for the purpose of finishing it.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I regret very much if I went beyond the limits of fair criticism in speaking of Mr. Rogers' report. I had no intention of doing so, but I simply referred to it to compare his estimate with the different estimates contained in Mr. Rubidge's report which is the only one we can compare it with. Mr. Rubidge's report, as you well know, recommended a five foot canal and Mr. Rogers' report upon the Port Hope canal was for a six foot canal. That should be taken into consideration also. In so far as the large quantity of earth excavation is concerned which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) referred to—he lost sight of the fact that the greater part of that excavation was going through the height of land. It was not in taking out the earth for the locks, but the greater portion of it was going through the height of land. You must bear in mind also that Mr. Rogers estimated that the level of the land with the lake was 4½ miles from the lake instead of 2½ or 3 miles as in Mr. Maingy's report, and I know as a matter of fact, that the land dips from the level of the lake again about 3 miles from Rice lake. Therefore, I think there is some ground for the criticism I made. It is simply a matter of figures and I had no idea whatever of reflecting upon Mr. Rogers. In regard to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), he has presented the argument of the Peterborough people, the sole argument, I think, used by the opposition which has taken place since we have been advocating the Port Hope route. That is the open lake argument. Perhaps my hon. friend is not aware that from Cleveland, barges constantly go down to the mouth of the Erie canal at Buffalo, 100 miles, whereas, there is only open lake, as far as this end of the Trent valley canal is concerned, from Port Hope to the headland going through the entrance of the Murray canal, a distance of 26 miles.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would my hon. friend (Mr. Ward) allow me to say that I entered into no discussion whatever of the merits of the two routes.

Mr. WARD. Still, the hon. gentleman uses that argument. It is the stock argument of the opponents of the Port Hope route. The open lake should not make any great difference and for this reason: I have been informed by mariners who have been all their lives on Lake Ontario that they would very much prefer going down by the open lake from the outlet of the canal, to going down by way of the Bay of Quinté. That is a matter in regard to which I have been spoken to on several occasions by different captains of vessels. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has referred also to the deep waterway, and it seems to me that in view of the fact that at no very distant day Canada will require a deeper waterway than five or six feet, it will be well for the government before going on and filling these two gaps in the canal to consider whether it would not be wise to make the canal eight feet at once instead of six feet. In regard to that I have also the evidence of some shippers at Kingston, who tell me that the 8,000 bushel barges which would be the capacity of barges going through a five foot canal could not possibly go down the St. Lawrence and pay. They would have to tranship at Kingston in any event and the grain or whatever cargo they carried would have to be placed in larger barges. There is a freight rate of one and five-eighths cents a bushel from Kingston to Montreal and it would be very much cheaper to tranship at Kingston than to send these small barges down the St. Lawrence. If a deep waterway were constructed and vessels of the capacity of an eight foot canal were to go down it would be quite easy for these large barges to come from Kingston to Port Hope and tranship there; in fact, they could do that even if only 8,000 bushel barges were used. I do not think, therefore, that the open lake argument is one which can be used against the completion of the canal by way of Port Hope. I would therefore urge upon the hon. minister again that the matter of the water levels of the great lakes ought to be taken into consideration before anything is done and that the harbour of Trenton ought to be carefully surveyed so that it can be seen, whether, as a matter of fact, if the level of the water went down to the point reached in 1895, it would absolutely shut up the canal for the time during which the water remained at that level.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). Mr. Speaker, there does not appear to be any serious difference of opinion in regard to the advisability of the construction of this waterway. This is a matter which had its inception with the Conservative party in power before the present government

and it appears to be one that has received the approbation of the government of the day. It appears to me to be simply a question of the government of the day determining the route which this waterway should take. In the estimates which have been brought down before this House during the past few years there has been large sums appropriated for the construction of this canal work and as far as I have been able to ascertain that money has not been fully expended, although the government have, by bringing down these estimates, shown their appreciation of the importance of that work and have given evidence of their belief that it should be completed in the interests of the country. I found on my investigation of this question upon which I had occasion to speak a year ago, that in the years preceding the general elections for the House of Commons the appropriations for the completion of the Trent valley canal have been very materially increased. Perhaps it may not be out of place to say that this was done for a purpose. It does appear to me that in view of the fact that these appropriations were made at the particular time when a general election was just about to be held, it was done for the purpose of forwarding or improving the interests of the political party or of the government which was making these appropriations at the time.

I know whereof I speak, when I say that in my own riding the adoption of the line of the Trent valley canal as at first proposed, has been traded on not only in the last election, but in the previous election, for the purpose of securing support for the government candidates. In the west riding of Hastings, it was held forth as an inducement that the government intended to complete the Trent valley canal and to have its outlet at Trenton on the Bay of Quinté. However, Sir, in reply to a question which I put at the last session of this parliament, I was informed by the minister that the government had not yet determined whether the southern terminus of the canal should be upon the Bay of Quinté or upon Lake Ontario. Although appropriations were being asked from year to year for the ostensible purpose of completing this work, yet, strange to say, the government have not determined finally upon the route. That does not seem a businesslike way of conducting such an important work. While I do not wish to differ seriously from the arguments that have been advanced here, yet I do desire to point out the importance, in the interest of the country at large, of that canal being constructed according to its natural course, and having its outlet on the Bay of Quinté. That was the original design, and any arguments I have heard advanced have not convinced me that that design should be departed from. There is a serious objection to having the outlet of that canal on the open lake instead of on the Bay of Quinté, because should it open on the lake it will be subject to very great risk from storms, which risk would be avoided if it had its outlet on the Bay of Quinté. I strongly urge upon the government, that they should decide at once that the outlet should be on the bay and not on the lake. I need not say anything in addition to what has already been said as to the importance of this work. The action of both parties in this House in respect to that question precludes any discussion now. Its importance to the country at large has been generally conceded. I trust, Sir, that the conduct that has characterized this government during its regime will characterize it no longer in respect to the Trent canal, and that instead of putting sums in the estimates for its construction and allowing the work to drift along in a perfunctory manner, a little being done here and a little being done there ; the government, in the interest of the country, will determine at once where the outlet shall be, and then push the canal to completion in a businesslike manner.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Might I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) to what particular appropriation he refers.

Mr. PORTER. I cannot give you the exact figure, Sir, but in looking over the appropriations from year to year, I notice that $300,000 has been appropriated for the Trent valley canal, and that the expenditure has been far below that amount. It appears to me that if it were necessary to appropriate that amount, it should be necessary to expend it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Whether you could properly expend it or not.

Mr. PORTER. At all events, I find that in the year preceding a general election both the appropriation and the expenditure is largely increased, and that I complain of.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) is very anxious apparently that the canal should proceed slowly.

Mr. PORTER. I am very anxious to have the canal constructed, because I believe it to be a work of very great benefit to the country at large. I do not think it is of any advantage to this country to have the government trifling with this matter as they have been trifling with it. In conclusion, Sir, I again strongly urge upon the government the importance of determining at an early date, the route of this canal. And I trust that in the interest of the country they will see that it is completed as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—FREE TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. BELL moved for :

Return showing persons, not being members of the Senate or House of Commons, or members of a provincial government, or employees in the regular service of the Intercolonial Railway, to whom free transportation has been given over the Intercolonial for the years ending June 30, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I would be very glad to bring down the return asked for by the hon. gentleman so far as it is possible to do it. The custom in the department from time immemorial has been to destroy the passes down to the last year. I think probably the rule has continued, so that we should only be able to furnish those for the year 1902.

Mr. BELL. I should be satisfied if the minister brings down what he has.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may say to my hon. friend the returns for the previous years were uniformly brought down and handed to individual members who moved for them. They were not laid on the Table. I could give my hon. friend the names of one or two members to whom they were handed, if he wished to refer to them.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all correspondence which has taken place between the Dominion government, or any member thereof, and the government of Ontario, or any member thereof, regarding the proposed reduction in the representation of Ontario to this House, under the Redistribution Bill now before parliament.—Mr. Sproule.

Copies of all correspondence between the city of Vancouver and other persons, and the government of the Dominion, or any member thereof, relating to grant or lease of False creek.—Mr. Earle.

Return giving:—

(a) The names of those in the employ of the government of Canada who went to South Africa in any of the contingents, or the South African constabulary, classified by corps.

(b.) The names of those who received, in whole or in part, the pay of their office as servants of the government, in addition to their military pay, classified by corps.

(c.) The names of those who were restored to positions under the government upon their return from South Africa, classified by corps.

(d.) The names of those who were not reinstated in their former or any positions on returning to Canada ; with the reasons for such non-employment, classified by corps.

(e.) The names of those who have appealed to the government for reinstatement, and been refused re-employment ; with the reasons for such refusal.—Mr. Hughes (Victoria.)

Copy of the correspondence, reports, and any other documents, in the Department of Public Works, in respect of the claim of Amable Paradis, of Whitford, Alberta, for the services of a ferry boat and transportation upon the same.—Mr. LaRivière.

A list of all permanent and temporary officials of the several branches of the Department of the Interior ; date of appointment, and their salaries, on the first day of July, 1902. Also, a list of the permanent and temporary officials of the Indian branch of that department, on the 1st day of July, 1896. And also, on the same date in 1902 ; with same particulars as to date of appointment and salaries.—Mr. LaRivière.

Copies of all papers, Orders in Council, letters and correspondence, between the government, or any member thereof, in reference to land granted to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company ; and also, all letters, papers, correspondence, and Orders in Council, if any, with the Saskatchewan Land Company, in reference to their acquisition of the land granted to said Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company. And also, as to their acquisition of the even numbered sections within the territory granted to said railway company.—Mr. Roche (Marquette.)

Return showing the rates over the Intercolonial Railway for live stock, coal, lumber, and for freight under classes 1—10, between Stellarton and West River ; and between Stellarton and Antigonish, and between Stellarton and Pictou Landing, at present in force. Also, showing rates for same classes between same points in 1897.—Mr. Bell.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

STANDARD MILK CAN.

Mr. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL (West York) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 20) to amend the Weights and Measures Act. He said : The object of this Bill is to provide an authorized can for the sale of milk in the towns and cities throughout the Dominion. As is well known milk is sold by the can throughout the Dominion. In Ontario, it is an understood rule that eight gallons should constitute a can of milk, and the custom has been for the farmers to contract with the dealers in the cities or towns for one, two or three cans as they may be able to supply. The dealers, as a rule, furnish the cans, and, as there is no law to define how many gallons a can of milk shall hold, it has become a practice to make the cans a little larger and a little larger, until, at the present time, there are hardly any cans in use in Ontario that hold less than from eight and a half to nine gallons. The farmers are obliged to fill the cans, otherwise they will be docked. Thus you will see that the farmers are furnishing from one-half to two-thirds of a gallon of milk for every can more than they should and more than they get paid for. This may seem a small thing, but when you recollect that, in Toronto alone, it is estimated that three thousand

cans of milk are brought in every day, this extra quantity of from one-half to two-thirds of a gallon becomes a serious thing indeed for the farmer. They have complained a good while about this injustice, but without steps having been taken to remove the grievance. Last session, I had the honour of introducing a Bill upon the subject, but it was too late and could not go through that session. So, I have reintroduced the measure this year. This Bill does no injustice to anybody. It does not interfere with the present cans or with any cans. One may make cans to hold eight or ten gallons or any quantity he likes; all that the Bill provides is that when a farmer sells a can of milk it shall mean that he sells eight gallons. In the province of Quebec this Bill has met with great favour also. I have a letter from Mr. Robert Ness, President of the Milk Shippers' Association. He says :

Howick, April 2, 1903.

Archibald Campbell, Esq., M.P.

Dear Sir,—Your favour of 1st duly received and noted. I am very pleased to see you have taken up this question. Our people have spoken quite often of the tendency of the milk vendors to increase the size of the can. Some of them have even refused taking it if the can is not filled. In most cases the can holds more than the measure. I am certain the association of which I have the honour to be president will heartily approve of your Bill on every point. I hope you will succeed in getting it made law. If we agree to supply so many gallons of milk, the right measure is all that should be required. If we can assist you in any way don't be backward in asking us. Thanking you for favour.

I am yours,

ROBERT NESS,

President Milk Shippers' Association,

Montreal, Que.

I sent Mr. Ness a copy of the Bill and asked him for his approval. I am sure that this is a Bill that should receive no opposition, for it only provides in the case of milk what is provided in the case of other commodities. In every other commodity, parliament has settled what shall be meant by certain terms. For instance, if you sell a man a bag of potatoes, the law says that ninety pounds must be furnished. I see that in the province of Quebec, if you sell a bundle of hay or straw, timothy hay or clover hay, the law says how many pounds shall be in the bundle. If you sell a barrel of flour or a barrel of salt, or a bushel of wheat, or oats, or barley, or peas, the law says just how many pounds you shall furnish. Here is a commodity that has been sold for many years, the sale of which is a matter of great interest to the farmers, not only in the province of Ontario, but in every other province, but there is no law to determine what the measure shall be. So I hope the Bill will meet with the approval of the House. The Bill is very brief. The first section provides :

When milk is sold by the can, the can shall be considered as equivalent to eight gallons, and the half can to four gallons.

This does not interfere with the package at all. As I say, the can may be made to hold any quantity. The Bill merely provides that when a man has contracted to deliver a can of milk, the delivery of eight gallons shall fill that contract, or, half a can, four gallons. The second section reads :

Milk cans shall, when presented for verification to any inspector of weights and measures, be inspected and stamped with their capacity as then determined.

And, for this there is a fee, provided for as follows :

The Governor in Council may make a tariff of fees to be paid for inspecting and stamping milk cans, but the said fees shall not exceed one and one-half cent per gallon.

I move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I would inquire of the Minister of Inland Revenue, (Hon. Mr. Bernier) before I speak on this Bill, if the government intend to take this matter up. I understood the hon. minister intended to look into this Bill and see what had better be done.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). As I understand the Bill, it is proposed as an amendment to the Weights and Measures Act. It has no reference to the affairs under my department, unless parliament designs to adopt a new standard. This Bill provides that when milk shall be sold by the can, the can shall be considered as equivalent to eight gallons, and half a can to four gallons. The law now recognizes as measures of capacity the following : Bushel, half-bushel, peck, gallon, half-gallon, quart, pint, half-pint, gill, and half-gill. The Bill proposes to add another measure which shall be equivalent to eight gallons. That is to say a certain can shall be manufactured supposed to contain eight gallons, or half a can four gallons. I wonder how that plan will work unless the vendor and purchaser agree to accept these measures. The Bill, as I read it, does not make that can a standard measure, but a substitute for it. Under these circumstances, I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) will reach his object unless parliament creates a new standard. If that new standard is created, all my department will have to do will be to inspect the new measures of capacity. I have considered, as I have already informed my hon. friend, that this Bill relates to matters coming within the scope of the Department of Trade and Commerce, and I will ask him to wait until the Minister of that department (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is present.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). If it is the intention to hold the Bill over I will wait until it comes up for discussion. I presume my hon. friend will be willing to

have it lay over at the request of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This is the last day we may reach it. If we do not go on with it now, we may as well throw it up for the session. If there are any objections, I think we might hear them now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). If the Bill is laid over at the request of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Inland Revenue, owing to the absence of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the government will be obliged to facilitate this discussion later on. It would not be fair to cause it to be laid aside and then shut it out at a later day.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Since the Bill is before the House, it may be as well for us to consider its effects now, even though it may come up again at a later day. I quite approve of fixing a standard for milk cans. That has been a live question within a radius of Toronto for a number of years, but I am at a loss to interpret the present Bill, and fear that a good deal of trouble might follow, if adopted in its present form. The clause reads :

When milk is sold by the can, the can shall be considered as equivalent to eight gallons and the half can to four gallons.

As I understand this clause, it can make no difference how much milk there is in the can. Whether it contains seven or nine gallons, it is to be considered as equivalent to eight gallons.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The number of gallons will be eight. It would not be a can if it contained anything less.

Mr. HENDERSON. I fail to see that the Bill states positively that the can must contain eight gallons, neither more nor less. No matter how much milk there may be in the can when delivered by the farmer to the dealer, it is to be considered as equivalent to eight gallons, even though the can should contain seven gallons or nine gallons. It seems to me that the Bill is badly worded, and that some change should be made in the wording in order to prevent the possibility of misunderstanding. I do not wish to oppose this Bill, because I think it is of a kind that is called for, and attempts along this line have been made in past years to secure legislation of this character. But if we are to pass legislation at all, we should make it so definite as to avoid any possibility of dispute. In the second clause there is no light thrown upon the first, because under it a can of any size could be inspected and stamped by the inspector of weights and measures. The second clause reads :

Milk cans shall, when presented for verification to any inspector of weights and measures, be inspected and stamped with their capacity as then determined.

A can may be inspected as containing nine gallons or seven gallons. If inspected as a seven gallon can, the purchaser knows that it cannot contain more than seven gallons, but it may contain less, so that there is no protection to the purchaser. It will be necessary to have a standard can to which, after a lapse of two years, all cans should conform. At present the milk cans are of varied capacity. Some are seven gallon cans and some are eight and more than eight. If the hon. gentleman would provide that after a certain time, sufficient for the present cans to be worn out, only cans of a fixed capacity of eight gallons could be used, this Bill would be more effective. There would then be no dispute possible, as the can would be a standard measure, just the same as a gallon or a half gallon or a quart measure. I do not make these observations for the purpose in any way of hindering the passage of a Bill of this kind, because I know that my own constituents are interested in having such a measure become law, but I would like to have the Bill passed in such a way as to avoid dispute.

Mr. KEMP. I have had several letters from different parties asking me to find out whether this Bill is going to be endorsed by the government, or be withdrawn, so that they might know whether it will be necessary for them to come to Ottawa to protest against it. The size of the milk cans now in use vary from two to forty gallons ; and while some of the milk in the country is sold by gallon, the greater portion of it is sold by weight. To the cheese and butter factories it is sold by weight. Those who have spoken to me in opposition to the Bill say that they are willing that a law should be passed providing that the milk be sold by weight, but they protest very strongly against this measure. I hope the hon. gentleman will be willing to let the Bill lay over until the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has heard these deputations, because a great deal of money has been invested in all these various sized vessels for conveying milk. If a standard can should be adopted that would cause great loss to those who own the cans now in use. In 1892 a measure of this kind was adopted and in 1898 it was cancelled, and a new regulation put into effect. That regulation I have before me. The Minister of Inland Revenue has read from that regulation the standards used for measuring all kinds of liquors. The intention of this Bill is to make another standard, and is impracticable. These cans are carried into the cities by railways and wagons, and after the first trip or two they become indented and their capacity is less. That portion of the present law which was read by the Minister of Inland Revenue provides that :

No measure of capacity, of which the sides or bottoms are indented, battered or knocked out of regular form, will be admitted to verification.

Therefore, if these cans were taken to the inspector to be verified, after they had become dinged, he would refuse to verify them. In other words, the standards of the country are not to be used for the purpose of conveying commodities, they are to be used in the most careful manner. A man having a measure is supposed to take the greatest care of it and put it in a place where it will not be dinged or indented, in consequence of which the capacity of that measure might become impaired. I think it is impossible to use a measure of this kind for the purpose of conveying any commodity. But if it is absolutely necessary to make a law regulating the sale of all milk, let the law be made to sell it by weight, as is already done in many parts of the country. At any rate, I want to say to the Minister of Inland Revenue that I fully expected an opportunity would be afforded whereby I might be able to notify those who have been opposing the Bill of a date upon which they could wait upon the minister in regard to this matter. Another objection to the Bill is made on account of the excessive fees which would be charged for verification, sixteen cents on every can, and that sixteen cents would be good only so long as the can remained undinted and in its original shape. As I said before, if this Bill becomes law it will cause great loss to those who own cans. One of the largest dealers in milk in Toronto at the present time, who handles one-sixth of the whole product in the city of Toronto, buys its milk by weight, and does not depend altogether upon the size of the can. The seller of milk knows exactly what he is going to get for a certain weight of milk. A gallon of milk, as we know weighs ten pounds, eighty pounds of milk would be eight gallons. There is a measure now recognized on the statute-book, that is called a bushel measure, which contains eight gallons. I trust that the hon. gentleman will yield to the wishes of the Minister of Inland Revenue and leave this matter over until we have more time to consider it.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not see why there should be any urgent need for the Bill at all. It seems to me that we are better off now than we would be if the Bill passed. In the event of this Bill becoming law, you would only have two sizes of cans. Now the quantity of milk that a farmer can furnish from day to day varies a good deal. He must either send cans partly filled, or else have more than one can. Why not be able to use any sized can you like, and sell your milk by the gallon? Let the buyers offer to purchase as they like. The farmer is not obliged to sell execpt by the gallon or as he agrees to. The standard is a gallon, then why not use the standard we have? There is no farmer who has a number of cans but will find that the quantity of milk he has to sell varies from day to day, scarcely two days alike, owing to the different kinds of food he gives his cattle, and the many other causes that affect the milk supply. Many farmers always send what they can spare, as many gallons as they can spare. There would be no objection to have all the cans stamped with their capacity, an eight gallon can stamped as a measure that will hold eight gallons, and a four gallon can stamped as a measure that will hold four gallons, and so on. In selling milk by gallons, there can be no injustice done to either the farmer or the purchaser. When that is done, the farmer can use the can that is most convenient for him to use according to the supply of milk he has on hand. On the other hand, if you adopt the other standard of selling milk by the pound, that is perfectly fair to both the buyer and the seller. In that event, there is no need of having any provision as to the size of the can at all; use any can you like, you are selling the milk at so much a pound, the farmer is paid for the number of pounds he delivers, and no more. It seems to me that no farmer can be injured in that way, and the purchaser always knows what he is getting, and what he is paying for. I think we would only be increasing the evil by making another standard, and we would be increasing the inconvenience to the farmer whose quantity of milk that he has to sell varies so much from day to day.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). I was going to say to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) who introduced this Bill, that I would like him to look after the interest of the consumer of milk. This Bill is evidently intended to apply to the seller of milk who sells in large quantities, and to the purchaser of large quantities, or to the consumer who purchases his milk by the can. In our town, and I presume it is the same all over, the milk vendors sell milk by the can or the quart, they deliver a quart can at your door every morning.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We don't interfere with that at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly, but when the milk is sold by the can the can must be considered an equivalent to eight gallons. Where will my hon. friend provide a can that is equivalent to a quart or two quarts? That is like what he wanted to do to help the market gardeners; it is merely to make the milk vendors believe that he is going to do something for them. As the Minister of Inland Revenue stated a few moments ago, we have a standard to-day fixing what a can should be. Now a farmer in the country sends in his can of milk to the retailer, who sells to the consumer by the gallon, or by the pound, if he chooses to make a bargain to do so. But he cannot say, this can contains ten gallons, or fifteen gallons, he says: The can contains so much. If the purchaser, when he comes to

measure out that can of milk, finds that it does not contain the quantity the farmer sold it for, the latter is liable to a penalty by the old Act. Every person who sells a less quantity than the Act provides for is liable to punishment. Therefore I see no necessity for this Bill at all. It will work injuriously to the seller and the consumer placed on the government orders. I want to ask the Minister of Finance a question, that is drawn out by the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill. The Minister of Inland Revenue asked that the Bill might lie over until the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in whose department this Bill belongs, would be present. The hon. member who has charge of this Bill says this is the last day that we will have an opportunity of dealing with public bills and orders.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It might be.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the Minister of Finance said that on account of the government asking that this Bill should lie over, they would see that an opportunity was given to have it brought up, or perhaps placed on the government Orders. I want to ask the Minister of Finance in what position that arrangement will place these Bills that are not printed. I see here a Bill introduced by the hon. member for St. Lawrence, Montreal, (Mr. Bickerdike) in reference to cigarettes, which is not yet printed in English or French. That Bill has not been printed and as this is likely to be the last day for the consideration of public Bills and Orders and as that Bill is nearly at the bottom of the Order Paper it is very liable not to be heard this session if it is not taken under the government's wing. This being the case is it the intention of the government to place the Bill of the hon. member for Montreal (St. Antoine) amongst government orders ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is hardly correct in stating that this is the last day for the consideration of Public Bills and Orders. It may be that Mondays may be taken, but it has not yet been determined upon, and if there are a number of Bills on the Order Paper which have not then been reached that would be a very fair reason why the government should not take Mondays. I think the hon. gentleman may very well assume that there will be another opportunity of dealing with those Bills which are on the Order Paper.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to know whether or not it would better serve the interests of the milk trade that a further provision such as my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) points to in this Bill should be adopted. However, it does appear to me to be somewhat difficult to set up a standard. If you are going to establish a new standard it must be a standard which will have a distinct name, and call for a distinct quality. As to whether this is feasible or not, I think the question is of such intricacy that it is one upon which the proper officers of the proper department might very well decide before my hon. friend presses this Bill for further consideration. We would scarcely be in a position to-night to make much progress with a Bill as it stands at present. Then, if it is desirable that a standard measure, to be called a can, shall be legalized, I would take it that my hon. friend would need to change very materially the phraseology of the Bill, because, I quite agree with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) when he criticised the language of the first clause and pointed out that the use of the words which says that a can shall be equivalent to eight gallons is something which is altogether too vague and indefinite to mean anything, such as parliament could intend that it means, or such as would be at all operative. To say that it shall be considered equivalent to a certain quantity is not certainly providing that it shall actually contain that quantity. It may be alleged to be a statutory declaration but as long as you have a can and that can shall be equivalent to eight gallons you can sell whatever you can get a person to take from you. At all exents, I think the Bill should be closely looked into from the professional, ministerial and legal standpoints.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word in reference to this Bill. I think it is a very desirable thing that something of this kind should be passed. In reference to the remarks from my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), I just wish to say this : He says that he is afraid that a large number of cans which carry milk to creameries and cheese factories would become useless because they would not hold the exact amount of eight gallons. I would just like to say that cheese factories and creamaries do not buy milk. They take the milk from the farmers and make it up into cheese and butter for so much a pound. Here is another point in connection with the transportation of cream and milk on the railways. This matter came up at our board meeting on Friday last. We had quotations from the express company stating that they would take an eight gallon can a certain distance for so much. But in every case they wished it to be distinctly understood that these cans should hold eight gallons, no more, no less. If we had a law passed whereby one of these cans would be measured and stamped so that we would know that it held exactly eight gallons we would get over one of those difficulties that we have in connection with the express companies and railway companies in carrying our cream to the factories. There is another class of dealers who retail milk in cities and towns. They buy

their milk at so much a can. It is a question very frequently whether the can holds eight gallons or not. Sometimes it does and sometimes it does not. They would like to have the can stamped so that they would know when they buy a can of milk they buy a certain quantity. I think this Bill is a good measure, and as to the statement that cans might become useless if it passed, I think there is no difficulty in that respect. I do not think there is anything in that at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to allow this Bill to stand until the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is present. I may say that we are not in this Bill establishing a new term. Some hon. members think that we are establishing a new term, the fact is that milk is sold now by the can. Three thousand cans a day come into the city of Toronto alone. What is a can of milk? Can anybody tell? Is there anything on the statute-book to tell how much a can contains—whether it is four, or six or ten gallons? Nothing at all. This Bill may possibly have been a little more clearly worded, but the idea is a good one. It is to determine, when a man buys a can of milk, how much he has to get. The farmers are losing on every can of milk they sell in Toronto and Montreal from one-half, to two-thirds of a gallon. This may be a simple thing for some people but it is an important thing for the farmers of York, Peel, Halton and all around the city of Toronto. I am surprised that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has raised objections to this Bill, when I consider the number of milk cans that come in from this county. The farmers of this county want this Bill to become law. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) I am sure, is in favour of this Bill because his constituents are largely interested in it and it will do no harm. The Bill simply determines what must be the quantity which a man must deliver when he sells a can of milk. If a can holds ten gallons, there is a can and one-fourth, if it holds nine gallons, a can and an eighth, if it holds seven gallons, seven-eighths of a can. There might only be four gallons, and if so, there is a gallon measure established by the department and you can easily determine whether there are four or five gallons in the can.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of providing another standard measure? Why is it not just as well to say seven gallons to seven-eighths of a can?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Seven gallons?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says that if a can holds seven gallons it will be the equivalent of seven-eights of a can.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They are now using the can as a measure.

Mr. SPROULE. There is nothing to compel the farmer to sell by the can.

Mr. COCHRANE. How are the farmers losing.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Because the dealers make the can, and they make it to contain eight and a half gallons and sometimes more, and the farmer loses half a gallon on each can. I do not wonder at the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) being opposed to this Bill because the milk dealers in his constituency are up in arms against it. They are getting an extra half gallon on every can without paying for it. I am speaking for the farmers who sell the milk, and I say they should not be obliged to furnish any more milk than they are paid for.

Mr. E. COCHRANE (East Northumberland). If I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) aright the farmers up in his section of the country do not know when they get a can whether it contains eight gallons or eight gallons and a half. They must be as simple as they were when they voted for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) under the supposition that he was a protectionist. The man that is silly enough to order an eight gallon can and to take a can that contains eight gallons and a half deserves to be fooled. But what can be said of the hon. gentleman's electors when they were fooled into voting for him as a protectionist, and now he comes down here with his soul overburdened for the farmers interests and every time he gets a chance to vote for protection he votes against it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to make a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Campbell) expresses surprise that I should oppose this Bill. I wish to state that I emphatically declare that I do not want to oppose the Bill. He simply put that language into my mouth. I was not opposing the Bill by any means; I was simply endeavournig to get it into proper shape.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I am in favour of some change in the law as it now stands in respect to the sale of milk. In the county I have the honour to represent there is very general complaint that the farmers are not properly treated by those who purchase the milk in the large cities. I think, however, that the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) has not been careful enough in the preparation of his Bill. The Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) gave him a very heavy rebuke when he told the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) that his Bill was open to very grave objection, and so I will reserve my remarks until the Bill comes before the House in proper shape. In the meantime I would suggest to the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) that he should consult with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) so that he may draw up a proper Bill,

because I believe that this is a matter that should engage the serious attention of the government. There has been very great complaint for many years, especially in the neighbourhood of Toronto, and it is my opinion that parliament should take means to protect the honest farmer who is every day selling very large quantities of milk in the centres of population.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know enough of the particular circumstances of the case to express an opinion as to whether or not it is necessary to have a further standard of quantity. To judge from the speeches of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) he is seeking to establish a new standard of quantity for the sale of milk, but his Bill does not at all make provision for that. If he means what he says, then the language of his Bill falls very far short of its object. The objection taken by the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Railways and Canals is well founded in that respect. I thought the hon. gentleman was not going to permit milk to be sold except in eight gallon cans, but apparently he does not intend that, although the Bill sounds as much like that as it does anything else. Assuming that the principle of the Bill is good, my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) will have to reconsider the wording of it very carefully, because in its present shape it would leave the law in a very much worse state than at present.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

LOAN COMPANIES—EXTENSION OF POWERS.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Mr. Speaker. During my absence from the House for a moment, a Bill standing in my name was called, and with the consent of the House I would like it to be taken up again. I refer to Bill (No. 24) entitled an Act to extend the Power of Loan Companies. It was threshed out in the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and there was no objection taken to it. I wish to have the Bill considered in committee and read a third time.

Mr. SPEAKER. With the consent of the House that may be done.

House went into Committee on the Bill.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That section seems to go pretty far. I suppose it has been fully considered by the Committee on Banking and Commerce ; but suppose, for example, that a loan company wishes to invest in the stock of a mining company, it might be a pretty speculative matter. The only pre-requisite imposed by this Bill is that the mining company should be one incorporated by the parliament of Canada. I may say that I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, but I must acknowledge my fault in not being present when this Bill was considered.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). I may explain to my hon. friend that this clause is exactly the same as what appears in the General Loan Companies Act of 1899, with the exception that the word 'future' has been inserted to make it applicable to future provinces that come into the confederation, as well as to existing provinces. It is not extending the powers of loan companies at all, but is giving them the same powers that companies incorporated under the Act of 1899 enjoy, nothing more nor less.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it is a bad provision, the fact that other companies have the right to do the same thing does not make it any better. That might be a good reason for amending the Act to which my hon. friend has referred by limiting the powers of these companies. I would like to know how it strikes my hon. friend the Finance Minister. These loan companies are regarded as pretty safe investments for the estates of people who desire to be very secure ; and yet this provision gives them a very wide scope for the investment of their funds, and possibly parliament may have gone a little further in the Act to which my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) refers than it should have gone.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The question has been very fully considered in times past, and I think the legislation adopted in the General Loan Companies' Act was regarded on the whole as safe. When the effect of this Bill is simply to bring the companies of earlier incorporation under the same standard as those incorporated later, I do not see how we can refuse it. Whether, speaking generally, we have made the powers of loan companies too broad, is a fair subject for consideration ; but I do not think we should be doing wrong by putting all the companies on the same footing.

Mr. HEYD. Does this apply to companies operating under a provincial charter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. I think the company referred to was operating under a Dominion charter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We know there have been mining stocks in Canada which have dropped from 350 down to 12 in the space of a few months. If one of these companies happens to have been incorporated under an Act of the parliament of Canada, this provision would permit a loan company to invest in it. I do not think that advisable, even if we have passed legislation to that effect. However, the government is responsible for this legislation, and I bring my objection now to the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance, protesting, as far as I am concerned, that I do not think it

desirable to give a loan company the wide powers conferred on it by this section.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that when the Act was before the committee a number of members opposed it strongly. Personally, I held the same view then that I hold to-day, that we were giving too wide powers to these companies. It was said that if we gave these wide powers to them other companies which had not equal powers would come and claim the right to have them; and this is just what has happened. I agree with every word that has been said by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Borden, Halifax), that we are giving powers that are altogether too wide.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am rather glad to find that view prevailing, because I admit that the tendency of our legislation in this House is to be rather too liberal to the companies that come before us. I would rather see their powers somewhat restricted instead of being extended. Now that the matter has been brought to my attention, I will have it looked into; but in the meantime, I think we should give the same powers to one company that we have given to others, and, if there is to be a change, let the change apply to all.

Bill reported.

SUPREME COURT—AMENDMENTS.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville) (Translation) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 22) to amend the Supreme Court and Exchequer Court Acts.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is incumbent on me to reassure this House. The judiciary is part and parcel of our body politic. To seek its overthrow, would be to shake the very foundation on which the state rests. On the contrary, to work towards its betterment and improvement is, to my mind, the part of good citizenship.

The uninitiated who witness the glorious uncertainty of the law, the endless conflicts going on among the courts and often among the judges of the same court, may be tempted to take the view that the best judgment is the quickest and that courts of appeal should be dispensed with. That is a serious mistake. Courts are apt to err in rendering hasty judgments, and that in itself is sufficient reason for having courts of appeal. Hence, to the question: What are the courts whose judgments should be final, Bentham unhesitatingly answers: None. But, if courts of appeal are a necessity, it does not follow that they may not become too numerous.

In a country like ours, where all members of the bar take up the same studies, where the skill and experience required by the judges in the various courts are similar, it cannot be argued with seriousness that the judges of courts of appeal, whatever be their jurisdiction, are necessarily superior in knowledge to the judges of the superior courts.

If the former are called upon to revise the judgments rendered by the latter, it is solely for the purpose of avoiding mistakes due to hasty decisions. That is all, so far as clear cases are concerned. As regards doubtful ones, they cannot be ended too soon in the interest of the parties. That is a safe rule, to my mind, when private interests only are at stake. The question is a different one if you are dealing with the political and commercial interests of the country. The uniformity of the laws in this connection could not be imperilled without causing an injury to the people as a whole.

My conclusion, then, is that in the case of laws concerning the whole empire, the final decisions, from the nature of things, should rest with the highest tribunal of the empire; in the case of laws interesting Canada only, the decision of our Supreme Court should be final; and when the citizens of one province only are concerned, the courts in that province should be left to deal with the case. In questions of law, as in matters of ethics, interest is the measure of actions. In cases where the Privy Council has been called upon to give its interpretation of the British North America Act, 1867, or of some of the Imperial Acts, its jurisdiction was always looked to with respect and favour by all classes. The provinces will not forget that the Privy Council has at all times shown itself the custodian of their rights, and it would be a great mistake on their part to endeavour to escape its jurisdiction.

But to call upon that tribunal to settle a petty dispute over a party wall, is dragging it out of its proper realm and lowering its prestige. The needy litigant who is forced to appear before these far-away courts, rightly wonders at it, and the public mind is disturbed, as it was in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company *vs.* Roy. This morning's papers reproduce an article from a paper in London, going to say that the organization of the Privy Council as regards colonial matters is faulty and should be modified. That view is not a new one. Here is what Lord Brougham said as early as 1828, regarding the Privy Council:

> It is obvious that from the mere distance of those colonies and the immense variety of matters arising in them, foreign to our habits, and beyond the scope of our knowledge, any judicial tribunal in this country must, of necessity, be an extremely inadequate court of review.

These remarks are applicable equally well to the Supreme Court. If after twenty-seven years' experience, I make bold to propose that the constitution of that court be amended, it goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is for me to prove that it has not come up to the expectations of its promoters. I shall do so with all the respect due to the powers that be, but at the same time with the freedom inspired by a strong belief.

Far from me the thought of dragging into this debate the distinguished members of the judiciary. Some papers have in this respect committed excesses which the public conscience condemns.

My indictment will be short. I charge the Supreme Court of Canada with having failed to secure the confidence of the country.

Last year, 'La Patrie,' one of the important papers supporting the government at the time, stated: 'The Supreme Court, from the start, was unpopular in all the provinces.' For the last ten years, at almost every session of parliament, its abolition was sought, and one of the present judges, taking the moderate view which I now take, moved in 1881, to have its constitution amended.

The Supreme Court, as we know, was established in 1875. Although it was a government measure, several supporters of the party in power, considered themselves bound in duty to vote against the Act, particularly Mr. Béchard and Mr. Bourassa, both representatives of the counties which I now represent. In 1881, Mr. Girouard, who is to-day one of the judges of that court, introduced a Bill to restrict the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

That same year, Mr. Landry, now a member of the Senate, introduced a Bill for the abolition of the Supreme Court. And in 1881, Sir John Macdonald said:

Are we to appoint a certain number of judges *ad hoc*, taken from the judiciary or the bar of Canada, to complete the personnel of that tribunal, when cases from the province of Quebec have to be adjudicated on, or are we to adopt some other means ? I would not like to say, and if the Supreme Court is to be upheld, we shall have to find a solution that will do away with the dissatisfaction that prevails, at all events, among the French Canadians of Lower Canada.

In 1882, Sir Alexander Campbell introduced in the Senate a Bill to amend the constitution of the Supreme Court. Not only did the French speaking population find fault with that court, but the English speaking people as well were dissatisfied with it. Let me quote from the 'Legal News,' the organ of the English speaking lawyers. At page 140 of Vol. I., we read :

1 L. N., p. 140. The Supreme Court at present is looked upon with great distrust.

2 L. N., p. 161. This is saying nothing new to lawyers in this province, for it has long been evident that some of them, as well as their clients, are unwilling to take any case to Ottawa which can possibly be carried to England. The reason for this state of things is to be found in the dissimilarity of the law in the different provinces from which the judges have been taken, and the fact that the cases from this province are generally supposed to be left chiefly to the two members who were appointed from the bench and bar of Quebec.

4. L.N., p. 74. The dissatisfaction of Ontario and Quebec has manifested itself with considerable violence and some reason.

The province of Quebec was not the only one to complain. The province of Ontario took the same position from the beginning, and up to this day, complaints have not varied. I may be permitted to quote the following extracts from the Canada Law Journal, the great law periodical of Ontario. Canada Law Journal, 1879 :

The profession, as a whole, have not that confidence in it which should appertain to a court of final resort ; for example, there is hardly a lawyer, in this province at least, who would not, on a question of Ontario law, prefer the opinion of our Court of Appeal, or even of one of our Superior Courts. . . . It is also manifest, that the court, so far, has been a disappointment.

Canada Law Journal, 1880 :

There are some who think the best way to improve the Supreme Court would be to improve it off of the face of the earth. We trust some less heroic remedy may be found, though the court certainly has, both collectively and through some of its members, on several occasions and in various unnecessary ways, endeavoured to commit suicide.

Canada Law Journal, 1882 :

The court has so far been a failure, partly owing to the inherent difficulties of our confederation, partly to the fact that the best talent has not always for some reason or other been taken advantage of, and partly owing to the difficulties and infirmities of a personal nature which we do not care to enlarge upon.

Canada Law Journal, 1892 :

The court has not in the past commanded the confidence of the public to the extent that the court of final resort for the Dominion should.

Canada Law Journal, 1895 :

May we be forgiven for venturing to suggest that the opinion of the profession is that, though the Supreme Court contains much valuable judicial material, it is not the strongest, does not command the greatest confidence.

Canada Law Journal, 1896, p. 646 :

This court has long lacked the confidence of the bar, both in the English-speaking provinces and in Quebec.

Canada Law Journal, 1902, p. 63 :

Speaking generally, parties do not go to the Supreme Court because they expect more careful consideration or better exposition of the law, but rather on the off chance of a reversal by another set of judges, gambling on the uncertainty of the law. Let it be remembered, however, that in the Supreme Court there are never more than two judges from any one province. To these two, or perhaps to one of them, is often in effect left the criticism of three, four or five judgments of men of at least equal attainments, and having special knowledge of the law affecting their various provinces. Is it likely that a reversal under such conditions would be considered a satisfactory adjudication ?

From the same periodical, same year, p. 178 :

We have not said and do not mean that the Supreme Court has not occasionally laid down the law more correctly than the courts referred to, but we repeat what we have already said,

that, speaking generally, the appellate courts in the various provinces stand higher in the estimation of their bars than does the Supreme Court of Canada. For example, what professional man can be found in Ontario who would prefer the opinion of the men composing the Supreme Court Bench to those now sitting in the Court of Appeal at Osgoode Hall.

Lord Dufferin, at the time our Supreme Court was established, referring to the Supreme Court of the United States, said :

Witness the respect and deference with which the chief court of the United States is quoted by British and European jurists.

The Supreme Court of Canada, on the contrary, continues to be looked upon, as stated by the Legal News, 'with great distrust.' Are we going to perpetuate this state of things ? Yes, if we persist in closing our eyes to the cause of the evil. This is to be found either in the inherent constitution of the body or in its constituent parts. I am aware that the judges of that court have often been attacked. But to my mind, Mr. Speaker, nothing is more unfair. The proof is this : The judges of that court have been chosen from among men who had previously distinguished themselves. To refer only to the province of Quebec, did any one ever doubt of the attainments of the Hon. Mr. Fournier, Minister of Justice, or of the Hon. Mr. Justice Taschereau, who is one of a family of jurists and who has written highly esteemed works, or of the Hon. Mr. Justice Girouard, who had an extensive practice in commercial matters, and has made a reputation for himself through his legal writings ? Besides, to my mind, a peremptory argument is the following : the original members have been replaced and the body is still diseased. The ailment is therefore a constitutional one. The jurisdiction of the court in provincial matters is unwarranted. The right of the Supreme Court to deal with provincial matters is doubtful, if we consider only the wording of the law ; it is more so, if we take into account the spirit of the constitution. But there cannot be any doubt left if we look at it from the point of view of common sense : this does away with it entirely.

Section 101 of our Constitution reads as follows :

The parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, from time to time, provide for the constitution, maintenance and organization of a general court of appeal, and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada.

Do the words 'for the better administration of the laws of Canada' apply to the whole sentence ; that is the vexed point, Mr. Speaker. The section itself would lead us to doubt it.

True, the Supreme Court has decided this point in its favour in a case of the Saint Jean Baptiste Association vs. Brault, in which my colleague the hon. member for Ottawa appeared. But a judge should not be expected to decide against himself in his own case. The court by that judgment maintained its jurisdiction in matters of civil law ; but what it was not in its power to do—what it is in the power of no tribunal to do—was to dispel the doubt existing in the minds of the people. We are familiar with that ancient custom whereby sovereigns attempted to establish their right to the throne by having the lords of the land to take the oath of allegiance. But that would not prevent the people from being in doubt. Opinion persists in spite of edicts.

Now, if it was in order for two of the present judges, when members of this House, one in 1875, the other in 1881, to state their belief that this court was exercising usurped powers, I should be permitted in 1902 to entertain some doubt on the matter.

But when I take into account the spirit of our constitution, which has for its mainstay provincial autonomy, my doubts are greatly strengthened ; and they materialize in the form of the following agreement, which, I think, will have some weight.

The legislative and the judiciary powers are correlated. There is no judiciary power that does not rest on legislative authority ; and no legislative authority that is not sanctioned by the judiciary power. Then, section 92 of the British North American Act enacts that in certain matters the legislative power will be vested exclusively in the provinces. Does that not signify that the judiciary power will be, as well.

But in one respect there cannot be any doubt ; it is this : the constitution of that court is repugnant to reason.

On that point I could not do better than to quote the opinion expressed by Mr. McCuaig, in the Hansard of 1881 : Mr. McCuaig said :

The opinion entertained by the majority of the inhabitants of the county I represent is this : We have a Supreme Court composed of six men, two from Ontario, two from Quebec, and two from the maritime provinces. As I understand the matter, the two judges from Ontario are not at all familiar with the laws of Quebec, while the two judges from the maritime provinces are not familiar with the laws of either Ontario or Quebec. Now, in Ontario we have an Appeal Court, composed of four judges of high legal attainments and well qualified to decide finally upon most every case that comes before them. But a case taken from our Court of Appeal, presided over by four of the best judges of Ontario, may be taken to the Supreme Court, and their judgment overruled by the four judges from Quebec and the maritime provinces, not at all familiar with our laws. That is not at all calculated to create any confidence in the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Last year, the House had the advantage of listening to an able speech from the hon. member for Hants in favour of uniformity in our laws. It is not my intention to refer to the debate which followed. The inference which I desire to draw from it, is that laws differ greatly from one province to the

other. In case it was desired to bring about uniformity, would not advice be sought from jurists in each of the provinces ? Why ? Because life is short, and the way that leads to knowledge is a long and winding one. To acquire a thorough knowledge of the laws in each of the provinces is a difficult task ; but that does not suffice. I am of opinion, said a latin writer that theory without practice will not give a perfect knowledge of law. The laws of the various provinces, in accordance with this principle, prevent any who have not practiced their profession during a certain number of years, from exercising judiciary functions. Nevertheless, we have here judges who decide in last resort on laws which they have neither studied nor practiced.

And there are those who wonder that such a court should be unpopular ! Some periodicals, some papers ask that the best men be appointed. They are losing their eyes to the light. The evil is apparent : if the judge is to apply the law, he should be familiar with the law.

It may be stated : If he does not know the law when appointed, he will make himself familiar with it. Here is d'Aguesseau's answer to this :

> Amid a variety of positive enactments, based on the customs of peoples, or on the sovereign will of the legislator, this body of laws has nevertheless its rules and principles. To become conversant with them, shall we wait for the crafty and interested party to lay before us fragmentary excerpts, skilfully selected and artfully arranged ; and shall the judge, whose part it is to instruct men in the law, be content with learning it in the pleadings of litigants ?

Lord Brougham, in his great speech on judicial reform, on February 7, 1828, referring to judges in India, said :

> In total ignorance of the manners, the customs, the prejudices, possibly of the language of those upon whose affairs and conduct he is to sit in judgment, and by whose testimony he is to peruse his inquiries, and very possibly equally uninformed of the laws he is to administer—he must be wholly dependent upon his pundit for direction, both as to matter of fact and matter of law.

Mr. Speaker, how are we to expect that, even in time, our brightest lawyers in the provinces, our magistrates, and all who have spent days and nights pouring over the study of provincial laws, and who, nevertheless, have to acknowledge their ignorance, will lay their case without reserve or reticence before a tribunal constituted as is the Supreme Court ? That was possible in times gone by when authority was supreme ; it cannot be expected to-day, when right is everything.

It is that lack of confidence which has been the incentive of the numerous attacks to which the Supreme Court has been subjected. Therefore, its constitution is defective.

The Bill submitted to your consideration has for its purpose to make the Supreme Court a Federal Court. The court will thus gain in prestige what it loses in scope. The clause suggested is taken from the constitution of the United States.

I quoted, a few moments ago, the opinion of Lord Dufferin regarding the Supreme Court of the United States. Let me quote also from Alexis de Tocqueville : The Supreme Court, he said, is on a higher plane than any known tribunal, both as regards its powers and the kind of people over whom it exercises those powers.

Professor Dicey, referring to the Supreme Court of the United States writes :

> Nothing in the institutions of America has exacted more admiration among foreigners than the position given under the constitution to the federal judiciary.

In consequence, several confederacies have followed suit ; it will suffice to mention Mexico, Columbia and Switzerland. Were we to give our Supreme Court a truly federal character, what respect would it not command ? Courts of law being tribunals of compulsory arbitration, they should, like Cæsar's wife, be above suspicion. Our Supreme Court at present resembles the sphinx, a monster, neither man nor beast, and which the passer-by seeks to avoid. I would have it resemble the shining statue of Memnon, which emitted harmonious sounds at sunrise, and to which would come all those seeking justice and truth.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll, Kamouraska). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as the hon. leader of the opposition understands French and was able to follow the speech made by the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers), I shall give in French the few remarks I have to offer.

The hon. member for St. John and Iberville, who just moved the second reading of the Bill, made a very broad charge against the Supreme Court : that of not having secured the confidence of the people either in Ontario or in Quebec. What proofs did he bring forward in support of his charge ? A statement in 'La Patrie' to the effect that the Supreme Court did not command public confidence. Also quotations to the same effect from the 'Canada Law Journal,' since 1882.

That is a very hard charge to make against the highest tribunal in the Dominion ; and the only evidence in support of it are extracts from 'La Patrie' and the 'Canada Law Journal,' a periodical edited by some one who likely has some old grudge against the court.

When the hon. member, after bringing forth that general charge, entered into particulars, some statements he made struck me. He likened the Supreme Court to a monster; but at the same time, spoke highly of the judges who compose that tribunal.

They were, he said, honest, fair-minded men, eminent jurists, whose knowledge of the law was all that could be desired. I should have preferred if he had dealt with the living and left the dead alone. However, he thought fit to follow the opposite course. I regret that notice was not given me until this evening that this Bill was to come up for discussion. I would have been better prepared to reply to the eloquent and learned disquisition from my hon. friend, the member for St. Johns and Iberville.

His main contention is that the Supreme Court, as now organized, is unconstitutional. That is to say, when the said court was established in 1876, that establishment was not constitutional. And in support of this statement my hon. friend quoted the opinions expressed by Judges Taschereau and Mills, the latter to-day a judge of the Supreme Court. I have read Mr. Mills' speech, and I believe he does express doubts as to the constitutionality of that tribunal. So does Mr. Taschereau, and so does Mr. Moss, now a judge at Toronto. Mr. Taschereau was at one time member for Montmagny in this House, and he is to-day a judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec.

But from what was said when the question came up for discussion, at the time of confederation, it is easy to find out what was the intention of those who inserted in the British North America Act a clause providing for the establishment of a Supreme Court. Sir John Macdonald spoke as follows :—

> There are many arguments for and against the establishment of such a court, but it was thought wise and expedient to put into the constitution a power of the general legislature, that, if after full consideration they think it advisable to establish a general Court of Appeal from all the Superior Courts of all the provinces, they may do so.

The following is the opinion expressed by Sir George Etienne Cartier :

> Accordingly, when we have lived some years under the federal regime, the urgent need of such a Court of Appeal with jurisdiction in such matters will be felt, and, if it is created, it will be fit that its jurisdiction should extend to civil causes which might arise in the several confederate provinces, because it will necessarily be composed of the most eminent judges in the different provinces, of the jurists whose reputation stands highest, of men, in short, profoundly skilled in the jurisprudence of each of the provinces which they will respectively represent. Well, if this court is called upon, for instance, to give final judgment on a judgment rendered by a Lower Canada court, there will be among the judges on the bench, men perfectly versed in the knowledge of the laws of that section of the confederation, will be able to give the benefits of their lights to the other judges sitting with them.

The honourable Mr. Justice Fournier, who introduced the Bill constituting the Supreme Court, stated that this tribunal, as organized, was strictly constitutional. But let us forego that question, and deal with the actual facts. The Supreme Court has been in existence twenty-seven years. At the outset, many complaints were made against it. I remember reading, in the report of the discussion which took place when Mr. Girouard introduced a Bill to the same purpose as the present one, in the House. But who were the complainants ? Members, unsuccessful litigants, who had had cases before that court and had not succeeded in having their claims sustained. That was the cause of much discontent for six or eight years. But since 1882, has there been any serious cause of complaint proven against the Supreme Court ?

The hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville, who carefully worked up his case, could only find, after going through the volumes of 'Hansard' since 1882, such extracts as he quoted from the Canada Law Journal, in support of his contention. I admit there is something abnormal about the constitution of the Supreme Court in the fact that there are only two judges familiar with the French laws of the province of Quebec. But I contend that this defect is not of such great consequence as some would have us believe. The French law is based on the Roman law, and so is the English law. It may be that, as regards questions of procedure, the inconvenience is felt to a greater degree, but it is a poor compliment to pay to our civil laws to represent them as a mystery which no one can solve. If that argument had any weight it would apply more particularly to the Privy Council whose members are not supposed to know any thing at all about the civil law of the province of Quebec, while there are two judges of the Supreme Court specially conversant with that law.

I am in favour of maintaining the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, as I believe the provinces are not yet ripe for judicial autonomy. To convince oneself of the truth of what I say, it will suffice to observe what is going on. Notwithstanding all the respect I have for the courts of appeal of my province, notwithstanding the attainments, integrity and impartiality of the judges composing them, I say that the Supreme Court, as well as the Privy Council, serve, so to speak, as safety valves, and that it is a good thing for litigants to have a court of last resort outside of the provincial domain.

See what is going on in Ontario. There, judges of the High Court have been made the object of attacks in the legislature to a degree unknown in my province.

But there is another reason, of a more practical character for upholding the Supreme Court. Should that Bill become law, the maritime provinces, which have no courts of appeal, would be without an appellate tribunal to resort to. The answer given to this argument is that such courts of appeal should be provided for those pro-

vinces. Well, let these courts of appeal for the maritime provinces be constituted first, and then parliament may be called upon to vote the Bill proposed by the hon. member. For reasons of a practical character, the government cannot allow the Bill to become law just now. It may be voted a few years hence when our judicial system has been reorganized.

Mr. J. E. E. LEONARD (Laval). (Translation.) I did not inted to address the House after the hon. Solicitor General. But as the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) has not thought fit to be present here tonight, to defend the policy of the government, relieving himself of the burden on the hon. the Solicitor General, I deem it my duty as a French member from the province of Quebec, to give my support to the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville, in respect to the Bill, the second reading of which was moved this evening.

The province of Quebec, more especially, suffers from the judgments of the Supreme Court. And it is made to suffer the more because the majority of the judges of that court, consisting of talented men, no doubt, are utterly ignorant of French laws and customs. The province of Quebec wishes to remain French, and to attain that object, it must keep its civil laws and have judges who studied and understand its laws.

The hon. Solicitor General, in support of a cause which he unwillingly upholds, argued that the maritime provinces had no court of appeal. That is so, but it is an easy matter to establish such courts. There can be no difficulty in giving those provinces what they are in need of, and it is unfair that the province of Quebec should be made to suffer any longer for such trifling reasons.

We are all aware that, at the time the Supreme Court was constituted, the members from the province of Quebec almost unanimously opposed the Bill for the reasons given to-night by the member for St. Johns and Iberville. The majority of the judges of the Supreme Court are not at all conversant with the French civil laws ; and the barristers in the province of Quebec, knowing as they do that these judges are not competent to deal with matters of French civil law, generally advise their clients to limit their claims to $1,999, in order to preclude any possibility of appeal to the Supreme Court. The hon. the Solicitor General stated that it was in the interest of the province generally, and of the province of Quebec in particular, to uphold the Supreme Court, which played the part of a safety valve, its judges being outside of provincial influences. I feel I am in duty bound to say that, as regards the province of Quebec, the courts of appeal now in existence answer all purposes of that kind. All thejudges who sit in those courts are really qualified, and soar above the disputes of litigants.

As I stated a moment ago, I was not aware that the Bill was to be discussed this evening. I regret it, for had I known, I would have made it a point to get ready for the debate. It would have been an easy matter to find arguments in support of the Bill. However, I have no hesitation in saying that the case made by my hon. friend in support of his Bill was carefully prepared and clearly laid out. The House should pass this Bill at once, even if it were only through consideration for the province of Quebec. The supporters of the government are largely from that province, and a good way for the government to show their thankfulness to Quebec would be to comply with the wishes of the members from that province, and to do away with the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in matters of civil law, which would then be referred in last resort to the highest court of appellate jurisdiction in the province.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I merely want to add a few words to what has been said, and I think it is proper and a simple matter of courtesy to our English-speaking colleagues that a few words should be said in English on this subject; not that much practical result will come from this debate at present, but I believe that this parliament and government will be forced before long to remove the sentiment of distrust that is growing in the province of Quebec against the Supreme Court. It may be said that the word 'distrust' is a strong one, but it is that which was used by my hon. friend and which he has taken from another authority. As my hon. friend from St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) has said, that sentiment does not arise, and has never arisen, from any personal animosity against the members who compose the Supreme Court of Canada. But, as my hon. friend has said—and this is the one line of argument on which I desire to insist—there is something in the Supreme Court that shocks common sense. Apart from the legal aspect of the question, upon which of course I would not dare to express my views, the federal Act creating this federal court authorized it to act as the highest court of appeal in all matters and laws affecting the Dominion, whether provincial or federal. The parliament of Canada has thought proper to give to that court an appellate jurisdiction in all cases in which a higher amount than a certain prescribed sum is at stake, affecting the civil and other laws that are within the exclusive legislative powers of the provinces; so that certain laws and matters, in respect of which we have no power whatever to legislate, in respect of which the supreme power of legislation lies in the provinces and in respect of which provincial tribunals have been established to adjudicate, the parliament of Canada has brought within the jurisdiction of this federal court which it has established. Therefore, we have given to a court created by this parliament jurisdiction to decide on matters concerning which we have no power

whatever to legislate. That being the case, there is at the basis of the creation of the Supreme Court of Canada something, it seems to me, that shocks common sense. My hon. friend the Solicitor General has said that in the beginning there were some complaints against the Supreme Court, but that those arose from political causes and came from members of parliament who considered themselves aggrieved by decisions of the Supreme Court in election matters. I shall not refer at all to that part of the question, but I say that although complaints may not often have been made in the parliament of Canada, nevertheless they still exist. As my hon. friend from St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) says, we have sometimes had complaints made on account of the personnel of the judges composing some of the courts of the provinces. At times it has been urged that the Court of Appeals of the province of Quebec does not now enjoy the esteem in which it was held some years ago on account of its personnel, but we have never heard any complaints with regard to its jurisdiction. It has never been urged that its jurisdiction should be amended. It has been said that the government did not always choose the best men to sit in that court. But as regards the Supreme Court of Canada, complaints have been made that cases which were decided by one of the judges of the Superior Court and three judges of the Court of Review and five judges of the Court of Appeals of that province, or in all, nine judges conversant with the laws of the province of Quebec, were afterwards decided by a tribunal on which there were only two judges who could be considered as authorities on the laws of that province. So that you have, as far as the province of Quebec is concerned, placed in the hands of two men the right to revise the judgments of nine other men equally versed in our laws. My hon. friend has said that the right of appeal to the Supreme Court and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a safeguard to the litigants of our province, who might not be satisfied with the decisions of the final court of appeals of that province. Well, the same thing might be said of any tribunal. Litigants that are not satisfied with the judgment of the Privy Council would say that there should be another safeguard. But now we have an Australasian colony, one where there is no race question to deal with, and which is known as being the most loyal of the British colonies—I refer to New Zealand—complaining bitterly as to the way the British Privy Council has dealt with some of the judicial matters of that colony. Therefore, the fact that complaints may arise against one tribunal is no reason for saying that we should give more appeals. In France, I believe, appeals are limited to two courts, whatever may be the amount involved. One is the court of appeal—I do not know the name it bears—and then the court of cassation. Beyond this, there is no appeal. In England there are less appeals, I believe, than with us. In this country where we are more distant, where the interests are smaller and the litigants are poorer—where everything is against the multiplicity of appeals—we have more appeals than they have in England, or in the republic of France, or in the United States. My hon. friend from St. Johns and Iberville has quoted words from Lord Dufferin which apply most perfectly to this case, words spoken by him when the Supreme Court was created. He expressed the hope that the Supreme Court of Canada would attain an equally high position in popular respect with that of the Supreme Court of the United States. As a rule, comparisons between the constitution of Canada and the constitution of the United States are entirely in favour of Canada. But this is one particular point in which we might take a lesson from our neighbours. As is well known to the members of this House, whether they belong to the legal profession or not, the magistrates of the United States do not enjoy, on the average, the same respect that our judges or the judges of England enjoy. How is it, then, that the Supreme Court of the United States is the one tribunal in that country that has never been attacked by any class of men, but, at times, has saved the dignity and future of the republic? This arises from the fact that the legislators in the United States have vested in the Supreme Court only such powers as might be exercised properly by such a tribunal, and have prevented small cases that might cause useless friction between the litigants and the highest tribunal of the republic being brought before that court. The jurisdiction is limited to the same power as those to which my hon. friend would like the Supreme Court of Canada to be limited. And what has been the result? People know that when they appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States they appeal to a tribunal that has nothing to do with trifling matters, with small matters between individuals, but with matters designed to promote harmony between the citizens of the United States or between the states themselves, or to interpret the general laws of the republic or laws that might arouse conflict between the states. Here, it is entirely different. Not satisfied with the multiplied appeals that we have in the provinces, we have created a supreme body. Whatever be the legal power of the parliament of Canada at the time they created that Supreme Court, it is certainly against the spirit, if not the letter of the constitution, that the federal authorities should have the power to create another tribunal than one that would give uniform jurisprudence in matters of federal legislation. But I am quite positive, and common sense would tell us that the authors of confederation never contemplated—or, at least, it was not their main purpose—to create an appeal

body for the different provinces. What they meant, and what we should carry out—for, after all, the work of the fathers of the confederation is a work that may be changed once in a while, though, as a rule I am not in favour of changing the work of the authors of the constitution—is when we find in some of the subsequent legislation matters against the spirit of the constitution, we should come nearer to the spirit of the constitution, though we may break with the letter. Can it have been the intention of the fathers of the constitution to create a tribunal of appeal for the provinces? It must have been their intention to create a supreme body that would enjoy the respect of the whole people of Canada and of the different governments of Canada; therefore, a body that would be composed of men entirely versed in the law they were to interpret. But, as my hon. friend from St. Johns has said, when we have cases brought from the court of appeal of Quebec to the Supreme Court, we know—I have been a witness of it myself—that the lawyers from the province of Quebec find it necessary to make for some of the judges an elementary course in the law of our province, such as is given to the second year student. This is not a fact that is likely to raise our respect for the Supreme Court; and, our respect for the Supreme Court being diminished in ordinary legal matters when it is called upon to give interpretation on the main body of our provincial laws, in the reaction, we have less respect and consideration for them in matters in which they have perfect jurisdiction and in which they ought to be the supreme body. Therefore, for the safety of our constitution, for the harmony of the provinces, and in the interest of uniformity in our law and the giving to the provincial law the proper interpretation, they should deal with federal law, and should not have the power to pass judgment under the law of the different provinces. As my hon. friend has said, in every province it is forbidden for a lawyer, although he may have practiced for twenty-five years in another province, to plead even an ordinary case before any of the courts of such province in which he is not a member of the bar, because he is supposed not to know the law of that province. But now, simply by an Act of this parliament, a man who would not be allowed to plead before a justice of the province of Ontario will come and give judgment as a final appeal against all judgments that may have been rendered by the high court of justice or the court of appeal of Ontario. And, in the same way, a lawyer who, because of his lack of legal knowledge, could not plead before the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, will, the day after he is appointed to the Supreme Court, pass final judgments on matters that he does not know and will reverse the judgments of the Superior Court, the Court of Review and the Court of Appeal of that province, courts that are composed of men who must have practiced law in their province for at least ten years. I appeal to any man of common sense, whatever might be the letter of the constitution, whatever might be the intention of the men who created the Supreme Court, if the time has not come to deal with this problem and put the Supreme Court in a position, not of less power and prestige, but of greater power and prestige, because their jurisdiction would be confined to matters that these judges will know?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The government can hardly realize the importance of this measure, otherwise we should not see the front benches opposite in their present condition. This is a Bill that proposes to take away about nine-tenths of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Canada. We have not the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice or any other member of the cabinet in the House to consider it, except my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding).

I think therefore there must be some misapprehension in the minds of the members of the government as to what this Bill really means, or we would see some little attention paid to it by members of the government. Does the Minister of Finance realize what this Bill means? Does he realize that it is one of the most important Bills touching the judiciary of this country that has ever been offered to this House? I should think that some members of the government, at least, would tell us what they are prepared to do with it, and that we would not see the spectacle in this parliament of its passing, as it actually did, the second reading a moment ago, and having this principle affirmed without a single member of the government except the Solicitor General, who addressed the House to some extent upon it, saying a single word about it. I do not think that seems to indicate that the Bill has received very much consideration at the hands of the government, or we would surely have heard something more about it.

Now I do not deny that there is something in the argument of my hon. friend from St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers). I understand that gentlemen from the province of Quebec do not like very well to see the judgments of their own final courts overruled by the Supreme Court of Canada, and possibly, in some cases, when a judge from their own province may have sustained the judgments of the court below. I believe that has happened sometimes. Well, that happens sometimes in cases from other provinces. I myself, from the province of Nova Scotia, have known a unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court of my province overruled in the Supreme Court by a divided court, the majority of which included two judges from the province of Quebec. Of course these are circumstances that will

sometimes occur. But it does not necessarily follow that you cannot have a Supreme Court of Canada that will do fairly good work. I acknowledge at once that, from the very constitution of that court, there may be to a certain extent a sort of inherent weakness in it; but I do not think it is a weakness that is not capable of being overcome by appointing to that court the most eminent men that you can get in the whole of Canada, and appointing those men at a time of life when they can devote some time to the study of the laws of the different provinces. My hon. friend emphasizes altogether too much the differences between the laws of the various provinces. Now take cases from the province of Quebec. You will find among them questions arising upon matters as to which the laws of all the provinces are practically the same. The laws of Quebec as well as of the other provinces are supposed to be founded on common sense. For example, take the provisions of the Code, they are in many respects very much like the provisions of our English common law. Our English Equity system is founded upon provisions of the civil law which is really very much the same as the system of law administerd in the province of Quebec to-day. Take all the statute law of Canada, take for example the Bills of Exchange Act, and you have the same provisions prevailing in all the provinces.

My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) spoke of counsel from one province not being fit to conduct a case before a magistrate in another province. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. In the province of Nova Scotia we would be glad to welcome at our bar any member of the bar of the province of Quebec, and admit him by courtesy to practise before our courts in any case in which he happened to be interested. That is done every day. Members of the bar of the United States of America come into our courts in cases in which they have clients in the United States, and by courtesy are allowed to practise before our courts. Members of the bar of Ontario have, during the past year, appeared before our courts.

Mr. EMMERSON. This privilege is reciprocal in the United States.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know it is. I am only pointing out to the member for Labelle what perhaps he has not fully appreciated, that even as between ourselves and the various courts in the United States, the laws are so much the same that a man eminent in his profession in one place can practise with advantage in another place, and is allowed to do so as a matter of courtesy. So far as the laws of the maritime provinces and the laws of Ontario and the west are concerned, they are very much the same. There is really no reason why a judge from the province of Ontario, or a judge from the maritime provinces, cannot deal successfully with cases coming from a province in which he has not practised; that is to say, a judge coming from the province of Ontario is fully capable of sitting in appeal on cases coming from the province of Nova Scotia, and I think judges and lawyers from the maritime provinces, assuming they are eminent men at the bar, are capable of dealing with cases that come from the province of Ontario, or Manitoba, or British Columbia.

Now it is not impossible, Mr. Speaker, to have a court that will give satisfaction, although that court has to administer laws with which all the members of the court are not familiar. Take for instance, the Privy Council, referred to by the member for St. Johns and Iberville. The Privy Council, I think, has commanded the respect, not only of litigants but of lawyers from all parts of the British empire. The Privy Council administers, I suppose, twenty different systems of law, at least—I am speaking offhand—and administers laws with regard perhaps to thirty, forty or fifty different races. The Privy Council commands the respect, I believe, of my hon. friends of the bar of the province of Quebec—I have not heard anything to the contrary in the speech of the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville. Well, the members of the Privy Council are not men who have made a special study of the laws of the province of Quebec, but I think on the whole, cases from that province that have gone to the Privy Council, as a general rule, have received the consideration which has entitled that judicial body to the respect of members of the bar from that province. The Supreme Court of the United States administers different systems of law. Is it not a fact that the state of Louisiana enjoys the advantage of a civil law which, to some extent, resembles that which prevails in the province of Quebec?

Mr. EMMERSON. New York has a code.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax. But I am speaking of an entirely different system of law. The state of Louisiana has a different system of law from most of the states comprising the American republic.

Mr. BOURASSA. Has the Supreme Court of the United States jurisdiction over the state laws of Louisiana when they do not affect outsiders?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not pretend to be very familiar with the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States, but I should suppose that when a question of state law arose between the residents of that state and those of another state, the Supreme Court of the United States would have to deal with it.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is what this Bill proposes to do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would not the Supreme Court of Canada, or the Supreme Court of the United States, be able to deal

with the local laws in cases of that kind ? What makes the Supreme Court of Canada, or that of the United States, better able to deal with the laws of the provinces or of the states in such cases ?

Mr. BOURASSA. It is a matter of necessity.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is there any necessity ? Why not, in that case, leave it to the law of the particular province in which the litigant resides, and from which the case comes on appeal, if you take it for granted that the ultimate tribunal is not capable of dealing satisfactorily with the question presented to its consideration ? That argument carried to its logical conclusion would exclude a Supreme Court of Canada altogether. The argument of my hon. friend from St. Johns and Iberville, if carried to its logical conclusion, would abolish the Supreme Court of Canada, and would leave it with not even the fragment of its jurisdiction which it is proposed to preserve by this Bill. Now I do not say that the Supreme Court of Canada is perfect; I do not say that the selections to the bench of that court have always been such as commended themselves in every way to all the people in the country. I admit that there is what you might call the inherent weakness that I have mentioned. But still, I say that the Supreme Court of Canada has in many respects done fairly good work; and if appointments of the most eminent men to be found in Canada are made to the bench of that court, it is capable in future of doing even better work than it has done in the past. I do not think that a measure of this kind ought, at least, to be passed by this House without more consideration not only from the House but from the government than that which this Bill apparently has received at the present time. It is a Bill of the most important character and I would suggest to my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that if the Bill has not already been fully considered by the government perhaps it might be wise to allow it to stand in order that it may be considered and in order that we may have the views of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) in regard to it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I perhaps might take exception to the statement of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that the government will permit this Bill to be passed without any objection. Being a layman I will not presume to discuss the merits of the Bill, but the hon. Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Carroll) in the absence of the hon. Minister of Justice, gave expression to his views of the government against the Bill and we were about to call for the division when the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) rose and continued the debate. So that, there is no reason for saying that the government has not fully considered the matter. I am aware that the hon. Minister of Justice has advised that it is inexpedient that this Bill should be adopted at the present time. The government are prepared to take that view, and I hope the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) will not press the Bill at the present stage. But, if he is obliged to do so, all I can say that we will have to ask the House to reject the Bill.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to discuss the merits of the Bill but there was one remark which fell from the lips of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) which I think should not go unchallenged. He has drawn a comparison between the Supreme Court of the United States and the courts in this Dominion and he made the statement that so far as his information was concerned the federal court in the United States was one that was above criticism. I think that the hon. member has not been familiar with the history of that court. He has not been familiar with the decisions of the federal court of the United States. Many hon. members, especially those in the legal profession, recollect the Dred Scott case, the legal tender case and many other cases involving the question of slavery and a very notable case, that of the contention between Hayes and Tilden, candidates for the Presidency of the United States. On the contrary that court has been subject, and subjected, to very great citicism in the years in which it has been in existence. I do not think it is a matter of very great remark that ought to be emphasized but it only goes to show that it is impossible to constitute a tribunal that would be above criticism. The courts of this Dominion are not subjected to very great criticism, I think, in comparison with other courts and they are not entitled to greater criticism than are courts in other jurisdictions. I simply call the attention of my hon. friend to the circumstances with the view of repelling the idea that there is even one court in the United States which stands superior and above any court in this Dominion.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). Mr. Speaker, I believe that diversity is one of the elements of beauty. I believe also, judging by this debate, that by an assimilation of races as well as by a uniformity of laws in this Dominion, our country would lose much of its attractiveness. Although the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has stated that the government wanted this Bill to be rejected, I for one, will be obliged to vote against the government, much to my regret, because I entirely agree with the views so ably expressed by my hon. friend from St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers). The members of this House are

not passing judgment on the Supreme Court. We might appeal to a much higher authority than to that of the members of this House. We can quote the judges of the Supreme Court against themselves. Let me take the dictum of Mr. Justice Girouard himself. I find by reference to 'Hansard' of 1881, that he was the father of a Bill quite similar to the one introduced by the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville ; in fact, I think the two Bills are exactly the same. It is true that, to-day, Mr. Justice Girouard, one of the legal luminaries of this Dominion, is sitting on the bench of the Supreme Court. But what was his opinion in 1881 ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be my hon. friend's opinion when he occupies a seat on that bench ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Wait till the clouds roll by. Let us stand by what we are discussing now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Think of the future.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I see that Mr. Justice Girouard, speaking in 1881, after having quoted the section of the British North America Act as follows :—

> The parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, from time to time, provide for the constitution, maintenance, and organization of a general court for Canada, and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada.

makes this comment :

> It seems to me that it is more than doubtful that this parliament had a right to establish a provincial Court of Appeal. The provision is to the effect that we shall have a right to establish a general Court of Appeal for Canada. We have made it general for the Dominion, and we have also made it a general Court of Appeal for the provinces. We have made it a Court of Appeal for the province of Quebec, contrary to the provision which I read a few moments ago, which says that provincial courts shall be established by provincial legislatures. This is to me apparent, when we read the last words of the same clause providing for the establishment of any additional court, which would seem to be in the same spirit and sense, that is to say, for the better administration of the laws of Canada, not for the administration of the laws of the provinces; not for the administration or interpretation of property and civil right, or provincial rights. As I said in opening, I contend the Supreme Court is a necessity in constitutional cases, and that was also noticed at the time of the discussion of the Confederation Act before the imperial parliament.

Now, Mr. Justice Girouard is not the only one to hold such views. Sitting beside that learned judge on the Supreme Court bench we find the ex-Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Mills), a very high authority on constitutional questions. 'Hansard' is indeed very useful in a discussion of this kind, as I find that in 1875 Mr. Mills said :

> It seemed to him that this expression 'a General Court of Appeal for Canada,' meant a court of appeal having cognizance of questions arising under the legislation of this parliament and not on any question that might arise under the jurisdiction of any one of the provinces.

You will also find, presiding over that court, a gentleman created Chief Justice, by this government, which I am sorry to say will ask this Bill to be rejected, Sir Elzéar Taschereau, who, speaking in 1875, a long time ago, said :

> In a word, they have their good old French laws which had been secured to us by solemn treaties, laws of which they were so proud, and under which their forefathers had lived so happy, and he might add, so loyal, under the protection of the British Crown. All these laws had a few years ago been codified by the most eminent jurists of their province, and at the present time their two codes of civil law and of civil procedure could well bear the comparison with the French modern Napoleon codes. The English speaking citizens of Lower Canada had long been accustomed to see their civil rights governed by these laws, they had learned to admire and cherish them, and they were now perhaps, as firmly attached to them as the French Canadian population was. In fact he hoped to see the day when all their sister provinces, seeing the perfectness of their codes, would adopt them as their laws of the land. But the more they were attached to their dear old laws, to their own legal machinery, so different, so widely different from the system of the other provinces, the more they were inclined to see a danger in all innovations proposed, in all new jurisdictions which were intended to be established, and he thought he was not going too far when he said that when a supreme tribunal of appeal was proposed to be created outside their province, composed of judges, the great majority of whom would be unfamiliar with the civil laws of Quebec, which tribunal would be called upon to revise and would have the power to reverse the decisions of all their Quebec courts, there was, for them at least, cause for alarm if not a danger, a great danger to be apprehended.

We therefore have the opinion of three of the most distinguished judges of the land; nay, three judges of the Supreme Court——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; Mr. Justice Taschereau whose opinion he quotes is Mr. Justice Taschereau of Montreal ; not Mr. Justice Taschereau of the Supreme Court.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I believe the Solicitor General is right. He is a cousin of Sir Elzéar any way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He belongs to the same distinguished family.

Mr. CASGRAIN. They are all judges in that family.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At all events we have a majority in our favour. We have two judges of the Supreme Court : Mr. Justice Girouard and Mr. Justice Mills both of whom not so long ago stated that in their opinion the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court was un-

constitutional as regards the interpretation of the Civil Laws. Having the authority of judges who themselves have contested their jurisdiction, and the Supreme Court being intended to be essentially a federal court—quite recently the court was asked for an interpretation of subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act—should not the government support the Bill which has been introduced by the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) ?

Motion for second reading of Bill negatived on division.

INSOLVENCY ACT.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 53) respecting Insolvency. He said : Mr. Speaker, in proposing the second reading of this important measure I have to express my regret once more that it has not fallen into abler hands than mine. But coming as I do from a city where we have very considerable commercial transactions it is perhaps not inappropriate that I should move in the matter. I know the trouble that was taken with this Bill when it was first introduced by my former colleague, now Mr. Justice Fortin, who with others took great pains in the preparation of the Bill, and who obtained the sanction of the commercial bodies throughout the Dominion and the approval of many legal gentlemen.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). This is a Bill on which a great number of the members of the House who are not present tonight would like to speak. Would my hon. friend object to have it stand,—I ask him in the interest of those who are in favour of the Bill.

Mr. MONK. I would have no objection but for the fact that now we have little time left for the consideration of Public Bills. If I had the assurance of the government that this Bill would be discussed during the present session, there would be no difficulty in allowing it to stand. Private members now have only Mondays at their disposal, and the Order may not be reached again. I think the Bill should get its second reading now and we can consider it in committee later on. I would be very glad to see a larger House when such an important measure is being discussed, but, if I allow this opportunity to pass I have a fear that it will meet the fate that several Insolvency Bills have met with before 1896 and since.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). To be candid with my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) I do not think he can expect to get his Bill through the present session. I could give him the assurance without hesitation, that there will be another Monday left when his Bill will be reached, if that is what my hon. friend means. What would happen after that I cannot say. In view of the condition of the Order Paper, I would not lead my hon. friend to believe that there would be a possibility of the Bill going through all its stages this session, but an opportunity for discussing it will occur next Monday.

Mr. MONK. That is not a very hopeful view which the Minister of Finance presents. This is a Bill which I think commends itself to the consideration of this House because it is the result of the study and experience of the men who are most interested in the administration of the insolvency law. It does not come to the consideration of the House at that stage in which measures often do, because hon. gentlemen will see that the Bill has been very carefully elaborated, and though I do not claim it is perfect in its present stage, yet it deserves to be experimented with.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it the same Bill that was introduced by Mr. Justice Fortin when he was a member of this House ?

Mr. MONK. Yes. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I think this Bill meets a want which has been very long felt in the country, and which it is imperative that parliament should supply. Almost immediately after the repeal of the Insolvency law, in 1875, boards of trade throughout the country urged upon the government of that day the necessity of some new insolvency law ; some law which would have general and uniform application throughout the country. In 1883 a Bill was submitted by Mr. Beaty, then a member of the House. In 1884 a Bill was presented to this House by the then member for Montreal Centre, now Mr. Justice Curran, neither of these Bills provided as complete an insolvency law as that which is now under consideration, because they failed to provide anything more than a method of distributing the assets of the insolvent. They made no provision for the discharge of the insolvent, nor for the penalties which are provided at the end of this Bill for the purpose of assuring an honest administration of the estate of the insolvent. In 1885 a Bill which had already been introduced once was reintroduced by Mr. Curran. Mr. Beaty also introduced a Bill which he had previously brought to the notice of the House. In that year there was a committee of the House, which received the support of the Montreal board of trade, and I think of some other boards of trade. That committee prepared a Bill which was introduced in 1892, but which did not pass. Another Bill was subsequently prepared by the Toronto, Hamilton and Montreal boards of trade. That measure was urged upon the government of the day. In 1893 efforts were renewed in the same direction, and in 1894 the Bill which had been prepared was introduced in the Senate by the then Minister of Trade and Commerce, Sir Mackenzie

Bowell. That Bill received the consideration of a committee of the Senate, was discussed before that committee, passed the Senate Chamber, and subsequently reached this House, at the end of the session, but did not in this House go beyond the first reading. In 1895 the same Bill was introduced in the Senate. It was announced in that year, if I mistake not, or in the previous year, in the speech from the Throne. The Bill died after passing its second reading in the Senate, and did not even reach this House. Another Bill was introduced in this House in February, 1896, by Mr. Martin, member for Winnipeg. That Bill did not pass. Every one will remember the circumstances of that session. The time of the session was occupied with one single measure which itself did not pass.

Coming now to the measure itself, which I have the honour to submit to the House, I will not go into all the details, but will explain as briefly as possible the general scheme of the Bill. Let me say in the first place, that the courts which, under the terms of this Bill, take cognizance of all insolvency matters in the first instance are: In the province of Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia, the county court; in the province of Quebec, the Superior Court; in the North-west Territories, the Supreme Court. As the House will see further on, there is an appeal from the decisions of these courts to a higher tribunal.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is that the same as in the old Act?

Mr. MONK. Yes. As regards the application of the Act, it applies solely to people engaged in commercial or manufacturing pursuits, not, as the English Act, I believe, to anybody who wishes to take advantage of it. Section 3 says:

This Act applies only to persons who as a means of livelihood, manufacture, buy, or otherwise acquire goods, wares, merchandise or commodities, ordinarily the subject of trade and commerce, and sell or otherwise dispose of the same to others, including commission merchants, whether they sell by auction or otherwise.

By another section of the Act it is declared not to apply to incorporated companies which may fall under the provisions of the Winding-up Act. The second part of the Bill defines what constitutes insolvency. It provides that a person to whom the Act applies commits an Act of insolvency in any of the following cases:

(a.) If he ceases to meet his liabilities generally as they come due;

(b.) If he calls a meeting of his creditors for the purposes of compounding with them; or if he exhibits a statement showing his inability to meet his liabilities; or if he gives notice to any of his creditors that he has suspended, or is about to suspend payment of his debts; or if he otherwise acknowledges his insolvency;

(c.) If he absconds or is about to abscond from any province in Canada with intent to defraud his creditors, or any of them, or to defeat or delay the remedy of any creditor, or to avoid being arrested or served with legal process; or if being out of any province in Canada, he so remains with a like intent; or if he conceals himself within the limits of Canada with a like intent;

(d.) If he secretes or is about to secrete any part of his estate or effects with intent to defraud his creditors, or any of them, or to defeat or delay their remedies or demands;

(e.) If he assigns, removes, or disposes of, or is about or attempts to assign, remove or dispose of any of his property with intent to defraud, defeat, or delay his creditors, or any of them:

(f.) If he makes any general conveyance or assignment of his property for the benefit of his creditors; or if being unable to meet his liabilities in full he makes any sale or conveyance of the whole or of the main part of his stock in trade or assets without the consent of his creditors, or without satisfying their claims;

(g.) If he permits any execution issued against him under which any of his chattels, stock-in-trade, assets, land, or property is seized, levied upon, or taken in execution, to remain unsatisfied until within four days of the time fixed by the sheriff or seizing officer for the sale thereof, or to remain unsatisfied for fifteen days after such seizure;

(h.) If, with intent to defeat, defraud, or delay his creditors or any of them, he procures his chattels, stock-in-trade, assets, land or property, or any portion thereof, to be seized, levied on, or taken under or by any process or execution.

As to what takes place when these conditions exist, under the provisions of this Act there is no voluntary assignment. It seems to have been the opinion generally amongst the commercial bodies consulted throughout the country, that voluntary assignment leads to abuse. So that there must be a forced assignment when a person commits an act of insolvency and finds himself under any of the conditions which I have just described. When such conditions are made clear to the court, a receiving order is addressed to the sheriff of the county or district, who seems to be the proper officer to take the first step towards placing the assets of the insolvent under the control of his creditors and the liquidator. The sheriff then proceeds to take possession of all the assets of the insolvent. Provision is also made for special cases. It is provided that, when special circumstances exist, these being set forth by affidavit or otherwise, the court being satisfied that the necessity exists, and the affidavit being accompanied by a statement of the majority and amount of the unsecured claims against the estate, instead of the receiving order going to the sheriff, it may go to the liquidator, the person chosen by the creditors, and deemed satisfactory by the court. The debtor who applies for a receiving order must conform to certain conditions mentioned in section 6. He must be an unsecured creditor for $200, the debt must be due, it must be a liqui-

dated amount, there must be a refusal on the part of the insolvent to satisfy the claim, and other conditions mentioned in clause 4.

When the receiving order has been obtained—and it may be obtained without notice to the insolvent—it is served on the insolvent, who has a delay of three days within which he may make application, on giving notice to the creditors interested, for a dissolution of the receiving order.

There are provisions in sections 12 and 13, providing for the vesting of the estate in the hands of the sheriff, who acts as guardian temporarily, or, in exceptional cases, in the hands of a liquidator designated by the court to take possession of the estate. There are general dispositions, following the important one to which I have referred, giving the effect of the receiving order, vesting the sheriff or the liquidator with the whole of the estate of the insolvent debtor.

Then the Bill proceeds to indicate what are the duties of an insolvent, against whom a receiving order has been obtained. He has certain duties to perform which he must execute at once, subject to the severe penalties provided in one of the last clauses of the Bill. He must immediately place in the hands of the guardian a correct enumeration of all his property and a most complete statement of what is due him, where his properties are, how they can become available, what he owns, and in fact of all his affairs.

After these preliminary duties have been performed, the guardian calls a meeting of creditors. I will not weary the House by reading the long section of the Bill which deals with this matter, but I may say, that the mode of calling a meeting of the creditors and of appointing a permanent liquidator is very much the same as that which exists under the old insolvency law and very nearly the same as that which is at present in vogue in the province of Quebec. The creditors, having been summoned in a regular way by registered letter, appoint a liquidator. The liquidator must be a responsible man and give security for the fulfilment of his duties. Once that the liquidator is duly appointed, the temporary guardian transfers to him all the assets of the insolvent debtor.

The liquidation of the insolvent estate is then carried on by the liquidator, under the control of the inspectors, if the creditors deem it necessary to appoint inspectors. In such case, the creditors may appoint one or two, and not more than five. The inspectors of course receive no remuneration unless the creditors pass a resolution to that effect.

The insolvent, until he has obtained his discharge, acts under the control of the liquidator. The liquidator may remunerate the insolvent for his services, if the insolvent helps to liquidate the estate, but in any case the debtor is obliged to appear before the liquidator, may be examined under oath, and must give the liquidator every possible assistance. There are a number of sections and subsections which deal with the duty of the debtor. In many respects they are the same as those to be found in the old insolvency law, but additional clauses have been added which will insure more careful investigation into the value of the estate and better liquidation of the assets. In fact the insolvent becomes, as it were, the employee of the liquidator and is under his control continually. The letters which he or his estate receives are handed over to the liquidator and every opportunity is given to the liquidator to become conversant with the business of the estate.

As regards the discharge of the insolvent, it is provided in section 27 that he may, at any time after the first meeting of the creditors, file with the liquidators a deed of composition and discharge executed by creditors entitled to vote, who represent at least three-fourths of the entire value of claims of all the creditors then entitled to vote and the majority of such creditors having claims of $100 and over. When the insolvent has handed over to the liquidator such a deed, the liquidator has to call a meeting of the creditors of the estate to take it into consideration. Provision is made for giving notice of the meeting and also to compel the liquidator to call such a meeting in case of his neglect or refusal to do so.

There is a provision in section 28, as follows :

> In no case shall a meeting be called to consider a deed of composition and discharge, nor shall the same be confirmed or any discharge thereunder effected unless such deed provides for the immediate payment in full of all costs, charges and disbursements in connection with proceedings under this Act then remaining unclaimed and of all claims declared by this Act to be privileged claims, and for the payment within one year from the date of such confirmation of at least one-half of the amount of claims provable against the estate, and no deed of composition and discharge nor any discharge of the insolvent thereby effected, shall be binding on the creditors until such deed is confirmed by the court as hereinafter provided.

This provision prevents discharges being obtained too easily. The House will see that all privileged claims must be paid and also, within the year, one half at least of the claims really due by the estate.

Then, the meeting having confirmed the deed obtained under these circumstances, the court is called upon to examine what has taken place in the meeting of creditors. In the first place, the liquidator is obliged to deposit his deed with the court, and to deposit also a certificate of considerable length showing clearly that the conditions imposed by the Act as to the obtaining of a valid discharge—the meeting of creditors, the notice sent to each creditor, the amount which, in conformity with section 28 must be paid by the insolvent. This certificate given by the liquidator must show that all these

things have been passed. The application is made after another notice given that it will be presented to the court for confirmation of the deed and the discharge. If, in the management of his estate the insolvent has in any way transgressed some of the penal provisions at the end of the Bill, or if he has dealt fraudulently with the estate, and it has been shown by the examination of the insolvent himself, or in any other way, it is an absolute bar to his obtaining a discharge. But, if, in every respect, his conduct has been that of an honourable merchant, and if he conforms with the rather hard conditions named in section 28, the court may grant confirmation of the discharge. The discharge granted under such circumstances, that production, of course, affects the reconveyance of the estate to the insolvent. Still, it is provided in one of the sections of the Bill, that, even after this reconveyance has taken place, if the insolvent fails to carry out the conditions imposed upon him by the deed of his discharge, the liquidator without any other formality—I may mention that there was evidently a great desire by the framers of the Bill to avoid useless cost and expense—may resume the estate, saving, of course, rights that may have been acquired in the meantime. Of course, when the discharge is granted and the conditions have been carried out, this operates as a complete relief to the insolvent from all the debts he owes at the time of his insolvency.

There is a provision against what has happened sometimes, the obtaining of a fraudulent discharge, or the fraudulent obtaining of deeds of discharge. Under section 40, it is provided, that wherever there has been fraud of any kind, or any kind of false pretense used in obtaining a deed of discharge, that discharge is null and void.

In part 3 of the Bill, provision is made for the liquidation of property. Costs incurred after the state of insolvency has been carried are not recoverable against the estate. Claims are proved by an affidavit. When supported by instruments in writing, those instruments have to be filed with affidavits in the receiver's office.

There are, of course, sections which provide for the application of the law of set-off. Privileged claims are set out in section 44 of the Bill. Remuneration of disbursements of the guardian, proper taxable costs of the liquidator, and arrears of salary or wages due, owing and unpaid to persons in the employ of the insolvent at the date of the insolvency for one month before, but not exceeding three months, of such arrears all claims for rent are provided for under section 59.

In the case of joint and separate assets, there is a provision in section 45. The debts of the partnership are paid in the first instance out of the assets of the partnership, and the assets of the partners are applied to the settlement of the individual debts of the partners, and then to the debts of the partnership.

There are provisions with respect to secured credit where only claims of secured creditors are to be settled. These provisions are rather lengthy, and I will not read them, but I think they provide in an excellent manner for settling claims that are secured in such a way that the creditor gets the full benefit of his security, and, at the same time, the creditors of the estate who have not such security are provided against loss.

There are provisions also for dealing with conditional and contingent claims. I may say at once that these claims are valid as between the liquidators, and if these cannot agree after conference between themselves, the court is called upon to direct in what manner that claim shall be assessed or valued. The costs in a case such as this and other similar cases are to be left to the decision of the court. There is a provision as to the valuation of negotiable instruments upon which the insolvent is only secondarily liable, under section 46.

There are also some special provisions in regard to the laws of the province of Quebec relating to rights under marriage contracts in the province, providing that there must be registration of the contract a certain time before insolvency in order that the wife may be able to claim her rights. I think that is already our law in the province of Quebec. The liquidator has no right directly or indirectly to dispose of the estate in favour of himself, but his duty is to dispose of it under the direction of the inspectors, as soon as possible after he has obtained absolute control. He may provide, under one of the sections, in his own name for the recovery of all amounts due to the estate, and the costs in such a proceeding are to be charged to the estate. He may sell, with the sanction of the inspectors collectively, all the debts due to the estate, and persons who purchase these debts from the liquidator may sue for the recovery of these debts in their own name as effectively as the liquidator could have done before parting with these assets.

There are special provisions in section 59 in regard to leases, where the insolvent is a tenant of property. I shall not go into all the details of that section. It is sufficient to say that the privilege of the proprietor for the lien due him is preserved to him under the terms of the Act. A liquidator may give three months' notice to the proprietor that he intends putting an end to the lease, and the proprietor may claim damages in consequence of that, but the lease is brought to an end nevertheless. The liquidator also, in spite of conditions to the contrary inserted in the lease, and in spite of the provision that insolvency will ipso facto put an end to the lease, may dispose of the lease for the balance of the term. I think this is a wise provision, because very

often leases of that kind constitute a most valuable asset of the insolvent, and where there is a clause in the lease protecting the proprietor and providing that in case of insolvency the lease will come to an end ipso facto, the creditors of the estate of the insolvent are deprived of a very valuable asset which might be utilized by them without causing any prejudice whatever to the proprietor.

Special provisions are contained in sections sixty and sixty-one as to sales of real estate. In the province of Quebec we have, as you are aware, a special law in regard to forced sales of real estate. I will not trouble the House with detailed explanation of these sections, because I think they can better be considered in the Committee stage of this Bill. But I may say that so far as I have been able to discover, this provision in regard to sales of real estate in the province of Quebec appeared to me to be in conformity with the disposition of our own code of civil procedure.

As to the distribution of the property, there is nothing in this Bill which varies much from the provisions of the old insolvency law, and our own law as it exists at present in the province of Quebec. The dividend sheet is prepared, notice of the deposit of the dividend sheet is given by the liquidator, claims may be contested by handing in a contestation to the liquidator. That contestation may be admitted or may be opposed, and the documents constituting the record of the contestation are transferred by the liquidator to the court having jurisdiction in that case, just as it would in an ordinary case. There is an appeal from the decision of the court of first instance, just as is the case in our own province and in the other provinces.

There is a special provision in section seventy-seven. It is there provided that where a creditor is of opinion that he may take certain proceedings for the benefit of the estate, and the liquidator, creditors or inspectors of the estate are of the opinion that these proceedings are unwise and should not be taken, the creditor may apply to the court, and, on satisfying the court that he is acting bona fide, not in collusion with the liquidator, he may be authorized to take proceedings in the name of the liquidator, but at his own expense and risk, upon terms and conditions which are fixed by the court. In that case the proceedings are conducted by the creditor, and any amounts which he recovers under these proceedings are applied in the first place to the payment of the claims of the creditors who have taken such proceedings, and the balance, if any, is distributed among the other creditors. This is a new, and I think, a wise provision.

There is a part of the Bill devoted to the manner of the distribution of small estates. I think it is unnecessary for me to go into that in detail at the present moment. There are several provisions in part five in regard to the duties of the liquidator, the security he must give, his inability to act until he has given that security, the time within which he must give it, the register which he must keep of all his proceedings, his duty in depositing in a bank any moneys in reference to an estate he has under administration, his duties when he wishes to employ counsel, his remuneration; also for the proceedings to be had in case of the death or removal of the liquidator; also the discharge of the liquidator when he has completely fulfilled his duty and has rendered an account.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). What is his remuneration ?

Mr. MONK. This is what is provided in regard to remuneration :

> The liquidator shall receive such remuneration as may be voted him by the creditors, or in default thereof fixed by the inspectors ; but if such remuneration is not voted by the creditors, or fixed by the inspectors, before the declaration of the final dividend or the preparation of the final account of the liquidator, if there is no dividend, if so voted or fixed, the liquidator is dissatisfied with the amount so voted or fixed he may apply to the court, giving notice to the inspectors of such application, and the court shall thereupon determine the amount of such remuneration, having regard to the nature and value of the estate, the work done and services performed by the liquidator and the responsibility involved.

Mr. EMMERSON. Are there any limitations as to the amount ?

Mr. MONK. No. In part six of the Bill there are penalties provided for persons who, being insolvent, being in the conditions which I have referred to when I began the explanation of this Bill, endeavour to defraud or obtain credit by false pretenses. Every such person is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment, or any greater punishment attached to the offence by any other statute. Are guilty of indictable offence also insolvents who do not make a full discovery of their property, as they are required to do the moment their insolvency is declared, who withhold their books or any of their property from the control of the liquidator, who conceal or secrete property, who do not disclose false claims made upon their estate, mutilate or falsify their books, make false entries therein, or dispose of property unpaid for. There are also indictable offences created in regard to creditors who obtain unduly and fradulently a preference against insolvents' property as regards other creditors. A liquidator is also guilty of an indictable offence under certain circumstances provided in section ninety-one, which amounts to gross dereliction of duty.

In part seven entitled 'procedure generally,' there are rules provided as regards meetings of creditors. What must be done at the meeting. The chairman must be ap-

pointed, that chairman decides all disputes, carefully prepared minutes must be kept, and it provides to what extent creditors may vote. I do not think it is necessary for me to go into all details just now.

Mr. EMMERSON. May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Monk) whether this Bill assumes any conflict of authority between the parliament of Canada and the legislatures of the different provinces and if it presumes to in any way repeal the Acts of the several provinces relating to the distribution of assets ?

Mr. MONK. In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) I will say yes, to a certain extent, it repeals all the provisions of the local legislatures in regard to insolvency. As I understand it the provisions we have in the province of Quebec are not strictly speaking insolvency legislation. There are several enactments in regard to the distribution of the assets of a person who is not able to meet the claims made upon him when they come due.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Would not the same remark apply to the other provinces as well ?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They do not claim to be insolvency laws.

Mr. MONK. No. We have, as I understand, absolute jurisdiction in matters of insolvency and that is why we begin the Bill by defining what constitutes insolvency, in what state a person must be to be considered an insolvent and therefore falling under our legislation. I suppose we have absolute jurisdiction to legislate as to what will be done when a state of insolvency exists, so that I do not think there is exactly a conflict of authority.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It supersedes the provincial legislation.

Mr. MONK. We declare that a person finding himself in the condition described in the fourth section of this Bill is insolvent, we define insolvency and then we assume to legislate as to what would be done in the case of a person who is in that condition.

Mr. EMMERSON. If a sheriff under the provincial Act had charge of the assets of an estate how far would this Bill enable the liquidator to take that property out of the hands of the sheriff ?

Mr. MONK. I start from the principle that we have jurisdiction in matters of insolvency and the moment that state exists, even if the sheriff is in possession of the assets of an insolvent person, I assume we have the right to legislate and that the sheriff will conform to certain regulations mentioned in this statute in regard to insolvency.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Hants). The question is not as to the right of this parliament to pass this legislation, but I think what my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) is asking is if there is any machinery in the Bill of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) to deal with the case of the partial administration of an estate where there are provincial laws practically on the subject of insolvency although not professedly so.

Mr. MONK. Where there is a partial administration ?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MONK. No, I think there is nothing in the Bill as to that.

Mr. RUSSELL. There should be something in the Bill to meet cases of that kind. I refer to cases that we have happening in Ontario, probably in New Brunswick and certainly in Nova Scotia where we have been legislating on the subject of insolvency although we have not said so. I think this legislation has been sustained by the Ontario Court of Appeal. I do not know whether it has ever yet come before the Supreme Court of Canada, but in the province we have been practically assuming to do what this Bill is proposing to do, and the question is whether the Bill will deal with that condition of things to which I have referred, that is the partial administration of an estate, and whether it contains provisions for cases of that sort that may arise.

Mr. MONK. I think the Ontario Act in regard to the subject was sustained by the Privy Council. I would not like to be positive, but I think the original provincial Act was sustained.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not quite sure. I have not followed the question for the last few years, but we have been legislating upon the question of insolvency and my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) wanted to know whether the Bill made any provision in regard to the particular case I have mentioned.

Mr. MONK. I think our own legislation on that subject was sustained by the Privy Council, but I would not be sure. I do not think there was any provision in the Bill as it is now drawn to meet that case.

Mr. EMMERSON. My question did not raise any doubt as to the power of this parliament to pass insolvency laws but it is only in regard to the machinery. I desired to know whether there was any machinery provided by the Bill which would enable an estate that has been partly administered under the laws of the several provinces to be taken hold of and the administration completed.

Mr. MONK. No. There is nothing in this Bill. It would be somewhat difficult to draft such a provision.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be almost essential.

Mr. MONK. I think it would be very difficult, where proceedings had been taken

under provincial legislation for us to interfere. It may be done, but I cannot see how it can be done very easily nor do I think it is very essential. We are legislating for future cases.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think you could repeal their Acts relating to the distribution of estates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There was a condition analogous to what the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has mentioned in connection with the Winding-up Act and the old Insolvent Act. Under the old Insolvent Act a bank could be put into insolvency. When the Winding-up Act was passed it was provided that where a bank was in process of winding up under the Insolvent Act the assignee or curator, or whatever he was, could apply to the court to have the winding up of the estate brought under the provisions of the Winding-up Act and the court might so order. From the time the court so ordered, the estate was wound up under the Winding-up Act and not under the Insolvent Act. It would not be very difficult to make some similar provision to meet such a case as that which has been mentioned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Except that they were both federal Acts and my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) is speaking of a provincial Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Quite so, but if this Act has the effect of superseding the provincial Acts then this House might properly enact that the winding up of an estate which has been partly conducted under the provincial Acts should be conducted under this Act.

Mr. MONK. There are provisions in respect to the jurisdiction of the courts, power of the courts to pass rules for the proper carrying out of the provisions of the Acts and appeals in certain limited cases. These are the principal provisions of this Bill, and I regret very much that, although I have summarized the Bill as much as possible, I should have taken up so much time. I think the Bill is entitled to a trial. It meets a very long felt want throughout the country. Our commercial relations between the different provinces are now very frequent, our commercial relations with other countries are increasing and I think it would be of very great advantage to us to have one absolutely similar law on this important matter of insolvency throughout the whole Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the government will have something to say in the discussion of this Bill and as I know that several hon. members who are not here would like to say something, and as the hour is late, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid that this Bill will meet the fate of previous insolvency Bills. Is not the government of opinion that we might at least sanction the principle of the Bill, and advance it to the committee stage? We can discuss in the committee questions such as have been raised by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) but I think we are able to form an opinion now as to the principle of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there will probably be some discussion on the principle of the Bill. I do not wish to express any strong opinion on behalf of the government against the Bill, and the observations I made were not so much on the merits of the Bill as on the possibility of its getting through this session. My own judgment is that a Bill of this importance will never get through until it is taken up by the government. The experience of the past history of such legislation, which my hon. friend has referred to, goes to show that this Bill will only be got through when it becomes a government measure. The government has expressed no general opinion on the merits or demerits of the principle of insolvency legislation, but I am aware that the government is of opinion that such a measure as this can not be enacted during the present session. If the House desires to go on with the Bill to-night I have no desire to prevent it, but I am aware there will be some discussion on the principle of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do you want to sit any longer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If we are going to sit any longer we might as well go on and discuss this Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Unless hon. gentlemen interested in other Bills wish to press them I think we might now adjourn.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver). I have had a Bill on the Order Paper for the last five weeks, and I would like to have it get its second reading now so that it may be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals. I have been sitting all night here with that intention.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection to sit longer if hon. gentlemen wish. We might take up non-contentious Bills.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have no objection to that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We can call the Bills in order and those not objected to can proceed. If any hon. gentleman is not ready his Bill can stand until another sitting.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have no objection to that.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question is whether a Bill that stands now will ever

do anything else than stand during this session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, there will be another chance.

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Bill (No. 77) to promote the Safety of Railway Employees.—Mr. Smith (Vancouver) read the second time.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver) moved that the Bill be referred to the Select Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the leader of the House if he intends to shut us off entirely. Surely we can say a few words about these Bills.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The understanding was that a Bill not objected to would go on, and that contentious Bills should not go on. I am quite willing to sit late if the hon. gentleman wants to.

Mr. INGRAM. So far as I am concerned I am glad that this Bill has passed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It goes to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understand it, there is not the slightest restriction on the discussion at all. By the unanimous consent of the House Bills that do not involve any discussion are to be taken. That can only be done by the unanimous consent of the House and there cannot possibly be any restriction of discussion on either side.

Motion (Mr. Smith, Vancouver) agreed to.

FRUIT MARKS ACT.

On the Order being called for :

Second reading of Bill (No. 86) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1891.—Mr. Smith (Wentworth).

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I am ready to go on with this Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman does not object to let it stand until the next occasion, he will have an opportunity again without fail.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Very well.

Order allowed to stand.

ALIEN LABOUR ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. CHARLTON (North Norfolk) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 106) to amend the Act to Restrict the Importation and Employment of Aliens.

He said : At this late hour of the night and as the Bill is likely to provoke some discussion it might be advisable to allow it to stand, with the understanding on the part of the government that it shall be reached again.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I regret very much that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) requests that this Bill should stand. I have certain objections to this Bill and if next Monday is to be the only day on which it can be discussed, then I may not be here and I would like to have an opportunity of stating my objections.

Mr. CHARLTON. I certainly have no objection to going on with the Bill, and under the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) perhaps it would be as well to go on with it. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Bill which I submit to the House for second reading is a Bill for correcting a provision of the Alien Labour Law which bears with great severity and with great unfairness upon the manufacturing industries of this great Dominion.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Is it the intention to go on with this Bill at this late hour and with so few members in the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no means of preventing any hon. gentleman from taking up his Bill. We would prefer that anything that is debatable should be postponed, but we have no means of enforcing that if the House wishes to go on.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not anxious to go on with this Bill now, but the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) and the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) I understand, raised objections to letting the Bill stand. My own preference would be to let the Bill stand, but if there are any members who want to discuss it to-night and who do not expect to be here when it comes up again, of course I am ready to bow to their wishes and proceed with the Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely, in the case of this Bill which is of vital importance to the interests of the working classes of Canada, the hon. gentleman will not proceed with it in the absence of the Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock).

Mr. INGRAM. Those of us who may not be present again have the right to express our objections when we have an opportunity.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) perhaps would be interested in this Bill; he ought to be here if he is. The laying aside of legislation because some member of the government is absent is a bad precedent to establish. I am in the hands of the government however.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. You can go on with the discussion and adjourn the debate after those who wish to speak have done so.

Mr. CHARLTON. In view of the wish of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) I think he should have an opportunity of stating his objection. The Alien Labour Law chapter eleven of sixty and sixty-one Victoria provides in section five :

Nor shall this Act be construed as to prevent any person, partnership or corporation, from engaging under contract or agreement skilled workmen in foreign countries to perform labour in Canada in or upon any new industry not at present established in Canada; provided that skilled labour for that purpose cannot be otherwise obtained.

The amendment which I propose to this Bill will eliminate the words:

In or upon any new industry at present not established in Canada.

Then the section will read:

Nor shall this Act be so construed as to prevent any person, partnership, or corporation, from engaging under contract or agreement skilled workmen in foreign countries, to perform labour in Canada provided that skilled labour for that purpose cannot be otherwise obtained.

Now, Sir, this law which I propose to amend has been in operation for about five years. Manufacturers universally feel the burdensome character of this law. The provision that a man shall not be permitted to engage skilled labour that cannot be obtained in Canada is utterly absurd. It is an act of tyranny on the part of any organization whose influence secures that provision. The manufacturing interest of Canada is certainly worthy of consideration and of encouragement. There is a great party in this country which makes the cardinal principle of its platform the promotion of the manufacturing interest, which is prepared to give to that interest ample protection, higher protection than it enjoys at the present time. This Bill asks nothing of that kind; but it asks for a chance to have increased prosperity and increased development for the manufacturing interest of this country.

Mr. CLARKE. By lower wages.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not by lower wages, but by the privilege of importing skilled labour—not ordinary labour or cheap labour, but skilled labour, and of a character that cannot be procured in this country. It does not propose to take from the skilled labourer here the employment that may be his due, but merely asks the privilege of importing that kind of skilled labour which cannot be procured here. This is a class of protection without increase of duty. It is a class of protection that will enable the manufacturer to increase the efficiency of his operations, to import improved methods and improved machinery, to bring here a class of expert workmen who can teach others in this country the methods in which they have been instructed in foreign countries. The great manufacturing nations of the world are all copying the improved methods which other manufacturing nations have developed, they are all bringing in skilled labour to increase the efficiency of their operations, to cheapen and increase production. Russia has developed an enormous manufacturing interest in textile fabrics, in metals, in all lines of manufacture, and Russia imports English workmen, American workmen, American machinery. Russia has created a vast manufacturing interest by doing the very thing which this absurd law condemns and prohibits. The same is true with regard to Germany. Germany is importing American machinery for the manufacture of bicycles, for the manufacture of boots and shoes, for making pig iron, for rolling rails, for making structural steel, and is importing American skilled workmen to set up that machinery. The manufacturing industries of Germany have been revolutionized by the adoption of the very methods which this law will not allow us to adopt in the Dominion of Canada. I myself saw a German who was sent to examine the system of manufacturing pig iron in the United States, who said that the labour of ten men would produce more pig iron under the American system then the labour of twenty men would do in Germany; and his business was to look into the system, to see what the methods were and the character of the machinery employed, and to make arrangements to import into Germany the kind of skilled labour which was not obtainable there. If this absurd law had been in force in Germany, such a thing could not have been done. There could have been no improvement in the methods of the German manufacturer, because the very steps to improvement would have been declared illegal.

Mr. CLARKE. What law was that copied from?

Mr. CHARLTON. The English manufacturers have also been copying American methods; and where they have failed to do so, they have fallen behind in the race in many lines. Take, for instance, boots and shoes. A short time ago an English shoe dealer who had bought $50,000 worth of shoes in Chicago to send to England, was asked: Why have you done that? Have you not as cheap labour in England? 'Oh, yes,' he replied, 'Well, what is the matter?' 'We have not the improved machinery that the Americans have.' 'Why don't you get it?' 'Because the trades' unions of England will not allow that machinery to be put in operation. Not only will they not allow us to import skilled labour, which we cannot get in Great Britain, but they will not allow us to use the improved machinery, and consequently we are losing our hold on the markets.' That is the work of the trades' unions in England, cutting off their noses to spite their faces, and doing more than that—depriving themselves of bread.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Not a thing in it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly there is. It is a palpable fact; and here is this law, maintained and upheld by the trades' unions

of Canada, which lays on our manufacturers the handicap of being unable to put themselves in line with their competitors in other countries, because it does not allow them to introduce the machinery necessary, or the labourers necessary to put that machinery in operation; but they are to be compelled to stay in the background, going on in the old rut, employing the old class of labourers and the old class of machinery, and playing second fiddle to other countries.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Is there any law in England which prevents the importation of expert labour ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, there is a law there, the law of brute force of the labour unions. We have not developed the brute force here, but we have the law on the statute-book, which acts just as effectively, and more so. As I have said, England's loss from the practical adoption of this policy is the loss in many instances of her progress in manufactures, the loss of her ascendancy, the loss of her ability to compete with her competitors, the loss in that keen race between the manufacturing nations which requires the nation which is going to forge ahead, to be permitted to use every instrument, every force, every improvement, every degree of skill, to range the whole world over to bring to herself all those elements of success which are essential to the consummation of her ambition. Special and skilled labour is a necessary thing in a country like Canada, where our manufacturing interests are not fully developed, our manufacturers can only hold their own against the manufacturing interests of the great nation to the south by being permitted to use the best methods to secure the best labour, by being entirely untrammelled in their operation and efforts to secure ascendancy or at least abilty to compete.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). Have they not an alien labour law in the United States ?

Mr. CHARLTON. They have no such law as this, forbidding the importation of skilled labour.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). It is the same law.

Mr. CHARLTON. It does not matter. If a manufacturer who has the plant and finds that he cannot get the labour to run that plant successfully, is to be debarred from bringing that labour in which he cannot secure at home, his operations are handicapped, and you are placing a restriction on him that is not only injurious to himself but detrimental to the interests of the country and the very association which is forcing this absurd provision on the government of Canada. I repeat that the provisions of this law are unjust. It is a self-evident fact that where a manufacturer requires skilled labour and improved machinery, where he requires any improvement that will tend to increase the efficiency of his operations by diminishing the cost of production, a law that prevents him from going out and securing the best kind of machinery and the means necessary to put it into operation, is unjust to him, detrimental to the interests of the country, and an absurd act of tyranny on the part of whatever force or element forces that law into operation. I shall not detain the House further, but ask concurrence in the Bill I submit. It is as follows :

Section five of chapter eleven of the statute of 1897, intituled 'an Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens' is amended by striking out the words 'in or upon any new industry not at present established in Canada' in the tenth and eleventh lines of that section.

The second section will then read :

Nor shall this Act be so construed as to prevent any person, partnership, or corporation for engaging under contract or agreement skilled workmen in foreign countries to perform labour in Canada, provided that skilled labour cannot be otherwise obtained.

The question may be raised as to what is skilled labour and whether it can be obtained or not and how that is to be determined. I was discussing this matter with the hon. Minister of Justice, and I agree with him that if this amendment were allowed a second reading, it should be referred to the Committee of the Whole and that I should move that that Committee of the Whole should rise and report progress for the purpose of giving the hon. minister and the government opportunity to make such safeguards as they might deem proper. If the House will permit the second reading, it will open merely one stage in the matter and then whatever safeguards with which my hon. friend desires to surround his amendment, may be incorporated in it.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not intend to take up very much of the time of the House at this late hour, but am rather surprised at the hon. gentleman moving of a Bill of this character, in view of the fact that he himself is one of the commission, I believe, which intends going to Washington in a very short time. I remember the hon. gentleman finding fault some years ago with the government for taking off the duty on corn, because in so doing they had taken a very strong argument out of the mouth of the Canadian ministers for getting something which would be of advantage to the people of Canada. He is to-night doing the same thing himself. The present Act was before this House many years and defeated many years until public opinion became so strong that it forced the government to pass it. We all agree that it is an act of tyranny, but so is the law of the United States, and it became necessary for the people of Canada to pass this Act in order to protect themselves against an exactly similar one passed by the United States We were obliged to give the

people of the United States the same dose of medicine they had given us. When Canadians, who desire to go to the other side under contract to do skilled labour, are debarred from doing so, is it great hardship to the people of the United States that we should apply to them a similar restriction ? The hon. gentleman said there is no reason why we should exclude from Canada a desirable, intelligent skilful class of Americans who wish to come here and engage in the development of manufacturing industries. Well, the law of Canada does not prevent any skilled workmen coming here. But what we do prevent is their coming in under contract, and we have a right to do this, at least until our hon. friend goes to Washington and persuades the Americans to remove the restrictions they now impose on Canadian workmen. I listened to the hon. gentleman's speech on the budget, and I find that in moving this Bill, he has forgotten what he then said. He then said :

> If we propose to transfer manufacturing interests to this country as we are doing, and will do to a still greater extent if our tariff is changed in the direction of protection, it will be necessary in some cases to permit these American manufacturing interests to import skilled labour, and why we should impose this handicap in existing circumstances on our manufacturing interests I am at a loss to understand. It should be our aim and object to develop the resources of Canada, to increase its wealth in all lines of business in the country, and especially manufacturing interests.

Using the hon. gentleman's words, I am at loss to understand why, 'If we propose to transfer American manufacturing interests to this country, as we are doing and will do to a still greater extent if our tariff is changed in the direction of protection—'

Mr. CHARLTON. I want our manufacturers to be allowed to import skilled labour.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman's contention be correct, if we want more protection, and if that would be the means of bringing in manufacturing interests from the United States, I ask him to be consistent.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will they not have to bring their skilled labour ? Will they bring Dagoes here ?

Mr. INGRAM. This is nothing about the increasing of protection. Raising the tariff is the only means for that. It does not mean that the fact of skilled workmen coming into this country is going to increase our manufacturing interests. So I say the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is inconsistent in this, as he is in other lines. I do not wish to take up more time, for it is late. But I say, in the words of the hon. gentleman, skilled workmen would be biting off their noses to spite their faces if they allowed a Bill like this to pass the House. For the reasons I have stated, the only protection they have is to hold this present law until the obnoxious section is removed from the law of the United States. And I would say, in conclusion, that if the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk is to be one of the Canadian commissioners at Washington, I would urge him to use his best efforts to have the United States authorities remove that section. So far as I am concerned as a Canadian, I shall be glad to support a measure of this kind after such action has been taken by the United States. I do not believe in legislation of this kind, but we are simply compelled to keep it on our statute-book to protect ourselves against the injustice of the American people at this particular time. I do not wish to occupy time at this late hour, so I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it would be better to refer the Bill to the Committee of the Whole House, with the understanding that a motion shall be made that the committee rise and report progress. Then we can consider the Bill in committee. That was the understanding of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) to say that the Minister of Justice has approved of this Bill ?

Mr. CHARLTON. No ; I do not say he was opposed to it. What I say is that he suggested the course that I now propose, that the Bill pass its second reading and be referred to the committee, and that then the motion be presented that the committee rise and report progress, and leave the Minister of Justice to consider the Bill, and the Bill to be dealt with in committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it would be better to carry out the understanding that at the conclusion of the speech of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) the debate should be adjourned. There are several hon. gentlemen who wish to speak on the main question. We should not make progress at this late hour by continuing the discussion.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business may we expect to-morrow ?

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). On the list of Public Bills a Bill standing in my name follows that of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). There are also three other Bills. From the Orders of the Day it would appear that none of these four Bills have been printed, and so could

not be taken up. But I find, by referring to my file, that all these Bills are there printed. It would seem that a course of this kind would prevent Bills coming forward in due course, and, perhaps, delay altogether their passage through the House. I was wondering why this should occur—why the Bill should be on the file, yet that it should appear from the Orders of the Day that they are not printed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can only guess at the reason, and that is that these Bills were printed to-day after the Orders of the Day for this sitting were printed, and immediately placed on the files. If that is not the explanation, I could not offer any. In answer to my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), as to the business for to-morrow, there are several Bills on the Government Orders which will be taken up, and, after that, Supply; the Minister of Public Works again bringing forward his estimates.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). Before the adjournment is carried, as I do not wish to take either the government or the House by surprise, I desire to give notice that the next time a motion is made for Committee of Supply I shall bring up for debate the matter of the position of the commander of the militia, especially with reference to some speeches and interviews recently given by Lord Dundonald.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the motion the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) intends to make occupy some time ?

Mr. BOURASSA. It is not a motion, but simply the discussion of a matter which I wish the government and the House to take notice of. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) knows, such a discussion need not be followed by a motion.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In that case, I beg leave to give notice to the government that the next time there is a motion to go into Committee of Supply I will move a resolution regarding the passing of certain Orders in Council relating to the Treadgold concessions in the Yukon.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 5, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 144) respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Bill (No. 145) respecting the Quebec Bridge Company, and to change its name to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 146) respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—Mr. Hughes (Victoria).

Bill (No. 147) respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 148) respecting certain trust funds of the diocese of Moosonee.—Mr. Osler—by Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 149) to incorporate the Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 150) to incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company, Limited.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 151) to incorporate the St. Joseph's Transportation Company.—Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 152) to incorporate the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Riley—by Mr. Logan.

THE NIPIGON IRON RANGE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. DYMENT moved :

That the petition of Hamilton Cassels and others, presented this day, praying to be permitted to lay before the House their petition for an Act of incorporation under the name of Nipigon Iron Range Railway Company, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for presenting petitions for private Bills, be now read and received, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say in regard to this that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said that last session he intended to stop the practice of extending the time for the introduction of Bills after the time had passed. I simply draw his attention to it now so that it will not be continued too far, because it is one of the means by which our sessions are often lengthened, and as every one must have reasonable notice when a Bill is introduced, giving notice so late in the session and then bringing Bills in after the time has expired for receiving Bills or petitions is an improper thing and it should be discontinued.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). Last session we shortened the time of these extensions which had occurred time after time, but if the House is warned in advance that this final extension will be finally final it will act accordingly and I hope we will not be called upon to extend it later on.

Motion agreed to.

MR. JAMES SINCLAIR McDOUGALL—REVIVAL OF PATENT.

Mr. D. GALLERY (Montreal, St. Anne) moved :

That the petition of Philip Demers and others, presented this day, praying for leave to present the petition of James Sinclair McDougall, for an Act to authorize the committee of patents to receive a partial fee and revive certain letters patent of invention, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for receiving petitions for private Bills, be now read and received and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. SPROULE. Despite the fact that the right hon. Prime Minister has said that this has been made finally final, it is becoming a bad habit.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The time limit ought to expire in regard to a Bill of that kind.

The PRIME MINISTER. The time limit must be extended to all or none.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). Mr. Speaker, I have already called the attention of the House to the fact that by a recent decision of the Supreme Court in the matter of patents a great many patents have lapsed. I have seen on the Order Paper for a long time a Bill proposed to be introduced by the hon. Minister of Agricultrue (Hon. Mr. Fisher). I think that Bill, if it were carried, would remedy the evils which are complained of in the present instance. I would urge upon the government the necessity of pressing this Bill, if it is to be pressed, as soon as possible, so that it will be passed this session. If it is not passed this session, I may tell the government, what probably the government know already, that a vast injustice will be done to a great many owners of patents.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) I may say that I think he is mistaken in supposing that these private Bills are of the same nature as the government Bill referred to. I think these Bills would be necessary any way, but the Bill of which notice has been given in the name of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) will be brought forward at an early day. The hon. minister is on his way home and we would prefer that he should deal with the subject himself.

Mr. S. HUGHES (North Victoria). I would take the liberty of calling the attention of the government to a point that should be remedied in any Bill which is introduced. A person applies for a patent and before it issues from the department one of his workmen leaves his employment, gives away the secret to another firm that begins to manufacture and under the law no injunction can be obtained restraining this firm from using this patent and there are no means of bringing cases of that kind to an issue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The remedy would be by an amendment to the regulations of the department providing means by which an issue of that kind might be brought forward more quickly than by the present regulation, which allows two years. The matter is now engaging the attention of the department.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY—THE PARLIAMENT GROUNDS.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw attention to something which I think should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. I refer to the work going on down here on the parliament lawn. I noticed yesterday and to-day, some eight or ten men and two or three horses and carts engaged in cutting off the sod——

Mr. SPEAKER. Permit me to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that it would be more regular to bring this matter up when the House is moved into Committee of Supply. When the Orders of the Day are called, only questions of privilege should be brought up, but I have noticed for some time that hon. members have departed from that rule. As we now go into Committee of Supply almost every day, such matters can then be more conveniently brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I have merely followed the usual custom in doing this, and if necessary, I shall conclude with a motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the right to make a motion that the House do adjourn, but the practice followed in England is that these matters are brought up on the motion for the going into Committee of Supply, and I think that is a very good rule to follow here.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought this a matter of the greatest importance to refer to it at the earliest possible moment. There are at least two motions giving notice of when the House goes into Committee of Supply, and if I followed the suggestion of Mr. Speaker it would be some days before I can bring the matter before the attention of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is mistaken. When an amendment to Supply is disposed of, another amendment cannot be made, but it is open to discuss any question on the main motion.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 82) respecting and restricting Chinese Immigration.—The Prime Minister.

On section 6,

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is an alteration in this section from the old law. It raises the poll tax from $100 to $500.

On section 17,

The PRIME MINISTER. The old law provided that any person who contravenes this section illegally would be subject to a penalty of $200, but as the tax has been increased to $500, we now make the penalty $500.

On section 24,

The PRIME MINISTER. Under the old law the proportion of the poll tax to be paid to the province was one-quarter, and now it will be one-half.

Bill reported; read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—THE GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to bring before the House a matter which I spoke of last night before the adjournment. At the outset I wish to say that the remarks I intend to make are not at all dictated by any motives of personal hostility towards Lord Dundonald. I have not the advantage or the pleasure of knowing the gentleman; and, anyhow, I would consider it to be unworthy of my position as a member of this House to make a personal attack upon any official of this government. If my remarks had reference only to the personal opinions of Lord Dundonald, as an official of the government, my attack would naturally have to be directed against the responsible head of the Militia Department, that is, the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick W. Borden); but some of the utterances of Lord Dundonald should, I think, bring to the mind of the House the general subject of the relations that should exist between the responsible head of the Militia Department and the officers sent by the British government to take the position of commander of our militia. This is not a new matter. It has been a source of difficulty in the past between nearly all Ministers of Militia and officers commanding our militia; so that I say—and this is the point I wish to make to-day—that the weakness in our system does not come from the choice of the man, but comes from the system itself, and that it should be remedied as soon as possible.

On the 23rd of April last, at a large banquet which was held in the city of Hamilton in honour of St. George's day, Lord Dundonald made a lengthy and eloquent speech.

Mr. CLARKE. What paper are you quoting from?

Mr. BOURASSA. I am quoting from the Hamilton 'Times' of April 24. In the speech he spoke at length about the reorganization of the militia in Canada, and I quote two paragraphs:

> It was too late to organize when the storm-cloud had burst, organization must be done before. The more civilian the force, the more perfect should be the organization. What he wanted in Canada, was that when he touched a button in his central office that every regiment in the land could be called out fit for service. Was this the case now? he asked. (No! no! from several voices). . . . . .
>
> The militia, he was afraid, had had as their diet promises for a long time, instead of food, praise exuberant, instead of wine. What was wanted, was a little of that thirteen millions of dollars. He did not wish to create that bugbear—the spirit of militarism, but he did want to see an efficient force in Canada—a force efficient in all its departments, and having every facility for imparting every information to the officers to enable them to properly command their men. This was not militarism, it was common sense.

To these words of the officer, taken by themselves, I make no objection; but the point which I want to make, and which I will make still more strongly from some further utterances of Lord Dundonald, is that he is not the proper person to declare what should be the military policy of Canada. The Minister of Militia is the proper authority to give an opinion as to what reforms should be made in the militia of Canada, because he is the man whom the people and the parliament of Canada have a right to criticise and vote against if his policy does not suit them.

On the previous day, the 22nd of April, Lord Dundonald was passing through Toronto, where he gave an interview which I find in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of April the 23rd. In that interview he said:

> Some people may endeavour to discourage what they deem militarism, but it can be understood how futile the strength of the defensive force of Canada would be without it. That is simply what I shall endeavour to bring about in the Canadian militia, organization on reasonable and sensible lines. I shall be in Toronto in a short time, and I shall have an opportunity of stating publicly my opinions regarding the organization of the volunteer forces and I am sure they will meet with the approval of those who understand the governing of Canada, her position in the empire, and her standing in the world.

Here there was a slight difference. In the speech at the banquet Lord Dundonald said that far from his mind was the idea of favouring the spirit of militarism; but in the interview at Toronto he said that the only way of improving our militia was by fostering that spirit. To this declaration I am glad to say we have a strong and forc-

ible answer from the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), who, speaking at the same banquet at Hamilton, made a speech against the spirit of militarism. I have already had occasion to express to that hon. gentleman my opinion of that speech, and here I have pleasure in saying that it is one of the most promising declarations we have had from a responsible member of the government since the conference in London. I will quote one paragraph from that speech :

> Militarism is the enemy of true liberty, and its adoption in Canada would go to weaken, if not destroy, the bond of union now so firmly and happily uniting us with the great mother of nations.
>
> It is Canada's ambition to follow all that is glorious in the annals of Great Britain. Canadian citizenship is now being extended to vast numbers of people, who, weary of old-world burdens, disappointments or oppressions, come here to breathe the air of free Canada, to share with us in her bounteous gifts and assist us in building up in this western world a Greater Britain, suggesting the thought that the centre of empire may yet be in British North America (cheers). But be that as it may, Canada's task awaits her.
>
> Ever guided by the torch of liberty, instead of destroying with the sword, let her aim be to acquire industrial dominion over her fertile lands, her productive waters, her mines, her forests, to drive away the solitude of her vast unoccupied areas with the cheerful music of human voices and hum of productive machinery; to awaken her dormant wealth, lying everywhere easily within man's grasp ; to extend her commerce to the uttermost corners of the earth, and to make the name of Canada everywhere stand for freedom and progress.

I need not say, Sir, that this is a national programme to which every member of this House should be happy to assent.

On the 1st of April last the Dominion Rifle Association met at Ottawa. Lord Dundonald was present, and here is a quotation from his speech on that occasion, which I take from the ' Citizen ' of the 2nd of April :

> Though I have recommended certain steps which I think are necessary for the militia, I wish here emphatically to deny a falsehood current in certain papers, namely, that I was much annoyed that $12,000,000 was not provided in this year's estimates for the militia for capital expenditure. If $12,000,000 were provided this moment I could not with the moderate proposals I made recommend its expenditure with advantage within a year. Such expenditure might well be spread over two or three years so that organization in men and their efficiency could go hand in hand with the provision of material.

The gentleman leaves us the hope that we may have the chance of getting our share of the surplus of $13,000,000 for the development of trade and industry in Canada, but he warns us that his intention is to swallow it up in three years instead of one year. I know very well that this is not the policy of the government. The hon. Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) has expressed clearly, within the last six months, on several occasions, what is the policy of the government with regard to militia matters. In only one of those speeches was there perhaps a tendency expressed similar to that stated by Lord Dundonald, but when I brought that speech to the attention of the hon. minister he said emphatically that the report was incorrect. We have further the strong expression of opinion given by the hon. Postmaster General, which I have already quoted. The point I want to make is this, that on militia matters, or any matters whatever connected with the expenditure of the people's money, it is not proper that we should have on one side a programme laid down by one of the irresponsible officials of one of the departments and another programme on the other side laid down by the responsible head of that department. Suppose the Minister of Public Works were to declare at a banquet that he was in favour of deepening the Ottawa river, or building the Georgian Bay canal, and that while he did not want the $13,000,000 surplus of this year spent for that purpose, he would spread the expenditure over three or four years ; and then suppose we had the minister responsible for that department stating at another banquet that it was not the intention of the government to do either of these works :—would not any member of this House say that such a state of affairs should not be encouraged ? Would not likewise any member of this House, whatever may be his opinions on militia matters and the relations that should exist between this country and the old country with regard to military organization, and who knows anything about responsible government, say that we should not tolerate any irresponsible official declaring publicly for a policy which the government disavows?

An hon. MEMBER. It is funny that all those quotations are from speeches made at banquets.

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, and the funniest thing is that the most reasonable of those quotations, which I have given, are from speeches that were made at banquets. The most reasonable quotation was from a speech made by the hon. Postmaster General at a banquet. The other quotation was from an interview given to the reporter of a newspaper, and the third was from a speech made in the city of Ottawa at the meeting of the Dominion Rifle Association. If the views expressed by Lord Dundonald do not represent the policy of the government—and we have the best of evidence that they do not—then we are in the presence of a struggle between an irresponsible official of the government and the responsible head of the department. Certainly that condition of things cannot be allowed to continue. As I have said, I am not attacking Lord Dundonald personally. But we have had from the beginning to the end, the same conflict

between every British commander of our militia and every Minister of Militia, and no doubt the cause is to be found in the fact that our law provides that the officer commanding our militia shall be sent here by the British government. The result is obvious. The gentleman who leaves the other side to take command of our militia has no intention of becoming one of our own, and does not come here to take his responsibility as a Canadian officer. He comes here to introduce into the military organization of Canada such reforms as may be pointed out by the head of the War Office in the mother country. Not being a military man, I shall not attempt to discuss the value, from a military point of view, of Lord Dundonald's merits; but what I say is that there should be a distinct understanding between this government and the government of the old country that in military, as well as in other matters, this is a self-governing country and that any military regulations and laws which may commend themselves to our approval we will adopt of our own free will at the suggestion of the responsible head of the department and not at the suggestion of an officer who becomes, the moment he lands, a paid official of this government, and has consequently no right to direct our policy. This is not merely a personal opinion I am expressing. Difference of views between the officer commanding the militia and the responsible head of the Militia Department is considered in England as a struggle between the imperial and the Canadian authorities. As evidence of this let me quote from the London 'Morning Post' of the 30th of April last, which has a long article on the position of Canada from a military point of view. In that article, after some words about the progress of military spirit in Canada, I find this paragraph:—

> But it does not go nearly far enough, and we should not be surprised if the report that the Earl of Dundonald is dissatisfied with the government's response to his request for more men, better guns, and a more thorough organization turned out to be substantially correct. Nor is it altogether certain that Lord Dundonald has succeeded in preventing the use of military appointments as rewards for services to a ruling political party.

We have here one of the leaders of public opinion in the capital of the empire discussing the matter as a struggle between the officer commanding and the Canadian Minister of Militia. If this opinion exists in the old country, it should be dissipated as rapidly as possible, not only from our point of view but from the imperial point of view; because so long as the leading men in England are not perfectly convinced that whatever may be the policy of Canada with regard to military or other matters, that policy will manifest itself in laws and regulations adopted by our Canadian parliament, and not according to the dictates of any irresponsible officer, we are likely to see no end to this continual friction between those officers sent out by the British government to command our militia and the Canadian government.

I do not think that I need add very much to what I have said. I have not brought this question up from a military point of view but as a layman. Judging, however, by what I have read on the subject in the newspapers in England, particularly the military and naval newspapers, I think that while on many matters perhaps British officers have more experience than ours, in some matters they have an experience that rather unfits them for the direction of the military organization of this country. No body of officers of this country, for example, would stand being flogged for not having had proper uniforms on when going to the barber shop in the morning. That is an extreme idea of military discipline which would not be tolerated in this country. As regards the vote for military expenditure by this parliament, no doubt, whatever may be our individual opinion on the amount of money which should be expended, there is no division of opinion in this parliament as to the authority which should decide on that expenditure and how the money should be expended. Therefore we should on this occasion, as we did in the case of General Hutton, call for an explanation from the government, so that the lines may be drawn clearly as regards the real position of the officer commanding our militia and the relations that exist between him and the responsible head of the Militia Department.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). I think it would be very much out of place on this occasion to enter into any discussion of any proposal with reference to military expenditure which may be under the consideration of the government, although my hon. friend has tempted us perhaps to follow in that direction. I think, however, that the question he has brought up is one to which the House may very profitably give a few moments consideration. I do not, I may say at the outset agree with my hon. friend in his criticism of the utterances of the present officer commanding. I have failed to discover in the quotations which he has read anything which the most exacting member of the government or member of parliament could take exception to. Nor do I think, from my knowledge of the intentions of the present general that he intended to say anything of an improper character, or that he intended to assume powers which did not properly belong to him. To say, for instance, that it is too late when the storm has passed—to prepare for a storm—we cannot take much exception to that. To say that he desires to have every battalion in Canada, so far as we have battalions, in a state of efficiency is not a thing that one could take exception to. Not only that, but I may say that I endorse

absolutely the desire expressed by the General that, so far as we have a militia in this country, it shall be an effective militia. Nor do I quarrel very much with the statement which the General appears to have made that the militia of Canada has had promises too long and performances for too short a time. I would agree with him in that; I would like to see more performance. But I agree with my hon. friend when he leaves the particular case under consideration and traverses the broader field. I agree with him entirely when he says that the general officer commanding the troops in this country is a servant of the people of Canada, and an official of the government of Canada. I think there has been, in the past, some misapprehension in this matter in the minds of gentlemen who come to this country to occupy the prominent position of the general officer commanding the Canadian militia. Some three years ago, it became the duty of the First Minister to state very distinctly the views of the government with reference to this matter. And I shall take occasion before I sit down to read the words to which the Prime Minister gave utterances at that time. But, before doing so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have carefully studied this subject with a sincere desire to find out if I could, why it was that this difficulty to which my hon. friend refers between the generals who come here, imperial officers, and Ministers of Militia and Defence in this country should recur over and over again in this country. I have come to the conclusion that the reason of it is that the imperial officers who come here have no experience which would fit them to deal with the government of the day. They come here as imperial officers, having lived for a long time in a very narrow sphere where they have learned nothing but to command, being also under the command of a superior officer—not even having had the opportunity of having served in permanent positions in the war office where they would be brought in contact with the executive government, with the War Minister. They come to this country therefore without the experience which would fit them for a position directly under a minister who is responsible to the parliament and the people of Canada. They have not even had the advantage of occupying a position near the executive of the mother country. How much less, then, can we expect them to immediately accommodate themselves to occupying a subordinate position in a colonial administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, this, I believe, is the cause of the serious difficulties we have had; and I am afraid that, until the time comes when a different class of officers, men who have had experience in the war office and in touch with the executive of England, are sent to this country, these difficulties will recur over and over again. The general officer commanding the militia of this country is an imperial officer, it is true and must have rank not below that of colonel in the British army. Why is that made a provision of the Canadian Militia Law? Simply and solely because it is thought that it may be presumed to secure the necessary qualification to enable him to command an army in this country, and for no other reason. When he leaves the British army for the time being and comes to this country, he comes here as the official of the Dominion government, he comes under Order in Council appointing him by the Governor General of Canada, and is the officer and official of the Canadian government and responsible to the Canadian government and the Canadian people alone. Do not let us misunderstand this point—that although he is an imperial officer, that fact does not give him any additional power or authority in this country. Now, I do not know that it is necessary for me to enlarge. I will simply conclude what I have to say by reading again what was said in this House by the Prime Minister in 1900, on the occasion of the difficulty that occurred with Major General Hutton:

> The government desire to state that while they will, at all times, be prepared to give the most careful consideration to any representations which may be made by the officer commanding the militia, it must be distinctly understood that any such officer, on accepting the position in question becomes from that time an officer in the employment of and subject in all respects to the government of Canada, and that he is to be regarded as an adviser but not as entitled to control the Department of Militia. The government are responsible to the parliament and people of Canada for the due administration of each and every branch of the public service, and they would be derelict in their duty if they were to permit any subordinate official, under any circumstances, to take upon himself to disregard the instructions he may receive from the constitutional head of his department.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (North Victoria). I am delighted to hear the Minister of Militia reiterate the words prepared, I believe by the hon. and gallant gentleman who fills the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and voiced by the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It took the ministry a long time to learn their duty in the premises. A struggle went on with that officer—I refer to General Hutton. He tyrannized over the Minister of Militia, he tyrannized over the Prime Minister, he even undertook to manage those higher in authority. But I claim the credit of having taught the country what the duty of a general officer commanding in Canada ought to be. But I was not supported. I regret to say that I was deserted by my own friends, and I was not reinforced by the present government. I fought the fight single-handed on that occasion. The voice of my good friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was unheard.

He was silent. To-day, when we have a general officer commanding who is a gentleman, when we have a general officer commanding who has won his laurels on the fields of fame, when we have a general officer commanding who lives within the constitution, we find that hon. gentleman rising in his seat and slinging mud at him.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has complained of the language made use of by Lord Dundonald in the city of Hamilton. Lord Dundonald gave utterance to no language that was confidential; he expressed no opinion there which had not been officially reported to his minister, and that had not been endorsed by his minister; and I believe, and am credibly informed by gentlemen who were there, that when the Postmaster General got through reading his carefully prepared essay on militarism at the banquet in Hamilton, he found his utterances received so coldly that even he swung round and endorsed the remarks made by the general officer commanding. At all events, I find by the newspapers published in the city of Hamilton, Liberals and Conservatives alike, that the Hon. Col. Gibson rose in his place and endorsed most cordially the remarks of the general officer commanding. Lord Dundonald did not seek to override the minister in the slightest degree. But we found the ministers, and we find the followers of the government, sitting dumb in their seats when a former general officer commanding did seek to override the Minister of Militia, and in fact did override the whole ministry. Lord Dundonald did not treat the Minister of Militia as an inferior and refuse to obey his orders. Lord Dundonald has never undertaken to place a curb on any member of the House of Commons; he has never undertaken to control the action or the language of any military member of this House of Commons on military questions; yet this was done, to the knowledge of the ministry, by the former general officer commanding, and not one word was uttered on the floor of this House or elsewhere in this country, so far as known in condemnation of that policy. Lord Dundonald has never had the audacity to approach His Excellency over the head of his minister, and to receive and transmit commands from His Excellency to officers of the militia of this country. Were he to do that, I am satisfied he would be dismissed. But a former general officer commanding did do it, and did it with the knowledge of the government, and he was not checked for it by the government. Lord Dundonald has never attempted either to communicate officially with the war office in the old country. I fail to see why this officer should be brought up before the country to-day and be treated in the manner in which the hon. member for Labelle has undertaken to treat him here to-day. I must congratulate the minister though in this regard, that he has treated Lord Dundonald very fairly, and although there may be a little hidden menace in the note of warning he read at the conclusion of his address, I must congratulate the minister on his treatment of the general officer commanding.

Now I noticed in the essay read by the Postmaster General at Hamilton, a very beautiful essay, that he discussed most eloquently the curse of militarism. Let me point out to that hon. gentleman that when he speaks of the 'northern hemisphere'—I presume he meant the western hemisphere, but the newspapers credited him with saying the northern hemisphere—when he refers to the United States of America as a nation indulging in the arts of peace and whose footsteps we should follow, let me tell him that, starting from the year 1783 when the United States first gained its independence down to a time subsequent to the Boer war, the United States has spent millions of dollars more on war than have Great Britain and all her colonies combined. I have the figures, and shall be pleased to submit them to the House if required, or to the minister on any occasion. More than that, I want to point out to him that Britain's prestige to-day, Britain's civilization to-day, Britain's Christianity to-day, are due to her power in war; and I have yet to see the nation that has earned greatness in commerce, greatness in art, greatness in anything that goes to make a nation illustrious, that has not owed it primarily to her military prowess. I am prepared to discuss that question whenever it is necessary so to do. It is only in recent years that Great Britain has given way to the spirit of militarism.

Take the speech of Lord Dundonald at Hamilton, and compare it with the essay of the Postmaster General. Sir, I maintain that, on the one hand, the remarks of Lord Dundonald breathed the true spirit for a democratic country to adopt. Train up the militia of the country, make its organization as perfect as possible, and you will prevent the spirit of militarism from becoming dominant in that country. You will find that the rank and file of the people, the boys on the farm, the young men in the workshops of the cities and towns, will be a military people, they will be military men in their capacity as citizens. But the policy propounded by the Postmaster General has bred in all countries a spirit of militarism and exclusiveness, that has built up tyrannies the world over; for we find that in these countries where a citizen soldiery has been neglected, tyrannies rise much more easily than they do in those countries where the rank and file of the people are trained in their duties as citizen soldiers.

In the remarks made by Lord Dundonald at the meeting of the Dominion Rifle Association, the Minister of Militia was present, and I am satisfied he will bear me out in saying that the remarks of the general officer commanding did not at all permit the

construction placed upon them by my hon. friend from Labelle. He referred jocularly to the expenditure of $13,000,000 in the development of militia. Supposing we armed the people of Canada, I would like to see 150,000 rifles, I would like to see 500,000 rifles placed in the hands of the farmer's sons of Canada by the government. Let them be placed with the boys on the farms and with the people generally, under any proper system of control. What would these rifles cost? Multiply each one by $25, and you will have the figures, nearly the full amount of that $13,000,000. Then supposing you were to have a few more batteries of artillery, a few more regiments of cavalry, and you will reach beyond the $13,000,000 at once. But once these expenditures are incurred, they need not be repeated for a great many years.

It has been made public in some unofficial way that Lord Dundonald has recommended an expenditure of $13,000,000, and I have demanded that his report shall be made public officially so that the public may have an opportunity of knowing what his recommendations are. I can readily figure out that for placing this country in a better state of preparedness and for providing the necessary armament for the defence of a young nation such as this an expenditure, extending over a number of years, of course, involving a number of millions of dollars could very properly and very usefully be indulged in. However, it is not my intention at this period of the session to discuss this question any further. I must congratulate the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) on his endorsement of the course of Lord Dundonald. Mark you, if I found Lord Dundonald, or any imperial or Canadian officer, encroaching upon the rights of citizenship, encroaching upon the rights of the people's representatives in this House, I would be one of the first to bring him to time, but I have watched Lord Dundonald's course very carefully, and I have seen nothing to find fault with in it. In South Africa he was a gentleman; he treated the officers and men under him as gentlemen and soldiers, and they followed him as a leader. In this country Lord Dundonald has not once encroached upon the domain of the minister. He has been in every respect, so far as I can judge, a model general officer commanding, recognizing that he is the servant of a responsible government and that the minister is responsible to the people of the country. On another occasion, when the Bill of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence comes down, we will have an opportunity of discussing these matters at greater length, but in the meantime, I wish to express my disapprobation of the line of action pursued by the hon. member for Labelle in bringing this matter up and seeking to cast a reflection upon the general officer commanding. When I heard of the matter first I did not know what Lord Dundonald had said in Hamilton, but I got the papers and read them over very carefully, and I was more than surprised to find that he had kept himself so well under control, and that he had not referred to one solitary matter that the minister had not cordially endorsed his position upon.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I do not rise, Mr. Speaker, to attempt any defence of Lord Dundonald. It seems to me that is quite unnecessary, especially after what I think are the very proper remarks of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). I happened to be chairman of the banquet in Hamilton, and as I paid very particular attention to the language of Lord Dundonald on that occasion, I confess that it was with the utmost surprise that I heard that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) thought of bringing forward this question in the House. If that hon. gentleman had been present, I think he would have admitted that there was not a syllable uttered at that banquet by Lord Dundonald which might not have been uttered had the hon. minister been at his side. Lord Dundonald, I may say, was there as one of three guests who were invited from a distance by the St. George's Society. Lord Dundonald was one, the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) was another, and my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was another. On that occasion Lord Dundonald was called upon to respond to the toast of 'Our Defenders.' In the course of his response he referred to his service in South Africa, and particularly, when alluding in the usual terms to the regular forces, the army and navy, he dwelt upon the colonial volunteers, and he especially mentioned in the warmest terms that gallant regiment the Strathcona Horse. He said that it had been an honour for him to have included in his brigade in South Africa the Canadian regiment called the Strathconas; and I mention that particularly in consequence of a few words that fell from the hon. minister, and because Lord Dundonald appears in South Africa to have had under his command a large force of colonial troops, which experience, I should think, makes him most fittingly the right man in the right place in Canada. Lord Dundonald, when alluding in the usual terms to the troops, added some words upon the experiences he had had in Natal, and in referring to the miseries of the people there, he said that the lesson they had learned in that province was to organize in good time and not wait for the bursting of the storm. He at the same time said he thought it would be well if the people of Canada and if the militia of Canada, a large number of officers being present and listening to him, would take the lesson to heart and see that the militia force was made effective. Lord

Dundonald, from first to last, never used one word upon the policy of this country as to the militia. He never departed from mere questions of detail. There was not a word uttered from first to last as to the numbers of the militia, as to whether the force should be increased, or as to any such question of policy. But he did say that what he desired to see was that the militia of Canada should be effective, that if, under any unfortunate circumstances, the militia were called out and regiments brigaded, it was his desire that they could be turned out ready in every particular to do their duty. In this connection he mentioned two or three matters of detail, and these were the particular matters upon which his speech chiefly ran. He said, first of all, there was the question of transport, and he thought it was of the utmost importance that this question of transport should be considered and that the force should be fully equipped for service in that respect. Judging by the response which the officers present gave to that remark, I think they all agreed with him. He further said it was of importance that the force should be educated in signalling, that the officers should be so taught that a general in command of a brigade, or of any body of troops, could flash his orders to the heads of the component parts of the brigade. The appliances for that purpose should be provided and officers commanding should be so instructed that they would understand the signals when they got them. I think that also received the approbation of all who heard it. He referred to the field telegraph, the heliograph and other matters of that kind, and his speech was confined soley to such matters. Judging by the demonstrations and comments of those who were listening, and they were prominent people belonging to the city of Hamilton and officers of the local force and from the neighbouring towns, I think his remarks were received with unanimous approval. He deprecated anything like militarism ; he did this more than once ; but he said, as has been quoted here to-day : That he thought the matters he was trying to impress upon his audience were matters of common sense, and he urged them merely as matters of detail regarding the force as it exists, and not at all as undertaking to urge that any other or larger force should be created. The Postmaster General (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock) followed in response to another toast, and he also deprecated militarism, but I did not understand the Postmaster General to take exception to any remark made by the Major General Commanding. I quote from a newspaper one remark made by the Postmaster General, and apparently uttered by him to show that he was not taking exception to what Lord Dundonald said. He said :

> I refer not to measures of defence, but to that aggressive warlike spirit known as militarism.

The Postmaster General was condemning the aggressive, warlike spirit known as militarism, but he was not condemning defence, and the Major General was commenting upon the organization of our troops as a defensive body and urging that they should be equipped most thoroughly for that purpose. The Attorney General for Ontario was present, and I think he is as good a Liberal as the member for Labelle or any member of this House. Speaking after the Postmaster General and the Major General, the Hon. Mr. Gibson said :

> The gist of Lord Dundonald's argument was well expressed when His Lordship said : 'As citizen soldiers what was wanted was organization.'

There is the language of the Attorney General for Ontario, who understood perfectly what the Major General was referring to under the term 'organization.' Lord Dundonald was not speaking of organizing the people of Canada into a military force, but of organizing the force that exists ; a force which this government and all preceding governments have conceded is a necessity for this country. Lord Dundonald argued, that that force, proud as we are of it, is lacking in some respects, and he wanted to see it up to date in every respect, so that if called upon it would, as he said, spring out ready equipped for duty on the bell being pushed. The Attorney General of Ontario is an old parliamentarian and he used this language further :

> As commander of the militia Lord Dundonald was the right man in the right place. While the General Commanding and the Postmaster General had reached the same conclusion he had to admit that they argued along different lines.

The only difference between them was that the Postmaster General was speaking of the blessings of peace, and he did so most eloquently, but he carefully guarded himself from saying one word against the argument that had been used with regard to defence. I do not know that I need say any more. It is a painful thing that any gentleman who was a guest on that occasion and who used language that no person could take exception to, should have his name brought up in this House as if he were guilty of some indiscretion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. As one who was present and knowing how utterly undeserved is the language used in regard to that gallant soldier, I say it is a painful thing that this matter should be brought before the House in this way. Lord Dundonald was kind enough to come all the way to Hamilton as a guest of St. George's Society. He did so at a great deal of inconvenience to himself and he was most guarded in the language he used. It is unfortunate that his name should be mentioned in this House in connection with a supposed impropriety such

as the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) imagines. Now, Sir, I may say with regard to the general subject of the right of a commanding officer to speak on such an occasion, it does seem to me most extraordinary that a member of this House should think that the Major General should have his tongue tied, and should not be allowed to express an opinion, even on matters of detail with regard to our militia force. Surely, the superintendent of our farms, in making a speech at some banquet, would not be condemned because he would advocate farming up to date, or, if he said jocularly that he hoped the government farm would get a little of that $13,000,000. Suppose the manager of our railways was making a speech at a banquet and he advocated railway appliances up to date, would it be expected that the Minister of Railways should turn upon him and say: You had no right to speak, sir; you must not utter a word in public; you must let me speak for you. Surely gentlemen who are charged with most important public interests, whether as commanding our militia force, or as controlling departments under ministers, have some right to express their opinions. What is the good of them if they do not form opinions, and if they do form them, why not tell us what they are? We are expending something like $2,000,000 a year on our military force, and is the man who tells us that we should have that force, which costs us so much, properly equipped and efficient, but that it is not so; is he to be condemned if he expresses that opinion? I hope not, Sir.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker. I am essentially a man of peace.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. And although I believe that under the terms of the statute, I belong to the militia of Canada, I do not rise with any idea of criticising our military organization. But, as having been one of the guests at the banquet at Hamilton, I feel it almost a duty to confirm what has just been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Barker), the member for that city. I may say, Sir, that sitting alongside of the general officer commanding, I lent particular attention to every word that fell from his lips, and in anything which he said I did not notice a word that would lead one to believe that it was his desire to innovate in any way and still less to dictate to the administration the line of conduct it ought to pursue in respect to military organization. The general officer commanding began by stating that what few remarks he had to offer he wished to confine them exclusively to the efficiency of the militia force as it exists. He spoke of the importance, in a large country like ours, of having our militia men conversant with the signalling system; he spoke of the necessity of proper accommodation for the militia; he spoke of the necessity, demonstrated during the late war in South Africa, of practice in rifle shooting; and he did say—and it seemed to me he advisedly said—that we should have such a militia organization that would admit of it being placed at a moment's notice upon a proper footing of defence. Beyond that, he mentioned the conduct of our own troops in South Africa and gave us some very interesting reminiscences of his own experiences during the war; and I feel bound to render him the tribute of justice which I am doing in confirmation of what has been said by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). I am happy, in the absence of the general officer commanding, who is not able to defend himself in this House, to render him this tribute, that he impressed me as being not only a very brave man, but a man of very modest and unassuming demeanour.

I do not think any person in this House will call in question what was laid down by the hon. Minister of Militia, and what was insisted on at perhaps unnecessary length by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), that we have absolute control of our own militia organization. There is no doubt on that point; and, for my own part, referring more particularly to the explanatory remarks made to-day by the hon. Minister of Militia, and in spite of what has been said here on more than one occasion by my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), I have always adhered to the hope that at some date not too distant—and I have expressed this hope at different places in my own province and elsewhere—it will be possible for us to have at the head of our military organization some man of Canadian birth and origin. In the meantime, however, I think it is only justice that we should not rashly attack in this House statements made at public meetings by men of the high standing and reputation of the general officer commanding, whom I had the honour of meeting in the city of Hamilton.

I do not concur in the opinion expressed here by my hon. friend from Labelle, that a general officer commanding, coming to this country under the circumstances which we know, occupies absolutely the same position as a deputy minister of militia or some ordinary head of a department. I do not think the government would subscribe to the proposition. My hon. friend from Labelle must not forget that statements made at the colonial conference by the members of the administration, who represented us on that occasion, as contained in the blue-book published by the British government, and which I regret very much to say, our own government have not seen fit to give us communication of. In the blue-book we find it stated that the Prime Minister at the colonial conference declared that it was the intention of our own government to organize a naval force here. I find in the

memorandum submitted by our own ministers, at page 74, the following statement:

In conclusion the ministers represent that while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed——

These were measures of regular organization for defence.

—they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purposes of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer in the mother country from some of the burdens which he now bears, and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities and under the advice of experienced imperial officers, so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self-government, which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

Now, Sir, after that statement by our ministers at the colonial conference, and submitted in writing, I do not think we should be easily disposed to find fault with an experienced imperial officer coming out here, who is invited to a banquet, and who suggests such improvements and reforms in the militia as were suggested at the banquet in Hamilton by the general officer commanding. I should add, before taking my seat, that after the hon. Postmaster General had expressed his own views to that important gathering, he turned to the general officer commanding and stated that none of the remarks which he himself had just made should be construed in any sense as being a contradiction of what had been said by the general officer commanding, with whose views he was in perfect accord. Under these circumstances, I felt that it was my duty to render to a man whom I was proud to meet, that tribute of justification which I have taken the liberty to render to-day.

Mr. A. T. THOMPSON (Haldimand and Monck). Mr. Speaker, I feel that the subject before the House has been pretty thoroughly exhausted, and I would take no part in the debate but for the feeling of deep respect which I entertain towards the general officer commanding, Lord Dundonald. I was sorry indeed that the hon. member for Labelle saw fit to bring this matter before the House, and in a manner which I think made it little less than an attack on the general officer commanding. As usual, I think that hon. member was constitutionally right and otherwise wrong. I do not think anybody will be found in this House or out of it, to challenge the position he takes, that the militia policy of this country must be dictated by the government of the country. But who was attacking that principle? Did Lord Dundonald attack it in one single utterance of those which the hon. gentleman quoted? I happened myself to be present at the meeting of the Dominion Rifle Association at which Lord Dundonald delivered a speech from which the hon. member for Labelle quoted. Lord Dundonald was merely meeting and repelling an attack which had been made upon him by some of the newspapers of Canada. One of them had said that he was recommending an expenditure of $12,000,000 in one year on the Canadian militia. This was doing nothing more nor less than holding him up to ridicule in Canada. All of us know that an expenditure of that kind would be impossible in this country, and to suggest it would stamp a man as completely out of touch with the public sentiment of this country and ignorant of the resources of the country. Lord Dundonald merely said that he had made no such suggestion, but that the money might be spent in three or four years to advantage, and so it might. The hon. member for Labelle professed to be only discussing the constitutional question; but he did not confine himself to that, but undertook to criticise the statements of Lord Dundonald, and went on to say, with a great deal of glee and merriment, that Lord Dundonald admitted that he was willing to spend that sum in three or four years. And yet the hon. member for Labelle himself—and I always listen to him with attention—said on this very floor that he would recommend the government of Canada to take over the defences of Halifax and Esquimalt. Does he know what that means? Does he know that 1,600 British troops are at Halifax now, and that a fortification, for its size one of the strongest in the world, christened Spion Kopje, has lately been built there by the British government at a very large cost? Does he know that the defences of Esquimalt involve a further cost of hundreds and thousands of dollars, and that the expendiutre involved in taking over these two defences, which he advocates, would probably be as much as he criticised Lord Dundonald for having hinted at.

Still the hon. member for Labelle went further and said that he was in accord with the feeling in this country that the militia of Canada should be put on a suitable basis. Does the hon. gentleman know what that means? Those of us who have studied the subject realize that we require a very great deal in Canada to put the militia on a proper basis. I do not know that we really need 500,000 rifles in Canada as suggested by the hon. member for Victoria. I think that we could get along with a few less, although as rifles are liable to get out of order, it might be as well to have considerably more than the 40,000 now in our armouries? Of what use to have 100,000 trained men and not enough rifles to go around? We cannot fight with pitch forks at two thousand yards. I think that we might also spend a little more money in increasing the armaments of this country. I do not think that there is anything very ridiculous in that proposition, and I believe that the hon. member for Labelle, in advo-

cating that the Canadian militia should be put on a proper footing, is actually recommending an expenditure far in excess of what Lord Dundonald ever proposed. The hon. gentleman appears disposed to hold Lord Dundonald accountable for an article in a newspaper, but I doubt whether the hon. gentleman himself would like to be held accountable for all the items concerning him that have appeared in the Canadian press. In the article from which the hon. gentleman quoted, the hint is thrown out that Lord Dondonald had declared that the Militia Department of Canada was being used for political purpose and that appointments by that department were being given as rewards to politicians. Sir, there is nothing in Lord Dundonald's remarks to warrant any such conclusion, nor is there anything in the records of the department to prove anything of the kind. Take, for instance, the contingents which were sent to South Africa and the old country, and you will find that among the officers of these contingents there were as many Conservatives as Liberals. I shall not, Sir, occupy more time of the House, except to say that, in my opinion, no better officer was ever sent by the British government to Canada, and no one who enjoyed a higher personal reputation, than the gentleman who now occupies the distinguished position of general officer commanding our militia. Lord Dundonald is an indefatigable worker. I doubt that whether any man in this House of hard workers—for, joking aside, hon. members are, as a rule, hard workers—spends more time attending to his duty, and I am only expressing a self-evident fact when I say that the hon. member for Labelle enjoys alone of this House the unenviable distinction of being one who could find something to carp at in the attitude and record of Lord Dundonald.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). As extracts from the report which appeared in the Hamilton 'Times' of the speech delivered by Lord Dundonald on the 23rd of April have been read to the House and comments made on them, it is only due to that gallant officer that I should quote the full report of the speech he made, and with your permission, Sir, I would like to do so. Lord Dundonald said :

His Lordship said that he would not be able to reply to the toast in the eloquent words in which it had been proposed. It was a big subject and it included the soldiers of the empire, whose drum beat was heard around the globe. His Lordship referred to the assistance Canada had given to the mother country in the South African war. He had in his command Lord Strathcona's Horse. He never had such eager men in his command. His chief trouble was to hold them back. He spoke feelingly of the Canadians who had given their lives for the empire, and he made reference to the bad news of yesterday from Somaliland. He had confidence the memory of the disaster would be wiped out by British troops.

Lord Dundonald spoke of the campaign in Natal during the recent Boer war, and he referred to some of the scenes through which his troops passed. He believed the lessons of the war were being considered, and the people of South Africa were putting their house in order. He thought the people of Canada also were considering the lessons of the war, and they had learned that the time to organize was before the storm broke—not afterwards. What he would like to see in the country was a condition in which when he pressed the button the regiments throughout Canada would turn out at once.

Was this the case now ? Lord Dundonald said that it was necessary to have a better system of transport. How was Canada equipped in this respect ? Would any hon. member say that in drawing attention to these matters, the general officer commanding our forces was not acting within his duty ? Would any hon. member be disposed to censure him for drawing attention to what he considered a matter of urgency ? Then, after pointing out the various ways in which improvements could be made, he proceeded to say, according to this report :

The Canadian militia had had as their diet promises instead of food ; praise instead of wine. What was wanted was a little of that $13,000,000 surplus. A bugbear of militarism was not wanted, but an efficient force—efficient in organization, in its departments, and efficient in its system of leaders. The modern rifle had given to small nations a power they never had before, but it also gave an aggressor power to hold what he seized. It was the duty of all men in the nation to study military matters, so they would know what was needed for the good of the country.

In his opinion the northern nations of the earth must be the dominant nations. The men of the north, who were brought up amid the hardening conditions of ice and snow must be superior to those raised in the balmier climate of the south.

His Lordship said it was a great pleasure to him to be present at a St. George's dinner. It was the first time for him to dine at a St. George's banquet, but he had been at a St. Andrew's festival gathering. He thanked the St. George's Society for having invited him to the city.

After listening to the remarks of the hon. member for Labelle, I could not help asking myself whether we were really in one of the free parliaments of the British empire this afternoon. How any Canadian subject, who desires to see the militia of this country made as efficient as possible, could take the slightest exception to the remarks of Lord Dundonald I fail to understand. I thought that the remarks of the hon. member for Labelle were very far-fetched. At that banquet were present my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), my hon. friend for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), my hon. friend the Attorney General of Ontario, Mr. Gibson, and the hon. members who represent the city of Hamilton in this House, every one of whom is just as jealous of the honour and prero-

gatives of the parliament of Canada as the hon. member for Labelle can possibly be. Had the general officer commanding given expression to opinions or sentiments that he should not, every one of these hon. gentlemen would have been willing and anxious to set him right, if not to take him to task. What did the hon. Attorney General of Ontario say ? He said :

While the general officer commanding and the Postmaster General had reached the same natural conclusion, he had to admit that they had argued along different lines.

If an officer who occupies the position of the general officer commanding the militia forces of Canada, and who is an imperial officer, is not permitted to express his opinions regarding the position in which he finds our militia, and to make suggestions among a company of Canadian gentlemen gathered together at a St. George's banquet, I am at a loss to know what freedom of action his duty to this country will allow him. Surely the remarks he made were merely personal expressions of opinion, in no way reflecting on the policy of the Militia Department; and it seems to me that it was clearly out of place for the hon. member for Labelle to challenge these remarks, because, as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has said, they are endorsed by all the members with the single exception of the hon. gentleman who takes exception to them. I think that the record of Lord Dondonald, the record of the services he has performed, the fact that he is the worthy head of a great clan, and the worthy representative of a great nation which has given so many soldiers and sailors to the empire, the fact that he has stated nothing contrary to the interests of the Canadian militia, the fact that he has in no way interfered with the prerogative of the Minister of Militia and Defence or of this parliament, should have protected him from the assault which has been made upon him this afternoon And I, for one, hope, Mr. Speaker, that this is the last occasion when, on such a flimsy pretext, such a discussion as the present will be raised in this House. I desire to congratulate, and congratulate most heartily, the Minister of Militia and Defence on the stand he took in this case. It is high time that officers who come from the old land, who are British subjects like ourselves, should be protected in giving expression to their opinions on matters on which they are competent to form an opinion, and they should not be attacked for giving to the Canadian people advice which will enable them to make the militia force of Canada a force efficient in every respect. The Minister of Militia and Defence will admit, and every military gentleman in this House will admit, that every word stated by the officer commanding respecting our militia force is true. Will any hon. gentleman who has had experience in militia matters contradict one single statement to which the general officer commanding gave utterance ? If not, the time of this House should not be wasted ; and the character and reputation and rights of honourable gentlemen and gallant soldiers who cannot come here to defend themselves should be protected. The House should frown down these exhibitions which are calculated to do harm and which certainly cannot do good.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I rise with some diffidence to speak in this debate ; for my military days are over. There was a time when I was more warlike and would not have hesitated to shoulder the musket, but I have now reached an age when I have been placed upon the 'reserve.' I would not take part in the debate except for the warm manner in which my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has addressed the House. I must say that I do not think the strictures which he passed upon my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) were at all called for. I do not take it that my hon. friend from Labelle took exception to the sentiments uttered by Lord Dundonald, but I understood him to say that he thought that Lord Dundonald was trying to dictate to the policy of the government. I do not think his criticism went further. Whether the conclusion reached by my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) was warranted or not, I do not know, because, I must confess, I did not read at the time the words of Lord Dundonald. Of course, Lord Dundonald is a brave officer ; he has made his career and proved his courage, and I believe that he is able and painstaking. So far, I agree with my hon. friend from West Toronto. But, I must say that the gentleman who commands the militia of Canada whatever may have been his services elsewhere, is always amenable to public opinion as expressed in parliament. Whether his services are meritorious or otherwise, whether he is right or wrong, it is the privilege of any member of this House to call his actions in question. And I must say to my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) that if we are to doubt to-day whether we are in a British parliament or not, the doubt does not arise from anything spoken by my hon. friend from Labelle, but from what has been spoken by my hon. friend from West Toronto. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman commanding the militia, as much as my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) has. I think he is one of the ablest men we have ever had to perform this important duty.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And he is a gentleman.

The PRIME MINISTER. He is a gentleman in every sense of the word. Whether we should have a Canadian or imperial officer as our commander of militia, I will not discuss now. But, whatever may be the merits of the officer commanding the mili-

tia, he is a subordinate of the Canadian government, and, if he has any policy to propound, it should be propounded to the minister, and the minister is responsible.

Mr. CLARKE. He did not propound any policy.

The PRIME MINISTER. If there were any doubt, I have only to say that we have the same privilege in this House that they have in the British parliament, and there is no doubt whatever that a general commanding the forces has no right to give advice to the people. If he has advice to give, he must give it, not to the people but to the minister whose officer he is. If the General Commanding the Militia has advice to tender, it is not his right—I say it deliberately—to offer advice to the public, but it is his duty to offer it to the minister, and for that policy the minister shall be responsible. The principles are too elementary to be contradicted, but I thought, after the expressions of my hon. friend from West Toronto, it was not inadvisable to repeat them to the House, and even to himself.

PARLIAMENT GROUNDS—THE LAWN.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). If this war like episode is over, perhaps I may be permitted to refer to the matter that I attempted to bring up when the Orders of the Day were called, the mutilation of the beautiful lawn on the parliament grounds. I noticed yesterday some nine or ten men working on it cutting off the sod, and to-day they have horses and carts drawing the sods away. My first impression was that they intended to attempt some ornamentation with flower beds. But, on making inquiries, I was surprised to find that the object was to make cricket ground for the benefit of the youthful members of the Senate and the House of Commons. I have known for some time that it was the desire of the present government to reform the Senate, but I did not think that that reform would take this direction. They have put in the Senate so many youthful gentlemen between the ages of sixty-five and eighty-five that now they seem to think it necessary to spend public money to make a recreation ground to keep them in good condition mentally and physically. I regret this very much, because it seems to me this mutilation is more like vandalism than anything else. A few years ago, we had the diagonal paths across the grounds, and I do not think they were an element of beauty by any means. It was decided, in the wisdom of those who control these matters, to fill up these paths, and that was done at considerable expense. I thought the result was a very beautiful landscape. When I see the sod cut off to make a cricket ground at an expense to the country of $150 to $200, I confess the wisdom of such a step is beyond my comprehension. If it is absolutely necessary that we should have cricket why should not the members of parliament, and senators go to Cartier Square and amuse themselves there? I wonder how far we are to go in these matters. We cannot stop at making grounds. After they are made, we must have an item in the estimates to buy leggings, balls, bats and all the necessary equipment, including clothing, for a proper and respectable parliamentary team, that, I suppose, may travel over the country. I object to this kind of thing all the more because of the parsimony of the government has led them to refuse us anything except an ordinary table in a room. We have been refused a desk, a cupboard or anything where one could store one's letters and lock them up, because you, Mr. Speaker, tell us that the government's desire is to exercise the most stringent economy in connection with the affairs of this House. If a little were saved out of the expense of making a parliamentary cricket grounds and we were given ordinary conveniences to carry on our parliamentry work, it would be better. I think that the government, having their attention directed to this matter, ought to put a stop to this work. I don't think that is right, I don't think the country should endorse it. I do not think that it is right that the beautiful landscape we have had heretofore should be destroyed for the purpose of giving a few youthful members of parliament and senators physical exercise.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Although I have already spoken, I may be pardoned for speaking again on this subject. It so seldom happens that I can agree with my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) that I desire to say that on this occasion I agree with everything that he has said. I do not know that his remarks will be approved by the Minister of Public Works, but I shall convey to him the remarks of my hon. friend, along with my own strong endorsation of his view in favour of keeping the lawn.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). It seems to me that the parsimony of which the hon. member for East Grey complains as existing in the government, exists rather in the heart of the hon. member himself. It is true, I believe, that some members representing both sides of the House spoke to the Minister of Public Works, and pointed out that the grass on the spot where improvements are now going on was not in very good condition. He and his officers looked at it and came to the same conclusion. A small sum of money, not so large as the hon. member has stated, is being spent there for the purpose of improving the ground. But it will not be left in the condition in which it is now, it is going to be sodded so that a game of cricket can be

played upon it. To suggest that playing cricket upon the grass in front of this House is a work of vandalism, is more I think than the free British people in this Canada of ours will uphold. Now, it is just as easy for us to improve our bodies by playing cricket as it is to improve our minds by sitting in the House of Commons and listening to the hon. gentleman's speeches. It is sometimes necessary to seek recreation for the purpose of bracing one's self up after listening to the speeches of the hon. member for East Grey. As to his complaint about parsimony, I presume that if something was done to some room or other in the Commons, if the desk which he says he cannot get were supplied, possibly he would shut his eyes and wink at the expenditure which has been made for the benefit of the whole parliament. I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman is somewhat jealous, because he would have you understand that a room which he himself occupies is not furnished as he would desire. I have been in the rooms of some of the hon. members on that side of the House, and I have seen them very well furnished, a great deal better furnished than some of the rooms of hon. members on the government side. So possibly it is jealousy which exists in the mind of the hon. member whom the Minister of Customs referred to the other night as the opposition leader from Ontario. Now I believe this is the extent of his complaint, that if we went to the Minister of Public Works and asked him to give the hon. gentleman a desk, or a chair, or a sofa, which would probably cost $100 or $150, he would probably wink at it, and would not mind the expense of the improvements on the lawn in front of the House. Now cricket is known to be a game in which the Britisher delights, and I should think that improving ourselves in that way would meet the approval of the hon. gentleman. I would ask him if he does not approve of a game which improves the strength of a senator who may be between the years of sixty-five and eighty-five, as well as the strength of those representing a younger branch of the legislature. I think that we may all be permitted to enjoy a game of cricket, without in any way damaging the beauty of the lawn in front of the House.

Mr. H. A. WARD (East Durham). As one of the cricketers, I would like to say a word as to the improvement that is in progress on the lawn. I should like also to allay the anxiety of the hon. member for East Grey in regard to the desecration. I think when the hon. member sees a game going on there, he will be inclined to come and join us himself. I approve of this small expenditure which is entailed by the new sodding, because I believe that cricket is a good thing for us young members, at any rate, and perhaps for some of the older members of the House, if they would join with us. It would be very advantageous to our health, if we are going to be kept here during the summer, that we should be provided with some recreation of that kind. I am sure that the small expenditure that is being made by the Minister of Public Works will not be found fault with by our constituents in the country.

THE TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). Yesterday I gave notice to the government that when the House was next moved into Committee of Supply I would bring up the matter of the Treadgold concessions. But at the request of certain hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who wish to speak on this question, and as the Minister of the Interior is not here, I readily acquiesced in the request for delay that has been made, with the understanding that the question will be taken up to-morrow.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry to say that I do not think it will be possible for it to come up to-morrow. We have some important Bills which will take up the time to-morrow. But if they are disposed of, we will be only too glad to give an opportunity to my hon. friend.

CONGESTION OF RAILWAY TRAFFIC.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Now that the very important question of military propriety raised by my hon. friend for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and I suppose the equally important question raised by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) have been settled to the satisfaction of the House, I desire to draw your attention for a few minutes to another important matter, that is the congestion of the railway traffic which prevails in this country. That congestion now prevails to a serious extent in the western part of Canada, and has prevailed for the past twenty months. In place of the situation improving as the months go by, the people in western Canada find that the traffic congestion is becoming still more serious, and it has reached a state now when I am warranted in bringing it to the attention of the House and of the government. I ask the pardon of the House for reading at some length newspaper statements, and some documents bearing upon the question, which are calculated to lead the House to realize the gravity of the question. In the issue of a Regina newspaper dated the 30th of April, I find an article headed :—

A FREIGHT JAM AT REGINA.

Yards Choked with Traffic—Merchants Suffering from Ruinous Delays.

For many weeks past first one merchant and then another has in vigorous language drawn the attention of 'The Leader' to the fact that

the condition of railway traffic in the west is continually getting worse. The situation last year was bad enough when for days and sometimes weeks merchants would be completely out of certain lines of goods because the railway could not get them in, but this year it is infinitely worse for many business houses have been completely sold out of certain lines for weeks and months, notwithstanding that their orders had been placed in plenty of time and the goods promptly shipped by the wholesalers in the east. There is to-day hardly a merchant in Regina—and our exchanges tell the same story of all parts of the territories—who has not orders for goods which were promptly shipped now long overdue. Merchants who ordered goods for the Christmas trade received them after that festive season was over and had to dispose of them at a sacrifice. Others who had supplies ordered and shipped for the early spring trade will have to carry them over for a whole year. The situation at present is that so unreliable has the freight service become that merchants are afraid to place large orders for certain seasonable goods not knowing but they will arrive after the opportune season is past. Any supplies which must be secured without a delay of a month or more are ordered to be shipped by express. This of necessity makes a ruinous inroad into the profits.

A representative spent a short time on Tuesday in going over the Canadian Pacific Railway yard here. By actual count there were over 200 freight cars on the sidings, not taking into account engines, tenders, water tank cars, cabooses and passenger coaches. Cattle cars were to be seen loaded with coal, some of which had not been cleaned before loading, while Lemp's brewery car was labelled as being loaded with lumber from British Columbia. Some of these cars have been in the yard for weeks and were as yet unloaded because they had not been placed where teams could get at them. The yard was so badly congested, almost every foot of track on the sidings being taken up with cars, that it was practically impossible to place cars and in one part of the yard a gang of men were unloading goods on to the prairie. Here was a miscellaneous collection of stoves and other hardware, dry goods, drugs, books and stationery, confectionery and candies, &c., some of which had been on the way to Regina for a couple of months past. In another part of the yard a gang of men were at work laying more track.

On Sunday, the 19th inst., a gentleman counted 123 cars in the gravel pit at Pilot Butte, eight miles east of here——

I may say that Pilot Butte is simply a flag station.

--and many of these were consigned to Regina and had been in the pit for weeks. One of the Regina carters has made numerous trips to Pilot Butte in order to dray goods into town. One case may be cited of goods ordered of a Toronto firm by telegraph from Regina on February 21st for immediate shipment, a portion of which was delivered here on April 25th ; the balance is yet to come. These goods were in the Pilot Butte gravel pit for some time. Goods were lying here on Saturday which were billed from Grenfel to Indian Head, both stations east of here.

The week before last a car of United States immigrants was detained at Regina for three days as the company had not a spare engine to haul their coach and several cars of horses, cattle and household effects north, every available locomotive being utilized to transport the Barr party to Saskatoon.

The Qu'Appelle 'Progress' interviewed a number of representative business men recently and published their statements which show that a period of three weeks in transit was the very best time made between Winnipeg and Qu'Appelle, a distance of 324 miles, while in the majority of cases a month and one is recorded of goods shipped from Winnipeg on December 1, 1902, which were not yet to hand April 15, 1903. On this date also goods shipped from Montreal on February 27th, from Hamilton on March 10th, from Galt on March 14th had not arrived. The 'Progress' states that 'more than one merchant is ready to show that he has lost hundreds of dollars by delay in delivery of goods.' Newspapers all over the North-west record the same state of things.

Of course, this is not at all a new story. We from the west had to complain last year of a most serious congestion of traffic which had existed then for several months. I may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway is the only road the people of the North-west Territories know, and the only road they do business with. We were promised last year by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that any inconvenience we had suffered in the preceding season would not be repeated, but we found last fall that conditions were even worse than they were the year before. The Winnipeg board of trade, as everybody here is aware, is a very representative and intelligent body of business men, representing, as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) sometimes points out, not only the people of Winnipeg, but, in some sense, the people of Manitoba and of the North-west Territories. That board of trade was led to frame a resolution, and a stronger indictment of any corporation or body was never framed than this resolution of the Winnipeg board of trade, which I am going to place before the House. It was not framed hastily. It was discussed by the members of the board of trade on two, if not on more occasions. The first proposition which was placed before them in the way of a resolution was amended and changed. This resolution was adopted after full and serious consideration, and it goes on this wise :

Whereas, in the autumn and early winter of 1901, the farmers and business classes of Manitoba and the North-west Territories suffered severe losses through the inability of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to cope with the grain traffic ; and whereas, it was promised, on behalf of that corporation, that it would supply itself with an equipment that would enable it to carry out the crop of the present year (1902), and whereas, the company was authorized by parliament to issue additional stock to the amount of $20,000,000, with the express condition that the proceeds were mainly to be used to purchase the necessary equipment, and whereas, the conditions in regard to grain transportation during the present shipping season are as bad as, if not worse, than those which prevailed in 1901, with the same result

of heavy loss to the farmers and to the community as a whole, and whereas, on account of the same lack of proper equipment, the railways have not been able to supply transportation for fuel, and as a result of their failure, great loss and much personal hardship and suffering have been experienced in nearly every portion of western Canada ;——

These are weighty words if they are true, and I can assure the House that they are only too true.

—and whereas, the passenger service has become so irregular, unreliable and apparently disorganized, that much loss has been inflicted on business men, and the travelling public has suffered great and long-continued inconvenience and hardship, and whereas, the equipment of the railway company has fallen into such a condition that the corporation is utterly unable to handle the traffic of western Canada, and whereas, the people of western Canada, seem, under present circumstances, to have no recourse or redress against the corporation for the enormous losses which they have sustained, and whereas, the railway corporations have received from the parliament of Canada valuable franchises, monopolies and privileges, besides enormous donations of public money, grants of public lands and the use of the public credit for large sums, in consideration of the corporations providing an adequate and efficient system of public transportation ; and whereas, the parliament of Canada, as the charter-granting power, is the supreme and responsible authority in all questions relating to the regulation or control of public transportation, and the government of Canada is vested with authority to enforce the terms of charter obligations ;

Therefore, be it resolved : That this board respectfully urges the Dominion government to take such immediate action as shall remove the grievous disabilities under which the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories labour ; and to take such further measures as shall effectually prevent the recurrence of conditions such as those herein described ; that a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary to the government of Canada, and to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The Winnipeg board of trade found it necessary very recently to further consider this matter, and we see by the press reports that they have decided to send a delegation of their members to Montreal to personally interview the president and other head officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I have one other document, and only one other, which I will ask the House to bear with me in reading, framed and adopted by the North-west Assembly in the shape of an address to the Governor General in Council. It goes on to say :

We, His Majesty's dutiable and loyal subjects, the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories of Canada, in session assembled, humbly approach Your Excellency for the purpose of representing—

That after making due allowance for the extraordinary circumstances with which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has had to contend it appears to this House—

That the practically continuous freight congestion of the last two years has abundantly demonstrated that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has absolutely failed to provide adequate facilities for the transportation of the grain, cattle and other natural products of these territories and that there has resulted in consequence of the lack of such facilities great loss and damage to the people of these territories not only in respect of the depreciation in the market price of grain but also in respect of cattle, and has further resulted in vexatious delays in the importation of merchandise and in the transaction of the ordinary business of the country :

That the volume of business originating along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in the territory directly tributary thereto necessitates that the energies of the company should be concentrated on the providing of adequate facilities for handling such business (which are not now provided) and that good faith with the people of these territories demands that branch lines already promised and partially constructed should be completed this year rather than lines in territory already provided with railway facilities, and

That the prospective increase in the volume of traffic which largely increased cultivation and settlement of lands in these territories will certainly create, will further tend to congest traffic between these territories and the provinces to the east, and unless it is held desirable to divert part of such traffic through foreign channels, adequate facilities for its transportation must be immediately provided, and

That this House does therefore humbly pray that Your Excellency may be pleased to take such action as may be necessary or expedient to insure that the people of these territories are provided with an efficient transportation system as contemplated by the contract made beween the people of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Now I may be asked and I very likely will be asked : What are you going to do about it, or what can you suggest to be done about it ? I do not know that I should be held responsible for suggesting a remedy but at all events I do intend to suggest some course of action to the government which may result in bringing about a remedy. I wish to point out to the House that there are two distinct phases of the transportation question as affecting the people of western Canada at this moment. One has reference to providing immediate extension of lines, chiefly in the North-west Territories. The province of Manitoba is already fairly provided with railways so far as the mileage is concerned, but there is necessity in the North-west Territories for a very considerable and a very immediate extension of the railway mileage, because to-day the class of settlement that needs free homesteads has been forced long distances away from the existing railway lines. Even last year it was stated in the Railway Committee here that immigrants from the United States were being forced as far back as seventy-five miles from the Calgary and Edmonton Railway in order to obtain free homesteads, and a large number of the Barr colonists are at present going 180 miles away from any existing railroad. It is

plain that it is absolutely impossible for people to make a satisfactory living out of agriculture if they are located anything like that distance from a line of railway. It is computed that if a farmer is twenty miles away from a railway line he is at the extreme distance which enables him to make a satisfactory living. There is therefore necessity for the immediate extension of the railway mileage in the North-west Territories, but that is not the question which I intend to discuss this afternoon. The other phase of the question chiefly affects the people who live along the existing lines in the territories. The newspaper paragraph which I read has to do with those who live in towns, for instance the people of Regina, who have had the Canadian Pacific Railway for twenty years, and Regina is the southern terminus also of the Regina and Prince Albert line. The most urgent question now, is the question of furnishing facilities on the existing lines. It must be plain to the House that it is not a very sensible proposition to urge the extension of branch lines and other lines in that country, without first urging that provision should be made to facilitate the movement of traffic on the existing lines, because every mile of extension will mean more business and will consequently necessitate more facilities on the existing main roads, and more congestion if the facilities are not provided. I have here quite a mass of literature which is calculated to convince the House that this is an extraordinarily serious matter to the people of the North-west Territories. The blockade which has been most talked about for the past twenty months is the wheat blockade. That is uppermost in the minds of most people and it is perhaps the most serious, but it is not the whole difficulty by any means. I am neither a wheat grower nor a wheat dealer, but in my personal business I have experienced the effects of the traffic congestion in a way which leads me to speak of it with some feeling born of experience. An instance which occurred to me personally may appeal to the members of this House who are newspaper publishers. We in the western country buy practically all our paper supplies in eastern Canada, and I purchased some paper in the east about the first of March before I left Regina to attend the session. Under ordinary circumstances that paper should have reached Regina three weeks after, but as a matter of fact the office only received that paper last week, when it was fully five weeks overdue. But that is not the whole story. For three weeks I was receiving letters and telegrams constantly, advising me that the office was in very great difficulty on account of the non-arrival of this paper, and finally they told me that every stick of type in the office was set in form for the presses awaiting the arrival of the paper and that if some relief was not forthcoming the whole staff would have to take a holiday. To relieve the difficulty I bought a quarter of a ton of type in Toronto, and as it was useless to put that type in a freight car, because there would be no guarantee that it would get there any time before Christmas, I sent the type by express. To alleviate my feelings I learned just after the type was sent by express at very high charges, that the office was informed that the paper had been in the Regina yard for three weeks notwithstanding that inquiries were made to the railway agent at that point every day during these three weeks. That simply illustrates the extraordinary confusion which exists over the whole railway system in the west. The local officers of the railway are not at all to be blamed, because they are simply overworked, and have been overworked for months. They are not the men who are to blame. That is merely one instance which I cite as to my own personal loss. I will give another instance of the loss which was entailed on a Regina cattle shipper last fall. He ordered cars ten days ahead for the shipment of 250 export cattle, and he writes :

> I had to hold my cattle here a week after the cars should have been here. The result was : I lost my buyer ; I lost the boat at Montreal ; and I was forced to take the shipment to Toronto. I fed at Winnipeg and again at Schreiber, but the run was so slow, together with the six-inches-deep mud pond in which the cattle had to lie down at Schreiber, that the animals fell off, looked badly and sold poorly. I lost a good thousand dollars by that week's delay in procuring cars.

It must be evident to every man in this House that such conditions will eventually prevent men from doing business in the west and will shake the confidence of the business community in our transportation system. To show the state of confusion that exists now, and which has existed for months, I will relate an incident that was given to me by a farmer of the Indian Head district, who told me that having shipped a car of wheat for Fort William, he waited the ordinary time, and not receiving returns he commenced to make inquiries, and after considerable delay he was informed that his car of wheat had been found at Lethbridge, which is six or seven hundred miles west of Indian Head, in place of at Fort William, which is six or seven hundred miles east. The Public Works Department of the government of the North-west Territories last year lost two cars of bridge timber which they had ordered in British Columbia, and after weeks of apparently fruitless search one of the cars which should have been at a point in southern Alberta was found down east of Estevan, in southern Assiniboia, and the other car was found north of Regina, but the timber which should have been on it was gone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCOTT. As every hon. gentleman here from the west knows, I might go on to give incident after incident of this kind, so that they would fill not only books but the whole library. These things go to show what the people of the west have been suffering for nearly two years. A worse phase of the matter than almost any I have spoken of is this, that from the early part of November till late in February, the people in Manitoba and in the greater part of the North-west Territories were on the ragged edge of a coal famine. If we had had last winter the kind of storms which we have suffered in some years, it is almost certain that hundreds of people in that country would have been frost-bitten, and that an absolute coal famine would have taken place. As it was, in certain parts of the country the farmers were driven to the necessity of burning their fences.

Mr. DAVIS. And their furniture.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan says, 'And their furniture.' That was reported; but I know that people were frequently deprived of coal because of the inability of the railway companies to deliver coal, and were driven to the necessity of getting fuel of other kinds. Then there was trouble in connection with the passenger service. Every department of the railway seemed to be short or disorganized. For five months at Regina the No. 1 express train from the Atlantic, heading for the Pacific, did not come into the place five times on schedule time. The trains were usually half a dozen hours late—sometimes three or four hours, sometimes five or six hours, occasionally twenty or thirty hours. The conditions would not have been complained of so bitterly if the people could have got any word of when they could reasonably expect the train. The train would be billed up an hour late; passengers would go to the station at the specified time, and find that the detention was extended a couple of hours, and sometimes very much longer. The hon. member for Saskatchewan will remember one occasion in February, when he and I were at Maple Creek. No. 1 train, according to the schedule, should have passed there at half-past four o'clock; but it was billed to arrive at eight o'clock. There were some parties there from Medicine Hat who wished to go home on that train. They sat in the hotel at Maple Creek till half-past eleven. The report came from the station that the train would certainly be in at a quarter to twelve. At a quarter to twelve the report came that it had not yet left Swift Current, and could not possibly reach Maple Creek till four o'clock. As a matter of fact, it came along at about five o'clock, and our Medicine Hat friends got on board to go home, after sitting the whole night in suspense. That kind of thing occurred during the whole winter. Conditions became so serious that the commercial travellers held indignation meetings at Winnipeg and passed strong resolutions protesting to all concerned, as I am doing this afternoon, endeavouring to create some general realization of the conditions which the people in the country have to bear.

Last year, when this matter of the Canadian Pacific Railway equipment was discussed, certain excuses were made by some members of the House for the company's lack of facilities, and I was myself disposed at that time to feel that there was some excuse for the company—that a swift rate of progress had come so suddenly on the country, and its growth was so fast, that it was not surprising that the company, like other people, had been taken somewhat unawares. But a year has passed since that time, and we find, contrary to the promises given by the company to the House and the country, that the conditions to-day are very much worse than they were then, and I think to-day the company is deprived of any reasonable or valid excuse for those conditions.

Occasionally an officer of the company will state in eastern Canada—he will not make the same statement in western Canada, because the conditions are too well understood there—that a great part of the cause of the congestion is to be found in the Manitoba Grain Act passed by this House. The company in that way tries to put the blame on the members of this House, implying that this House has passed a foolish and unreasonable Grain Act which has tied up the operations of the company. A reason of that kind would not stand very long if stated in the hearing of western people. The meaning of it is that the platform-loading provision of the Act holds the cars of the company, or is liable to hold them, for twenty-four hours. But that provision did not damage the power of the company last season one-half of one per cent, because during two or three months practically every siding on the whole system, in the North-west Territories at all events—I am not so certain about Manitoba—was blocked with loaded cars, which, after being loaded with wheat, stood there week after week, in some instances as long as two months. That is sufficient to show that no weight at all is to be placed on the excuse of the company, that part of the reason of the congestion was to be found in the Grain Act.

We had it also stated to the House last year, and it is stated at odd times throughout the country, that it is unreasonable to expect that the company is going to move out the whole wheat crop during the navigation season, which is of about three months' duration. The people do not ask that; but last year, out of a total crop of some 64,000,000 bushels, when navigation closed it was found that the Canadian Pacific Railway had only been able to haul to Fort William 15,000,000 bushels. So that when the company cannot haul 25 per cent of the crop in the navigation season, they

cannot contend that they have adequate equipment. I think every one now is compelled to admit that the conditions which prevail to-day and which have prevailed for the past twenty months, are due wholly and entirely to the lack of that equipment which the country has a right to expect the company to have, and which any company serving a district so important and in which the products promise to become so great, should have provided. But still we occasionally meet the statement that the business of that country has grown to such proportions that no single road could be expected to handle it.

I may say that in that statement I take no stock at all. I think it would be possible to have the present Canadian Pacific Railway line equipped in such a manner that it would not only do all the business to be done at present, but five or six times as much more to meet future demands. I am led to this belief by the conditions of other railways. On the Pennsylvania there are maintained twenty freight cars for each mile of track and that company has one locomotive in operation for every two miles of track. A proportionate equipment on the Canadian Pacific Railway would mean 160,000 freight cars and 4,000 locomotives. Last fall the Canadian Pacific Railway had only 27,000 freight cars and 743 locomotives. Hon. members may say that you cannot make a fair comparison between the Pennsylvania and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then take a road with which a comparison may be more fairly made. Take the Northern Pacific. It has six cars per mile of track and one locomotive for every seven miles. That would mean 48,000 freight cars, as against 27,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and 1,100 locomotives, as against 743. I have not here the actual figures regarding the equipment of the Great Northern, but I am informed that it moved in the month of November 12,000,000 bushels of grain, as against 15,000,000, which was all the Canadian Pacific Railway was able to move during the whole shipping season. And the Great Northern is a road which was built entirely, I believe, without public aid. Nevertheless it is equipped and operated as a private enterprise, and is running through a country which does not offer the business that our North-west does, so that there is all the more reason why the Canadian Pacific Railway should have far superior equipment. It may not be out of place to make some reference to the departments in which the Canadian Pacific Railway seem to be deficient. It is not a question of cars at all. I believe that last fall the company had sufficient cars for freight, if their other equipment had been up to the mark. I do not believe that it is a question of lack of locomotives so much as a lack in other departments. We know that last year the company put on ninety-eight new locomotives, and I believe that every new locomotive simply added to the congestion and confusion. The deficiency seems to be in round-houses and shops more than locomotives. A gentleman who was here last week told me that he had seen at one time eleven locomotives in the Moosejaw yards, which had come in from their run in fairly good condition, and could not get into the shops, because the shops and round-house room were wholly inadequate. There may be sufficient shops in Winnipeg, but west of Winnipeg, at Brandon, Moosejaw and Medicine Hat and at other points, I am informed that the shops are simply what they were twenty years ago. Practically no increases have been made since the line was first built.

Mr. COWAN. You cannot move grain with a round-house.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend from South Essex says you cannot move grain with a round-house. Certainly not, but you must have locomotives, and you must keep them in order so that they may be able to move the grain, and to keep them in order, you must take them into the shops and have little repairs made to them. But owing to the impossibility of getting locomotives into the shops, they had to stand in the yard with water in them and the steam up and turn out again on their run, and the result was that all last fall and winter there were dead engines to be met everywhere. On one occasion the one locomotive on the Prince Albert branch died ; another was sent to its relief, which, too died ; and finally there were five dead engines on the branch. Then there is a lack of sidings. In fact, in every department the equipment has become inefficient. The impression prevails amongst the people of the western country who pay attention to these matters—and most of us out there do—that for the sake of the stock market the Canadian Pacific Railway system has been simply starved for years. There is to be found the real reason for the existing condition. I have here a statement made about the Canadian Pacific Railway, as far back as 1896, by a financial journal, so well known as the London 'Economist' :

> We cannot understand how the reduction of expenses referred to can possibly have been attained except by the postponement of necessary outlays. Expenses must have been cut down to the bone, and the future will have to afford a recompense.

In its succeeding issues, this paper criticised the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway and pointed out clearly what was bound to happen, almost as clearly as if at the time it had a knowledge of the facts existing to-day. The 'Economist' pointed out that some day progress would come on the country with a rush and the company would be totally unable to keep up with it. No one in the west, who comes in touch at all with the railway officials, is ignorant of the fact that from year to year, or rather from

half-year to half-year—because, I understand, that the estimates of the road are made up half-yearly in many cases—the estimates sent down to the head office by the western officials were chopped sometimes sixty, seventy and eighty per cent, and the company have sometimes asked their staff on the western line to do the business with twenty per cent of the money which those officials declared necessary to keep up the system as it ought to be maintained.

I shall probably be asked what we are going to do about it. I do not know that I am very clear on that point in my own mind. But I am free to say that I think the problem is one which this government and parliament are bound to face and face boldly. Just what can be done, I do not know that I am prepared to say, but something must be done if Manitoba and the North-west Territories are not to receive a very serious check. There is one thing that may be suggested. In the Canadian Pacific Railway contract there are specific provisions with regard to the character of the service to be given by this company which was organized in 1881. The company, of course, was placed under the general law with regard to the efficiency of service and that law contained these provisions. I am quoting from the statutes of 1879, the Consolidated Railway Act, section 25, subsection 2 :

The trains shall be started and run at regular hours to be fixed by public notice, and shall furnish sufficient accommodation for the transportation of all passengers and goods as are within a reasonable time previous thereto offered at the place of starting, and at the junctions of other railways and at usual stopping-places established for receiving and discharging way passengers and goods from the train.

3. Such passengers and goods shall be taken, transported and discharged at, from and to such places, on the due payment of the toll, freight or fare legally authorized therefor.

But, in the contract and in the Act of incorporation there are more stringent provisions. In section 3 of the Act by which the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was ratified, we find these sentences :

Upon the organization of the said company, and the deposit by them, with the government, of one million dollars in cash or securities approved by the government, for the purpose in the said contract provided, and in consideration of the completion and perpetual and efficient operation of the railway by the said company, as stipulated in the said contract, the government may grant to the company a subsidy——

—and so on. Thus, it is very distinctly provided that there shall be efficient operation by the company in return for the valuable privileges and franchises conferred upon them. Also, under section 5 :

The Canadian Pacific Railway defined as aforesaid shall become and be thereafter the absolute property of the company ; the whole, however, upon the terms and conditions,——

—one of which I have recited——

—and subject to the restrictions and limitations contained in the said contract.

There is a sentence at the end of section 7 of the contract :

And the company shall thereafter and for ever efficiently maintain, work and run the Canadian Pacific Railway.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, before six o'clock I had already occupied more time than I had expected would be necessary in bringing the question of the serious congestion of railway traffic in the country to the attention of the House. But, possibly, if it is justifiable for hon. members to occupy a couple of hours discussing the question whether the officer commanding should or should not have made a particular speech, and to occupy fifteen of the twenty-eight-dollar minutes of the House in discussing whether a few yards of sod in front of these buildings should be taken out, it may not be improper for an hon. member to spend some time in ventilating in the House such very serious conditions as do exist to-day, as must be admitted to exist to-day, in this country with regard to railways.

Now, as I said before, I shall probably be asked : What do you suggest ; it is very well to talk about these conditions existing, but what are you going to do about it ; what is it possible for this parliament to do ? Some hon. gentlemen may say that this is a business pertaining entirely to the company, that the company is responsible. But I think that when we remember the very large assistance that was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway by the people of Canada to assist at the inception of their undertaking, and the very considerable assistance that has been given to the company from time to time within the last twenty years, and when we consider the nature of the contract and undertaking the company entered into with the people of Canada, it cannot but be admitted that the representatives of the people in this parliament have a duty to perform, that they are face to face with that duty and are under obligation to deal with the problem without delay. We shall likely be told, also, that the company has already expended large sums of money. As a matter of fact, the information was given to the House yesterday, by the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) in answer to a question by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that the government had been informed by the company that already some $7,000,000 of the $20,000,000 authorized by this parliament last session has been expended on rolling stock within the past year, and that the company has contracted to spend nearly

$4,000,000 for more rolling stock. This is well, and good, so far as it goes; but I question whether it will be satisfying to the people, at least, until the effect of the expenditure becomes apparent. These statistics placed upon the records of parliament are not going to be effectual in moving out that wheat or in moving merchandise into the country. And I seriously question whether the amount which has been expended, even augmented by the expenditure in contemplation, will be found anything like sufficient for the conditions. The people of the western country have, for many months, been fed with fine promises by the officers of the company, and the most of these promises have not been fulfilled. On the other hand, there has been, even up to this day, I believe, a resolute refusal on the part of the head officials of the company to meet the representations and recommendations that have been made and are being made by their officers in the west, the men who by their position and work—being actually on the grounds and face to face with the conditions—must be most competent to give information and make recommendations on these matters. I believe the head officers of the company are even yet, as in years past they have been, resolutely refusing to act upon the recommendations of their western officials. It was only the other day that the president of the company, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, returning from a visit to the old country, was interviewed by newspaper reporters in Montreal and was asked what preparation the company was making to cope with the great development taking place in the western part of Canada. He gave a certain amount of information and said that the company was doing a great deal. But he said: We cannot lose sight of the fact that, in the future, there may be crop failures, and we must guard against the difficulties arising therefrom. If the farmers and business people of the North-west Territories all went about their business with the spectre of a crop failure before their eyes, there would be such a lack of confidence, that the development that has taken place in that country and that we expect to see go on, would quickly cease. As long as the head officer of the Canadian Pacific Railway keeps before his mind the spectre of a crop failure that may some time occur on the North-west prairies, I fear that the people of that country are never going to have satisfactory railway facilities or traffic conditions. If I may presume to advise Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and his colleagues in the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I would say to them that they should listen to the advice of the men who are working for them and are on the ground in Winnipeg and west of Winnipeg. These are the men who know the conditions, and who are competent to give advice, and their advice ought to be acted upon.

If I may so far presume, I should also advise the officers of the company to take the people more frequently into their confidence. I think that very often there would be less intensity of feeling on the part of the western people if the officers of the company would take the trouble to outline publicly the plans they have in contemplation. The people of the western prairies are not unreasonable, and if sometimes they are compelled to complain loudly, when we look closely into the facts, we will find they have very good reason for their complaints. Everybody knows that difficulties in regard to railway traffic have occurred in many parts of the country. These difficulties have not been confined to western Canada. Reports that come to us from the south of the line, in many of the states, show that in that country also they have serious traffic difficulties. If the facts were placed before the people of western Canada with reasonable fullness, very often the people would realize the difficulties of the railway company, and would be willing to take these difficulties into consideration. But usually, in place of giving any intimation of their plans to the people, in place of allowing the people to have any inkling of the efforts the company is making to meet the conditions, we have had on the part of the company nothing but statements pooh, poohing the idea that any difficulty at all existed, and promises made that the business was going to be conducted to the satisfaction of every person. Those promises have been falsified by experience so often that now the people of that whole country are very dubious about accepting any assertion that is made by the officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There would certainly be much less complaint on the part of the people if they believed that the company was putting forth its best efforts and was really desirous of using every means to furnish relief. But very frequently the contrary fact is made apparent.

I am going to tell the House about a conference that was held at Regina on the 20th of July last, with Mr. Whyte, the assistant to the president, with regard to the wheat situation as it existed at that time. There were present at this conference representatives of the North-west government, I think Mr. Haultain, the premier of the Territories; and Mr. Bulyea, who was then Commissioner of Agriculture for the Territories; as well as representatives of the Territorial Grain Growers' Association. Mr. Whyte came up from Winnipeg to meet with them, and to discuss the situation as regarded the wheat traffic. Full figures respecting the wheat then in the country were brought to the conference from the officers of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and the North-west Department of Agriculture. When the position was threshed out and thoroughly discussed with Mr. Whyte, it was found that, to enable the farmers to get all their ex-

port wheat into the country elevators before the break up of the roads, which might be expected about the end of March, and before the seeding season came on, it was necessary that 13,000,000 bushels of wheat should be shipped out of the country—that would be between the 20th of January and some date towards the end of March. Mr. Whyte admitted that the largest amount his company could expect to handle within that time was 6,000,000 bushels. He said that they expected to be able to haul 3,000,000 bushels to St. John by rail, and they would, before the end of March, have an additional 3,000,000 bushels space at Fort William. They could therefore expect to handle 6,000,000 bushels, and no more, out of the 13,000,000 bushels that it was admitted then must be taken out of the country before the break up of the winter roads. The Territorial Commissioner of Agriculture, Mr. Bulyea, had just come from St. Paul where he had conferred with the officials of the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific and the St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie roads; and he had come back to Regina with promises from these companies that they would accept all the wheat that the North-west could furnish to them within the next two months. They said there was at that time open space in the Duluth elevators for 30,000,000 bushels, and they had sufficient railway equipment at their disposal at the time to enable them to handle all the wheat that we could furnish to them. It was suggested, naturally, to Mr. Whyte that the solution of the problem as it existed then was that the Canadian Pacific Railway should turn over to the Soo and to the Great Northern the 7,000,000 bushels of excess. The House will scarcely believe me when I state that when this proposition was made to the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company he turned it down, he absolutely refused to allow the people of the North-west Territories to send out that excess of 7,000,000 bushels of wheat through American channels. When the question came up in that form the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway was intensely patriotic: It would be acting against the interests of Canada to allow this wheat to go out over American roads, and rather than permit that, the wheat must lie upon the North-west farms and rot. It may be contended—if there is any one here to speak on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway—that I am putting the refusal of the president a little too bluntly. I may admit to you that when the fact was stated in the newspapers in the North-west Territories, the Canadian Pacific Railway did complain, and tried to hedge about their refusal. I may be permitted to read a letter which was sent with regard to this matter by Mr. Whyte, the assistant to the president. A newspaper in Regina had stated that Sir Thomas Shaughnessy had turned down the request of the Western Grain Growers' Association on that occasion, and Mr. Whyte sent this letter to the newspapers, dated January 31:

> I am very much surprised at the article which appeared in your issue of January 29, headed 'The Canadian Pacific Railway refuses.' In fairness to the company I trust you will kindly publish this and my telegram to Mr. Bulyea, which I understand is the refusal you refer to, and which reads as follows:—
>
> 'I am authorized to say that instructions have been given to load back all cars coming in by the Soo line and Great Northern routes. Since our meeting'——

That is the conference that I have referred to.

> —'space has presented itself at Fort William by the opening of elevator D, and shipments to that point are being again accepted. Nearly 2,000,000 bushels more space will be available in March by the completion of new annex to elevator D at Fort William. Daily shipments are being made by our all rail route and we are taking all grain offered by that route as well as the grain for export that we can find ocean space for. Over two million bushels have been forwarded, all rail, since navigation. The company is fully alive to the requirements of the situation, and feels satisfied that the supply of cars now being sent to the territories will meet farmers' requirements.'

That is the kind of statement that has been repeated to the people of the west for many months, that the company was entirely satisfied that they were going to be able to meet all the requirements of the situation:

> I may further add that during the last day or two cars supplied at stations in territories for use of farmers have not as yet been loaded and I will feel obliged if you can do anything to get them to load cars more promptly.

That was another characteristic and typical statement that we have had ever since the traffic congestion became apparent, and we have had, month after month, the officials of the company endeavouring to put the blame on somebody else. Now this telegam of Mr. Whyte was just as much a refusal as the telegram of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy directed to the Commissioner of Agriculture had been, to the request that the company would permit a quantity of grain to be sent out over American roads, Mr. Shaughnessy's reply was that the people who were in the conference—I suppose they must have included Mr. Whyte, the representatives of the Grain Growers' Association and the members of the North-west government—must have been unaware that the company was already allowing grain to be shipped out over American roads. The arrangement that was in force and to which the president referred was the arrangement that all American or foreign cars finding their way into the territories might be loaded and sent back over these roads. Prior to the 20th of January this arrangement had been in force for over two months, and up to that time I venture

to say that not more than 40,000 bushels and in all probability not 25,000 bushels had then found their way out of the country. That arrangement might have been working for fifteen or twenty years before the 7,000,000 bushels requiring to be moved could have been sent out under it. The company repeated that they were quite satisfied that they would be able to deal with the situation. The House will remember that a year ago when we discussed the conditions that existed in the fall of 1901 the company professed to be quite satisfied that these conditions would never be repeated. It is such statements as these made by the company and which are never fulfilled that have led to a very serious intensity of feeling on the part of the people in regard to the operations of the company. I may say at the very time that Sir Thomas Shaughnessy patriotically was refusing to allow Canadian wheat to be hauled over American roads a number of grain dealers in Vancouver were obliged to refuse Australian orders for western Canadian wheat on account of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway was unable to deliver the wheat at Vancouver and the Australian dealers were obliged to go across the line to the state of Washington to get their orders filled. I must say, for my part, that when we find conditions like these and when we find an attitude like this on the part of the company the people of the west are entirely within their rights when they make representations to this government and to this parliament demanding that some action be taken on the part of the government and of parliament to compel the company to observe their charter and contract obligations. Before six o'clock I was referring to the very specific provisions which appear in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. Defective as this contract is in many particulars in regard to the rights of the people it seems that the framers of it had been careful to have very specific provisions put in in regard to the character of the service which the company must maintain and I think I quoted before six o'clock from section seven of the contract. The last sentence of section seven states :

> And the company shall thereafter and for ever efficiently maintain, work and run the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Section eight is as follows :

> Upon the reception from the government of the possession of each of the respective portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the company shall equip the same in conformity with the standard herein established for the equipment of the sections thereby contracted for, and shall thereafter maintain and efficiently operate the same.

If a suggestion is demanded from me in the way of a remedy for the conditions of which I am complaining I will propose this : The company have plainly forfeited their charter rights by failing to give an efficient service to the people of Canada in return for the very great privileges, franchises, subsidies and land grants that were handed over to them and if there is no other method of bringing the company to a realization of their responsibilities, or of compelling the company to carry out their charter obligations, I would suggest that a case be taken to the courts to decide now whether or not the suggestion I make is not the right one. Take a case to the courts and have a judicial decision given upon the point whether or not the Canadian Pacific railway have by their failure to serve the people forfeited their charter rights and whether these charter rights may not be taken away and such fresh arrangements made with the company by parliament as to the representatives of the people seem proper. There is another suggestion, perhaps a little less drastic than that, which may be made and which I think there is no doubt would very quickly bring an end to the condition of things against which we have at present to complain. In one section of the Manitoba Grain Act there are three words, which, if cut out, I think, would go a considerable length in very quickly bringing relief. These three words are 'without undue delay' and they refer to the furnishing of cars. I think if we cut out these three words 'without undue delay' a great deal of good will be done. I make this suggestion to the government in all seriousness as a remedy for the conditions that are prevailing in the country at the present time. I propose to cut these words out of the Act and make the company liable to penalties for failure to give cars within a reasonable time after they are applied for, to put them under a penalty for failure to do the business of the country in an efficient manner and I think that possibly next year and for all time to come we will not be under the necessity of taking up the time of the House in making such serious complaints as I am endeavouring to voice at the present time. As I have said the position now has become entirely intolerable. This difficulty commenced about twenty months ago during the autumn of 1901 and the company told the people from time to time : Well, we have been caught a little bit but this will never occur again. We are going to make provisions which will remedy this condition next season and there will be nothing like this to complain of. Well, next season came and we found that notwithstanding the great promises the company were making about the expenditure of money and the additional equipment and facilities they were providing—I say we found that last season, in the month of November, notwithstanding the promised additional equipment, that the company hauled 1,000 cars less to Fort William than they did the year before and that during the whole season of 1902 their haulage to Fort William was 750 cars less than their

haulage of 1901. I am bound to say that the cars were larger and that they hauled a few bushels more of wheat than in 1901, but as a matter of fact they hauled 750 cars less than during the preceding season. From time to time during the whole of last summer when it was apparent to almost everybody in that country who took the trouble to look into the situation that there was going to be a repetition of the blockade, business men, grain shippers, and others urged upon the company that they ought to bestir themselves and make some further efforts with the view of meeting the situation and the answer of the officers of the company was: What do you know about this matter? Have you the information? We have the information, we know what is being done and you do not know anything about it. We know all about the conditions and we are perfectly satisfied that we can do all the business that requires to be done this fall. Yet, we find that the conditions were very much more serious than they were the year before. The same thing occurred during last winter at the time of this conference with Mr. Whyte. I was present at this conference at Regina on the twentieth of January when it was urged upon Mr. Whyte that not only in the interest of the company but in the interest of the country and the people generally the company should be only too glad to get rid of this 7,000,000 bushels of wheat because it was plain to every person that there was going to be an enormous immigration, that it would be necessary to haul down an enormous quantity of lumber and that in these ways the business of the company was going to be so greatly increased as to seriously tax the equipment of the company no matter how good it was and no matter how many additions were made to it.

But the officers of the company said: Oh, we are perfectly satisfied that we are going to be able to do the business all right. And the result is that the congestion and confusion at all points of the Canadian Pacific Railway, west of Winnipeg, are worse today than they ever were in the history of the country or in the history of the company. The Canadian Pacific Railway are perfectly satisfied; they were perfectly satisfied last fall when some of the settlers had to burn their fences because of lack of fuel. Of course the Canadian Pacific Railway tried to put the blame on other people; they do that constantly. There was a considerable amount of correspondence published in the newspapers late in the fall between the officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the officers of the coal companies at Roche Percee and Lethbridge. The coal companies did not relish the idea of the Canadian Pacific Railway putting the blame for the fuel famine on them, and the officers of the coal companies made it clear to the officers of the railway company that the latter were to blame for the condition of things that existed. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not told one-thousandth part of all that might be told, but I think possibly I have occupied the attention of the House long enough and there are other representatives from the west who are prepared to supplement the few things that I have said. I emphasize the fact that this is not a local question, but that it is a national question. Probably the people west of Lake Superior feel the pinch more than others do, but there is no person in the Dominion who is not interested or who ought not to be interested in this question. There was a loss to the half a million people in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, and that means a loss to all the people of Canada. I am convinced that there was a loss of not less than $10,000,000 last year to the people of the Northwest because of the conditions that prevailed on the railways. There was a loss of $5,000,000 on the wheat alone. I believe that the price of wheat was depressed an average of ten cents a bushel. I know of a particular case where the difference between what they call the 'street' price and the 'track' price was as much as seventeen cents a bushel. That is to say, that when a farmer did procure a car by chance and was able to send out his own wheat and sell it, he got seventeen cents a bushel more for it than he was offered at the elevator. The House will recognize that any condition which depresses the price of the farmer's wheat to the extent of ten cents a bushel, and seventeen cents a bushel in an extreme case, is an intolerable condition. I believe that the farmers of that country were robbed of not less than $5,000,000 on their wheat because of the condition that prevailed last year on the railway. In other ways, some of which I have described, there was a further loss, and I believe, Sir, that the people of that country were robbed of not less than $10,000,000 on the whole last year, because of this condition of things. The company tell us that they are not able to get the equipment, but I very much doubt that. They have been bonused and assisted enough by the people of Canada to warrant them in making an extra effort to save the people of the west from being robbed in the way I have described, and they could well afford to take say $3,000,000 to go to the markets of the world and purchase locomotives. I think that if I were furnished with $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 and let loose in Europe or the United States to pick up locomotives and freight cars I would not come back empty handed. Months ago I suggested, and I repeat the suggestion now, that a commission should be appointed by the government to study the conditions on that railway, and if necessary the commission should go to other countries to discover whether railway equipment cannot be bought with money, no matter what the price would be. It would pay the govern-

ment, if the company cannot stand the cost, to spend half a million or a million if necessary rather than to have half a million of the citizens of Canada robbed to the extent I have stated. This is a phase of the question distinct from that of the extension of railway mileage in the west, and it is a phase which is of more immediate importance to us. It is absolutely useless to allow people to come to our country at the rate they are coming in now—35,000 new settlers up to the present this year, 20,000 during April alone—and to increase the production, if we do not take steps to see that their products can be shipped out. Every additional mile of railway built in Manitoba or the North-west Territories is merely going to add to the congestion if we do not provide facilities for operating the existing lines and accommodating the people in that country at the present time. The building of new lines of railway will not relieve this congestion in the time in which it must be relieved. It is impossible to build a new railway from the east to Winnipeg this year, and the unfortunate condition of things I have described must be relieved this year if a worse condition is not to be created. Mr. Speaker, I trust I can with confidence leave this matter in the hands of the government and of the House.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Let me say a word or two on behalf of those people in Canada who have an interest in a land which is not North-west land. We fully recognize the importance of the west. As I have said on many occasions, we from the other provinces will be always glad to do anything possible to promote the progress and development of our North-west lands, but we believe that the part of the country in which we live is just as good as the North-west, and that the half million people who are in Manitoba and the Territories are not any better people than we are. They are just as good but no better. We wish them God speed, but on our side we would like to have from them the right to be allowed to live. My hon. friend (Mr. Scott) has used very strong language indeed. He goes to the extent of saying that the people of Canada are allowing the Canadian Pacific Railway to rob the people of the west.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. These are very strong words, but we have been hearing them in this House for the last three or four years. We are now told that this year the people of the west have been robbed of ten cents, or perhaps seventeen cents per bushel on their wheat. That is a statement for which I would like corroboration in stronger evidence than words. I do not believe that anything of the kind has happened and I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) can prove it. He thought, of course, that he was speaking Gospel truth ; but he cannot prove what he has said. There has been congestion of trade in the Canadian west, just as there has been in the American west. The Northern Pacific and the Great Northern have not given better accommodation to the American farmers than the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern have given to our farmers. For two months the Great Northern could not handle its trade.

Mr. SCOTT. May I remind my hon. friend that I stated that in the month of January the Great Northern was able to handle all the grain the North-west Territories could give it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There was just as much congestion on the American side as on the Canadian side.

Mr. SCOTT. There was congestion, but not much.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There was quite as much. Their roads could not take any more freight just then. If five additional railways were built in the North-west Territories they could not possibly handle the trade during the season of navigation. The west is developing. Last year the season for moving the crop began on the 12th of October, none of the crop was moved before the 12th of October, and the 6th of December was the last day on which the port at Fort William was open. It was a very short season indeed. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern, powerful as they are, cannot lengthen the season, and the government cannot do it either. Even if there were three or four more railways, they could not handle the trade of the west in such a short season. It cannot be done ; it is out of the question. My hon. friend has said that in the month of January an application was made to ship to Duluth 6,000,000 bushels of grain. Well, I doubt very much if there were 6,000,000 bushels of grain ready to be shipped at that time, and the hon. gentleman cannot prove it.

Mr. SCOTT. There were 14,000,000 bushels ready to be shipped.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The point is not whether the wheat was there. The question is whether the farmers were ready to ship it.

Mr. SCOTT. At the moment there were far more than 6,000,000 bushels of wheat in the country elevators.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not say that the grain was not there. What I say is that the farmers were not then anxious to ship their grain to that extent. The farmers were told that on application they would be given as many cars as could be placed at their disposal. Since the month of January the Canadian Pacific Railway has taken 3,000,000 bushels of grain on its all-rail route.

Now, this country must stand by itself. There is a North-west, but there are also Canadian railways and Canadian ports; and the ambition of the Canadian people, when they decided to spend about $100,000,000 in building a great transcontinental railway, was to use their summer and winter ports as much as they could. Therefore the Canadian Pacific Railway is not only justified, but must make it a duty, to ship through Canadian ports all the trade they can handle. There are very many business men in this House, and there is not one of them who does not know that on many occasions he could not get immediately all the accommodation he wanted. There is not one shipper in the older provinces who, during the last two or three years, the last year especially, has not been obliged to wait for cars. I have seen on the sidings between Montreal and western points last year as many as 1,500 cars waiting. We could not ship everything at the same time. Our friends in the west must submit to the inevitable, as we have to do in the older provinces. My hon. friend, who is generally moderate in his views, has not been very mild to-day, but has gone to extremes. He has given us as an evidence of bad management and bad will on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway the fact that one car has been lost track of. Well, among the many thousand cars that are moved on a great railway, it is not a miracle that one car is lost. I remember very well, during my travels on the other side of the ocean, that one of my friends lost his wife for two long days ; but he found her all right—she had been in good hands. Joking apart, it seems to me that our hon. friends from the west, instead of doing their level best to depreciate a great Canadian enterprise, would be wiser to join with us in finding the best means of alleviating the situation. What is the use of giving delight to the great American railways, the competitors of the Canadian Pacific Railway ?—because that is what it means. Every blow aimed at this great enterprise gives delight to its American competitors. It seems to me that we should stand by each other better than our friends from the west do. Let them permit me to say that to them in all friendliness : They are wrong in their views, and in the policy they are pursuing.

My hon. friend has admitted that the Canadian Pacific Railway has spent about $7,000,000 in equipment. That is a large sum. Why, the port of Montreal, needs to-day an expenditure of $5,000,000 or $6,000,000. The older provinces have some importance, but we do not get up in arms and say that we are not getting anything. We understand that we must move with the times and take into account the difficulties we have to meet. As far as I am concerned—and I know that I am expressing the feelings of the great majority of this parliament—we will stand for Canadian ports as against American ports ; and if our friends from the west have to wait a little, they will have to hold their souls in patience as we are doing. The two railways already in that country have equipped themselves to the best of their ability. My hon. friends know that the Canadian Pacific Railway have tried to get more stock than they have been able to secure. They have given orders to some Canadian corporations for locomotives and they are not yet delivered, with the view of encouraging Canadian industry. They have applied to the United States, France, England and Germany for cars and locomotives, but could not get them for love or money. My hon. friends from the west cannot be ignorant of that. What is the use then of getting up in the House and saying that the Canadian Pacific Railway are robbing the people of the west to such an extent that their charter should be forfeited ? That is going very far in the wrong direction.

There is another fact which my hon. friend knows perhaps better than any body else. Water supply for the locomotives was not available. In the grain growing districts during the months of August and September and October, in the season of 1900, the rain fall was 7·66 inches, the following year it was 4·37 and last year it was only 2·31 inches. The result of that was that not sixty per cent of the power of the locomotives could be used. My hon. friend knows that as well as I do, and probably better because he was there.

Mr. SCOTT. There was a lack of expenditure to provide the water.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There was no rain and therefore that was the fault of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is just the way we are treated, I do not believe that it is fair for us members of parliament, even members representing such a large portion of Canada as the North-west, to take such a stand. It may be if the Canadian Pacific Railway had foreseen that there would be no rain, they would have dug new wells. I do not know what kind of work should be done there to secure water, but all the same the supply of water was not available because the Divine Providence did not send sufficient rain.

Mr. SCOTT. Might I ask my hon. friend what weather statistics he is quoting from, because, as a matter of fact, every one in the North-west knows that last year we had a good deal more rain than the year before.

An hon. MEMBER. It swept away the bridges.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend says that there was so much water that the bridges were carried away. They were carried away in the month of June, but not in the months of August, September and October. That is just the kind of argu-

ments these hon. gentlemen use. If my hon. friends will permit me, I would tell them that that sort of thing appeals to prejudice and nothing else.

Mr. SCOTT. I was in Calgary in the middle of July and was held up there for three days by high water.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We know now that it rained in July, but is that evidence that it rained in August, September and October. What I say is this, and the truth of my statements can be easily ascertained, that in the months of August, September and October of last year, there were only 2·31 inches of rain. That is my statement and it is true. My hon. friend knows that most of the locomotives were nearly half the time in the shops because the water became so bad that it was thick.

Mr. SCOTT. They did not have room in the shops for them.

Mr. DAVIS. They had not any shops to put them in.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is no arguing with those who do not wish to use arguments. There was no water. It is a well known fact, which my hon. friends know as well as I, that the locomotives could not work because of lack of water. But at the end of the speech of my hon. friend, we found the real reason for his utterances. He says : we want new lines. The Canadian Pacific Railway has already spent between $7,000,000 and $10,000,000 for equipment, for locomotives, for cars, for sidings and for other works, but that is not enough because we must have new lines. In other words, the Canadian people are being given notice to-day that an application for $7,000,000, $10,000,000, perhaps $15,000,000, will be on the Table in a short time. That is the meaning of the speech we have just heard. The policy of the government is not yet known, but I believe that fair notice of motion has been given us to-night. We have a large surplus in the treasury, business is booming, applications are booming also—applications from the different provinces for larger subsidies, applications from the North-west for perhaps $10,000,000. It is fine, it is interesting, but all the same I cannot forget—we from the older provinces cannot forget—that there are other needs, that we cannot comply with every demand from every part of the country—from every Tom, Dick and Harry—but we must think of ourselves a little, and I invite the attention of the House and the country to the statements made here to-night. We have been given notice of motion that an application for further subsidies for a large amount of money will be on the Table before long. We will discuss them when they come before us. But in the meantime it is but fair to state that both the Great Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway have, during the last year, added a vast amount to their rolling stock and drawing capacity. Thousands of cars have been added to the rolling stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway since the last season. The elevator capacity along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been increased by 7,500,000 bushels. At Fort William and Port Arthur alone, the additional elevator capacity for the season will be 4,000,000 bushels. The Canadian Northern has done a great deal also. I had the pleasure of travelling over that road last fall. The road was not in just as good shape as now, but the company have done very fine work indeed. They are adding to their branches and the efficiency of their road. My hon. friend has, perhaps, lost sight of the fact that, if more grain was not taken from Manitoba and the North-west during navigation season, it is for the reason—besides the one I have already given—that there was a shortage of ships. At the close of navigation, there was a good deal more grain in store at Fort William than there was at the close of the previous season.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) should not say so, because he will be giving comfort to the American shipowners—using the same argument as he used about the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The comfort of the American ship-owners does not concern me. We are discussing a question of fact; and I state again, as a matter of fact, that, when the season closed last fall, there was in the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator at Fort William, more grain than there was at the close of the previous season.

Mr. SCOTT. I think my hon. friend's (Hon. Mr. Tarte's) information is not quite accurate. There never was a moment in the last shipping season closing on the 5th of December, when the elevators at Fort William were blocked with wheat.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not say that.

Mr. SCOTT. That is the whole question.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No ; what I say is that ships could not be secured to take out the balance of the wheat in the elevators That cannot be denied. My hon. friends always try to avoid the issue. I did not say the elevators were blocked, but that more grain was left in them at the close of last season than at the close of the previous season, and that for the reason that no ships were available. And, in the month of April, before the opening of navigation, there was less grain in store by a million bushels than at the same time in the previous season. And why ? Because the Canadian Pacific Railway have been carrying out grain by their all-rail route. Now, my hon. friend has said a word about the Grain Act. I would be very much surprised if my hon. friend would say from his place in this House that the Grain Act has worked to the satisfaction of the North-west farmers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I say it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. May I be permitted to ask if it is not true that meetings have been held to denounce the Grain Act and ask for changes ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, there was a meeting at Brandon. Will my hon. friend say there was not such a meeting to denounce the Act or ask for changes ? And I have been informed that, on several occasions, farmers have asked for a great many more cars than were necessary, thus keeping these cars idle—cars that might have been used elsewhere. Our friends from the North-west cannot possibly expect that the railway companies will ever be able to handle all their grain within the season of navigation. It would not be in the interest of the farmers themselves, for it would flood the market. But, aside from that, it is out of the question for a railway company to be able to handle a hundred million bushels of grain—still less two hundred million bushels, as we hope soon to have—within the season of navigation. What, then, is to be done ? Would it not be fair to expect that our friends in the west should do what their friends and neighbours in the United States have done—build granaries ? The farmers of Dakota and Minnesota have built granaries.

Mr. SCOTT. So have our farmers.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Only a few of them.

Mr. SCOTT. I can inform the hon. gentleman that there are four millions of bushels on the farms yet—in the granaries.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I speak of private granaries.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There are granaries at the stations. But the farmers in the United States have built them on their own farms. In the older provinces we have done the same. Our friends in the west want us to give all the money that may be made available for them, but they do not want to help themselves even to the extent of building private granaries on their own farms. They will make all the greater profit if they resort to the methods that the American farmers have adopted.

Mr. SCOTT. The railway company must carry lumber to the farmers before they can build granaries.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know from past experience that if the Canadian Pacific Railway were to spend in the North-west Territories all the money they could raise on their credit, there would still be grumbling. We are not surprised at that. Our friends from the North-west are right in making known their grievances, if those grievances are legitimate. But when I hear a member of parliament, and a very intelligent one too, tell us that one car has been lost and that the farmers of the west have been robbed of ten millions of dollars, I ask myself whether it was not necessary to have a pretty large fund of patience not to get a little mad. Our friends in the North-west have not been robbed of ten millions of dollars. They have been subjected to the difficulties that other parts of the country have been subjected to. The farmers of the province of Quebec have not been able to ship all their hay at the same time. They well understood that they could not get all the accommodation they would like to have. But they have not instructed any of us to try to destroy the credit of great Canadian corporations. My hon. friend has spoken of the coal famine. I believe I am within the truth in saying that no part of the country has been better stocked with coal than our own Manitoba and the North-west. We have been short of coal in the older provinces. Where is the member of parliament who has not been short of coal this year ? We have been all short of coal. But we have not made it a grievance against heaven and all the railway corporations in the world. It has been an accident, an accident that our friends from the west should be ready to accept as we have done. Before taking my seat, I say again that, ready as we are to vote all the money that is necessary to develop the North-west, there is one thing that we will not lose sight of—that the North-west must be Canadian from a commercial standpoint. Now, when they ask us to give them all the money we can gather, and to allow them besides to ship their trade through American ports, they are going too far, the country will not support them. The country will stand by the Dominion in summer and in winter. The port of St. John and the port of Halifax should become more and more the winter shipping points of the country. We should have a definite and clear policy to that effect. This is not the first time that I have protested against the policy that is too often propounded by some of our North-west friends. They look to Duluth, they look to Chicago.

What did we see during the last session of the local House ? Mr. Hill and his associates applied for charters granting them permission to build 2,500 miles of branch lines in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Why did they do so ? I believe I know something of their reasons, I am not far astray when I say that they did so because they were encouraged by people who have not Canadian interests at heart, who have some other interests to serve. I believe I am telling what is the fact when I say that Mr. Hill succeeded because there has been an unholy agitation in the North-west in favour of allowing Mr. Hill and his American associates to invade Canadian soil and Canadian territory, to tap the Canadian land so as to divert our trade through American ports. Mr. Roblin, who resisted

the year previous, was obliged to yield during the last session. A strong agitation was carried on by some of their friends and their organs, by the 'Free Press' especially, the organ of an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, which resulted in forcing the hands of the legislature of Manitoba into giving permission to Mr. Hill and his associates to build 2,500 miles of railway so as to carry our Canadian trade to the American Great Northern and to the Northern Pacific, Mr. Hill's roads. I do not believe those lines will be built, I do not believe Mr. Hill will build those lines. The reason he applied for charters was to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from going any further into his field. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have their Soo line, from which they are taking trade summer and winter to our Canadian ports, and Mr. Hill has found Canadians in the North-west who have helped him to check the Canadian Pacific Railway. That is just what has taken place. Sir, we are not friends of such an anti-Canadian policy as that. It is just as well that these things should be clearly stated in the House; it is time to state the facts openly.

I think the question raised by my hon. friend is of vast importance. The blockade of grain is only one incident, there are larger questions behind, and one of them I have just alluded to a moment ago. Mr. Hill and his associates, I say it again, have been helped in their efforts to take possession of the charters of the North-west Territories and to force the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from taking American trade to Canadian ports. I say that is an anti-Canadian policy. I say it is the duty of this parliament to stand by this country. Sir, I thank my hon. friend who has raised the question. He has shown us the efforts that are being made to-day by important interests, helped by public men in this country, to divert Canadian trade to American roads. History perhaps will tell us more than the past has told us. Perhaps the Canadian nation will know more in the future than it has learned in the past. Let us be careful, let us look carefully into the projects and schemes that may come before this parliament. Let us realize that our first duty is to stand by this country. Our electors, the people of Canada, will look to us to protect their best interests. The Canadian North-west will find friends in this parliament, as many friends as there are independent members, independent of railway corporations and financial interests. There are a great many members of parliament who are not influenced by such corporations. But the efforts that are being made to-day in certain quarters have to be watched with care. Our friends in the North-west may rely upon us, we will give them all the money that is necessary to relieve them from the difficulties under which they labour But the North-west must remain—I say it again with all the energy I can command—the North-west must remain Canadian. No Duluth, no Chicago for our business, but Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers in summer—

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the hon. gentleman just here, whether it is not a fact that the associations, accompanied by the Minister of Public Works, sought relief last October by going to Montreal first and discussing the question with the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and then sought relief from the American lines when they could get no satisfaction?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friends came to the city of Montreal, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company gave them all the relief it could possibly give them. I do not speak so much of the past as I do of the future. I am looking towards the future, because when we see efforts put forth, one of which I have just brought to the attention of the House, and when we see that such efforts have succeeded through the help that Mr. Hill and his associates have received from certain public men in this country, I say our duty is to be careful.

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say so much. But I think the time has come when the railway policy, the transportation policy of the country should be studied with more attention, and considered more carefully than it has been in the past. We are on the threshold of a new era. This country is developing by leaps and bounds. At last we are getting some immigration. We will get more if we stand by our country, if we equip it. We have all the money and all the credit that we need to do so. It takes a little time, governments cannot do everything in a day. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Great Northern have done well in the past. The Grand Trunk Railway wants to build a new railway through the west? We shall see how they want to build it. I know that this parliament would not consent to anything else than a thoroughly Canadian policy for the Grand Trunk Railway Company as for others, but we will discuss that later on. We do not know what the Grand Trunk Railway will tell us; we do not know whether they will apply for a subsidy or not. That will come later on. I only allude to that in passing and just to emphasize my view that this country is ready to do anything that our credit will permit us to do, but with this essential condition that the North-west Territories will stand with us. Our friends in the North-west Territories may just as well make up their minds now that they must look to the St. Lawrence route both summer and winter. If they ask us for millions to enable them to achieve that end they will get them. There will be no trouble as to that, but, if they ask us to sanction any policy which will permit them to divert the trade of the North-west to American ports,

I think they will meet with a response that will surprise them.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, as one of the representatives in this House from the west referred to in no very complimentary terms by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) who has just taken his seat, I want to inform the House and also the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, that the people who have representatives in this House expect that these representatives are going to look after their interests, and they have a perfect right on all occasions to get up and voice the sentiments of that part of the country from which they come without being called to account by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, or any person else. Now, I propose to say what I believe to be in the interests of the people of the North-west. It is true that I have not as large a brief as the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal. My brief is not typewritten; it has not been prepared for me. I know that railways have a manner of reaching the House which the farmers have not except through their representatives. I am here as the advocate of the farmers. My brief is not so long as that of the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, but I will endeavour to deal with the situation as briefly as possible. I noticed that in the speech which the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, treated the House to, he dealt almost exclusively with the grain blockade. I want to draw his attention and the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) in discussing this matter this afternoon, spoke very briefly on the question of the grain blockade, that, in fact, he only devoted a few moments to it. The balance of his speech was directed towards other things, to the blockade of merchandise, of cattle and a hundred and one other things, and as a matter of fact he scarcely touched upon the grain blockade at all, while the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, with his Railway Co. brief in hand dealt exclusively with the grain blockade, which went to show that his brief had been prepared beforehand and that it was a little old before he presented it to the House. He says that the people of the west are no better than the people of the east. I do not think that any hon. member from the west has ever claimed that the people from the western territories and provinces are any better than the people from the east. We have never claimed that at all and we have never been unreasonable in our demands. If our people have grievances I think we have a perfect right to ventilate them as we see fit without being called to account by any person.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We do not deny that.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, took exception to a statement made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia in reference to a certain amount of money that the hon. member for West Assiniboia said the farmers lost on their wheat. He went so far as to say that he had not any proof and that he did not know what he was talking about. I think the hon. member for West Assiniboia is in a much better position to deal with western questions and is much better versed in western questions than the hon. member for St. Marys, Montreal, is or will be in the near future. However, I am bound to say, he has travelled a great deal about the eastern provinces. We saw in the press about his trips on boats here and there and he went all over the country assuring the people that they ought to keep Canada for the Canadians, but he never came up to pay us a visit or to tell the people of the west that they ought to keep Canada for the Canadians. We know that without being told by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal. Now, he told us in his speech that the Great Northern Railway across the border was given no better service to the people over there than the Canadian Pacific Railway was given to the people of this country. I want to draw his attention and the attention of the House to the fact that last autumn the stock raisers of Alberta had to drive more than two-thirds of their whole product across the border to the Great Northern Railway before they were enabled to market their stock. Thousands and thousands of Canadian cattle had to be driven across the line and shipped out over the Great Northern Railway in order to get to market.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The reason why the cattle were driven over the American line was this: These shippers of cattle had come to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and asked them to discriminate against the port of Montreal and in favour of the port of Boston. The Canadian Pacific Railway declined to do so while the Great Northern agreed to do so. The Canadian Pacific Railway declined to discriminate against the port of Montreal and then the people simply drove their cattle across the line. The Canadian Pacific Railway did the right thing then.

Mr. DAVIS. While not wishing to contradict the hon. gentleman as I said a short time ago in his speech he found fault with the hon. member for West Assiniboia for making the statement that the farmers of the west had lost a certain amount of money on account of the blockade and he said that he wanted the proof. In carrying out the same principle I would like to have proof of the statement which the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, has just treated this House to before I will be willing to take much stock in it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. gentleman knows that it is a public fact that the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway were offered those cattle but they declined to discriminate against the port of Montreal.

Mr. DAVIS. If the hon. gentleman says it is a fact it must be confined to the hon. gentleman and a few of his friends because I never heard of it before.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It has been stated in the press publicly.

Mr. BOYD. I just wish to suggest to the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and also to the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) that the trouble in regard to the cattle, as I understand it, was that they could not get shipping from the port of Montreal.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No, they could get shipping. As soon as I read the statement in the press, I went myself, to the Canadian Pacific Railway offices in Montreal. The statement was made then in the 'Star,' 'La Patrie' and other newspapers on the authority of the Canadian Pacific Railway managers in Montreal and it is perfectly true that the Canadian Pacific Railway declined to discriminate against the port of Montreal and that then these cattle owners simply drove their cattle across the line to the Great Northern.

Mr. DAVIS. I remember a famous expression used by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, at one time that 'business is business.' I quite understand the cattle trade because I happen to be engaged in it and I know that if the Canadian Pacific Railway had not discriminated against the port of Montreal and that if they had fixed their rates right and given the same facilities for shipping and feeding and that sort of thing as were afforded on the other side of the line, the cattle owners of the country, who are as patriotic as any other class of people, would have sent every head of stock over the Canadian Pacific Railway to a Canadian port. It was the Canadian Pacific Railway who were not patriotic. It was not a case of Canada for the Canadians with them, but of keeping up high rates and not furnishing proper facilities for handling the stock. The result was that the cattle owners were obliged to drive their stock across the line and ship it by an American road.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend has not understood me. These cattle owners wanted to ship their cattle to Boston and they wanted the same rate for Boston as for the port of Montreal and the Canadian Pacific Railway declined to grant it. That is all.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that the cattle shippers of the west would prefer shipping cattle from Boston rather than from Montreal, if they had not to pay a higher rate via Montreal? Why the thing is nonsensical. If the cattle shipper of the west got the same facilities he would far rather ship from a Canadian than from an American port. But the truth is that after driving the cattle something like 200 miles over the prairie they made a saving in time, and $3 per head in freight rates. If, besides, they had shipped them by the Canadian Pacific Railway the cattle would have depreciated at least one cent a pound, which is the difference between the price of export cattle and butchers' cattle. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) gets himself into deep water when he commences to talk about the cattle trade, because he is not well posted on it. He had better get his brief amended. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) thought he had a point against my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) when he stated that the time was too short to get our wheat out of that country before the close of navigation. What was he going to do with all the famous canals he was going to build to carry our wheat, if the season is so short that we could not ship by those canals, but would have to store our wheat at the head of the lakes all the time. We would like to hear something further from him on that aspect of his canal policy. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) also told us that the people of the west would have to be treated in the same manner as the people of the east, that we were after money all the time. We have never asked for different treatment, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that if you look at the estimates for the last five years—throwing out the revotes, because he was great on revotes when he was Minister of Public Works—you will find that the western provinces did not receive their fair share of expenditure or fair treatment from the government so far as public improvements are concerned. The hon. gentleman also told us in his very dramatic fashion that every blow we struck at the Canadian Pacific Railway was helping the American roads. Not five minutes after he attacked the Canadian shipping interests by stating that they were not competent to take the wheat from Port Arthur and Fort William. If the people of the west are unpatriotic for striking blows at the Canadian Pacific Railway, he is unpatriotic when he strikes a blow at the Canadian shipping industry. But anyway the hon. gentleman had no argument in that. If the people of the west are labouring under a grievance from the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway corporation, does he mean to say that we have not the right to ventilate our grievances in this House, simply because that corporation howls that it is not patriotic for us to do so. If you carry that argument to its logical conclusion, you might as well say that if a Canadian robs a man, that man should keep his mouth shut about it simply because if he did not he would be holding up a Canadian a thief before the American people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a good word to say for the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The Canadian Pacific Railway is a good company in some respects, and they have done a great deal for this country, but at the same time this country has done a great deal for the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think we are pretty even in that respect. The Canadian Pacific Railway entered into an agreement with the people of Canada by which on their side they received a certain amount of constructed road, a certain amount of public lands, a certain amount of public money, and certain other concessions in the way of exemptions for ever from taxation on their main line and buildings; certain exemptions from taxation on their lands for twenty years, as we supposed, but which we find out to be forty years; and on top of all that they got the right to tax the people to their hearts content in the way of freight rates, and there is no question but that the Canadian Pacific Railway does that. In consideration of all this they were to give a fair and proper service to the people of Canada, west and east. The Canadian Pacific Railway should be compelled to carry out their agreement. The people of Canada have loyally carried out their part of the agreement. The poor settlers in the west who by their labour increase the value of their own lands were increasing the value of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands at the same time, and they made it possible for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to realize something like $100,000,000 out of Canadian Pacific Railway lands. The farmers of the North-west felt very sore over the grievances which they laboured under at the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway in this matter of taxation but when it was made known to them that there was a solemn agreement entered into between the people of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway, they loyally decided that they would labour under their disabilities in order to carry out their contract. But, Sir, on the other hand the Canadian Pacific Railway should be forced to carry out their share of the bargain just as loyally. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) was not far astray in his figures when he spoke of the amount of money that the people of the west have lost on account of the conditions that have existed in that country last year. There were about 25,000,000 bushels of wheat shipped out of that country last year, and I am here to say that through the inability of the Canadian Pacific Railway to handle that traffic the farmers lost not less than five or six cents a bushel, and any gentleman can take a pencil and figure out what that means. It means a loss to our farmers of $1,250,000. The buyers had to buy the grain early in the season on the basis of winter storage, because they had no guarantee that the wheat could be shipped out on account of the scarcity of cars and motive power. When a farmer happened to get a car and was able to ship his wheat to the lakes, he got six cents a bushel more than the grain buyer could give him at his own door. The farmers commenced to complain that the grain buyers were robbing them, but the whole thing came back to the fact that the biggest railway in that part of the country was not able to handle the traffic offered to them. There are about 14,000,000 bushels of wheat yet in the country that the railway was not able to take out, and on every bushel of that the farmer will lose six cents a bushel or $840,000. They have to pay insurance, storage, and interest on the money, because the farmers are like other business people and if their product is not marketed they have to borrow money to pay interest on it, and interest is eight or ten per cent in the west. But it is not only the farmers who have lost. The business men all through the North-west have lost money by reason of the inability of the Canadian Pacific Railway to bring in freight. That loss ultimately comes out of he settlers. My hon. friend (Mr. Scott) gave a case where the Christmas goods ordered by a merchant did not arrive until the spring. And any business man knows that you cannot sell dolls and jumping jacks in the spring of the year unless you are willing to take five cents on the dollar for them. The hon. gentleman from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) does not appear to know as much about the cattle industry as he does about the wharfs and piers in this part of the country, and I want to give him a little information about that industry.

There are two classes of cattle which we have to ship. One class is known as export cattle; they are worth in Winnipeg from $4 to $4.15 per 100 pounds. The other class is known as butchers' cattle, which are worth at Winnipeg three cents per pound. On a $1,400 pound steer, the difference in price amounts to a considerable sum. Just $14 again out of the farmer. When a cattle shipper wants to ship his cattle from Calgary, he may find when he gets to Moose-jaw, a divisional point, that there is no accommodation. If another shipper has got ahead of him, there is no shed, no yard, no hay, no water, for his cattle; so they have to go on. I have known of cattle to be three days on the cars without food or drink, and every one knows what that means. It means a reduction of 1·15 cents per pound on half of these cattle at least, because while half of them may be able to stand the hardship, the other half will go to pieces, and will have to be sold as butchers' cattle. That very thing happened all last fall. I had an experience of that kind myself. It took me one night and a whole day to go ninety-five miles with my cattle on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I arrived at a place where I had to feed them, but there was no yard and no hay, and I had to break the Sabbath in order to go and hunt a yard and provide water and feed for my cattle; and when

I got them to the market I lost 1·15 cents per pound on half of them. Is it any wonder that people will take their cattle to the Great Northern, which provides them with yard and shed accommodation, and with the food and water they require? It will take a great deal of patriotic talk to induce a man to go through rain and shine with his cattle, to go without proper accommodation, and to be willing to take a cent per pound less for them in order to send them by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let the Canadian Pacific Railway be sufficiently patriotic to give the people the facilities they require, so that they will be able to use Canadian roads and Canadian ports.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. May I ask, are there several stations where there is not accommodation?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, several stations.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How many?

Mr. DAVIS. If my hon. friend will ask the Canadian Pacific Railway company (whose brief he holds), they will tell him all about it. Now, I have been looking over a very important and good report, in which there is a great deal of information; and I hope my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) will not accuse me of being unpatriotic because I quote it in the House. That is the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission for 1901. At page fifty-one of that report I find that for every thousand miles of railway in the United States, taking the average all over the country, there were 195 locomotives and 7,535 cars. If my hon. friend will figure up the whole system of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he will find that it falls very short of that. There is no good reason why it should not have locomotives. This is not a new idea; it has been brought up here year after year. I have been in this House seven years, and every year during that time this House has been told that there were not sufficient facilities on that railway. The company have had plenty of time to remedy this state of affairs, and they should have done so. I also find that of the capital stock invested in railways in the United States, no less than 54·34 per cent paid no dividends in 1901, while the Canadian Pacific Railway has been paying five per cent and six per cent on its different classes of stock, though it has immense stretches that are unprofitable. All this bears out the statement of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) that the company have been starving the road from year to year. If they had been putting the money earned by the road into improvements instead of into the stockholders' pockets as dividends, we would not have to make these complaints. My hon. friend from St. Mary's spoke of water tanks, and he said the rainfall in June had not been sufficient to keep them supplied. When he was called up by the hon. member for Assiniboia, he dropped from June to July, and if my hon. friend had followed him up, he would have made him drop down to December. In the country we had a succession of dry seasons when there was very little water; but during these years we never heard a complaint of shortage of water on the Canadian Pacific Railway, but now there is a complaint of shortage of water when the seasons are so wet that it is hardly possible for people to travel across the country and bridges were swept out in all directions by too much water caused by excessive rainfall. The simple fact is that the tanks have been neglected and the locomotives have been worn out. I might give my hon. friend an example of how the business has been done. In my own town of Prince Albert there is a branch line called Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, which has been operated for twelve years by the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is a river as large as the Ottawa river, flowing past the town of Prince Albert, and the railway track runs within less than a hundred feet of that river; and yet the company can get no water at Prince Albert, and have to take the locomotives out twenty miles to get water.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Will my hon. friend allow me? Is it not a fact that about sixty per cent of the locomotive power of the Canadian Pacific Railway—new locomotives—have been out of shape during the months of September and October because of the alkali in the water, the result of there being no rain? I have been informed that that is the case.

Mr. SCOTT. There is a certain amount of truth contained in the question the hon. gentleman asks. But the difficulty was this, that the company failed to make provision for good water at points like Prince Albert, where they have the Saskatchewan, which is free from alkali. At that point there should be no difficulty getting water, but they have failed to make provision to keep up their supply. At Regina also, where the water from the wells is too hard for proper service in the locomotives, they have failed to make provision for getting good water, but they are making it now. The offices of the company are filled with reports made by the company's officials with regard to this particular matter—reports made seven and eight years ago but only acted on this year. Had these recommendations been acted on years ago, there would not have been any difficulty.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have in my hand a report from an official of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the effect that owing to the rain fall having been only 2·31, the water, which was good the previous year, became so impure that 60 per cent of the new locomotive power could not be used.

Mr. DAVIS. I have pointed out that we have had very dry seasons when there were scarcely any complaints and when there was no complaint of the alkali, simply because the water supply was looked after. But because it was neglected later, because the tanks were allowed to get our of order, through false economy in not keeping sufficient men to look after them, and because the wells were not kept clean, there was cause for these complaints. I have a good word to say for many of the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think they do all they can, and I think, if their reports and suggestions were taken into consideration a little more at the head office, the people of the west would not have so many grievances.

As regards to what my hon. friend from St. Mary's division of Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said about the unpatriotic manner in which some of the people of the west had insisted in bringing about such a state of affairs, that several charters were granted last session by the Manitoba parliament to the Great Northern people, to build roads into this country, let me tell the hon. gentleman that, so far as we are concerned, I never heard of any such agitation. As a matter of fact the Northern Pacific, which is now practically a part of the Great Northern, was brought into the province of Manitoba years ago. We had them in there, and my hon. friend might have gone further and told us how it was that they were driven out of the province. I do not know whether he would call that a patriotic action or not, but they were driven out of the province, and I am not aware that they wanted to come in since. The fact that some people applied for a charter does not warrant my hon. friend in saying that Jim Hill got it. It is well known that Mr. Hill has denied that he had anything to do directly or indirectly with the charter granted by the Manitoba legislature. But no doubt some persons thinking that there might be something in it, has applied for a charter, and we may hear something about it a little later on. As far as my part of the country is concerned, we have nothing to do with it. But if we want to get connection with an American road, I would like my hon. friend to tell me why we have not as good a right in the west to have connection with American roads as the older portions of Canada.

Mr. MONK. If you build your own railways, but not if you build them with our money.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know that this particular company to which my hon. friend from St. Mary's was alluding has asked for any money. If my hon. friend knows of any money they have asked for he is better informed that I; his political friends are connected with it.

Mr. MONK. I know what money you are trying to get now.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

Mr. DAVIS. I think we have a precedent for that sort of thing, and the less the hon. gentleman says about it the better. I could refer the hon. gentleman to that piece of railway which was built through Maine by the same company which my hon. friend talks about.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And which led to a great Canadian port.

Mr. DAVIS. A Canadian road led to the same part, but this was the piece of line subsidized by Canadian money to be built on American soil—going in and out again, as my hon. friend has said. But was it patriotic for us to subsidize a railway to be built on American territory to compete with our own national road? No one has ever pressed such a demand as that from this side of the House. The railway asked for is a line just reaching to the boundary. No one have ever asked this government to put their hands into the treasury and subsidize a road built on American territory. But that was done years ago by a Conservative government. We have the Grand Trunk Railway running into Portland. That was done in the good old days. My hon. friend might tell us something about that. Was that unpatriotic? You have I do not know how many roads running across the boundary line in order that you may do business with the Americans. You have to do business with them. They are our neighbours. And if it is good for the people of the east to have a connection across the line with the Americans and do business backwards and forwards, it also would be a very good thing for us. The sooner the people of this country realize that we in the west have not a sucking bottle in our mouth the better it will be for them. We have a right to say something about our affairs without being lectured for lack of patriotism. One thing strikes me, and that is that out of the contingent of western members from the country west of the lakes there was not one to be found to defend this proposition, and a man had to be got from the east, who appears with a big brief, and who is not posted on western matters as he should be. True, he made a couple of trips and there was no lack of cars—of private cars anyhow——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I shall come again.

Mr. DAVIS. I hope to see my hon. friend there. We will welcome him, but I am afraid if he takes the line of argument he did this evening in the House and accuse our people of being unpatriotic——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I never made any such accusation.

Mr. DAVIS. It was an implied accusation. It was an insinuation. I think the House will bear me out in saying that we were accused of trying to hamper a great Canadian industry and all that sort of

thing. I shall not take up any more time as other speakers will follow. The Canadian Pacific Railway have done a good deal for this country and I would like to see them prosper. We do not want to see then injured in any way, but when they can pay 6 per cent on their stock and have power to issue $20,000,000 more, on condition that $9,000,000 should be spent in the west in motive power and in doubling their tracks. We would like to see them carry out their agreement. That line has to be double tracked from Moosejaw to Port Arthur. Sidings and all that sort of thing will not relieve the congestion. If they have a double track from Moosejaw to Port Arthur with sufficient rolling stock, they can carry all the wheat out from that part of the country. Other portions of the territory will be served by the Canadian Northern. We have grievances, and it is not only good for the people but for the Canadian Pacific Railway that we should ventilate them. The Canadian Pacific Railway will find out that if they would adopt a more live policy in dealing with the west, it would be a benefit to themselves. Perhaps after the discussion this afternoon we may find them buying more locomotives and rolling stock. If they cannot buy them, they can manufacture them. The people of the west have the interests of the Dominion as much at heart as the people of the east, notwithstanding what my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has said this evening. I think you will find as much patriotism in the west as in any part of this Dominion. I need only go back to three years ago, when the empire needed volunteers. Who were the most ready to volunteer ? Who more ready than the men of the North-west ? And very good soldiers they proved themselves, and a very good showing they made.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIS. The people of the west have insinuated that they are not loyal or that they desire to sever that portion of territory from the empire and annex it to the United States.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). It is not very often that the members for Manitoba and the North-west have an opportunity of taking part in a discussion that comes so near to them as the one brought before the House this afternoon by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). For that reason I feel disposed to occupy a few moments of the time of the House in discussing the question. I do not altogether agree with the remarks of the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) when he said, as I understood him, that it was not in the best interest of the country that the matter should be brought to the attention of the House in the manner it has been. For my part, I believe it is in the best interest of the country in more ways than one that this subject should be thoroughly ventilated. There is no denying the fact that the people of the North-west Territories and Manitoba are not satisfied with the treatment they have received for the past two years and are still receiving. I admit that there is some excuse on the part of the railway company. We have had an increased acreage in cultivation, and, for two years, the crops have been exceptionally heavy. The transportation, not merely of these crops, but of the goods, the purchase of which naturally attend the more prosperous condition of the country, has made an enormous traffic for the railway. The passenger traffic also has been unusually great. Last summer, the railways had to carry in 25,000 people, harvest labourers, and then take them out again. Then owing to the prosperous condition of the people, many more than usual have been able to visit friends in the east and return. This also has made an abnormal condition of affairs. These things must be considered. For my part, I do not wish to minimize the difficulties or to find fault unnecessarily with the railway company. They have certainly done a great deal. In other seasons what they have been doing lately, would have been accepted as a fair effort. Still, as I have said, there is no denying the fact that they have not met the requirements of that country and that, if they are going to remain in the country and if the country is to make the progress we all feel it ought to make, either the company must voluntarily do more than it has done, or this government or whoever is responsible in the premises, must take steps to meet the emergency which now exists.

The hon. member for St. Mary's spoke of granaries. As to this, I cannot speak for the North-west Territories, but I know that, so far as certain portions of Manitoba are concerned, there is more granary capacity for the number of people and the number of acres under cultivation than in any other part of Canada or the United States. I say that without fear of contradiction. There are men in Manitoba whose granary capacity is from 1,000 to 18,000 bushels. I know that my hon. friend from St. Mary's when he made his statement, either was not conversant with these facts, or else he was speaking of the territory further west, where the people are not so well supplied in this respect. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) speaks of the people being patriotic. He tells us that the people of Canada have done a great deal for Manitoba and the North-west. Well, we in Manitoba and the North-west feel that we have done a great deal for Canada; and, if you take away that portion of the country, you leave Canada very small. But I do not think matters should be discussed in that spirit. There is no question of the patriotism of the people of the North-west, nor is there any question what you may expect of them in the future.

But, if you wish to keep them patriotic, it would be better to make provision that complaint cannot be made by the representatives of the people of that country such as have been made here to-night. And I may point out to my hon. friend from St. Mary's that if he supposes that the grain of Manitoba and the North-west Territories is to be brought through Canadian channels, Canada must meet the requirements of that country. I understand that some 2,000,000 bushels of wheat went to Minneapolis to be milled there and passed out through the United States. How are you going to stop these people from coming in and buying the wheat and taking it out of the country? Or how are you going to stop railways coming in and building lines and competing for the trade of the country? I notice the same condition of affairs in this House this year as when a somewhat similar question was under discussion last session. There are just two ministers present while this important matter is being discussed, one of them being the Minister of Militia, our fighting man. I would ask the members for Manitoba and the North-west to ask the government if they think they are showing the interest in our affairs that they should show and that the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories have the right to expect them to show. And, while they are asking the government this question, I would also like them to ask the government what they have done since they came into power in 1896 to meet the conditions that have been rising in that country, particularly within the last two years, and what we have to look for in years to come. We will forget, for the time-being what they did to prevent the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway into that country; we will forget the criticism they levelled at that enterprise and at the country; we will try to forget, in the kindness of our hearts, the things they said about us in those days. But I would ask what they have done for that country now that they are responsible for the future of the Dominion? I expect that some of the ministers will rise in their places and point out what they have done. We have been trying to find that out, but none of the men in the North-west Territories have been able to discern it up to the present time. So far as building other roads into the country is concerned, I remember that when I first spoke in this Chamber, about 1893, I pointed to the present premier (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who was sitting in opposition then, and said: If the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition will recant and say he is sorry for the things that the people whom he represents have said about Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and will go so far as to say that they have not done what they should have done, and that he will show his repentance by agreeing to the building of another road into that country—because by the time it is built it will be needed—then they might be looking for some support from that country. The hon. gentleman shook his head across the Chamber, and I said: The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but until he does something like that, he should not look for the support from Manitoba and the North-west Territories that he seems to think he deserves. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal press, particularly the 'Free Press,' poured out its vials of wrath upon me, because I had had the audacity to make such a suggestion as that. Well, Sir, after having lived up in that country for fifteen years, I recognized what was going to happen, and what has happened; and no act of the government now in power can be pointed out as having had any effect in relieving the situation, which has been caused by the greatness of that country itself and not by anything we have to thank the present government for.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I was surprised at the line or argument adopted by the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) in dealing with this question this evening. He takes a position that really was not advanced, and he sums up his whole argument by saying that this question is brought on to-day as a notice of motion that large bonuses are going to be laid upon the Table very soon. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want particularly to associate myself with the protest that has been made this afternoon; and at the same time I want to distinctly disassociate myself from sharing any information or any understanding as regards the inference that the hon. member for St. Mary's has drawn about this question being a notice of motion that parties are coming down here for bonuses in a few days. The complaint that has been raised to-day is almost exclusively in regard to the present blockade, not outgoing but incoming. A blockade of incoming freight is the great thing that is being complained of at the present time. A deputation has been sent from the Winnipeg Board of Trade to the head offices in Montreal, asking the railway authorities to take some steps to distribute the freight that is already in the country, and has been lying in the sheds for weeks, but which the merchants cannot get at. At this time it is not the outgoing grain blockade that is being complained of. I certainly think that the members from the North-west are not only within their right but performing their duty in bringing this matter before the attention of the government and of this House. Because who else can we look to for redress? They have not yet been able to get any relief, matters have been getting worse and worse.

But I rise now more particularly to refer to something that has not yet been touched upon, but which has had a material influence in causing the present freight blockade from Winnipeg clean through to the

Pacific coast. At the end of last year the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, through its secret service, became aware that a new and large organization was growing up on the western division of its line, an organization composed almost entirely of freight handlers and freight clerks. The company made arrangements to work a coup to break up that organization, to split it up before it had extended to the east. By the end of January they were ready, and they sent out their men from Montreal and commenced operations in Vancouver. Directly they took these initial steps, every man went out on strike, and they are all on strike to-day. They are not out for wages, they are not out for hours, nor is there any dispute about conditions, but they are out as a declaration that they shall not be discharged for belonging to this organization. To-day, from Winnipeg to Vancouver, the old freight hands on the Canadian Pacific Railway are not at work, and that fact is the cause, to a great extent, of the tremendous blockade, the crippling blockade, that now exists in regard to incoming freight. Freight trains have been piled up in the Winnipeg freight yard, in the yard at Calgary, in the yards in the mountains, in the yard at Vancouver, and the company themselves do not know what is there. It is their policy not to recognize any new organization of their employees. With my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), I regret that the members of the government do not stay in the House and pay more attention to these matters. The Minister of Labour has not taken any part at all in this trouble up there yet, but it is one of the matters that, if his department is to be of any use at all, it should have been dealing with for the last two months—not to help the company or to help the men, but to help the people of western Canada that are being held up through this blockade. I have now given you, Mr. Speaker, the chief cause of this blockade, and I charge without any hesitation that it was brought on by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and is deliberately maintained by them for that purpose.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). As an Ontario man I have listened with a good deal of interest to this debate, which has been participated in by members from the North-west. I listened especially with interest to the campaign literature which has been delivered by the hon. gentleman who moved the motion (Mr. Scott). I am free to admit that I sympathize with the hon. gentlemen from the North-west over the situation they have described to us. I know something personally of the conditions that have prevailed for the last six months, and while they are bad enough, I do not think I could go as far as the hon. member for East Assiniboia has done, and charge the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with being robbers. I think that is going a little too far. But there is no doubt that the conditions which have prevailed during the past year have been almost intolerable. But I want to point out that the conditions have been almost as intolerable in the east. We, in Ontario, have suffered fully as much, I am sure, as the men engaged in shipping in the west. Not only do we suffer the inconvenience caused by the delay in shipping stuff to the west, but by the delay in shipping stuff backwards and forwards from Ontario to the seaboard and from one Ontario point to another. Hon. gentlemen have given their personal experience, which is perhaps more telling than anything else. I may say that during the spring just passed the delay has been so great, not only on the Canadian Pacific Railway but on other roads, as to cause such inconvenience that we hardly know how to get along in shipping. Of goods shipped from the neighbourhood of Hamilton and the centre of the province of Ontario, in large lots, fully half of those shipments this spring were eight days in travelling from one to two hundred miles. When you compare that condition of things with the shipping facilities that prevail in England, for instance, you will agree that they are abominable. Why should goods shipped from the neighbourhood of Hamilton and the centre of the province of Ontario be eight, ten or twelve days in travelling one or two hundred miles, as fully half of the shipments have been this spring? It may be said, and I believe with a good deal of truth, that the amount of traffic is unusually heavy, and there is no question about that. But the roads ought to have prepared for the traffic. What would be thought of a merchant, a manufacturer, or a farmer whose business was increasing and who made no preparation for it? What would a merchant, a manufacturer or a farmer do if in anticipation of a double production of goods he did not prepare to double the number of his hands and the means for conveying those goods to market? Well, that is the position of the railway companies. They must have foreseen two or three years ago that the trade was rapidly increasing and they should have made provision then for meeting the condition of things which exists to-day. I have gone frequently to the managers of the roads complaining of this condition of affairs and they have told me that they did not doubt that what I said was true but that they had made every effort possible to buy locomotives and cars in every available place not only in Canada but in outside countries as well. They have told me that every workshop for the building of cars in Canada is taxed to its utmost capacity and that they are placing upon the roads all the locomotives and cars they can get. Doubtless that is true but my complaint is that they have not made greater preparation years before because this is a condition of affairs that might have been anticipated in a country like Canada. I was conversing with a gentleman from Glasgow

and he said that goods were carried between London and Glasgow in thirty-six hours, that he could order goods in London and be sure of receiving them in Glasgow within that time. We know that such a condition of affairs has never existed in this country, saying nothing about the last year or two when traffic had been unusually heavy. It was never known years before. It has always taken about six days for goods to go 100 or 200 miles in Ontario. I maintain that the railways of Canada are not managed on as good business principles as they might be. I can give one instance where an attempt has been made to carry goods quickly. The Michigan Central Railway will carry fruit from Winona to Petrolea and other places in the western peninsula of Ontario in sixteen hours. Some effort should be made by the railways to carry fruit at a quicker rate than that which now prevails. No doubt conditions that prevail in a new country where traffic is increasing rapidly are very different from those to be found in older countries. But there is a grievance existing all over the Dominion of Canada to-day in reference to railways. The railway companies say they are doing all they can possibly do to handle the traffic. It is a question whether it is not a matter of economy with them to provide just sufficient rolling stock so that the rolling stock may be employed the year round and so that the hands employed in the operation of these railways may be engaged the year round. That might be a matter that might very well be inquired into by the government. We have heard something about a railway commission to be appointed. It seems to me that the first matter that the railway commission should take up is the matter to which I have just referred. They should see whether the railway companies are providing all the means in their power to handle the traffic and whether they are making sufficient efforts to carry on the business of the country profitably. Hon. gentlemen from the North-west Territories complain of the loss and inconvenience in moving wheat out of the country. Wheat is an article that if it is not taken out to-day can be taken out to-morrow or next week, it suffers no great loss unless there is a fall in the market and it takes chances of a rise in the market. But it is different in regard to fruit. In Ontario, if you cannot get cars quickly, the fruit perishes. I am sure that last fall I lost several thousands of dollars owing to the delay in getting cars. Grapes stood on the platform for six days awaiting cars and they depreciated in value. The same thing occurs in the fall of the year in regard to apples. I believe that the apple shippers of Ontario last fall lost 40,000 barrels of apples which were frozen because it was impossible to get cars to ship these apples. We do not usually have so favourable a fall. It was the 10th of December before apples would freeze in box cars. I remember a season when apples were frozen solidly on the 16th of November. If we had had such a season as that last fall we would have lost one-third of the apple crop of Ontario for lack of cars at the proper time. I do not wish to say that the railway companies did not do all they could do on the spur of the moment. I believe they made every possible effort at that time to get cars but the effort was not made soon enough. Now, it seems to me that we have the right to insist that the government shall take vigorously hold of this matter. The railway companies owe the public a great deal. The Dominion of Canada, the provinces and the municipalities have donated in the neighbourhood of $250,000,000 to these railways and what have we got ? We have the Intercolonial Railway, a railway that for some years, at any rate, has lost the money of this country to the extent of a dollar for every man woman and child every year and which has lost $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 every year if we count interest on the money invested in the road. Then, surely the public have the right to inquire into the affairs of these railways and to see if they have the proper equipment to enable them to do all they possibly can do to further the interest of the Canadian people. It is the duty of the government to see that this matter is investigated. It is the duty of the government, either by way of a commission, or through the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, to investigate this matter and see if the railways are doing all they can and to bring such pressure to bear as will compel them to do more than they are doing if that is possible.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend from the west——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has already spoken upon this question. There is only one question before the House and that is that I do now leave the chair.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MONK. I think my hon. friends from the west will only have the present government to blame if it is thought not only by a number of members of this House but by the people generally throughout the country that the grievances which they have brought up to-night is to us the first, and perhaps to some extent, distinct news of the fact that the government intend to bring down to the House a proposition in regard to the building of a new railway in the North-west. There is no doubt, and I brought the matter to the notice of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) some time ago, that we should have had before this day, laid before us the proposition which at the present moment is being matured around

the lobbies of this House in respect to railway construction in the North-west Territories. There is no doubt about that and the fact, brought to the notice of the House by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) that throughout this discussion the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has been absent from the House, or, throughout the major part of it and has taken no interest whatever in the grievances which my hon. friends have sought to ventilate, will only add strength to the supposition prevailing everywhere that this is merely the first attempt on the part of the government—I do not pretend to accuse my hon. friends of anything of the kind—to prepare public opinion for some kind of a proposition which we will not be ready to accept. Now, my hon. friends have confined themselves——

Mr. SCOTT. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) permit me to make a brief statement? I think he must entirely have misapprehended the trend of my remarks. I endeavoured to take pains to state that the question I was discussing was a question entirely apart from the building of new lines and not only that but that it was a question which could not be met by the building of new lines. It was a condition prevailing which had to be dealt with immediately this year and which could not be solved by any proposition to build new railways because no new line could be extended to the country in time to give the relief that must be had this year.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Scott) confined himself largely to dwelling on the sufferings which the people of the North-west were enduring, because of the congestion of traffic. He made an onslaught on the Canadian Pacific Railway but he had not a word to say against the government which announced in the speech from the Throne its intention to bring forward some legislation to remedy that state of affairs, and which has kept us two months here without announcing their policy. What has my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) to say against the government for that kind of conduct? Not a word. I fully appreciate the suffering which the people of the North-west are enduring, but does the hon. gentleman imagine that we in the east have not grievances because of the blockade of the traffic on railways. My hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) has spoken of the grievances of the people in the province of Ontario, and I can tell the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) that in the province of Quebec at the present time, we are labouring under the same grievances. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) ask the member for Terrebonne (Mr. Desjardins) if during the recent election there the great cry was not the impossibility of the people getting cars for the absolute necessities of commerce. In fact there was no cars to convey wood to the suffering poor of Montreal. At the present moment in Montreal the builders cannot get cars to bring stone from outside the city, to enable them to carry on their operations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why is that?

Mr. MONK. Why? My hon. friend knows that the same state of things exist throughout the Dominion, and in the United States as well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in order to relieve the condition of things in the west, has drawn off the cars from the old provinces during the autumn months, and as a consequence you suffer in the older provinces. But still, the difficulty exists in the west and it is all due to the lack of the rolling stock on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MONK. Then we have a grievance against you, and we have often been told of that in the province of Quebec. When we go to the Canadian Pacific Railway officials and complain, they tell us: We have been obliged to draw upon our rolling stock here to supply the necessities of the North-west. But that is a condition which exists to-day on the whole of the American continent. Let me read a letter which was sent to the New York 'Post' by Mr. Stuyvesant Fish, president of the Illinois Central Railway, a man of high reputation as a railway man, and I read the letter because it throws a flood of light upon the question we are discussing here this afternoon. Mr. Fish writes:

> Sir,—The gravity of the situation in which the railroads of the United States stand in respect to their very general inability to carry the freights now offering must excuse this, perhaps, too long letter.
>
> The Interstate Commerce Commission has for some time past been inquiring into an alleged increase in rates by certain railroads in the territory east of Chicago and north of the Ohio river. From the accounts published in the newspapers it would seem that much testimony has been elicited showing that the cost of every item which goes to make up the expense of rendering the service has advanced beyond measure, particularly fuel, motive power, rolling stock, materials, wages, and taxes, possibly in the order named.
>
> The discussion might, and I think should, be put upon the higher plane of sound public policy rather than on that of mere cost. The public demand that common carriers shall furnish transportation when, where, and as called for, without previous notice. Facilities equal to the maximum and far above the average demands of the public must be provided at all times. For years past so doing has not been limited by the willingness or the ability of the railroad companies to defray the cost, but by their incapacity to get men and material for the work.
>
> The rates of freight and of fare now prevailing are substantially the abnormally low ones which the railroads were forced to accept in the bad times from 1893 to 1897, when their facilities vastly exceeded the demand for trans-

portation. The return of general prosperity has in all parts of the country created demands for transportation not only exceeding all previous experience, but growing with inconceivable rapidity and persistency.

Had the rates been advanced and kept in line with the price of other commodities and services, the demand for transportation would have been concurrently checked. This was not done, and as a result we find the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, which has in recent years raised the largest amount of new capital, and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, which has perhaps raised the next largest amount, blockaded at Pittsburgh.

Our situation on the Illinois Central is one of congestion, if not bordering on blockade, although within four years our capital stock has been increased from $52,500,000 to $95,040,000, through the payment into the treasury of $42,540,000 of money, which is more than 80 per cent of the amount which had been subscribed in the preceding forty-eight years, from 1851 to 1899.

Other companies all over the country have made proportionate expenditures on betterments, and all find their traffic congested. It is safe to say that with a 'bumper' crop of corn yet to move, the demand for transportation has this winter been further in advance of the supply than at any former time, and it looks as if things would get worse before they get better.

The custom among railways was, until recently, to contract in January, and even later, for a supply of rails for the then current calendar year. The great companies contracted in May, 1902, for their supply for 1903.

As to locomotives and cars the situation is worse. We still lack one lot of engines which should have been delivered last July, and others for later deliveries, and some thousands of cars. I was to-day offered twenty-five locomotives for delivery in January, 1904, and told that no other works in the country could furnish them at an earlier date. It took our greatest locomotive works, the Baldwins, seventy years to build 20,000 locomotives. I understand they now have 2,900 under contract, of which 1,000 are for delivery in 1904.

In structural iron, and in material of all kinds, like instances might be multiplied indefinitely.

The thing runs around in a circle, working back, in every case, to the failure of some one to deliver something. What except the growing excess of the demand for, over the supply of, transportation has brought this about.

Having regard to the best interests of the nation at large, have we not reached a point where the railroad companies now owe it as a duty to the public to advance their rates to the end that those who tender money may get the service and get it promptly? If not, can any measure of general relief be afforded in any other way?

Very respectfully,

STUYVESANT FISH.

January 7, 1903.

Mr. SCOTT. Will my hon. friend permit me to ask a couple of questions?

Mr. MONK. I do not want to take up the time of the House, but if my hon. friend makes his questions short, I will try to answer them.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. gentleman think, that any one of the roads referred to in that letter occupies the same position as the Canadian Pacific Railway does in its relation to the people of Canada; the Canadian Pacific Railway being under specific contract to the people of Canada, for value received to give an efficient service.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—from whom I may say I hold no brief of any kind—has contracted obligations towards the country; but there is such a thing as not being able to fulfil those obligations; and the point which my hon. friend has endeavoured to make, and which I want to make, is that we in the eastern provinces are suffering as well as the people in the west.

Mr. SCOTT. I am quite satisfied with that statement. The next question is, will my hon. friend support the suggestion I have made that some step or action be taken to enforce the terms of that contract on behalf of the people of Canada?

Mr. MONK. The answer to the question which my hon. friend puts to me would be very much the same as to one which I have given to his previous question. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company must be urged, and I would support the urging of that company, to give satisfaction in the west as well as in the east. Possibly I would urge that we in the east, who have done so much to build that railway in the west, should be the first to be accommodated; but at the same time, I must say, whether it is because we who live in the east are more reasonable than our young friends from the west, or for some other reason, we realize that to a large extent it is impossible for that company, as much so as it is for the Illinois Central or the other large American companies, to satisfy the demand fully. That is one point I want to make. Another point I want to make is this. We are perfectly ready, once we know what the government's proposition is, to do the very best we can to help our friends in the North-west, although we must recognize that the conditions are greatly changed from those which existed at the time the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, largely at our expense; and I for one, speaking off-hand, will give great consideration to the principle now laid down in the constitution of every state of the American union, that the time is past when the railways being built should be aided by the state. I think that is a matter for serious consideration; but what I say is that at the present moment the question of facilities for transportation is not to be considered purely and simply from a western standpoint, and I think that is a just and legitimte view to lay before this House when we hear our hon. friends expounding with so much vigour the difficulties that exist in the North-west, with which I thoroughly sympathize, and for the relief of which I and I am sure my friends on this side of

the House are willing to do everything that is possible. But while that is the case, we must not forget that the transportation question does not end on the shores of Lake Superior, but extends from the west down through Canadian territory, through the St. Lawrence river, and ends practically on the other side of the ocean; and the time has come when we who have made such large and important sacrifices to build up the west —and pleased we have been to make them— should be given some consideration in regard to the problem of transportation. Speaking more particularly for the locality from which I come, I ask of what use would it be to us if all the grain grown in the west came down to Montreal when we have there and at every other port in the province of Quebec such limited facilities for handling the traffic ? What has been done for the port of Montreal ? I say these matters must be considered simultaneously; and whilst we are ready to do everything in our power to aid the west, our hon. friends themselves, if they are affected by the patriotic feelings which they have spoken of this evening, and as to the sincerity of which I have no doubt, must at the same time consider that we in the east have great wants that must be attended to at once. I spoke a moment ago of what had taken place in the elections of Terrebonne and Two Mountains, where the grievance referred to by my hon. friend was one of the prominent subjects of discussion. In the division of Montreal, where we had a minister of the Crown coming forward for reelection, the question perhaps most discussed was the question of placing the port of Montreal and the navigation of the River St. Lawrence in such a condition as to make our national system of transportation a perfect one from the west down to the ocean. On that occasion the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) felt that question was one of such deep interest to the people of that section of the country, that he pledged himself on every public platform where he spoke, that the first duty of the government would be to place the port of Montreal on the footing of a national port, because he declared to the electors that a transfer would be made to his department of every part of the public works which concerned transportation. What I say is this, that we are ready, as far as we are able to do so, to help our friends in the west on this question of facility of transportation; but at the same time they must not fail to consider that the question of transportation, on which we have had no declaration of policy from this government since 1896, is one which must be considered from the extreme west to the extreme east, and I for my part will not be ready to make any undue sacrifices to help our friends in the west unless they are ready on their part to take a broad, national view of this question; because anything we may do now in the west alone would have the effect undoubtedly of diverting the traffic of the west into American channels. I therefore wish not to be understood in any sense as hostile or as unwilling to consider the grievances which these gentlemen brought before us this evening; but at the same time I deem it my duty to call their attention in a friendly manner to the fact that the transportation question at the present moment is perhaps more unsolved in our part of the country than it is in theirs. This question of transportation must be considered in its entirety, and while it is right for our hon. friends from the west to air their grievances in this House, it seems to me that we are equally entitled to call attention, in similar energetic language, to our side of the question. Let us have a complete national scheme of transportation, and whatever sacrifice it may entail on our part again— because that would be the second time for our eastern provinces—I am quite ready that we should undergo these sacrifices, but it must be for a scheme considered from one end of the Dominion to the other.

Motion (Mr. Casgrain) to adjourn debate negatived.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (East Assiniboia). I have no apology to offer, Mr. Speaker, for continuing the debate. It was not my intention to speak at any length, because I have not prepared notes, and was content to leave the matter very much in the hands of my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) who addressed the House this afternoon so moderately, ably and fully. I spoke on the question of the grain blockades last session and I am pleased to find that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has pointed out the commercial aspect of the blockade. I would ask the House not to overlook this fact, that it is the business of the east which is being hindered in the West. It is the outgoing of your goods to our people which is being hindered and obstructed. You send your agents to the west by the thousand, they get their orders and the goods are sent out, but the people of the west find that the transit of these commodities is greatly impeded and obstructed. This therefore is not a sectional but a Canadian question, in which the people of the older provinces are just as much interested as the people of the West. On this question of the grain blockade, I could speak at some length. Having introduced grain legislation since 1896, in this House, I have kept my eye very closely on the conditions from time to time. During the months of January and February, I considered it my duty, as representing the people of Eastern Assiniboia, to visit all the branch lines and pay special attention to the condition of the grain trade on these lines. I went from town to town and from village to village and made my notes as to the effect of the legislation of last season, and I may state

very briefly that every siding was filled with cars loaded with grain. If there were any empties at all, they were in such a position that they could not be utilized. I found men shovelling grain into cars from wagons in the winter snow when they could not reach them any other way. I remonstrated with these people and asked them why they went to such labour. But they said: We have as long as we choose to load these cars, because there is no engine to take them out; we can take a whole week, because when we have the car filled, it will stand perhaps two weeks before going out. This was the condition of things on almost every siding all through these branch lines, at least in my constituency. But my observations were not confined to my own constituency, I took the trouble of travelling into Manitoba and found the same condition of things existing there.

We have found to-night members of the opposition endeavouring to find excuses for the railway company. If they do not support the Canadian Pacific Railway in the condition of things which exists to-day in the West, they at least try to make excuses for the company. One excuse made by a leading official for Winnipeg in the city of Montreal, was that our legislation last year had greatly hindered the transport of grain by giving the farmers twenty-four hours to load a car. I wish to say that that statement is entirely unfounded because the cars, after they were loaded, stood two and three weeks and sometimes months before they were moved, and furthermore the farmers who had paid demurrage because they had been two or three hours over the twenty-four in loading the car, had the pleasure of looking at the loaded car week after week before it went to market. I need not tell you that this delay is very serious. We have been told that we should submit to the inevitable, that we are a long way from the seaboard, and cannot expect to get our grain out in two or three months. Well, our people are reasonable, but when we have the grain of two harvests in our granaries, when we sell fatted animals from our ranches in August and cannot get them out of our way before the end of November, are we to be told that we should submit to the inevitable and that we ought not to vent our grievances in this House? Is it not our duty, as representatives of a great grain growing community, to speak for the people; and in doing so, we speak for the people of our Eastern provinces as well as our own. Our interests are mutual. If the west is prosperous, every wholesale merchant in Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and elsewhere, will reap the benefit, so that you cannot draw the line and say that this is a western question. We do not like to be told that we are unreasonable or not loyal. The old British flag has always been my pride. I delight in it still, and would be glad to see all the produce of the west reaching the seaboard over Canadian routes, so that what has been said in that regard by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has my hearty concurrence. We have been always ready to vote any money asked for the improvement of the St. Lawrence and the harbour of Montreal, and I trust that we will always be found ready to do the same again. Every dollar spent to improve our routes to the seaboard and our sea ports will benefit the west as well as the east. We do not want to be unreasonable in our criticism even of the railway company. I believe that they are making vigorous efforts to meet the emergency. I believe them when they tell us that they will have 114 engines available before next season and that they are spending a large amount of money to meet present conditions, but what I do complain of is that they did not listen to the people who understood the development of the West years ago.

Five or six years ago they were told that they would not do the work of the country even with a double track—and I do not think they would be able to do it even if their track were doubled to-day. Further, they did not listen to their own officials in the North-west. They were very slow to receive instructions from those in their own employment who knew best what the conditions were. Now, they are up against a difficulty, and the people have to suffer, and they are told they must suffer patiently and loyally. The excuse has been made that it was the water supply—and the hon. member for St. Mary's, Montreal, has been eloquent about the water supply. The hon. gentleman forgets that, while the engines died on the track for want of steam power, the people all through the country there lived—even when it was so dry, as we are told, that there was no water for the engines. I am surprised that he overlooked that fact. The people there had water abundantly to meet their own needs and water their stock. Yet, a few, engines of the Canadian Pacific Railway could not find water enough to keep the breath of life in them. The fact is, the difficulty did not lie in the want of water, though we are told that sixty per cent of the engines could not be used for this reason. Then we are told that the water was bad. I have not much sympathy with that statement. The water certainly ought to have been much better during the last two years than during the preceding eighteen years, for we had a great deal more rain. Every place was filled with water. And the more you dilute the alkali, the weaker it becomes. To say that there was a lack of water is scarcely an excuse for a company that has such facilities for securing money that it can go to Europe and, in a single season dispose of bonds that bring $17,000,000. Surely such a concern might have provided some

means of purifying and cleansing the water. Why, this very evening I received a letter from my own town of Moosomin, which is under contract with Messrs. Sutcliffe & Muir to build a merchant flour mill. And this enterprising firm—I think they are from the United States, though I have not the pleasure of their acquaintance—would not go into the business until they had solved the question of the water, and the effect of the water upon machinery. They took the trouble to send a sample of the water to analysts in Chicago, and I have here the analysis by these gentlemen, Messrs. Dickman, McKenzie & Potter. This contains the whole story of the water from Moosomin, one of the worst places in this respect along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I shall not trouble the House with this analysis, but I may say that the water contains sodium chloride, sodium sulphate, calcium sulphate, sodium carbonate, magnesium carbonate, silica and iron oxide and alumina in certain proportions. The impurities amount to 127·28 grains to the gallon. This enterprising firm of Sutcliffe & Muir has found a process by which all these impurities can be eliminated, and they write me to ask me that I use my influence to get some consideration from the Minister of Customs relative to the duty of 25 per cent on the machinery required for this purpose which comes from Chicago. Here is a private enterprise and before they introduce machinery into their mill they solve the problem of the water question. Why cannot the great Canadian Pacific Railway spend a little of their money in eliminating the corroding element of the water that probably caused damage last winter ? I am not prepared to say that they had very great difficulty in getting a water supply, I know the water in the town of Moosomin is very bad and I am very glad that enterprising town, which has introduced the telephone and electric light, is seeking to secure perfectly pure water for the use of the people. This is an idea that might very readily be taken up by the railway company and that might solve the question of the running of their railways during the winter. My own idea is that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) struck the keynote when he said : They had not shelter for their engines, and they had not enough engines to allow each a day at proper intervals to be cleaned up and properly prepared to go to work again. In consequence, many of the engines came to grief.

Reference was made to the Bill respecting the grain trade that passed the House last year. It was said that it was causing trouble, and the hon. member for St. Mary's asked us whether or not a meeting was held in Brandon to find fault with the measure. A meeting was held in Brandon, not to find fault, but to make some additions to the law to make it more effective. It is true that exception was taken to a single phrase. It was suggested that the phrase 'without undue delay,' relating to the furnishing of cars, should be eliminated. And no objection would be made if these words were removed. But it is a wrong impression to leave on the minds of hon. members that the farmers are opposed to the Bill of last year. I am prepared to say from personal knowledge, having travelled over the branch lines, as I have said before, that the farmers are favourable to that law. The statement of those on these lines was to the effect that one who had shipped his own grain over the loading platform, had gained at the least calculation, nine cents a bushel. What does that mean ? It means, on the crop of this year a gain of some $4,500,000. So, we think we have a right to speak and to expect to be heard. We think we have a right to ask the House to consider the interest of these people who have lost immensely through the condition of things that have existed during all these years. The hon. gentleman stated that the gain by the farmers who shipped directly to the lakes, might be seventeen cents. I am prepared to support the hon. member in that, and I know cases where such a result was realized. Personally, we have shipped grain the same way, and got the benefit. I have heard both Liberal and Conservative farmers speak in unqualified terms of the advantage of the Bill. What they want is more facility for loading directly, what they want is to be allowed to take the car that is allotted to them to the elevator, and have it reckoned to their account and not to the elevator's account. The agents of the railway company have insisted all along the line if a farmer ordered a car to the elevator they should charge the car to the elevator and not to the farmer. I believe that an unlawful advantage has been taken of the legislation in that way. There are some conditions that might be improved that would make it much more efficient than it is today, but it has been an untold benefit to those who have made use of it.

If I had time to-night I could give you many facts similar to these given by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia. I could put my hand in my desk and give you testimony of grain growers' associations, boards of trade, agricultural societies and various associations interested in that trade, referring to the blockade, not only from a grain standpoint but also from a commercial standpoint. I hope that the facts which have been brought before the House will be carefully considered, and that some means will be adopted to relieve the west; and by relieving the west and assisting the business of the west, the eastern provinces will receive a like benefit, and perhaps a greater benefit. I quite concur in the arguments made, and the cases which have been brought before the House by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia. But my mind is not at all changed. I think we should in-

sist that when railway companies come for charters as they do, stretching their hands over the entire country, endeavouring to blanket the country with railway charters, this House should be exceedingly careful in granting any further charters until these companies show their ability to operate and complete the construction of the roads that they now possess. I dare say to-morrow there will be a warm discussion in the Railway Committee between the two parties now in the field seeking to construct roads into that country. It would be a wise thing if we restrained these railway companies in securing further charters until they show that the roads they now possess and operate are fully equipped. What advantage is it for us to open up a great country, in Mackenzie Basin for example, when there are no people there ? We are told that people will go there. But what about people that are going into the country now, if their wants are not met? What about all the immigrants that have gone in this season if they cannot get a thousand feet of lumber to put a floor under their feet and to cover their houses ? What about these people years hence when they have stuff to bring out and there is no railway to bring it out ? There are people who have been waiting for twenty years to get railways. I know the difficulties that exist in my own constituency. There is a proposition to extend a road this season, and we should be glad to see the road built. Here is a road to be extended from Moose Mountain to Regina. Well, it goes through a good country, there has been a large immigration into that district from the United States. There are people north of Qu'Appelle in the same riding who have been raising 6,000, 8,000 or 10,000 bushels of grain, and have been forced through circumstances to haul it twenty, or thirty miles, and some of them forty miles, and that for eighteen or twenty years. Now, if our railway companies would think less of the other fellow and more of the needs of the country, it would be a great deal better for the west.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman say who the other fellow is ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The other railway company that is seeking to get hold of the business. It is like a game of chess. When the other fellow is about to move, then his opponent will move in advance, so you have competition to gain territory, not to build railroads, not so much to meet the immediate wants of the people, as to blanket the country with railway charters. I think a great responsibility is resting upon this House at this time. We want all the railways that we can get, and I would be glad to see the country covered to-day with railways wherever there is a settlement. We do not wish to see a competition of the kind that is indicted, what we want is to satisfy the people that are now in the country. My immigration policy has always been to give the people that are in the country the conditions of success, and they become the best immigration agents. At present, through the good crops of the last two or three years, our North-west country is in the eye of Europe, in the eye of the world. Success will secure settlers. But if the settlement of these people is hedged about with great difficulties, if these people are not carefully housed in the coming winter, if they have not railway facilities to take out the little grain that they may raise within a year or two, then they are in straits, they are in difficulties; and you will have them leaving the country as they have done before, going away in bitterness of spirit, writing in the newspapers against the country, believing themselves betrayed and victimized, and decrying the North-west Territories. It is for us clearly to consider the whole situation, and by some immediate steps seek to meet it. But we disappoint these people, we discourage these people. I hope that the government will seriously consider the facts that we have placed before them. While we are in earnest in speaking on behalf of our constituents, it is not for political purposes. I deny that in toto. We are speaking in the interest of the people who have cast in their lot with us, and who are seeking to make homes for themselves and their families. It is for us to keep our eyes open and our hands active in order to meet successfully every emergency that may arise.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the seconder of the motion, having withdrawn his action, the motion to adjourn the debate was in order. I did not think the motion could be disposed of while the hon. gentleman was on his feet speaking. The hon. gentleman was standing all the time, otherwise I would certainly have availed myself of the right to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule of the House is that if a member simply seconds a motion he exhausts his right to speak.

Mr. SPROULE. He exhausts his right ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, without even saying a word.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware that a motion could be put before it was moved or seconded.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) has the floor.

Mr. R. H. POPE (Compton). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with keen attention to the debate that has taken place in connection with this very important subject which has been brought to the notice of the House by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). I fully realize, as I visit the great west every year, the importance of

its development and I also realize that while it is an important portion of Canada it is only a portion of Canada. It is not the whole of Canada and cannot be treated separately in many particulars and certainly not in regard to the transportation problem from the rest of Canada. We must first consider the most important point of responsibility. If we have not sufficient facilities for transportation in the great west of Canada for the settlement that is going into that portion of the country and if people are 100 and 200 miles from railways somebody is responsible for it. If the condition of rates and if the accommodation for the traffic of that country are not what they ought to be somebody is responsible. Parliament is divided into two parts. One portion of it is the opposition which has no power to operate but which has only power to criticise. That portion of parliament which has power to put measures in force and to operate in the direction of benefiting the people of Canada is the government of Canada. If these hon. gentlemen from the west have any right to appeal to parliament they have the right to bring pressure to bear upon the government which they stand so faithfully behind, which they support on each and all occasions which they will blindly vote for through thick and thin and which they will not vote against on this or any other question during this entire session. If there is a responsibility, and I claim there is a responsibility, it rests upon the other side of the House, it rests with the government of the day, because they have been marking time ever since they have occupied the honourable positions which they now fill rather than studying the requirements of the country and providing for them. They are up against it to-day. This is not the first time that I have spoken upon this subject. This is not the first time that I have given warning to this government that they would find themselves in a difficulty in that country. I spoke on the subject last year and the year before and the year before that and I notified the government then that they were not realizing what was about to happen in the west. They were not realizing the necessities that were going to spring upon them in that region of Canada and to-day they have hon. members from that country who support them, because they have the four territories, as represented in this House behind them, standing up one after the other and condemning the government for neglecting to realize the responsibility which rests upon them in connection with this matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) smiles. Does he propose that parliament shall operate as a parliament without the government? What does he mean when he asks the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) if he would join him? Join him in what? As a member of this House? Join him in going outside of this House, or in bringing force to bear as a member of this House? He has no power and no right, except a personal right, to ask the hon. member for Jacques Cartier as a member of this House to join him in bringing pressure to bear upon the government. There is no sense or reason in any other position than that and when the hon. gentleman asked the hon. member if he would join him he simply asked if the opposition in this House would join him in forcing the government to take such action as he thinks is essential to the welfare of the country. Otherwise his request is meaningless. But, there is one thing that has become chronic with these hon. gentlemen. For twenty long years, or at least during a considerable portion of those twenty years, the then opposition, the then Liberal party, spent their time denouncing the Canadian Pacific Railway, denouncing the Conservative party for supporting any syndicate in the construction of that road, denouncing the country through which that road ran, and denouncing the freight rates which had to be high in the beginning because there was very little to take out of the country. This spirit of criticism became chronic with these hon. gentlemen. It has settled down upon them like a fog, it rests upon them, they see through that fog the Canadian Pacific Railway and they say that the Canadian Pacific Railway is the curse and the bane of this country. That is the miserable misfortune of the party that has been denouncing this great project for years. What do we find, Sir? We find that a certain party, fortunately or unfortunately, found themselves intrusted with power, they found themselves placed in a position to govern half of the continent of America and they found themselves under the necessity of grappling with the great problem of transportation after twenty years of denunciation of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have travelled through the territories and the only extension which has been encouraged or constructed under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite of railway is a short line running from Lethbridge to the Crow's Nest Pass. Not another link in the railway system of the west has this government constructed, not a spike has been driven in these territories.

Mr. SCOTT. I would remind the hon. member (Mr. Pope) that for five years before 1896, except the Soo line between North Portal and Pasqua junction near Moose Jaw, not a single line of railway was built in the North-west Territories, while at this day, there are no less than five railways being extended from the Manitoba boundary into the territories.

Mr. POPE. Is there a railway from Regina to Prince Albert?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. POPE. Under whose administration was that road built?

Mr. SCOTT. That road was built about twelve years ago.

Mr. POPE. By the Conservative party? Who built the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway? You will own that before you get done. Under whose administration was the road built from Calgary to Edmonton?

Mr. SCOTT. It was built with the land of the North-west Territories.

Mr. POPE. Yes, with the lands of the North-west Territories and why not? Do they want my land in the eastern townships to build roads in their own section of country? It was the system of the whole continent of America. Who first spoke of land grants in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway? Did you ever hear of the administration of the late Alex. Mackenzie in this country? Did you ever hear of his advertising to the whole world for a syndicate that for so many acres of land and so many million dollars would undertake to construct that road? He established the principle of land grants and hon. gentlemen sitting over there, if they are not willing to father their past history, should repudiate it, but if they are willing to father it they should put that into their pipes and make the best construction of it they can.

One gentleman opposite tried to make us believe that because the Canadian Pacific railway runs through a corner of the state of Maine, it was the same thing as if we were taking the wheat of the North-west to ship it through a United States port. No such comparison can be made. Unfortunately for Canada the international boundary line was defined by incompetents and consequently a part of the state of Maine juts into what should be Canada, and in order to reach the port of St. John by the shortest route the Canadian Pacific railway has to pass through a comparatively short piece of American territory. But that is for the benefit of the people of the North-west because they get the advantage of a shorter haul for their wheat, and that wheat the Canadian Pacific railway ships across the Atlantic from a Canadian port. The hon. gentleman who used that argument has the reputation of having an inventive turn of mind, and I am sorry that he was so driven to the wall that he could not invent a better argument than that against our national railway. I agree that all Canada has been slow to realize the great possibilities of the west. I believe that the Canadian Pacific railway itself has been slow to realize the possibilities of that great country. But none have been so slow as the government who are sending immigrants into that country to-day 200 miles ahead of a railway, when if they had foresight and a proper sense of their responsibilities, the Canadian Northern would long ago have received the assistance it is going to receive and would a year ago have been built into the Saskatchewan valley. I have no doubt that that line will not get a land subsidy and they should not get a money subsidy, but I believe it will receive encouragement so that it can finance its undertaking. If the government of the day had one half the confidence in the west that it should have, the Canadian Northern would now be completed to Edmonton. Look at the confidence of the old Tory party in the North-west; look at how they insured the building of railroads when there was not a white man or a bushel of wheat in all that territory, and compare the confidence of the Conservative government with the dilatoriness of the present government which hesitates to encourage railroads now that there are 100,000,000 bushels of wheat grown for export there, and hundreds of thousands of active and enterprising settlers tilling the soil. What do you think of these four gentlemen on the other side who have spent hours in fault finding to-day, but who, on every occasion, will continue to vote for the government like so many blind mice. If they want to have their point carried with the government, let them show to the gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches that they meant what they say. Let me show gentlemen that independence of action is as necessary in this House as independence of thought, they are only fooling the people of the west until they show that if the government does not carry out their wishes they will take means to urge them to action. It is all very well for the rev. gentleman from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) to preach a beautiful sermon here. It was couched in very mild language. Why, if the whole fourteen ministers had been here instead of only one, not a single one of them could have the least fault to find with the kindly remarks of the hon. gentleman. He told us he waited twenty years for a railroad. How long does he think the Barr settlers will have to wait if the government does not do any more to encourage railroads in the North-west than they have done during the past six or seven years. Who has been at the back of the opposition to the Mann & Mackenzie road? Why is this that we have received maps from the Grand Trunk Railway Company showing their line running up and down Mann & Mackenzie's right of way; recognizing the Canadian Pacific railway but ignoring the Mann & Mackenzie road. I say Sir, that there has been an effort on the part of some one to take Mann & Mackenzie by the throat, but the circumstances which have arisen have forced the government to action. It was not their forethought or their confidence in the west that prompted the government to activity. It is through a chain of circumstances which has arisen which now forces the government to act, and if an effort had not been made to stifle Mann & Mackenzie in their infancy we should have three transconti-

nental roads now instead of two. With all its faults we have to thank the Manitoba government that Mann & Mackenzie were able to stand the financial attack on them, and with their line pointed towards the Saskatchewan valley, defy some of the senators and some of the members of this government and some of the financial institutions of this country. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side have stated in this parliament to-day, that you cannot get transportation into that country or out of it and amongst other things they said that the farmers have to pay ten per cent interest. All that is a bad advertisement for the west, and these supporters of the government might have omitted that from their remarks. They blame the Canadian Pacific railway but they should have followed the true rule of British parliamentary government and held the occupants of the treasury benches responsible for the existing condition of affairs. These gentlemen in trying to serve two masters; in trying to advocate the interests of their constituents and at the same time defend the government which has not these interests at heart, have made a pitiable exhibition in this House. They tell us that they hold the Canadian Pacific railway responsible. Nonsense. The Canadian Pacific railway is not the government of Canada and it is the government of Canada that is alone responsible. Sir, I hold the government of Canada responsible; first for the want of railway communication into that country; and second, because there is not to-day a second transcontinental line traversing this territory and affording that relief which hon. gentlemen opposite claim is necessary. I say that if the government had done two years ago what they have to do to-day, that line would have been in operation, and you would have had a double track from the Great Lakes into the interior of that country. With regard to extra transportation or accommodation for that country, the government of Canada is responsible and no one else, and the hon. gentlemen who sit back there will in a few days, when the motion is made, be found supporting the policy of the government which has made that extra accommodation impossible; for we will take care that these hon. gentlemen have an opportunity of showing their independence of action as well as their independence of voice.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). Mr. Speaker, I am not inclined to quarrel with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat when he says that perhaps neither the government nor the members of the House fully realized in the past the responsibility which devolved upon them, in view of the great development the North-west country was making, or we might previous to this have taken action to provide greater facilities for the movement of the grain and other products of the country in this era of prosperity. My hon. friend must remember, however, that for several years we had a period almost of stagnation, although many of us who had an opportunity of travelling through the west did feel that in a short time, if our expectations were realized, there would be a great development in the settlement of the country, and a great deal of grain and other produce to be removed. I must say, however, that I think my hon. friend was a little severe in saying that during its term of office this government has not to some extent, and to a very considerable extent, taken steps to relieve the situation. I remember, when we were giving assistance to what was known as the Ontario and Rainy River Railway that one of the leaders of the hon. gentleman's party said that we were giving assistance to a road that was being built through a country that was barren and useless. I am glad to know he was mistaken. The principal object of those who were supporting the road was to secure the construction of the most important link in the outlet from the west to Lake Superior. It was fortunate that that road was built, because it has been a great relief to the west. It is not my intention to speak on this question at any length; but I think the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) deserves the thanks of his constituents and of the country for bringing this matter to the attention of parliament, which he has done in a practical and argumentative speech. If he was severe in his criticisms of the railways, especially of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I think we can afford to be charitable to him for that when we realize the difficulties which the people he represents have laboured under during the past season. The government, realizing the condition of affairs in the west, have from time to time made representations to the different railway companies, as to the great urgency of supplying more rolling stock and greater facilities for moving the grain and other products of the country. This is one of the most important questions that can come before this House. It is one affecting our whole national life, because I have always felt that, rates being about equal, it is very much to the interest of the farmers and other producers of this country that their products should be carried to the markets of the world by an all-Canadian route. In that way they will retain their identity, and every farmer and business man knows that Canadian products in the past have suffered from the fact that they have had to go through foreign countries, and in many cases have been replaced by the products of other countries, and have been made to appear in foreign markets as inferior to what they are. The products of our farms are superior to those of almost every other country in the world, so that for the reasons I have stated, it is very important that we

should do everything we can to establish an all-Canadian route. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) reminded us that we must not forget the east. When I recall to him the fact that something over $6,000,000 has been spent on the St. Lawrence river channel and on the harbour of Montreal, it does not look as if the government had been forgetting the importance of establishing a national port in the harbour of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. Not $6,000,000 in the harbour of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The expenditure in the harbour of Montreal and the ship channel up to the present time has been over $6,000,000.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The money spent in the port of Montreal has been simply loaned money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are not going to quarrel about where the money came from. It was furnished by this parliament on the credit of the country. The money has been spent.

Mr. MONK. Will my hon. friend permit me to say that that is loaned money and we are paying interest on it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The interest is by the traffic of the whole country, not alone by the traffic of the city of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. I wish to correct the statement made that the country has spent $6,000,000 on the harbour of Montreal. We in Montreal are paying interest on that money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The consumers of Canada who have been buying the goods that have passed through the port of Montreal have paid the interest on the money.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The government has not paid a cent of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The people of Canada who consume the goods passing through Montreal pay the interest on the Montreal harbour works.

Mr. MONK. That is very far fetched.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not far fetched; it is a well-known fact. That is no reason, however, why we should not deal handsomely with Montreal, as the great port of Canada.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Montreal is the only port where such a policy is carried out. On all other ports we are spending money and charging the country with the interest.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The money has been spent on those works as part of the national highway, and the credit of the country has been given to improve the port of Montreal. It is the policy of the government, which I hope will be endorsed by parliament, to make these improvements not only at Montreal, but at other ocean ports. This is a great and important question, and it is desirable that we should look at it in the most careful and businesslike way. I think that my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) is to be congratulated for having brought this matter to the attention of the House, and I was rather sorry to hear some hon. gentlemen intimate that he had some motive other than that which he expressed in the remarks he made. There was not one sentence that would indicate that he had any other object except that of bringing to the attention of the House the conditions existing in the west, in order that any remedy which could possibly be applied should be afforded. I am perhaps inclined to differ with my hon. friend to some extent. It may be possible that the Canadian Pacific Railway have not done all they should have done. But many an interview has been had with the representatives of that company, and representations have been made by them, which I think ought to be accepted as satisfactory, that they were doing everything money could do to meet existing conditions. I hope that such is the case, and that the railway company as well as the government will be impressed with the urgent necessity of doing everything possible to advance the prosperity and progress which we all desire to see existing in this country. As a member of the government, I think that I am expressing the views of my colleagues when I say that we will do everything possible in our power to relieve the situation.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I only intend to take a few moments of the time of the House. And in doing so, I wish to pay a tribute to the hon. gentleman who introduced this question. I do not think he was influenced by any other motives than those to which he gave expression. The fact that a certain important Bill is to be considered by a committee of the House and the fact that a certain document is being circulated among the members, may be considered as rather strange, coming together at this time, but I have no wish to attribute any motive to the hon. gentleman beyond those he has stated. I think he was quite right in bringing the matter before the House, but I regret that certain statements made here to-night should have been given expression to, and I am confident that when some hon. gentlemen read over their speeches in to-morrow's 'Hansard,' they will be very likely to cut out some of the statements they made, because to my mind, as a practical man, they were most erroneous and unfounded. I fail to understand why any hon. gentleman should, particularly in this House, make rash assertions affecting so large an enterprise as the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have been told, for in-

stance, that that line is in a deplorable condition, that its management is very bad, and in fact it was really a dangerous line for any gentleman to travel on. That certainly cannot be the condition of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have been in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway in my time, and I want to say, on behalf of the management—and I am in a position to express an opinion because I have had experience on several other lines in the United States and Canada—that as regards the congestion of traffic, the Canadian Pacific Railway have been trying, not for two years only, but for a large number of years, to secure sufficient engines and cars. When I was a member of a special committee in this House, appointed to look into the question of railway equipment, I found that the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway were both doing everything in their power to increase their rolling stock and meet the demands of traffic. As a matter of fact, it is utterly impossible for the railway companies of Canada and the United States to obtain the number of cars and engines they require. What are the conditions in the North-west? If I were to confine my remarks strictly to certain portions of Ontario, I would say that the rolling stock of any railway operated in those particular districts would last much longer and not require so many repairs as in Manitoba. Why? Because the conditions are different. In Manitoba they have, in the first place, the alkaline water to contend with, and then, during a large portion of the year they have to suffer from severe frost. These are two things that railways have not to contend with in the section of the country from which I come. Then the Canadian Pacific Railway tried their utmost during last summer to secure a large number of machinists to go to Winnipeg for the purpose of repairing their engines. I am not rising as an advocate for the Canadian Pacific Railway, but simply to state the common sense practical views of a railway man on the question, given without fear or favour; and I do know, as a matter of fact, that the Canadian Pacific Railway were not able to secure machinists to repair their engines in Manitoba and in the North-west Territories. I may be asked why they did not import skilled labour from the United States. Well, the same difficulty exists in the United States. The railway companies there could not obtain machinists. These are actual facts. In a new country of the enormous size of the North-west and with its great traffic, the people will naturally have these grievances, and it is very unreasonable to expect the Canadian Pacific Railway to remove them entirely. One hon. gentleman stated here that the Canadian Pacific Railway inaugurated a strike in Winnipeg. Another hon. gentleman said that the company were so keen to declare dividends that they charged high rates, and so on. But if you will apply a little common sense to the question, whether you be a practical railway man or not, you will see that if the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway were so eager to secure dividends, the last thing they would dream of would be to foment a strike. Who ever heard of a strike on a railway being the means of creating a dividend? Is it not a well known fact that every strike on a railway is a source of great loss, not only to the company, but in many instances, to those engaged in the strike; and when an hon. gentleman says that the Canadian Pacific Railway was actually responsible for this strike. he is making a statement so absurd that it is its own refutation. What else have we to consider? Is it not a fact that there is a large number of stockholders in this company, who are not all rich people, and who have their money invested in the shares of the company. Should we not be very careful then about making speeches in the House of a character that might possibly lead timid shareholders to dispose of their stocks and thus create a slump in the market. Hon. members should consider some of these things. If we have some personal grievance against the Canadian Pacific Railway, let us state our grievance to the company, and if the company will not remedy it, then let us prefer specific charges and ask the government to investigate. And if the Canadian Pacific Railway is guilty, legislation should be prepared to prevent them creating grievances of that character The statement is made that the Canadian Pacific Railway allows cars to remain on the sidings for weeks and months. I would like you to compare this statement with the one I am about to make. A year or two ago legislation was asked for and passed by this House allowing them to have cars on the sidings for not more than twenty-four hours. I want to ask my hon. friend who stated that cars are allowed to remain on the sidings so long, what would be the necessity——

Mr. SCOTT. It is evident my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) entirely misunderstands the question he is attempting to discuss. We did come down to the House and ask that the people should have the privilege of demanding from the company cars for direct loading, and last year, or the year before, the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west were given that privilege. A statement was made here to-night in answer to the excuse put forward on behalf of the company that this direct loading privilege was responsible for the congestion of traffic. We pointed out, and pointed out truly that this had nothing to do with it, as was proved by the fact that every siding was crowded for weeks and months last fall with loaded wheat cars.

Mr. INGRAM. And I have no doubt they will be crowded for years to come, for the

very reasons I have stated here to-night. To hear these hon. gentlemen speak, one would imagine that the company was not doing its duty in not having removed these grievances. Surely——

Mr. SCOTT. If they would remove the loaded cars it would be all right.

Mr. INGRAM. But our hon. friends from the west forget the fact that, in the older parts of the Dominion we have the same difficulty to-day. Take the lines of railway that run through my own city, old established and well equipped lines that haul more cars in one train, probably than are hauled in two or three trains in the Northwest. Yet we have congested trade and are obliged to put up with it. We are exercising a little patience, I may say to these hon. gentlemen. After investigating whether the difficulty can be removed, and satisfying ourselves that it cannot, learning that the company are doing their best to meet the requirements of the service we exercise patience. Now, I say again that the statements made to-night are not correct; I have no hesitation in saying so. When they charge the Canadian Pacific Railway with being poorly and improperly managed, they are stating what is not the fact.

Mr. SCOTT. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. INGRAM. So it might be. But my hon. friend (Mr Scott) must remember that we have this year an unprecedented rush of freight and passenger traffic in the Northwest. It is said that if a merchant expects trade to increase he will prepare for it. That is exactly what the railway companies are trying to do. But they are not able to secure the rolling stock and engine power, and naturally these grievances follow. If these hon. gentlemen can tell me that there is a car or engine factory in this country that will supply the Canadian Pacific Railway with fifty or a hundred engines or with ten thousand cars, and the Canadian Pacific Railway has refused to avail themselves of this opportunity to increase their equipment I will withdraw the statement.

Mr. SCOTT. The excuse is made that there is a lack of water. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) that there are supplies of water that have been there for years and—I made this statement before—notwithstanding that the officers of the company, years ago, recommended that these supplies of good water be utilized, it is only within the last month or so that the company is making provisions for utilizing this water. The hon. gentleman from St. Mary's stated, as though he had the fact direct from the headquarters of the company, that 60 per cent of the power of the engines was useless last year because of the lack of good water.

Mr. INGRAM. The water and the weather combined—two very important elements in railroading—to put the engines out of repair. The severe weather during the winter months is a greater difficulty with regard to engines than any other they have to contend against, particularly when there is a lack of workmen to put the engines in repair. The company have done everything they could and, having done so they are not to blame. I have been told by a man from the west that a train starting with one engine, may require four engines before it can be moved. The alkali naturally affecting them so as to prevent them from steaming. We in eastern Canada have not this particular difficulty to contend with. We can do more work with one engine, probably, than can be done in the west with three. This greatly complicates the problem of running the road when there is a great rush of traffic. It is well for hon. gentlemen not to make too rash statements. They should bear in mind that the company have a great deal on its shoulders at the present time. I have no desire to run down the Canadian Pacific Railway, and no desire to praise it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. INGRAM. Some hon. gentlemen laugh. I would as soon praise the Grand Trunk or any other company that is making praise-worthy efforts to give the public a good service. I think that the Canadian Pacific Railway notwithstanding what has been said deserves some little credit for what they have done. As eastern men we are willing to do what is right by our friends in the west. But they should not be unreasonable. They are progressing very fast and their requirements are growing with great rapidity. They must not be too impatient—I trust they will excuse me for lecturing. If they will have a little patience they will get along very well.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). At the risk of being considered somewhat tedious, I desire to say a few words on this subject—

Mr. SPEAKER. I am under the impression that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has spoken.

Mr. SPROULE. I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, having spoken, has no right to make that motion himself.

Mr. SPROULE. I can move that the House adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. EARLE. I move that this House do now adojurn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. It is largely a waste of time crying 'carried.' I wish to say that,

some of the suggestions that have been offered even if carried into effect, would not accomplish what the western members desire. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) said that the double tracking of the Canadian Pacific Railway would meet the difficulty. But a moment's consideration would show that this could not possibly be the case. The contention is that there is a blockade on the road and that it is very inconvenient. No doubt it is. The difficulty is that there is much more freight and passenger traffic to be handled in a short time than there ever was before. But I might remind these hon. gentlemen that they are not alone in the experience of delay on the part of railways in handling freight. I am told by a business man in this section of the country that he had a car load of freight across the river from Windsor, twenty-three days ago, the contents of which were consigned to him, and it has not been delivered yet. I think that is a fair parallel with what some of the hon. members have experienced in the west. The number of passengers that are going into that country at the present time, over 20,000 this spring, and the amount of settlers' effects to be hauled in, and the grain that has to be hauled out of that country, have certainly overtaxed the capacity of the railway. But that is an exceptional thing, and I think hon. members from the west ought to be as patient as possible. No doubt they are patient, to a certain extent, and we sympathize with them in the difficulties they have to contend with, and are as anxious as they to find a remedy. But that is not the only portion of the country that is suffering. What is the trouble in that country? The increasing quantity of grain from year to year is such that no railway could handle it. Now, one hon. member said that double tracking the road would do it. Let me give him a calculation. Last year it was said there would be a hundred million bushels of grain to be disposed of. How many roads would be required to take that grain out of the country in the short time that the farmers desire it should be handled? One road would not do it, two roads would not do it, three roads would not do it.

Mr. SCOTT. A hundred million bushels is a small amount of business for a good railroad.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told by one of the stockholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway that their large cars carry about 666 bushels, so that it would require 7,507 trains of twenty cars in each to handle that grain. At the rate of three trains a day, it would take 522 days. Now, if you had three roads hauling that grain, say each hauling twenty cars and three trains a day, it would take eighty-three days, or nearly three months, to handle that grain in the time that the farmers think it ought to be handled, between the time of threshing and the time that navigation closes.

Mr. SCOTT. I stated that the farmers did not ask that it should all be handled inside of three months, but they did complain when less than 25 per cent was handled in a season.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, the contention is that there is a blockade, and that the grain cannot be handled. I am only drawing attention to the fact that it would require so many trains and so many railroads to handle even one hundred million bushels of grain, which was the crop of last year. Now, with the influx of population to that country which has been taking place lately, what will it be two or three years hence when you have four hundred million bushels of grain? Why, even twelve or fifteen railroads could not handle it. Therefore it will be apparent how impossible it is to get sufficient accommodation to handle the crop of that country in the short time the farmers think it ought to be handled. Then if you had the roads, what would they be doing for the other nine months of the year? They would not have the freight to haul, their earning powers would be nil, the irons would be rusting, there would be no interest earned on their money. Therefore that is not a solution of the difficulty. What the North-west farmer wants is to handle that crop in the fall of the year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The hon. gentleman says there will be no use for these railways the rest of the year after taking out the grain. Have we not endeavoured to show this fact, that the present railway facilities are not able to cope with the commercial business of the country going westward? There is not the slightest danger of the road running out of work the whole year.

Mr. SPROULE. I admit that there is a great deal more work offering for the railways than can be done, but I am starting from the desire of the farmer to move his crop in a short time, and I say that it would require twelve or fifteen roads to move in that short time the grain that is likely to offer in a very few years hence. But it would not require that number of railways to haul freight into the country, therefore some of them would be lying idle a good portion of the year. It seems to me that the only solution of this question is by building a road to the Hudson Bay. I travelled through that country for several weeks last fall, and endeavoured to get as much information about it as I could, and I frankly confess that I think this is the only solution of the situation. You are as near Hudson Bay from Regina, or Brandon, or perhaps Winnipeg, as you are to Port Arthur.

Mr. SCOTT. How long would the season of navigation be?

Mr. SPROULE. From all the information I can get, I think there is navigation on the

Hudson Bay about four or five months in the year, or a little longer.

Mr. SCOTT. At what date would it close in the fall ?

Mr. SPROULE. The best navigation of the Hudson Bay Company commences some time in July.

Mr. SCOTT. And what is the probable date that bay navigation would close ?

Mr. SPROULE. I did not get any specific date, but my opinion is that there is between five and six months of navigation, say at least four months. It commences towards the end of July, and you have August, September, October and November.

Mr. SCOTT. We can use the lakes up to the end of the first week in December. So by shipping to the bay we could not have any longer season.

Mr. SPROULE. But you have this advantage, that when you reach Hudson Bay you reach ocean navigation, where you can never have a blockade, because if you have freight offering, there will always be vessels to carry it away. You will not do as you do at Port Arthur, fill your elevators in a few weeks. When you come to an ocean port you cannot have a blockade. Then you have a great reduction in the cost of transportation.

Mr. SCOTT. I should think there would be a blockade during the six, or seven, or eight months that the hon. gentleman says navigation may be closed.

Mr. SPROULE. I say if you must handle the grain as the farmers desire it should be handled, inside of two or three months, that is the only feasible scheme for handling it. At best you have only to haul it four or five hundred miles. You can easily run several roads to the bay, as it is a cheap country to build through. If the great object to be attained is to haul the grain to the seaboard in a short time, I say that is the only way it can be done. But there are other ways of disposing of this trade.

Now, I notice that there is an important trade springing up with China and Japan. A great deal of the grain grown in the west is made into flour and shipped to the Orient, China and Japan, and will go in increasing quantities in the future. Then another portion of it will be consumed in the east. A large and increasing portion of it will be fed to stock, as is now being done in the older provinces. Take the province of Ontario. There are five to ten times as much grain, including wheat, oats, barley and pease, now fed to stock as was fed ten or fifteen years ago. And so it will be in the west if the farmers turn their attention to mixed farming. They will not have such a large quantity of grain to ship out of that country because it will be used up in the country in making another product that will be more easily taken out and the movement of which can be distributed over a longer season. These are some of the difficulties that a farmer has to contend with there, and if he insists that the government must provide railways in the immediate future to handle that great crop in a short time he is proposing something that no government can accomplish no matter how much money is spent. That is my opinion in regard to it and my opinion as to the solution of the difficulty. I think what I have suggested is the only feasible solution in sight. There are those who say that the Hudson's Bay is not navigable. Well, I am not going to waste the time of the House to argue that question. At least I am satisfied from what information I have been able to get that it is navigable and navigable between four and five months in the year, but if there is any question as to it, why do the government delay one hour from making a proper test? Why don't they send up one, or five, or even ten expeditions if necessary to collect data from year to year to determine whether it is navigable or not and do that right away ? Why do they delay ? Because I have no doubt this will become at some time in the future one of the great highways of commerce for the people of that country. As one of the people living in the east I say it is not the desire of eastern people to be niggardly in expenditure to help the farmers of the west. They have been giving every attention to this subject and are just as anxious as their friends in the west that some solution should be found for the difficulties of life which they have to contend with. But they should remember that there are insurmountable difficulties that cannot be always overcome and that it is not only in the west that cars cannot be supplied when they are required.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As the general desire to discuss this question has prevailed I think at this late hour with the permission of the House I shall ask leave to withdraw the motion for Supply and move that this House at the next sitting shall resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Earle) that the House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman has leave to withdraw his motion.

Motion withdrawn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

That the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What position will that put this side of the House in in regard to the moving of an amendment. If the motion of the hon. Minister of Finance passes now we will not be able to move an amendment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the ordinary motion will stand. It is in order that we may retain the motion for Supply in the usual position, that I make this motion. There will be no change and the usual motion will have to be made.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. What will be the business taken up to-morrow, and if the government Bills are to be taken up will the hon. minister tell us which ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will take up, first, to-morrow, the Bill of the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), item sixteen on the Order Paper for to-day, Bill (No. 17) to aid in the settlement of railway labour disputes, to be followed by item seventeen, Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways if there be time, although the first item may occupy some time.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.25 a.m., Wednesday.

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT, 1903.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn ; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved. Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward.*

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Appnmt. as Fruit Inspector (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

Binder Twine Inspection, Method of Collection, &c. (Ques.) 14684 (vi).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 12703 ; Neg. (Y. 35 ; N. 75) 12705 (v).

——— Pets *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections 13274 (vi).

Picton Mail Service, Irregular Delivery, &c. (remarks) 13134 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Buildings—B. C. (Rossland, armoury) 13133 ; Dom. (rentals, &c.) 13133 ; Man. (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13129 ; Ont. (Cobourg, P.O. 13118 ; (Deseronto, P. O.) 13113 ; (Picton, P.O.) 13113 (vi).

Angers, Mr. C., *Charlevoix.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5192 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10349 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6493 (iii).

Archambault, Mr. J. E., *Berthier.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co's. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10071 (iv).

Avery, Mr. M. *Addington.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5461 (iii).

Avery, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Enterprise Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14007 (vi).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4710 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11606 (v).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4107 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island, shoal) 13252 (vi) : Que. (Crane Island, wharf) 1513 ; (Grande Valleé, pier) 1515 ; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 : St. Alexis Bay) 2290 (i) ; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13345 (vi).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5500 (iii).

Ball, Mr. G., *Nicolet.*

Atlantic & Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 446 ; 2° m., 852, 1505 (i).

Budget, The, 2234 (i).

Chambly Canal Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12497 (v).

Drill Hall, St. Johns, Que., Contract, &c. (Ques.) 12496 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10165 (v)

Moreau, H., Collector, Chambly Canal, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 12497 (v).

Ottawa & Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) M. to ref. back to Com., 6617 (iii).

St. Johns, Que., Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 12496 (v).

Barker, Mr. S., *Hamilton.*

Audit Act. Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11163 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*

Auditor General and Civil Service Amt. B. (remarks) in Com., 13808 (vi).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (v).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) in Com., 5987 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7426 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4368, 4963 (ii) 5623, 5634, 5786 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5883 (iii).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4420 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 830 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com on Res., 12521 (ii), in Com. on B., 13808 (vi).

Desjardins Canal B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 3394 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (Compulsory Voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 899; in Com., 909 (i), 14416 (vi).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12296 (v).

G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2410 (i).

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 258: *See* 'Ry. Act' B.

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11181 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5156 (iii), 7852; on M. for 3°, 8062 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8593 (iv); in Com., 10446, 11190, 11249, 11377, 11835, 11918, 11972, 11999, 12187, 12263 (v); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12768 (vi).

G. T. Pacific, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to read Affidavits (remarks) 14848 (vi).

Halifax Cotton Co., Loan of Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) 14478 (vi).

I. C. R., Expenditure Chargeable to Capital (remarks) 14107 (vi).

——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3669 (ii).

——— Gross Earnings, Interim Reps. (Ques.) 4444 (ii).

——— Locomotives, Cars, &c., in Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4361 (ii).

——— Trackmen: *See* 'Trackmen.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10762, 11410 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5093 (ii).

Montreal Terminal Co. (remarks) 6097 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12326 (v).

Ont. & Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2716 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Over-Expenditures by Depts.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iii).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10796 (v).

Public Accounts Com., producing census schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iii).

Public Works Dept. Control and Management B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14741 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1336 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 251 (i); on M. for Com., 2590; in Com., 2598, 3563, 3723, 3833, 3887 (ii); 5252, 5569, 5682, 5768, 6073, 6087, 6179, 6214, 6244 (iii), 8153 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13841; (remarks) *re* Free Conference, 14760 (vi).

Ry. Act (supplies to I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12576 (v); in Com. on B., 12952 (vi).

Railway Appropriations, Transfer, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on Sen. Amets., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14475 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1241 (i); in Com. (Brant) 11101, 11032; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12438 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6521 (iii).

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act, B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census schedules) 7063 (iii); (contingencies) 4353; (postage, &c.) 4355 (ii).

Canals: Trent (Corry & Laverdure, contract) 7558 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Finance (Insurance) 12586 (v).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7782 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 6000 (iii).

Militia (Hamilton drill hall) 6950 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Art Gallery) 12589; (Dom. and Prov. arbitration) 12591; (Paris agency) 12589 (v).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 5841; N.S. (Arichat) 5830; (Middleton armoury) 5841; (Military college) 5842; Toronto post office) 5842 (iii); Ottawa (census building) 991; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 998; Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 435 (i).

Barker, Mr. Saml—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 1454; Generally (dredges, repairs) 2615; Man. (Lake Francis outlet) 1449; Ont. (Burlington channel) 1359; (Wendover wharf) 1435 (i); Que. (Hull wharf) 5901; (Isle Grosbois) 5902 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A.) 2726; (engineers' salaries) 2726; (surveys, &c.) 2721 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2691(ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Mar. Provs., cables) 2709 (ii); (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5826 (iii).

Railways: G.T.R. (rentals) 12890 (vi). I.C.R. (air brakes, freights) 8282; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (v); (bridge strengthening) 3699 (ii), 8272 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 12602 (v), 14094 (vi); (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8315 (iv), 12594 (v); (Connolly's claim, &c.) 14103; (double tracking, &c.) 14062 (vi); (draw-bars, exchange) 8288 (iv); (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 (v); (general vote) 12873; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14095 (vi); (Lévis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (Miramichi bridge) 8309 (iv); (Moncton accommodation) 12599 (v); (Moncton, station) 14090 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8312 (iv); (original construction) 3698 (ii); (Ouelle River, spur line) 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 14088 (vi); (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291 (iv); (power saw) 12607 (v); (Restigouche bridge) 8304; (Rivière du Loup work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8310; (rolling stock) 8292 (iv), 14101 (vi); (St. John, accommodation) 8315 (iv), 12596 (v); (sidings, additional) 14055, 14081; (steel rails, &c.) 14098 (vi); (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii); (Truro accommodation) 12603 (v).

Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A.) 2726 (ii).

P. E. I. (Charlottetown station) 14131 (vi); (general vote) 12608 (v); (Hillsborough bridge) 14108, 14116 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7530 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9419 (iv).

Trackmen on I. C. R., Wages Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14087 (vi).

Transportation Commission, Sir Wm. Van Horne's Views, &c. (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).

Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14475 (vi).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9152 (iv).

Beith, Mr. R., *Durham W.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Bowmanville) 511 (i).

Beland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Chicoutimi and North-eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 168) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10224 (v).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342. (iii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 118) 1°*, 1643 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12337, 12505, 12567 (v); on M. for 3°, 13947 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7508 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14418 (vi).

Dom. Gas Improvement Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 1193 (i).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8246 (iv).

Federal Oil Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 367 (i).

G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. (Mr. *Monk*) that Committee not properly constituted and 'Debates' not being reported (ruling) 10633 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry., Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14849 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 758 (i),

Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3259 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Wade*) to conc., 8042 (iv).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 2° m., 1512.

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 3° m., 4869 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 1378 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1318 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6809 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5864, 5868 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1023 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6302 (iii).

Ry. Debts. Bill: *See* 'Exchequer,' &c.

SUPPLY:

Post Office (letter carriers, salaries) 6027; (ry. mail clerks) 6027 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Ottawa post-office) 438 (i).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13796 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Lord Alverstone's Communication, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* 13671 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14819 (vi).

Amherst Postoffice, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4249 (ii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay of Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14193 (vi).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°*, 11170 (v).

Auditor General and Civil Service Bill (remarks) 13811 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6360 (iii).

Budget, The, 1907 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5053, 5074 (ii), 5432 (iii).

Canadian Mail via New York, Tons, &c. (Ques.) 10713 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co. Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4367 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) 267 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 368 (i).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13740 (vi).

See: Supply—Agriculture.'

Chamberlain, Mr.: *See* 'Militia Act.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13811 (vi).

Clergue Co. and Govt. Contract *re* Steel Rails (remarks) 14098 (vi).

Commanders of Govt. Steamers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

Conciliation Boards, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3628 (ii.)

Conciliators, Settlement of Labour Disputes, &c. (Ques.) 4003 (ii).

Customs Act (Surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3076 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 583 (i).

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 3, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to ref. to Sel. Com., 3003 (ii).

Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6913 (iii).

Electoral Lists, N.S., Changes *re* Printing, &c. (Ques.) 8331 (iv).

Financial Review (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y. 30, N. 68) 14642 (vi).

Fire at Mortimer & Co.'s, Govt. property destroyed (Ques.) 4836 (ii).

Fishing within Three-Mile Limit, Guysboro, N. S. (remarks) 4179 (ii).

Govt. Rys. Act Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12583 (v).

Govt. Steamers, Names of Commanders, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Order for Com., 4132 (ii); in Com., 5167 (iii); on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9784 (iv), 11213, 11243, 11368, 11936, 11991 (v); on M. for 3° (Amt.) 12772 (vi).

———Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13287 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, 13286 (vi).

See 'Ry. Policy.'

Halifax Marine and Fishery Offices, Resolution of City Council, Tel. (read) 14279 (vi).

House of Commons, Clerks, &c.: *see* 'Civil Service B.'

Hurley, Mr. (remarks) 13744 (vi).

Hydraulic Dredge, Mar. Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13319 (vi).

Hydraulic Leases, Yukon Ter. (M. for cor.*) 288 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6577 (iii).

I.C.R., Free Transportation, Names, &c. (M. for ret.) 2337 (i).

General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3687 (ii).

——— Lorne Siding, Ry. Traffic, &c. (Ques.) 2918 (ii).

——— Rates for Cattle and Coal, &c. (Ques.) 1857 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 2338 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers, 3712 (ii).

International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res, 7975 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).

Labour Disputes, Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 4003 (ii).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8213 (iv).

Librarians of Parlt., Salary B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13833 (vi).

Lime Rock, N.S., Postmaster, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).

Mail *via* New York: *see* 'Can. Mail,' &c.

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, sent from H. of C., 14536, 14574 (vi).

Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5995 (iii).

Militia Act. Amt. and Mr. Chamberlain's Suggestions (remarks) 6540 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 186 (i).

Minto, Govt. Steamer, Passengers, &c. (Ques.) 3631 (ii).

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 12811 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Nova Scotia Bank, Customs Duty *re* Safe (remarks) 13988 (vi).

N. S. and Can., Financial Terms, &c. (Ques.) 3001 (i).

Parliamentary Librarians: *see* 'Librarians.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep. Distribution, &c. (remarks) 879 (i).

Pugwash, N.S. Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 1856 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidies B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14696 (vi).

'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134 (ii).

Railway Policy of Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7121 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14370 (vi).

Railway Subsidies *re* Provinces, &c. (remarks) 14687 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11028; in Com. (N.S.) 11809 (v).

Safe purchased by Bank of N. S., Customs Duties *re* (remarks) 13988 (vi).

Scotch Hill Station, Pets, *re* (Ques.) 872 (i).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6494, 7214 (iii).

Springhill, N.S., Armouries, Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 1856 (i).

Steel Rails: *See* 'Clergue,' &c.

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, Coté's circular) 4661; (general statistics) 4429 (ii).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes) 12585 (v); (public dept) 14204 (vi).

Civil Government: Customs (salaries) 325 (i).

Customs (preferential tariff) 3937 (ii).

Excise (adulteration of food, &c.,) 5389; (analysts, &c.) 5389 (iii).

Fisheries (fish-breeding establishments) 4175; (fishways) 4174 (ii).

Geological Survey (Bell, Dr. appnmt.) 6818; (explorations, &c.) 6818 (iii).

Indians: Mar. Provs. (schools) 6414 (iii).

Inland Revenue (wood alcohol) 241 (i).

Legislation: H. of C. (sessional clerks) 14113 (vi); (voters' lists) 5276 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers, salaries) 4132; (Montreal pilot commission) 4173; (St. Lawrence navigation) 4159 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6000 (iii); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14250 (vi).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590;. (Art Gallery) 12589; (Mining Institute) 12591 (vi.)

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4078 (ii).

Post Office (arrears of salaries, postmasters) 5922; (Dawson and Eagle City) 5923; (salaries, &c.) 5924 (iii).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John drill hall) 13044 (vi); Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 982 (i); (ventilation of Chamber) 13007; Quebec (hospital for trachoma) 14245; (military iron foundry) 14247 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176; N.S. (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Glace Bay) 1094; (Meteghan Cove) 1137 (i); Ont. (Port Arthur dredging) 13021 (vi).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2680 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917.

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3700; (Lévis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (New Glasgow freight shed) 14096; (Pictou accommodation) 14088; (rolling stock) 14101; (steel rails) 14098 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8299 (iv).

Yukon Ter. (govtl. expenses) 6802 (iii).

Tariff Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4912 (ii).

Thanksgiving Day, Adjournment (remarks) 13379.

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, Free Representations, &c. (Ques.) 5990 (iii).

——— Hydraulic Leases, &c. (M. for cor.*) 288.

——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 5242 (iii).

——— Tel. from Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 1195 (i).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796 (ii).

Voters' Lists, N.S.: *See* 'Electoral.'

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1044 (i).

Yukon, Hydraulic Leases: *See* 'Hydraulic.'

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *E. Simcoe.*

Alaska, Str., Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 6629 (iii).

Ashcroft-Barkerville Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Bayfield, Str., Reps. of Mr. Evans and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5742 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7379 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) 12761 (vi).

Brunet, Arthur and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., &c., 108 (i).

Cane Bros., Timber License, &c. (Ques.) 2757 (ii).

Collingwood Dock, Estimated Cost (remarks) 5871 (iii).

Collingwood Harbour Dry Dock, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4016 (ii).

Cutler, Gore Bay Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 2308.

Cutler, Spanish Mills, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2308 (i).

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserves, Complaints *re* trespassing (Ques.) 7914 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 895 ; in Com., 902 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3007, 4679 (ii).

Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Licenses, &c. (Ques,) 2757 (ii).

Grain Importation through Western Lake Ports (Ques.) 97 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9198 (iv); in Com. on B., 10607, 11372, 11871, 12076 ; on M. for 3°, 12761 ; (amt.) 12767 (v).

G. T. Pacific Bill, Pets., *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13268, 13276 (vi).

Grant, J. G., Barrie, Customs Collector, Sureties, &c. (Ques.) 5991 (iii).

Huron Judgeship, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt (remarks) 207, 215 (i).

I.C.R., Stations, Restaurants, Fire Protection, &c. (Ques.) 14663 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7925, 7970 (iv).

Judges appointed from Local Bar : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10765, 10771 ; in Com. on B., 11420 (vi).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8089 (iv).

Longford, Output of Wood Alcohol, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7918 (iv).

Mail Bags, Repairs, &c., in Aurora, Remarks in Com. of Sup , 6139 (iii).

Midland Water Front *re* Lease to Pratt & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanations, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 173 (i).

Moose Deer Point Islands, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

Newmarket Office Specialty Co., *re* Personal Explanation (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).

Orillia Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

Ottawa Supply Co., *re* P.O. Contracts, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

Pratt & Co., Lease of Water Front at Midland : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5294 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11564 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5779 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11467, 11611, 11617, 12294 (v).

Ronan, W. and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sales, &c. (Ques.) 2502 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Action (remarks) 12719 (vi).

Soulanges Canal, Stewart *vs.* King (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

Standard Chemical Company, Purchase of Wood Alcohol, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i) 5363 (iii).

Stewart *vs.* King, Litigation Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (census, cost, &c.) 4816 ; (census, Cote's circular) 4667 ; (Simcoe census) 4825 ; (Diamond Baker Lumber Co.'s exhibit) 4613; (St. Louis exhibition) 4612 (ii).

Canals—Peterborough (lift lock) 12927 (vi) ; Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 ; Soulanges (construction) 7550 ; Trent (construction) 7556 (iii).

Civil Government : Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 207 ; Railways (salaries) 340 (i).

Customs (Midland collector) 3912 ; (salaries) 3911 (ii).

Dom. Lands (inspector's expenses) 6768 ; (land guides) 6768 (iii).

Electric Light (inspectors) 5408 (iii).

Excise (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373 ; (Standard Chemical Co.) 5373 ; (wood alcohol) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5285 ; (Collins, inspector, &c.) 5131 ; (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5131 ; (steamers, &c.) 5283 ; (water front lease, Midland) 5294 (iii).

Indians: Generally (legal expenses) 6419 ; Man., &c. (agricultural implements) 6423 ; (medical attendance) 6329 ; N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 6348 ; (supplies) 6423 ; Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6339 ; (survey reserves) 6410 ; Que. (Waby trial) 6419 (iii).

Inland Revenue (excise examinations) 5363 ; (Standard Chemical Co.) 227 (i), 5363 (iii).

Justice (Regina jail, land purchase) 5135 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5735 (iii).

Militia (Martineau investigation) 3753 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3593, 3754 (ii).

Post Office (jubilee stamps) 6060 ; (mail bag repairs) 6139 ; (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6146 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (Rossland armoury) 13133 ; (Rossland P.O.) 13131 ; (Vancouver P. O.) 13132 (vi) ; **Dom.** (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 ; Generally (armouries) 968 (i) ; **N.B.** (Marysville) 5835 (iii) ; **N.W.T.** (Macleod, court house) 959 ; (Red Deer, court house) 960 (i) ; **N.S.** (Arichat) 5827 ; (Guysborough) 5839 ; (Middleton armoury) 5841 (iii) ; **Ont.** (Alexandria P.O.) 488 (i) ; (Deseronto P.O.) 13112 (vi) ; (Midland) 5832 (iii) ; (Orillia armoury) 968 ; (Orillia, caretaker) 1007, 1016 (i) ; (Oshawa P.O.) 13110, (vi) ; (Owen Sound) 5832 (iii) ; (St. Mary's P.O.) 13109 ; (Sault Ste. Marie P.O.) 13107 ; (Wingham P. O.) 13122 (vi) ; **Ottawa** (caretakers, &c.) 982 ; (census building) 990 ; (elevators) 1012 ; (furniture, &c.) 973 ; (rentals, &c.) 990 ; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1006 ; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 998 ; (Royal mint) 345 (i) ; (steel shelving) 13088 (vi) ; (telephones) 1014 (i) ; **Que.** (Acton Vale P.O.) 13059 (vi) ; (L'Assomption) 429 (i) ; (Longueuil P.O.) 13069 ; (Magog P.O.) 13081 (vi), (Montmagny) 5842 (iii) 13066 ; (St. John's;

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

examining warehouse) 13069; (St. Louis de Mile End, P.O.) 13080; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi); Yukon (White Horse, P.O.) 13133 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1175 (i); (Miscou, wharf) 13234; (Petit Rocher, breakwater) 13234; **N.S.** (Fort Lawrence pier) 13181; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182; (Grand Narrows, wharf) 13198; (Indian Harbour, wharf) 13199; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 13201; (McKay's Point, wharf) 13201; (Middle river dam) 13202; (Morrison's Point wharf) 13203 (vi); (New Harbour) 1143 (i); (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi); (Tiverton breakwater) 1149; (West Baccaro channel) 1151 (i); **Ont.** (Blind River wharf) 13235; (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bruce Mines) 5911 (iii); (Collingwood, improvements) 13239 (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland, wharf) 13239 (vi); (Goderich harbour) 1367 (i); (Gore's wharf) 13244 (vi); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Midland harbour) 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246; (Parry Sound, wharf) 13248; (Port Arthur, dredging) 13012 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3368 (ii); (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431 (i); (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254; (Victoria harbour) 13255; (Wiarton, wharf) 13256 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallee pier) 1517; (Murray Bay wharf) 2268 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3310 (ii).

Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13365 (vi).

Railways and Canals: Generally (litigation expenses) 12912 (vi); I.C.R. (Chapman ball-bearing apparatus) 8283 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7520 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7277 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry., Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 2308 (i).

Transportation Commissioners and Tariff Inquiry (remarks) 855, 862 (i).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13365 (vi).

Trent Canal Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2319 (i).

Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ques.) 284 (i).

Wood Alcohol manufactured at Longford, Output, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Wood Alcohol, Purchase, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i) 5363 (iii).

Yukon Stenographers, Appnmt. of Mr. J. A. Valiquette (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

Bernier, Hon. M. E., (Minister of Inland Revenue) *St. Hyacinthe.*

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 881 (i).

Chabot, Mr. F. X., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2015 (i).

Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 3708; 2° m., 4007 (ii).

Bernier, Hon. M. E.—*Con.*

Excise Taxation, Revenue for 1896 and 1903 (Ans.) 14284 (vi).

Grain Weighing in Man and N.W.T. in Com. on B. 188 (remarks) 4189 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act. Amt. (B. 186) 1° *, 3708; in Com., 4007 (ii).

Inland Revenue Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

Milk Can Bill: *See* Weights and Measures B. 20.

O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory (remark) 13979 (vi).

Postal Scales Bill: *See* Weights and Measures B.

Standard Chemical Co., Purchase of Wood Alcohol, Remarks in Com. of Sup. 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (salaries) 227 (i).

Electric Light (inspectors) 5407 (iii).

Excise (adulteration of food, &c.) 5389; (analysts) 5389; (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5381; (grain weighing machines) 5382; (inspectors' salaries) 5381 (iii) 13974 (vi); (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373 (iii); (Prescott, salaries) 13968; (salaries *re* C. S. Act) 13967 (vi); (Standard Chemical Co.) 5373; (tobacco stamps) 5373; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373, 5404; (wood alcohol) 5373 (iii).

Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., shortage guarantee) 5405, 5407; (excise examinations) 5363; (Ferguson, Mr., legal services) 5412; (Guay, Mr., compensation, &c.) 5407; (Keilty, Mr., appnmt.) 5365, 5378; (Kelly, Mr., refund, &c.) 5404; (minor revenues) 5404; (Montreal office, reimbursement) 5405 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Que. (St. Hyacinthe) 440 (i).

Tobacco Duties collected, 1902 (Ans.) 2104 (i).

Tobacco, Duty on raw Leaf, &c. (Ans.) 446 (i).

Trottier, Louis M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8488 (iv).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2340 (i).

——— (Postal scales) Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 3708 in Com., 4009, 4187, 4189 (ii).

Wood Alcohol, Purchase, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup. 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Bank of Montreal Co.'s (B 72) 1°*, 814 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition (B. 133) 1° m., 2014 (i), 2° m., 3286 (ii).

See 'Supply-Excise.'

Companies, Incorporated Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 1193 (i).

Dom. Burglarly Guarantee Co.'s Change of Name (B. 92) 1°*, 1193 (i).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3581 (ii).

Imperial Co.'s incorp. (B. 71) 1°*, 814 (i); in Com., 3170 (ii).

Incorporated Companies (B 94) 2° m., 3257 (ii).

Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507.

Bickerdike, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4459 (ii).
Montreal Savings Bank incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 2501 (ii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6109 (iii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) in Com., 3225 (ii).
Shipping Federation of Can. incorp. (B. 93) 1°*, 1193 ; 2° m., 1328 (i).
SUPPLY :
Excise (cigarettes analysis) 5394 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7594 (iiii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3483 (ii).

Birkett, Mr, Thos., *Ottawa.*
Blind River Wharf, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 1298 (i).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 189) 1°*, 3864 (ii); in Com. 7479; 3° m., 7485.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12335 ; (amt.) 12349, 12370, 12500 ; (amt.) 12510, 12570 (v) ; 13812 (vi).
Geological Museum, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 11188 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10216 (iv).
Nepean Point Improvement, &c. (Ques.) 11829 (v).
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6808 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5859 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4168 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4093 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings—Ottawa (electric lighting transformers) 5844 (iii) ; (geological museum) 352 (i) ; (post office elevator) 5844 (iii) ; (Royal Mint) 347 (i) ; (steel drawers, &c.) 13087 ; (Victoria museum) 14244 (vi).
Roads and Bridges (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen & Co.'s Deposit, 6969 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7361 (iii).
Binder Twine, Cost in 1901-2, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).
——— Names of Purchasers (Ques.) 3798 (ii).
——— Prices for current year, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).
See 'Supply—Justice.'
Blankets, Web Cloth, &c., purchased by Govt. (Ques.) 10101, 10714, 10954 (v).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10732 (v).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
Bruce Mines Shed, architect : *See* 'Gordon,' &c.
Budget, The, 1785 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5853 (iii).
——— (remarks *re* Irish butter) in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
Cable Press Despatches from England : *See* 'British Cable.'
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
Census Expenditure (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 13699 ; Neg. (Y. 35 ; N. 69) 13759 (vi).
Census Schedules, Halton, Cardwell and Peel for 1891 (Ques.) 6894 (iii).
Census Schedules, 1891-1901, Questions *re* Peel, Halton, &c. (Ques.) 11425 (v).
See 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c., 'Halton,' &c.
Civil Servants, Interference in Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii).
Compulsory Voting. *See* 'Dom. Election B. 3,'
Criminal Code Amt. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).
Country Postmasters' Salaries : *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'
Crown Tailoring Co., Toronto, Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup , 6152 (iii).
Cummings, James, Payments to, by Govt. (Ques.) 9458 (iv).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3053, 4038 (ii).
Debates Translators, Rental of Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3799 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13594 (vi).
Doukhobors, Pilgrimage, Govt. Action, &c. (Ques.) 1030 (i).
Dredges, New, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 1856.
Election Printing in *Advocate*, Prince Albert, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Fishing Industry of N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13165 (vi).
German Goods, 'Teapot,' Importation under Preferential Tariff (remarks) in Customs Act Amt. B., 3056 (ii).
Gordon & Hellowell, Architects, *re* Bruce Mines Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 5914 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9495 (iv) ; in Com., 10709, 12100, 12280 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12724 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13273 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14650 (vi).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Halton, Cardwell and Peel, Census Schedules (Ques.) 6436 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
——— *See* 'Census.'
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928 (iv).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10774 (v).
Kelly, Wm., Census Account, &c., Letter *re* (read) 13705 (vi).
Census Commissioner for N. Hastings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
Latour, L. J., Leave of Absence, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8214 (iv).
Lunenburg Co., Assistance to Fishermen, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vi).
Macpherson, D. F., Census Enumerator: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9351 (iv).
Maps, Printing and Publishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).
Milk Can Bill : *See* 'Weights,' &c.
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12325 (v).
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2718 (ii).
Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13627.
Postmasters Bonds and Insurance Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'
Postmasters in Rural District, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 5863 (iii) 14039 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5863 (iii).
Post Office Insurance Fund, Rep. (remarks) 14660.
——— *See* 'Supply—Postoffice.'
Post Office Savings Bank Defalcations, &c., in Com., of Sup., 14655 (vi).
Press Despatches B.: *See* 'British Cable, &c.'
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Talbot*) 3127 (ii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B.21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3737 (ii), 6101, 6256 (iii).
——— (Supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B.258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12969 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14380.
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11623, 12293; (Toronto) 11742 (v).
St. Peters and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).
Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).
Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi); (census enumerators) 4646, 4820; (census, land, &c.) 4638; (census schedules) 7054 (iii); (Clinton, census, &c.) 4820 (ii); (cold storage) 7626; (creameries, N. W. T.) 7633 (iv); (exhibitions, furniture, &c.) 4604; (exhibition, Treadgold exhibit) 4612; (experimental farms) 4553; (Japan exhibition) 4635 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7647 (iv).
Canals: Farran's Point (acetylene gas plant) 14155 (vi); Galops (deepening, &c.) 8268 (iv); Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (O'Leary's claims) 14651; Welland (mitre sills lowering) 14148 (vi).
Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (salaries) 231 (i).
Customs (Bracebridge custom house) 3960; (contingent expenses) 3897; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3958; (legal expenses) 3963; (linseed oil fraud) 3934; (preferential tariff) 3945; (salaries, &c.) 3897 (ii).
Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (tree culture) 6779 (iii).
Excise (methylated spirits contract) 5378; (Standard Chemical Co.) 5378 (iii).
Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658 (vi).
Immigration (expenditure) 6868; (Lake St. John Col. Co.) 6888; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6848; (U.S. agents) 6848 (iii).
Indians: B. C. (expenditure generally) 7266; (industrial schools) 7256; (surveys, &c.) 7269; Generally (legal expenses) 6416; N. W. T. (supplies) 6425; (Stewart, E., travelling expenses) 6416; Yukon (education) 7274 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7764, 7772; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7764 (iv).
Interior (Amos Barnes, claim) 6924; (Banff museum) 6927; (Howie, F. W., legal expenses) 6795 (iii).
Justice: Miscellaneous (Statutes, Revision) 14643 (vi); (Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3515 (ii).
Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268, 14652 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour buoys) 13638; (Marconi stations) 13641 (vi); (St. Lawrence route, insurance) 5761 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 13680 (vi); (Can. and S. Africa) 5879 (iii) 7749; (G. B. and Can.) 7728; (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7738 (iv).
Miscellaneous (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14268, 14652 (vi); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6986; (Martineau defalcations) 6991; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6969 (iii); (Post Office Savings Bank, defalcations) 14655 (vi).
N. W. M. Police (Yukon) 5005 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, supplies, &c.) 4061, 4104, 5039 (ii); (life-saving awards) 13544; (masters and mates examination) 13531 (vi).
Post Office (box rents, &c.) 6139; (country postmasters) 6053; (mail service) 6065; (superannuations) 5932; (supplies, &c.) 6151 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (Rossland, P. O.) 13161; (Vancouver, P. O.) 13132 (vi); Dom. (heating, &c.) 1065; Generally (Brampton armoury) 966; (experimental farms) 973 (i); **N.B.** (St. John drill hall) 13051 (vi); **N. S.** (Arichat) 5829; (Guysborough) 5840 (iii); (Sydney Mines) 13028; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13083; (Guelph, armoury) 13084, 13085; (Hawkesbury, P. O) 13119; (Oshawa, P. O.) 13111; (St. Mary's, P. O.) 13110;

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

(Sarnia, P. O.) 13117; (Stratford, armoury) 13125; (Windsor, P. O.) 13113; (Woodstock, armoury) 13125 (vi); **Ottawa** (census building) 993 (i); (coal sheds) 13117 (vi); (furniture, &c.) 980 (i); (gas, &c.) 5845 (iii); (heating, &c.) 1010; (lighting, &c.) 974 (i); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1006; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 997 (i); (steel shelving) 13089; **Que.** (Acton Vale, P.O.) 13063; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13071; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 13059; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13068; (St. Johns, examining warehouse) 13069; (St. Johns, P. O.) 13061 (vi); Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978 (ii);

Dredging (new dredges) 2674 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Esquimalt, graving dock) 5919 (iii); Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3365 (ii); **N.B.** (Dipper Harbour, breakwater) 13233; (Hopewell Cape, wharf) 13234; (Petit Rocher) 13234 (vi); **N. S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1069 (i); (Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217; (Chegoggin, pier) 13179; (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Frudes Point, wharf); 13180; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1088 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13188 (vi); (Green Cove, harbour) 1100; (Grand Narrows wharf) 1094 (i); (Iona, harbour) 13200 (Jeddore, wharf) 13179; (Margaretville, breakwater) 13202; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203; (Middle River, dam) 13202; (Morrison's Point, wharf) 13203 (vi); (Neil's Harbour) 1140 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Poirierville, wharf) 13205; (Port George, breakwater) 13210 (vi); (Port Hawkesbury) 1147 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13209; (Porter's channel) 13206; (Prospect, wharf) 13205; (St. Ann, wharf) 13203; (Spry Bay, wharf) 13213; (Swim Point, wharf) 13211; (Victoria beach wharf) 13216; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13314; **Ont.** (Amherstburg dredging) 13235; (Barry's Bay) 13236; (Blind River wharf) 13236; (Bronte, improvements) 13236 (vi); (Bruce mines) 5912 (iii); (Cumberland wharf) 13239 (vi); (general repairs) 1374; (Orillia wharf) 1377; (Petewawa Narrows) 1443; (Pickering harbour) 1377 (i); (Port Arthur) 3344 (ii); (Port Credit) 13251 (vi); (Wendover wharf) 1438 (i); **Que.** (Cacouna wharf) 5897 (iii); (dredging plant) 2674 (ii); (Grande Vallee pier) 1533; (Murray Bay wharf) 2268; (Pointe St. Pierre) 2278 (i); (Rivière du Nord) 5909 (iii); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2260 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3311 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration and awards) 13339; (Ottawa river surveys) 13342 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2698; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2679 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, B.C. (Alberni Clayoquot) 5918; (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5827 (iii); Generally (Marconi system) 2712 (ii); N.W.T. (Alexander Indian agency) 5918 (iii); (Woodmountain, &c.) 13336 (vi); Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii); (Belle Isle) 2712 (ii); (Yukon, construction) 14042 (vi); (Yukon) 2994 (ii).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5501; (Rutherford, Dr., duties, &c.) 5509 (iii); (small-pox) 5010 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I.C.R. (air brakes, &c.) 8287 (iv); (car shops machinery) 14106 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7523 (iii); (Miramichi bridge) 8308 (iv); (Moncton locomotive works) 14090 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8312; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Rivière du Loup yards) 8310; (rolling stock) 8294 (iv); (sidings, additional) 14060, 14107 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8302 (iv); P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14108; (Murray Harbour branch) 14120 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7761; (international customs bureau) 7760 (iv).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276, 7286 (iv).

'Teapot,' German, purchased in N.W.T.: *See* 'German,' &c.

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9421 (iv).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Web cloth, blankets, &c. (Ques.) 10410 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i).

Wood Alcohol, purchased, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).

See 'Supply—Excise.'

Yukon, Mail Deficit, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *St. John City.*

Alberton Ry, Station, P.E.I. (Ans.) 2503 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1510 (i).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims, &c. (remarks) 3201 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation (explanation) 6736 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14440 (vi).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5068 (ii).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Canadian Freight Classification, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

——— O.C., *re* (remarks) 3302 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Securities B. 209 (prop. Res.) 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5101 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; in Com., 5589, 5786,

Canadian Northern Ry. Co., Ret. *re* Estimate of Cost laid on Table, 5052 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3227, 3982 (ii).

C. P. Ry. and Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ans.) 2306 (i).

C. P. Ry. Expenditure for Rolling Stock, 1902-3 (Ans.) 2311 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5556 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*
Canal Employees, Wages, &c. (remarks) 2303 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Appnmt. of Geo. Robertson (Ans.) 668 (i).
——— Names, &c. (Ans.) 875 (i).
——— Rep. to Govt. (Ans.) 669 (i).
——— Rep., &c. (remarks) 1199 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c. (Ans.) 1034 (i).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Charlottetown P. E. I. Ry. Station, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).
Commercial Travellers, Fares, &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5680 (iii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Election B.'
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1325 (i) 3237 (ii).
Demurrage on Cars, I.C.R., collected, &c. (Ans.) 3672, 4959 (ii).
Dixon, F. A., Chief Cor. Clerk, &c. (Ans.) 5319 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13609, 14425 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3007 (ii).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578, 3982 (ii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 293, 615 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5139 (iii) 7823 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8406; ('Senator Cox cannot wait') 8410 (iv).
G. T. Transcontinental Ry. and Govt. Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 675, 1031 (i).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental.'
Hamilton Electric Light, &c., Power, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3803 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Agreement, &c., Amt. paid (Ans.) 2758 (ii).
——— Contractor's Name, &c. (Ans.) 2584 (ii).
——— Preparation of Contract (Ans.) 4444 (ii).
Hudson's Bay, Change of Name B. 173 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 1°, 2795 (ii).
Immigrants for Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 1855 (i).
I. C. R. and G. T. R. Terminal Facilities at Bonaventure, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).
——— Traffic Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).
I. C. Ry., Coal Rates (Ans.) 6167 (iii).
——— Demurrage Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 4672, 4952 (ii).
——— Free Passes, Names, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337 (i).
——— General Statement, on M. for Sup., 3633 (ii).
——— Gross Earnings, Interim Reps., &c. (Ans.) 4445 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 3538 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*
I. C. Ry., Locomotives, Cars, purchased, &c. (Ans.) 4361 (ii).
——— Lorne Siding (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
——— Official Guide, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3535 (ii.)
——— Ouelle River Spur Line, &c. (Ans.) 541 (i).
——— Private Cars (Ans.) 2309 (i).
——— Rates for Live Stock and Coal, &c. (Ans.) 1857 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Pottinger, on M. (Mr. *Haggart*) for Copy, 3806 (ii).
——— Scotch Hill Station (Ans.) 872 (i).
——— Sussex, N.B., Roundhouse, Gates, &c. (Ans.) 4673 (ii).
——— Trackmen's Wages, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).
——— Traffic Rates, on Inquiry for Papers, 3712 (ii).
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3301 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 932 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 873 (i).
Lévis Land Purchase, I.C.R., Payment, &c. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2512.
Lorne Siding, I.C.R., Ry. Traffic, &c. (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
Man. and N. W. T. Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidies granted by Govt. (Ans.) 1197 (i).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Ministerial Changes, on Mr. Tarte's Resignation (explanation) 145 (i).
——— on Mr. Blair's Resignation (explanation) 6736 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (*Mr. Fielding*) in Com., 4454 (ii).
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 6080 (iii).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (*Mr. Lemieux*) in Com., 3222 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston & St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (*Mr. German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
O'Leary Station, P.E.I., Branch Line (Ans.) 6168 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry., Sale of Tickets (Ans.) 2503 (ii).
——— Total Cost, Misrepresentation, &c. (remarks) 1680 (i).
Private Cars, I.C.R., &c. (Ans.) 2309 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4206 (ii).
Pugwash, N.S., Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 1856 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14728 (vi).
Railway Accidents, Duties of Public Officials (Ans.) 1032 (i).
——— Investigations, &c. (remarks) 1331 (i).
——— Loss of Life (Ans.) 873 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 561 (i); (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c. (agreed to Y. 99: N. 53) 565 (i).

Railway Act (Consolidation) Amt. (B. 21) 1° m., 244 (i) on M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591, 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728, 4743 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5561, 5680, 5765, 6071, 6173, 6206, 6273 (iii), 8139 (iv).

——— Conference with Senate *re* Amts. to B. 21 (remarks) 14763 (vi).

—— (telephones) 5534 (iii).

Railways and Canals Dep't. Rep. (presented) 92.

Ry. Commissioners' Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv).

Ry. Land Grants voted by Parlt., &c. (Ans.) 1678 (i).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546 (i).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14440 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies, Interest payable, &c. (Ans.) 3971.

Ry. Subsidies in Land and Money in Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 1677 (i).

Ry. Subsidies (money) paid by Govt. in Provs. (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Ry. Subsidies paid by Govt. since Confederation (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Ry. Subsidies voted and paid, 1901-3 (Ans.) 2306.

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 5892 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (N.B.) 11812 (v).

Resignation as Minister: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Scotch Hill Station, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 872 (i).

Semaphore Lights, P.E.I., Discontinuance, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 452 (i).

Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2584 (ii).

South Shore Ry., Complaints *re* Safety (remarks) 206 (i).

——— Working of, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 450 (i).

Station Agents, P.E.I., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 4361.

Steel Rails, Contract, Price, &c. (Ans.) 285 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Railways (salaries) 333 (i).

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (St. John and Belfast) 7733 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John quarantine water service) 419 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3699; (general statement) 3633; (Levis accommodation) 3703; (original construction) 3698; (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii).

Telephone Cos. in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2585 (ii).

Ties on Govt. Rys., Importation, &c. (Ans.) 1679.

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii), on M. to resume adjnd. deb., 6198 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Application for Govt. Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1026 (i).

——— Contract with Govt. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).

——— (personal explanation) 2794 (ii).

——— Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 672 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., G. T. P. R., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 447 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., Proposals to Govt. (Ans.) 874 (i).

——— *See* G. T. P. Bill.

Treadgold Concessions, Appmnt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2863, 4513 (ii).

——— Appmnt. of Commission (remarks) 3878.

Trent Canal, Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).

——— Surveys at Rice Lake, on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2317, 2327 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2345 (i).

Welland Canal Water Power and St. Catharines Board of Trade, &c. (Ans.) 668 (i).

——— O. Cs. *re* (Ans.) 1859 (i).

West Lorne Accident, Commissioners (Ans.) 6168 (iii).

——— Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 5088 (ii).

——— on inquiry for Rep., 5242 (iii).

——— Verdict, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).

White, Albert S., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4673 (ii).

Windsor Junction Ry. Accident, Papers laid on table, 3712 (ii).

Winter Communication with P. E. I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1048, 1053 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick W., K.C.M.G.

(Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings, (N.S.)*.

Blankets, Web Cloth, &c., Dates of Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 10954 (v).

Brigade Camp, Sussex, N.B. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

Canadian (3rd) Mounted Rifles, Medals, &c. (Ans.) 1675 (i).

Can. S. A. Constabulary, Attestation, Discharge, &c. (Ans.) 14287 (vi).

Cartoons in *Military Gazette*, &c. (Ans.) 2103 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646 (iii).

Dixon, Capt., Rep. *re* S. Africa War (Ans.) 7914 (iv).

Dundonald, G.O.C., Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2404 (i).

Fishery Guardian, J. M. DesRoches, Alleged Fraud, &c. (Ans.) 10955 (v).

G. O. C. Commanding, Rep., &c., Suppression of (Ans.) 670 (i).

Gordon Highlanders' Trophy (remarks) 7253 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co., Par. in *Globe*, 5894 (iii).

Hutton, Maj. Gen., on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 207 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*
King's S. A. Medals, Pet. from N.C.Os., &c. (Ans.) 10491 (v).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Payment of Militia, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3802 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. and Mr. Chamberlain's Suggestions (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction (Ans.) 669 (i).
Militia Deptl. Rep. (presented) 283 (i).
Militia Pay and Allowance, General Statement in Com. of Sup., 13379 (vi).
Militia Pensions Act Amt. (B. 78) 1°m., 872 (i); and in Com., 2°m., 1116, 2240 (i).
Militia Reserve at Port Moody, &c. (Ans.) 447.
Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville (Ans.) 8616 (iv).
Military Stores, Erection of Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13055 (vi).
Mills, Mr., Annapolis, Claims against (Ans.) 6167 (iii).
Ninety-fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (iv).
Permanent Corps Officers, Qualifications, Certificates (Ans.) 4443 (ii) 6434 (iii).
Permanent Force, Increase of Pay (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades, &c. (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
'Ragging' in the British Army, on M. for Sup., 3132 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Royal Canadian Regiment, Strength, &c. (Ans.) 3802 (ii).
St. Johns Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 12497 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Action (remarks) 12718 (vi).
——Par. in 'Star' *re* Militia (remarks) 12939.(vi).
S. A. Constabulary, Complaints *re* Grievances, &c. (Ans.) 1028 (i).
S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, Reinstated, &c. (Ans.) 1027 (i).
——Medals, Regulations, &c. (remarks) 8319.(iv).
———Pensions to Canadians (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
———Saddles and Bridles (Ans.) 1675 (i).
See 'Canadian,' &c.
Springhill Armouries, Caretaker, &c. (Ans.) 1857 (i).
Sussex Armoury, Construction, &c., Overseer's Qualifications (Ans.) 8332 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Militia (salaries) 221 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 3603; (Association grants) 3767; (contingencies) 3778 (ii); (Cook *vs.* Cole, costs) 6950; (coronation contingent) 6950 (iii); (defence scheme) 3763 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (Esquimalt defences) 3778; (G. O. C.) 3781 (ii); (Hamilton drill hall) 6949 (iii); (Martineau commission) 3585, 3752; (Military college) 3778; (military stores branch) 3608; (pay and allowance) 3584 (ii); (pay and allowance general statement) 13379 (vi); (paving streets, Winnipeg barracks) 6949 (iii); (properties) 3611; (Toronto, drill shed) 3618; (transport and freight) 3752; (Valleyfield strike) 3587, 3753 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (armouries) 970 (i); Man. (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13127; N. B. (military buildings) 13041; (St. John, drill hall) 13043; N. S. (Middleton, armoury) 970 (i); N. W. T. (Strathcona Horse, barracks) 13130; Ont. (armouries, generally) 13084; (Belleville, armoury) 970 (i) 13082; (Military College, Kingston) 13094; (Toronto, drill hall) 13086; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086 (vi); Ottawa (desks, &c.) 986; (Royal Mint) 346 (i); Que. (citadel, drill shed) 13056 (vi); (L'Assomption) 430 (i); (military buildings) 13054; (Montreal, barracks) 13076; (Quebec, drill hall addition) 13077; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Kingsport, pier) 1103 (i).
Tents for N. W. Mounted Police, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3804 (ii).
——— *See* 'Woods,' &c.
Transcontinental (Can.) Ry., Representations *re* Military Purposes (Ans.) 541 (i).
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Payment of Militia (Ans.) 13571 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia,' &c.
Veterans, Pet. *re* Indemnity for Military Service (Ans.) 11189 (v).
Volunteers Man. and N. W. T., Land Scrip, &c. (Ans.) 820 (i).
Woods, J. W., Amount paid for tents, &c. 5764 (iii).
——— *See* 'Tents,' &c.

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*
Address, on The, 23 (i).
Colonial Conference, 25; Conference between Colonies, 24; Discrimination by Germany, 29; Relations with Newfoundland and French Shore Question, 30; Alaska Boundary, and Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, 31; Naval Reserve, 36; Transportation Question, 37; Tariff Revision, 38; Chinese Immigration Policy, 39 (i).
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6637 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Award, Alleged Interview with Mr. Aylesworth (remarks) 13667, 13958 (vi).
——— remarks *re* Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).
——— Alverstone, Lord, Criticism *re* Award, 13958, 13963 (vi).
——— Alverstone, Lord, Telegram (remarks) 13806 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Bond-Hay Treaty, Inquiry for Papers *re* (remarks) 878 (i), 14521 (vi).

——— convention respecting (remarks) 480 (i).

——— Notice of Remarks, 14765 (vi).

——— Official Information, Cor., &c. (remarks) 14521 (vi).

——— Mr. Sifton's Telegram *re*, 14530 (vi).

——— Protest of Canadian Commissioners, Cor. *re*, 14689 (vi).

American Cattle purchased for British Govt., Par. in Montreal *Gazette*, 5414 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4244 (ii).

Apples, Canadian Packing, &c., on Ques. of Order, 11185 (v).

Arsenault, Capt., Compensation for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5966 (iii)

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. *re* Debts, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 155, 14771 (vi).

Atlantic Fast ss. Service (remarks) on Notice of M., 13948 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., &c. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 14159; (Neg. Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

Requirements of present age, 14159; average time from Can. to G.B. 9, 10 and 11 days; forty years ago, logs of Str. *Asia*, stmt. of mercantile journal, 14159; records, &c. 14159; Sir Chas. Tupper's contract, 1896, 14161; Petersen, Tate & Co.'s tender, 1896, 14161; Allan's contract, Sir Wilfrid's reasons for non-acceptance, 14161; Toronto speech of Sir Wilfrid, 'Economical Govt.,' 14162; deposit returned to Petersen & Co., 14163; unpopularity, &c., 14164; prophecy, 14165; 21-knot service, no 2nd class service, 14166; New York route supplying boats, 14166; Govt. not enthusiastic, inspiration in Ottawa *Free Press*, 14167; tenders from Allan and British North Atlantic ss. Co., 14168; development of western country, willing to assist in giving aid, 14169; freight carried, 14169; cost of building, 14169; negotiations for short periods, 14170.

Atlantic Fast Service, Govt. Policy (remarks) 4007 (ii).

——— Tenders, &c. (remarks) 3882, 4120, 4445 (ii).

——— Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
See "Supply—Mail Subsides", &c.

Atlantic, North Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

——— *See* 'North.'

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11163 (v).

——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 13258 (vi).

——— Inquiry for Cor., &c., 11427, 11692 (v).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N. W. T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 884 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Autonomy of the N.W.T. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

——— O.C.'s, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2778 (ii).

——— inquiry for ret., 5083 (ii).

——— Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6891 (iii).

——— Return *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 256,' &c., 'Provincial,' &c.

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6365 (iii)).

Binder Twine Bounties Res., on Ques. of Order, 7305 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6757 (iii).

——— (remarks) 6522 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) 12758. vi

Bopp, Mr., German Consul, Cor. with Germany and Dom. Govt. &c. (remarks) 12218 (v),

——— *See* 'Budget,' &c.

B.C. Canners: *See* 'Salmon,' &c.

B.C. Statutes, Disallowance of, &c. (M. for O.C.'s, &c*) 706 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i).

——— (M.) to print cor., 2675 (ii).

Brunet, Arthur and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., O.Cs., &c., 106 (i).

Budget, The, 1462 (i).

Prosperity of Canada and former declarations of ministers, 1463; imports and exports, 1476, 1491; taxation, former utterances by ministers, 1465; expenditures, comparisons with former govts., 1468; per capita expenditure, 1470; capital and revenue expenditure of different depts., 1471; Public debt, 1472; surpluses and former utterances of ministers, 1473; Colonial Conference, Mr. Chamberlain's speech *re* preference, 1480; post office revenue, letter carrier's salaries, 1483; I.C.R. 'alleged' surplus, 1483; trade negotiations with other countries, 1484; cor. with Herr Bopp, &c. (remarks) 1484; German surtax former amt. *re*, 1485; Preferential trade, attitude of Govt., 1487-1490; tariff revision, 1493; policy should be, 1494; Canada as an agricultural country, adequate protection, 1495, 1500; and relations with U.S., 1496; fiscal policy of govt. and free trade utterances, 1498; protection to the farmers, 1500; protection to Can. industries, 1501; tariff relations with U.S., 1502; Res. *re* tariff policy 'adequate protection,' 1503; editorial of N.S. paper *re* coal duty, 1503 (i).

Budget, The,—Report of Winnipeg Speech *re* Agricultural Implements, 2192 (i).

——— Amt., Neg. (Y. 54; N. 107) 2235 (i).

Business of the Hse., Announcement *re* Further Govt. Business (remarks) 13667 (vi).

——— (remarks) 1110 (i), 3794 (ii),

——— Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Late Sittings (remarks) 3207 (ii).

——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4347 (ii).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 3708 (ii).

——— Procedure on Order Paper (remarks) 2302.

——— Suppl. Estimates (remarks) 4957 (ii).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5062 (ii).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial Explanation.'

Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8234 (iv).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian-German Fiscal Policy, Cor. with Herr Bopp (remarks) 12218 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4371, 4398, 4999, 5091, 5111, (ii), 5590, 5788 (iii).

C. P. R. Lands Exempt from Taxes in Man. and N. W. T. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5557 (iii).

Capital Cases, Commutation of Sentences, &c. (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4591 (ii).

Cargill, Henry, late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 12938 (vi).

Carlin, Peter J., Postmaster at Whitney Pier, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 130, 668 (i).

Carver *vs.* King, Commutation, &c., Reps. *re* (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) 267 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission, Rep., &c. (remarks) 1199 (i).

——— *See* 'Ry. Act B. 21.'

Census, &c. (remarks) 13672 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture, Census, &c.'

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5960, 6201 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 601 (i).

Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3191 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12505, 12539 (v).

Civil Service (superannuation) Act Amt. B. 49 in Com. on prop. res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 594 (i).

Clayton-Pulwer Treaty, Cor., &c., Inquiry for Papers *re* Alaskan Boundary, 14521 (vi).

——— *See* 'Alaskan,' &c.

Colonial Conference, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3632 (ii), 7923 (iv).

Columbia River Improvement Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. *Galliher*) on Sen. Amts., 6894 (iii).

Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Election B. 3.

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7492 (iii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3045, in Com. on B., 4010; on M. for 3°, 4187 (ii).

——— B. 273 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 14757 (vi).

Dawson Board of Trade, Communication *re* Treadgold Concessions (read) 1024 (i).

——— *See* 'Treadgold,' &c.

Debates, Official (remarks) 6 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Desjardins Canal B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4213 (ii).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) 13683 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 899; in Com., 907 (i); (compulsory voting) 13584; on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to dischg. Order, 14769 (vi).

——— Govtl. Intention (remarks) 12218 (v); 12719 (vi).

——— B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 95, in Com., 635, 1115; (objection) 945 (i).

——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com., 1064 (i).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6440 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3023, 3036, 4680 (ii).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

Election Law, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12218 (v).

——— *See* 'Dom. Election Bills.'

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8244 (iv), on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93; in Com., 620 (i).

Farquharson, Mr., Decease of (remarks) 5513 (iii).

Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.

Ferries, Control of, in Com. of Sup., 13697 (vi).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6538; in Com., 6896, 6910 (iii).

Fishing Industry, N.S., Harbour Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vi).

See 'Privilege,' &c.

France and Canada, SS. Service (telegram read) 4957 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt, B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3820 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).

German Consul Bopp, Cor. with Can. Govt., &c. (remarks) 12218 (v).

German Surtax, in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).

——— *See* 'Customs Bills,' 'Budget,' &c.

'Gerrymander' Bill: *See* 'Representation B 66.'

Good Shepherd Reformatory B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 4178; in Com., 4842 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1114 (i).

——— Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

——— Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).

——— Redistribution Bill (remarks) 204 (i).

——— *See* 'Business,' &c.

Govt. Ry. Policy (remarks) *re* Delay, 7298 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Grain Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 13807 (vi).

Grain Standards, Samples *re* &c. (remarks) 11180 (v).

Grain Weighing in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4189 (ii).

——— *See* 'Automatic,' 'Weights and Measures,' 'Man. Grain B.' &c.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii); in Com., 5137 (iii); 7816, 7842; on M. for 3°, 8059 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Bill Subsidy 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8961; on M. for 1°, 7697; 'Alternative Policy,' 8988, 8994, 9005 (iv); in Com. on B., 11190, 11204, 11240, 11263, 11308, 11395, 12075; in Com. (Amts.) 11833, 11890; in Com. (Amt. *re* securities 11959, 12015 (v); on M. for 3°, 12612; (amt.) 12642; Neg. (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690; on M. for 3°, 12755, 12770; on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Bill, Pets. *re* Authenticity, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Privs. and Elections Com., 13267 (vi).

——— (remarks) 13559 (vi).

——— Meetings of Com. (remarks) 13671 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to read Affidavits, Ques. of Order 14846 (vi).

G. T. P. Ry. Bill, Customs Duties, Legal Opinions (read) 11337 (v).

——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399, 8086 (iv).

——— Plans presented (remarks) 8082 (iv).

——— Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 14765 (vi).

Halifax Common, Rights of City, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).

Halifax Museum, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

Halifax P. O. Employees, Pet. *re* Salaries (remarks) on Conc., 14759 (vi).

Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks(in Com. of Sup., 13764 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).

——— (remarks) 1057 (i).

Hides Inspection: *See* 'Gen. Inspection B. 48.'

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 782 (i).

Huron, Erie and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1131 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Imperial Conference Cor., Can. Govt's. Refusal, &c. (remarks) 9457 (iv).

——— Report *re* (remarks) 3632 (ii) 7923 (iv).

——— *See* 'Alaskan,' &c., 'Colonial,' &c.

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2385 (i), 2788 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927, 930 (i).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928 (iv).

——— on M. for Sup. (remarks) 4040 (ii).

——— (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

——— Tariff Protection (notice of amt.) 3864 (ii).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).

Judges of N.W. Ters. Act. Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 12610 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11406 (v).

Judges of Provincial Courts and Sup. Courts, Quebec (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 11821 (v).

Judges Retiring Allowances B (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8093 (iv).

Judges of the Superior Court (Retiring Allowance) B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 94 (i).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2778 (ii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 955 (i).

Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Cor., 100 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8197 (iv).

Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).

Librarians of Parlt., Salary B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res. 13832 (vi).

Lt. Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administration (remarks) 112 (i).

Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2349 (i).

Long Lake & Sas. Ry. Surveys: *See* 'Supply—Dom. Lands.'

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2676 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Privs. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8048 (iv).

Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1586 (i).

Lumber Trade in B.C., Tel. from Manufacturing Industry *re* U.S. Duty, &c., Importations, 14766 (vi).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Stmnt. *re* Certain Rooms in H. of C. (remarks) 14530 (vi).

———Forwarding, &c. (remarks) 14569, 14682 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Threats to Express Cos. (remarks) 14851 (vi).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8005 (iv.); on Sen. Amts., 13624 (vi).
Man. Judgeship, Delay of Appnmt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
Man. School Lands, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).
Marconi System of Wireless Telegraphy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com. 5098 (ii).
Master and Mates B. 226 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6544 (iii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand) 5720 (iii).
Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) in Com., 1117 (i).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 20.
Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of (remarks) 2794 (ii).
Mining Cos. Incorporation B. (remarks) 14850 (vi).
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 148 (i) 6757 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).
Ministers, Reduction in Number of Depts.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5417 (iii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt. Governor of Ontario, Decease of (remarks) 1578 (i).
——— *See* 'Lt. Gov.,' &c.
Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14595 (vi).
Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779 (vi).
Newspaper Despatches from G. B.: *See* 'Cable,' &c.
Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6428 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 13372 (vi).
———Inquiry for Papers, 13667, 13933 (vi).
N.W. Ter. Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 13856 (vi).
——— Govt. Financial Aid B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12843 (vi).
——— Naturalization Returns (M. for Stmnt.*) 3804 (ii).
——— Prov. Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com,, 2719 (ii).
Order in the House (remarks) 12723 (vi).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452, 6807.
Pacific Cable, Concessions by Australia to Eastern Tel. Co. (remarks) 2675 (ii).
B

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Pardons, Preogative of His Ex., &c., on M. (Mr *Casgrain*) for Ret., 567 (i).
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14857.
——— *See* 'Sessions,' &c.
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3625; in Com., 4213, 4676 (ii).
Peggy's Cove Lighthouse, Retirement of Geo. Swinehammer (Ques.) 2312 (i).
Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and *Le Canada* Canvassing (remarks) 13985 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4177 (ii); in Com., 6456 (iii).
Pension for S. A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14595 (vi).
Petersen, Tate & Co., Ref. to in Deb. on Atlantic Fast ss. Service, 14159 (vi).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., on Res., 12782; on M. for 2°, 12984 (vi).
——— *See* 'Shipping,' &c.
Posters, Indecent, Handbills, Exclusion, &c., in Com, on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).
Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14676 (vi).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5657; in Com., 5667 (ii).
Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'Cable,' &c.
Private Bills, Pets.: *See* 'Rules,' &c.
Privilege, Ques of (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) *re* 'Outskirts of Civilization,' Ques. of Order, 13374 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11565 (v).
Provincial Autonomy, Further Cor,, &c. (remarks) 7296 (iii).
——— in N.W.T. (M.) to print ret., 5582 (iii).
——— Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii).
——— *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts Com., Addition of Name (M.) 3431 (ii).
Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4204 (ii).
Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4221 (ii).
Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com.. 14749 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. *Power*) in Com., 4586 (iii).
Questions by Members, Answers *re* (remarks) 544 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).
——— Consolidation Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 245 (i); in Com., 2599, 3714, 3746, 3841, 3886, 3974, 3985, 4128, 4564, 4693 (ii); 5699, 5770, 6076 (iii), 8131 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13835 (vi).
——— on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14520 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr, *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2786 (ii).

——— (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1060 (i).

——— (supplies for Govt. rys.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12946 (vi).

Ry. Debts B.: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2545 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14514, 14735; (auditing by Aud. Gen.) 14516; (location of rys., &c.) 14514; (payments, &c.) Suggestions *re* Safeguarding (remarks) 14512; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14515 (vi).

Ry. Mail Clerks, &c., in Com. on Postoffice Bill, 5667 (iii).

Ry. Mail Service, N.W.T., Overcrowding of Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5933 (iii).

Railway Policy of Govt., Delay in bringing down (M. to adjn. Hse.) 7109 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies voted for 1900, 1901, 1902 (remarks) 12805, 12843, 13005 (vi).

Rainy River Mail Service, Tel. (read) 6889 (iii).

Redistribution B.: *See* 'Representation B. 66.'

Reformatory Prisons, B. 221 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8087 (iv).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 715; on M. for 2°, 1207, 1265; on Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1290 (i); in Com., 11439, 11589; (Dauphin) 11759; (N.S.) 11793; (Quebec) 11793; (Toronto) 11695; (Waterloo) 11645; on M. for 3°, 12481 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 11618 (v).

——— Evidence laid on Table, &c. (remarks) 11423 (v).

——— N.B., Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, 941 (i).

——— P.E.I. and N.B., Cor. respecting (remarks) 876 (i).

——— Printing of Amendments, &c. (remarks) 11423 (v).

——— Schedules, Maps, &c. (remarks) 877 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5413 (iii).

——— Complaint *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

Rules, Revision, &c. *re* Pets. for Private Bills, 4441 (ii).

St. Chrysostome Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 6999 (iii) 13303, 13377 (vi).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4589 (ii).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 3298 (ii); in Com., 6920 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Salmon Industry, B.C., Tel. from Fraser River Canners Ass'on (read) 9970 (iv).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Govt. Proposals (remarks) 12717 (vi).

——— and Militi a(remarks) 12941 (vi).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. Mr. *Boyd*) 467 (i).

——— *See* 'Parliament.'

Settlers' Claim *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Com. of Sup., 13954 (vi).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12802; in Com. on B., 12994; on M. for 3°, 13560 (vi).

——— *See* 'Safety' &c.

Sorel, Deep Water Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12845 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours, &c., Quebec.'

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8267 (iv).

S. A. War, Purchase of Supplies by Imp. Govt. (M. for copies of O. Cs., &c.) 2760 (i).

——— *See* 'Hay and Oats,' &c.

Stanley and *Lansdowne*, Strs., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 13519 (vi).

Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 13637 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6513; in Com. on B. 6916 (iii).

——— B. 237 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12777 (vi).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iii).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7204 (iii).

Stuart, Capt. D. C.: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture,'

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 250,' &c.

Supply Bill in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5996 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* Prop. Res., 6003 (iii).

Supply Bill, 218, in Com., 6170 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, &c.) 4643, 4801; (census tabulators) 4656; (dairying branch) 4671; (Japan exhibition) 4626; (Stuart, Capt., dismissal, &c.) 4353 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (electric stations by-wash) 12906; (tow paths) 12907 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Finance (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 225 (i); Geological Survey (Low, Mr., salary) 13771; (salaries) 13770 (vi); Gov. Gen's Office (salaries) 207; Indian Affairs (salaries) 274; Inland Rev. (salaries) 227 (i); Interior (clerical assistance) 13769 (vi); (salaries) 268 (i), 13762; (Mines branch, salaries) 13763 (vi); Justice (salaries) 212 (i); N. W. Mounted Police (Drake, E. F., salary) 13761; (salaries) 13761 (vi).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3782 (ii); (salaries, overtime) 13985 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L. – *Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13955 (vi); (boundary delimitations) 6790; (homestead entries) 6773; (homestead inspectors) 6767; (inspector's expenses) 6766; (Long Lake and Saskatchewan ry. survey) 6941 (iii); (salaries, outside service) 13773 (vi); (surveys) 6939 (iii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 13776; (tree planting) 13775 (vi).

Electric Light (inspectors) 5407, 5410 (iii).

Excise (Montreal office, reimbursement) 5405; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5404 (iii).

Fisheries (fishery officers salaries) 5122; (lobster factories inspection) 5122 (ii).

Geological Survey (metallurgical, salaries) 13778 (vi); (plans, plotting, &c.) 6826 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6709; (repatriation, &c.) 6709 (iii).

Indians—B. C. (medical attendance) 13785; (salaries) 13785; Man. and N.W.T. (surveys, &c.) 13784; N.S. (land purchase) 13781 (vi).

Inland Revenue (Mr. Bourassa, shortage) 5408 (Mr. Ferguson, legal services) 5412; (Mr. Kelly, refund) 5406 (iii); (wood alcohol) 231 (i).

Interior (Amos Barnes, claims) 6923; (astronomical observatory) 6793; (astronomical work) 6790; (Banff museum) 6927; (Liard River miners, relief) 6926 (iii).

Justice, Administration of (Ad Hoc judges allowances) 3402; B.C. (judges travelling allowances) 3399; Exchequer Court (Admiralty, accommodation) 3408; (Admiralty registrar) 3408; Man. (judges' travelling allowance) 3399; Miscellaneous (prisoners in N.W.T.) 3399 (ii); (Statutes, Revision) 14644 (vi); N.B. (divorce court) 3400; Supreme Court (law books) 3405; (library) 3402; (Yukon law books) 3506; (police magistrates) 3422; (sheriff Eilbeck, salary) 3410; (stenographers) 3411; (travelling allowance) 3409.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str., &c.) 5746 (iii); (St. Lawrence route) 4157 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 5997 (iii), 7606 (iv), 13673 (vi); Can. and S. Africa) 7752; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756; (Grand Manan and mainland) 7742 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii); Magdalen islands) 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi); Manchester and Montreal) 7745; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 7744; (P. E. I. and mainland) 7742 (iv); (P. E. I. and Newfoundland) 13676; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13695; (St. John, N. B. and Glasgow) 13674 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740 (iv); (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 13695; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677 (vi); (Victoria and San Francisco) 7741 (iv).

Militia (Cooke *vs.* Cole, costs) 6951 (iii); (Valleyfield strike) 3759 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13958; (Canadian Mining Institute) 13965 (vi); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984; (naturalization Act, expenses) 6952; (Petersen, Tate & Co., deposit) 6953 (iii); (salaries) 13966 (vi); (unforeseen expenses) 6952 (iii).

N.W.T., Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6946 (iii); (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 4116; (Govt. steamers, repairs, supplies, &c.) 4074 (ii), 13519; (masters and mates examination) 13524 (vi); (meteorological service) 4118; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4114 (ii).

Post Office (Halifax) 6004; (P. E. I. winter service) 5943; (ry. mail clerks) 5933; (salaries) 5924 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (architect's staff) 962; (armouries) 967; (clerks of works) 963; (heating, &c.) 1065; (lighting) 1067; (water supply) 1067 (i); **N.B.** (Moncton, P.O.) 13038; (St. John, immigrant shed) 13040; (quarantine station, water service) 13041; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13041 (vi); **N.W.T.** (courthouses, &c.) 958; (Dom. buildings, repairs) 959; (Macleod, court-house) 959; (Yorkton, court-house) 961 (i); **N.S.** (Halifax, custom house) 13031; (Halifax immigration shed) 13033; (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 13030 (vi); (Middleton armoury) 969 (i); (Sydney Mines) 13028; (Sydney, post office) 13035 (vi); **Ont.** (Alexandria, P.O.) 488 (i); (Belleville, armoury) 13082; (Brantford, drill hall) 13108 (vi); (Clinton, P.O.) 518, 528 (i); (St. Catherines drill hall) 13106; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13110; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086; (Toronto, P.O., addition) 13101; **Ottawa** (additional rooms) 13007 (vi); (census buildings) 992; (elevators) 1011; (heating, &c.) 1009; (lighting) 1012; (Major's Hill park) 1015; (repairs, &c.) 987; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996 (i); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 13087; (steel shelving) 13093; **P.E.I.** (Charlottetown, Dom. Buildings) 13036; **Que.** (Acton Vale, P.O.) 13061; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13076; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 13058; (Montreal, postal station) 13081; (Quebec, drill hall) 13078; (citadel drill shed) 13054, 13056; (military buildings) 13054; (St. John's, P.O.) 13050; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi).

Dredging (new dredging plant) 2673 (ii).

Generally (transportation facilities, Port Colborne) 13024.

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 13304 (vi); **Man.** (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3358; **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); **N.B.** (Arsenault, Capt., compensation) 13231; (Campbellton wharf) 13005; **N.S.** (Abbott's harbour) 13141 (vi); (Amagandus wharf) 1068; (Bailey's Brook wharf) 1072 (i); (Baxter's breakwater) 13143; (Baxter's Cove) 13143; (Bayfield wharf) 13141; (Big harbour wharf) 13143 (vi); (Big Pond wharf) 1073 (i); (Breton's Cove) 13153 (vi); (Campbellton wharf) 1142; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1079 (i), 13178 (vi); (Digby pier) 1083; (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Economy wharf) 1087; (Fort Lawrence pier) 1087 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay wharf) 1087 (i), 13184 (vi); (Grand River entrance) 1094; (Green Cove harbour) 1100; (Herring Cove breakwater) 1102 (i); (Janvrin's Island wharf) 1102 (i); (Jeddore, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Judique, breakwater) 1103; (Kingsport pier) 1103; (Lingan beach) 1105; (Lunenburg harbour) 1110; (Margaree wharf) 1133; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Necum Teuch wharf) 1137; (New harbour) 1145; (Ogden's Pond) 1145; (Petit de Grat) 1146; (Port George breakwater) 1146; (Port Hawkesbury) 1146; (Sandy Cove breakwater) 1149; (Short Beach breakwater) 1149 (i); (Summerville wharf) 13213; (Swim's Point wharf) 13211; (Tenecape breakwater) 13213 (vi); (Three Fathoms harbour) 1149 (i); (Victoria beach wharf) 13215; (Wallace harbour) 13216 (vi); (Washabuck wharf) 1150 (i); (Wentworth wharf) 13216 (vi); (West B ccaro channel) 1150 (i); (West Bay wharf) 13217 (vi); **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191 (i); (Kingston graving

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

dock) 13023; (Midland) 13248 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3344 (ii); (Port Arthur dredging) 13012; (Port Perry) 13249 (vi); Que. (Bonaventure East breakwater) 13446; (Cacouna wharf) 13448 (vi); (Chateauguay river) 3210 (ii); (Grand Valley pier) conc., 6070 (iii); (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Lake St. John dredging) 13459; (Lotbinière wharf) 13460 (vi); (Magdalen islands) 2265 (i); (Maguasha pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Mistook wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay wharf) 2266, 2270 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13465 (vi); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279; (Rivière du Loup, wharf) 2281 (i), 13476; (Rivière Verte) 13471 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3308 (ii); (St. Louis river) 13474; (Sacre-Cœur wharf) 13479 (vi); (Sorel wharf) 2296 (i); (Sorel deep water wharf) 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi); (Touladie river) 2287 (i).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (Art gallery) 2725; (surveys, &c.) 2724; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2663 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2695.

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2680 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 2992; (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2997; (N.W.T.) 2991 (ii); Que. (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332; (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334; (Ste. Anne de Saguenay) 13331 (vi).

Railways—Generally (Dixon, F. A.) 2730; I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3700 (ii); (Halifax accommodation) 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi); (Lévis accommodation) 3704 (ii), 7520 (iii); (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7760; (international customs bureau) 7760; (iron and steel bounties) 7762 (iv).

Unprovided Items, 6993 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 6940, 7282; (Lithgow, Mr., controller, &c.) 7287; (roads and bridges) 7286 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2366 (i).

Swinehammer, Geo., Light-Keeper at Peggy's Cove, Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 2312 (i).

Swing Bridges B.: *See* 'Navigable.'

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt, (B. 262) in Com. on Res., 12800; in Com. on B., 12993.

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with France, Telegram read, 4957 (ii).

Tarte, Mr., Resignation of: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9425 (iv).

Toronto Post Office, Tender of Mr. Coleman (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13101 (vi).

Trans-continental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 7697 (iv).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. R.'

Transportation Commission, &c. (remarks) 1199.

——— Formation, Personnel, &c. (remarks) 4727, (ii), 7206 (iii), 9819 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Transportation Commission, Further Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 9458 (iv).

——— Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3432 (ii).

——— Instructions, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

——— Inquiry *re*, 4840 (ii).

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 854 (i).

——— *re* Speech from Throne remarks) 3129 (ii).

——— Sir Van Horne's Acceptation (remarks) 7297 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 3298, 3303, 3713, 3872, 4727 (ii), 6638, 7297 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com of Sup., 2887 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4509 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Rep., 3397, 4840 (ii), 13134, 13258 (vi).

Treadgold Concessions and Dawson Board of Trade (remarks) 1024 (i).

Treadgold Concessions, Free Representations, Tel. *re*, 6427 (iii).

——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 4564 (ii).

——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).

——— Representations, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).

——— Sec. 14, &c. (remarks) 4593 (ii).

——— Tel. from W. A. Beddoe, *re* Commissioner's Refusal to produce Files, &c. (remarks) 9818 (iv).

——— Tel. from Board of Trade *re* Scope (remarks) 8086 (iv).

——— Telegram *re* Charges (remarks) 9979 (iv).

——— Terms of Commission (remarks) 4120 (ii).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

U. S. Coasting Laws, Regulations *re* Bonding Privileges (remarks) 13137 (vi).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Vankleek Hill Postal Service, Complaint *re*, on Conc., 14764 (vi).

Vegetables imported from the U. S., Duty collected at Toronto and Montreal (M. fo ret.*) 1058 (i).

Ways and Means *re* G. T. Pacific Survey, in Com., 14765 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2347 (i).

——— (scales for grain) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4189 (ii).

Whitney Pier Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 130 (i).

——— Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1056 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Wood Alcohol purchased from Standard Chemical Co. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).
Woodmen of the World B. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 1854 (i).
Woodstock Post Office, N.B., Inquiry for Ret., 4563, 4593 (ii), 5735 (iii).
Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, &c., in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).
Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 94 (i).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*
Address, on The, 75 (i).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, History of the Case, &c., 14773 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14764 (vi).
See 'Clayton-Bulwer,' &c.
Business of the House (remarks) 2395 (i).
Canadian Cattle Embargo in G. B. (M. for cor.*) 110 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr, *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4383 (ii).
Chambers of Congress Banquet, Speech of Gov. Gen. (Ques.) 10100 (v).
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Abrogaton, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 109 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 7297 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (translators), on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) 111 (i).
Dundonald, Earl, G.O.C., Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).
Fire Sufferers in Ottawa Valley, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3133 (ii).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup. 4768 (ii).
G.O.C.: *See* 'Dundonald.'
Gov. General's Speech at Chambers of Commerce Banquet (Ques.) 10100 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5145 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9666 (iv).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Gov., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 689 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 763 (i).
Immigration Agents, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 289 (i).
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2373 (i).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4329 (ii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c. on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5722 (iii).
Minto, Earl of, Speech at Montreal, 10100 (v).
Naval Reserve, &c., in Can., Cor. between G. B. and Can. (M. for copies*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 7298 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Ottawa Valley Fire Sufferers, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3133 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Stock Gambling, 7204 (iii).
Procedure *re* Adjournment of House (remarks) 6634 (iii).
Speech of Gov. Gen.: *See* 'Gov. Gen.'
Stock Exchange Speculations (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).
——— (personal explanation) 7204 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2362 (i).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6669 ; (expenditure) 6616 (iii).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).
Veterans, Pet. *re* Indemnity for Military Services, &c. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

Boyd, Mr. N., *Macdonald.*
Assiniboine and Red Rivers, Navigation, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 12 8 (i).
Automatic Grain Weighers, N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 849 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 5051 (ii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5073, 5081 (ii).
Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4393 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 397 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *Wm. Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12367, 12532 (v).
Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3172 (ii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3280 (ii).
Fyfe, Mr., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5384 (iii).
Grain Weighing for Threshing in Man and N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. on Weights and Measures Act Amt. B., 4191 (ii).
See 'Automatic.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10076 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10153, 12094, 12269 (v).
Immigrants, Accommodations for Settlers, Par in Winnipeg *Telegram*, 1119 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14233 (vi).
Man. and N. W. T. Senators, Increased Representation, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7992, 8004 (iv).
Man., Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 216 (i).
N. W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 263 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12320 (v).

Boyd, Mr. N.—*Con.*

N. W. Provincial Autonomy, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1296 (i).

Parliament, Date of Convening (remarks) *re* Delay, 462 (i), 14853 (vi).

Postmasters' Association of Man., Memorial *re* Salaries (remarks) 14026 (vi).

Postmasters' Salaries, Increase to Rural Offices (remark) 14026 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2465 (i).

St. Louis Exposition, Live Stock Exhibit, &c. (Ques.) 4837 (ii).

Schooley, W. F. Relief (B. 128) 1°*, 2100; 2°m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223 (ii).

——— (M.) to return Evidence to Senate, 3224.

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting (M.) 462 (i), 14853 (v).

Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13953 (vi).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reps., (remarks) 11824 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census schedules) 4636; (St. Louis, exhibition) 4608; (Treadgold exhibits) 4621.
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 216 (i).
Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5384; (liquor inspection) 5401 (iii).
Justice, Administration of—Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3423; (living allowances) 3418; (telegraph operators) 3418 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13536 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings, Man. (generally) 442; Ont. (rural mail delivery) 514; Que. (Thetford Mines) 442 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3211 (ii); Telegraph Lines (Yukon, working expenses) 14041 (vi).

Telegraph Operators—Yukon: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr, *Bernier*) in Com., 4187, 4191 (ii).

Brock, Mr. W. R., *Centre Toronto.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7330 (iii).

Book-keeping on G. T. R. & C. P. R.: *See* 'G. T. R.,' &c.

Butter Adulteration Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5851 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5635 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5886 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 844 (i).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3262, 3271 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6641 (iii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. (B. 15) in Com., 3239 (ii).

Brock, Mr. W. R.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. (B. 39) 1°*, 541; in Com., 1324 (i), 2779 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3058, 3071 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 300 (i).

France and Can. ss. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12299 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9871; in Com., 10544, 11903, 12012, 12140 (v).

G. T. Ry. and C. P. R. Fiscal Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).

International Ry. Appliances Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 40) 1°*, 591 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft & Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14394 (vi).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).
See Toronto and James' Bay.

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8092 (iv).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2510 (ii).

Patent Act Relief: *See* 'International Ry. Appliances Co.'

Printing Bureau and Union Organizations, &c. (Ques.) 4179 (ii).

Railway Commission (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 14352 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 253 (i); in Com. (drainage) 4747 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2554 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14352 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) 14352 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Toronto) 11705 (v).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Grenville (guide pier) 12909 (vi); Trent (construction) 7551 (iii).
Customs (preferential tariff) 3946 (ii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6684; (U.S. agent) 6877 (iii).
Indians: B.C. (schools, industrial, &c.) 7259 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence route) 4155 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5881 (iii); (Can. and G. B.) 7600 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings—N. B. (quarantine station, drainage, &c.) 487; Ont., (Alexandria P.O.); (Bowmanville) 507; (Clinton P.O.) 526; (Ft. William) 636 (i); (Toronto, branch office) 5920 (iii); Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 985; (Royal Mint) 354; Que.: (L'Assomption) 427 (i).
Harbours and Rivers: B. C. (Esquimalt graving dock) 5919 (iii); N. B. (St. John river, wharfs) 1179 (i); Ont. (Bruce Mines) 5911; (Cobourg, repairs) 5909 (iii); (Port

Brock, Mr. W. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi); Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5896; (Grosbois Isle) 5903; (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Sorel wharf) 12849, 12869 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5905 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13349.

Telegraph Lines:—N.W.T. (Edmonton and Athabasca) 13335; (Wood Mountain Post) 13336; (Victoria to Andrews) 13335 (vi); Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii).

Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 12884; (G.T.R. rental) 12889 (vi); (Ouelle river branch) 7526 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4880 (ii).

——Govt. Policy, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6684 (iii).

Textile Fabrics Inspection: *See* 'Customs,' &c.

Tilsonburg & Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14383 (vi).

Toronto & James Bay Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14358 (vi).

See "James Bay."

Transportation Commission, Appnmt. of, &c., (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 14352 (vi).

——(Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4241 (ii).

Budget, The, 2119 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5454, 5853 (iii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canal Employees, Wages, &c. (remarks) 2303 (i).

Cattle Purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5478 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 839 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14641 (vi).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for Com. on Res., 9394 (iv) Com. on B., 10702 (v); on M. for 3°, 12695 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 754 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10783 (v).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14543 (vi).

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom, Govt. (remarks) 14590 (vi).

S.A.War, Pensions by Govt.(remarks) 14590 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7616 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 492; (Morrisburg) 492 (i).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 540 (i).

St. Chrysôstome Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 158) 1°*, 2582 (ii); M. to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii); in Com., 7771 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Quebec (Chateauguay river) 3209 (ii).

Bruce, Mr. F. C., *Hamilton.*

Mutual Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 707 (i).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7219 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Hamilton P.O.) 439; (Hamilton public buildings) 13113 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington channel) 1359; (Hamilton, dredging) 2638 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep-water wharf) 12857 (vi).

Bureau, Mr. J., *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7379 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 838 (i).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3537 (ii).

Fielding, Dredge, Plans, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 14283 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9906 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Sheds, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).

Public Debt, Amount of Decrease, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4173 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4093 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 988 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3217 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 2286 (i) 5904 (iii); (St. Maurice River, dredging) 13469 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2297 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 100) 1°*, 1295 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7362 (iii).

Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Brockville and North-west Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89) 1°m., 1193 (i).

Canadian Order of Woodmen of World (B.31) 1°*, 367; in Com., 1854 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 1675 (i).
Empire Accident and Surety Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1°*, 1378 (i); in Com., 2755 (ii).
Halton, Peel and Cardwell, Schedules for 1891-1901 (Ques.) 7092 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11584 (v).
Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 203) 1°*, 4727 (ii).

Calvin, Mr. H. A., *Frontenac.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11909 (v).
Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14657 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Galops (channel completion) 14645 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 (iii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *W. York, Ont.*
Business of the House, on M. to take in Mondays, 3710 (ii).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6200 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B., 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3113 (ii).
Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 367 (i).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360 (iii).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 13686 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. 14423 (vi).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Supt., 4792 (ii).
Grain Weighers: *See* 'Inspection.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12044, 12185 (v).
Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14312 (vi).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).
Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures Act.'
Mount Royal Savings Bank incorp. B. 153 (M.) to withdraw Bill, 10831 (v).
Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 210) 1°*, 5679 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3561 (ii), 6105, 6290 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14468 (vi).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11007, 11115; (Kent) 11580; (Toronto) 11701; (York) 11667; on M. for 3°, 12461 (v).
Sault Ste. Louis Light and Power Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 1462 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 5835; N.S. (Arichat) 5835 (iii); Ont., (post offices) 511; (rural mail delivery) 511; (Toronto Junction, post office) 651 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 14069 (vi).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 147) 1°*, 2396; in Com., 4868; M. for Com., 4672 (ii); Resuming adjnd. deb., 5555 (iii); in Com., 7812, 9419 (iv).
——— (remarks) on adjnd. Deb., 5555, 5883 (iii).
——— (remarks) 6105 (iii).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14468 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. (B. 20) 1° m., 203; 2° m., 2338 (i); on M. for 2°, 3245; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 205) 1°*, 5238 (iii).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief (B. 228) M. for Com., 9149 (iv).

Cargill, Mr. H., *E. Bruce.*
Animals Contagious Disease B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B. on M. for Com. of Sup., 395 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10146 (v).
——— Remarks *re* Vote, (remarks) 10538 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephones, &c.) 5521 (iii).
Railways, Comparison of Different Systems (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12891 (v).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10940, 10998 (v).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Touladie river) 2287 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (book keeping) 12891 (vi).

Carroll, Hon. H. G. (Solicitor General) *Kamouraska.*
Binder Twine, Cost of in 1901-2 (Ans.) 447 (i).
——— Name of Purchasers (Ans.) 3798 (ii).
——— Prices fixed, &c. (Ans.) 1595 (i).
Duchesneau, Dr., Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 286 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 925 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, Resignation of Warden (Ans.) 286 (i).
Statutes Revision Commission, Names, Progress, &c. (Ans.) 1030 (i).

Carroll, Hon. H. G.—*Con.*
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2358 (i).
Tobacco Combine, Rep. of Commissioner (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., *N. Hastings.*
Canadian Mint, Erection, &c. (Ques.) 10955 (v).
International Congress of Geology, Visit to Can. (Ques.) 8116 (iv).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8227 (iv).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G., (Minister of Trade and Commerce) *S. Oxford.*
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Opinion of Lord Alverstone, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 13671 (vi).
Allan Line Steamers, Rate of Speed (remarks) 13672 (vi).
Atlantic Fast Line, Tenders, &c. (remarks) 3882, 4727 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Binder Twine Inspection, Method of Inspection (Ans.) 14685 (vi).
——— Inspector Haycock, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5588 (iii).
Budget, The, 1596 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *Wm. Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12535 (v).
Commercial Agencies, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 4360 (ii).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels, Provisions (read) 13681 (vi).
——— (remarks) 7583 (iv).
France and Canada ss. Service Subsidy B. 252 (prop. res.) 10410; in Com. on Res., 11422; in Com., 12295 (v).
Grain Inspection Act (weighmasters) Amt. (B. 266) in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808 (vi).
Grain Inspection, Cost per Car, &c. (Ans.) 4837 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9622 (iv).
——— Pets. *re* Irregularities, Meetings of Com. (remarks) 13671 (vi).
Haycock, Joseph, Inspector of Binder Twine (Ans.) 4959 (ii).
Hides Inspector, Geo. Roy, Appmnt., &c. (Ans.) 3627 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties paid 1890-1903 (Ans.) 11556 (v).
——— *See* 'Supply—Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Japan Trade, Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 8617 (iv).
Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i),
Murray Bay and St. Denis Wharf, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard—*Con.*
N. W. T., Provincial Autonomy (remarks) *re* Ret., 5088 (ii).
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 475 (i), 14858 (vi).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 11447 (v).
Rideau Canal Employés, Delay in Paying (remarks) 13302 (vi).
St. James Division, Electoral District (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Sessions of the House, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i), 14858 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Indian Affairs (salaries) 274 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 7573 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7763; (Man. Grain Act) 7762 (iv), 13698 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada; and G.B.) 5997, (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672 (vi); (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi); (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv); (freight rates, &c.) 7583 (iii); (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756; (Grand Manan and mainland) 7742 (iv); (Halifax and Canso) 6002 (iii); (Halifax and Liverpool) 7730 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi); (Magdalen islands) 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi); (Manchester and Montreal) 7745 (iv); (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 13694 (vi); (P. E. I. and G. B.) 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv); (P E. I. and mainland) 7741 (iv); (P. E. I. and Newfoundland) 13676; (St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac) 13695 (vi); (St. John and Belfast) 7731; (St. John and Digby) 7739; (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7737; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740; (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7759 (iv), 13695; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677 (vi); (Victoria and San Francisco) 7741 (iv); (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694; (wrecking plant) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Lake St. John, wharf) 2246 (i).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7760; (international customs bureau) 7760; (iron and steel bounties) 7762 (iv).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 92 (i).
Treadgold Commission, *re* Tel. from Dawson (remarks) 9980 (iv).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2321 (i).
Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ans.) 284 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. Th. Chase, *Montmorency.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 4224 (ii).
Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Elections Acts (M.) for Pets., O. Cs., &c., 101 (i).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bills, 483 (i).
———(Remarks) 2395 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G. B,, on M. for Com. of Sup., 385 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt, B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 95 (i).
Ellis, Dr., Immigration Medical Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
Gaynor & Greene, Extradition (M. for copies of cor., &c.) 109 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12117, 12122, 12165 (v).
See 'Transcontinental,' &c.
Hides Inspector, Geo. Roy, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 3627 (ii).
I.C.R. River Ouelle Spur Line, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).
Judgeship offered by Mr. Dansereau to Conservative (remarks) 13806 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10760 (v).
Judges' Salaries, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 95 (i).
Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., Cor., &c. (M.) for copies, 98 (i).
Levis, Land Purchase for I.C.R. (M for O. Cs., &c.) 3806 (ii).
——(Ques.) 3631 (ii).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Patent Relief B. (remarks) 2397 (i).
Medical Examiner of Immigrants, Quebec (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
N.W.Ter. Act Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) 13855 (vi).
Orleans, Island of, Mail Service, &c. (Ques) 670 (i).
Pardons, Prerogative of His Ex., O. Cs., &c. (M. for ret.) 567 (i).
——Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 96 (i).
See 'Ticket of Leave,' &c.
Patent Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 97 (i).
Pilotage Act (Quebec and Montreal) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 3°, 13937 (vi).
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Pier, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, Wharf Construction, Contract, &c., Par. in *Le Soleil* (remarks) 2237 (i).
Railway Commission B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2594 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec (M. for ret.*) 109 (i).
—— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2109 (i).
Royal Trust Co.'s (B. 103), 1°*, 1295 (i).
South Shore Ry. Working, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 449 (i).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4084; (tidal survey) 4115 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; Ottawa (geological museum) 363; (Royal Mint) 346; Que. (Lévis) 431; (St. Hyacinthe) 439; (Thetford Mines) 441 (i).
Docks (commissioner's report) 2984; (Lévis graving dock) 2978; (Montreal dry dock) 2983 (ii).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Harbours and Rivers: Generally (dredges, repairs, &c.) 2632; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2632; Ont. (Port Arthur) 3351 (ii).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2632, 2953 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (Belle Isle station) 2990 (ii).
Ticket of Leave Act, Releases, &c. (M. for ret.) 566 (i).
——(Ques.) 96 (i),
See 'Pardons,' &c.
Transcontinental (Canadian) Ry., Representation *re* Military Purposes (Ques.) 541 (i).
See "G. T. P. R."
Translation of Parliamentary Papers, &c. (remarks) 545 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
See 'Supply—Public Works, &c.
Treadgold Concession (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95) 2914 (ii).
——Appnmt. of Commission (M. to adjn.) 3564 (ii).
——Appnmt. of Special Com. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4486, (amt.) 4498; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).
——(Remarks) 2394, 2424 (i).

Champagne, Mr. L. N., *Wright.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7513 (iii).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. 1st Rep. (presented) 654 (i).
—— 1st Rep. Conc. (M.) 814 (i).
—— 2nd Rep. (presented) 939 (i).
—— 2nd Rep. (translator) Conc. (M.) 1111 (i).
—— 3rd Rep. of Com. Conc. (M.) 1764 (i).
—— 4th Rep. of Com. (presented) 1674 (i).
—— 4th Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 1936 (i).
—— 5th Rep. (M.) to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii).
—— 6th Rep. of Com. (presented) 7658 (iv).
—— 6th Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 7922; (Amt.) 9349 (iv).
—— 8th Rep. of Com. (presented) 12216 (vi).
—— 7th and 8th Reps., Conc. (M.) 14053 (vi).

Charlton, Mr. J., *N. Norfolk.*
Address, on The, 67 (i).
Alien (Restriction) Labour Act Amt. (B. 106) 1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i). 3282 (ii).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5874 (iii).
Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks) 12805 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7315 (iii).
Budget, The, 1643 (i).
Business of the House, Procedure on Order Papers (remarks) 2300 (i).

Charlton, Mr. John—*Con.*
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Elections B. 3,' &c.
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3268 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7503 (iii).
Divorce Court in Can. (prop. res.) 568; (M. wthdn.) 588 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 3) 1°*, 92; 2°m., 885; in Com., 905, 1200 (i); (compulsory voting) 13560 (vi).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6442 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3033 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8467 8489, (iv); in Com. on B., 10445, 10594, 11879, 11906, 12124, 12232, (v); on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 734 (i).
Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 948 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2508 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).
Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp, (B. 68) 1°*, 813 (i).
McDermid, Ellen Relief B. 229 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for Com., 9148 (iv).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Grant to, &c. (remarks) 12805 (vi).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1305 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6453 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5864 (iii).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B. (remarks) 3221 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lennox) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11562 (v).
'Ragging' in the British Army, on M. for Sup., 3130 (ii).
Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. (B. 2) 1°, 92; 2°m., 545; in Com., 550, 1059; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 700; 3°m., 1199 (i).
Ry. Act (supplies to I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. 12964 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11613; on M. for 3°, 12399, 12426 (v).
Salmon Industry, B. C., Complaint, &c. (remarks) 9972 (iv).

Charlton, Mr. John—*Con.*
Schooley, Wm. F. Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for 2°, 2305 (i); in Com., 3224 (ii).
Sessions of the Hse. Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 470 (i).
Snow Storms in N. W. T., False Reports (remarks) 11828 (v).
Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (ventilation of Chamber) 13009; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9149 (iii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11168 (v).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (vi.)
Bills of the Hse., Delay in Printing (remarks) 482 (i).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7359, 7383 (iii).
See 'Supply—Justice,' &c.
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10737 (v).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7425; on Ques. of Order, 7341 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).
Budget, The, 1681 (i).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Bridge Co. and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).
C.P.R. (Kirkella and Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14498 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 398 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 14758 (vi).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13755 (vi).
——— Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 289 (i).
——— Cost of (remarks) 205 (i).
——— Payment to Date, &c. (Ques.) 286 (i).
See 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c., 'Pub. Accts.' &c.

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).
Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup. 3189.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12502, 12552 (v).
Country Postmasters, Salaries : *See* 'Postmasters.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3094, 4012 (ii).
Customs Salaries, Montreal (Ques.) 8115 (iv.)
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Dom. Elections Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 904 (i) ; (compulsory voting) 14425 (vi).
——— (B. 15) 2° m., 704, 1061 ; in Com., 1062 (i), 3237 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6442 (iii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 302, 616 (i).
Election Printing in Prince Albert *Advocate*, in Com. of Sup., 14653 (vi).
Ferries on Navigable Waters : *See* 'Navigable,' &c.
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14633 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6905 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7911 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9683 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10554, 10618, 10690, 11221, 11873, 11974, 12077 (v).
——— on M. to adjn. Debate (remarks) 8807 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets., 13265 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14649 (vi).
Halifax and South-western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup. 3685 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7926, 7982 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).
ames Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joggin's to Minudie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8104 (iv).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10743 (v).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Lake Superior, &c., Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Lambton Postmistress, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (ii), 14278, 14657 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).
Lobster Factory in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1589 (i).
McNulty : *See* "Lambton."
Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14326 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, *re* (remarks) 14235 (vi).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).
Members Rights to speak on Questions before the Chair (remarks) 10535 (v).
Middleton and Victoria Beach, N.S., Ry. Subsidy in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12985 (vi).
Nepigon Ry, Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14396 (vi).
News Cable from England : *See* "British," &c.
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).
N. W. Ters. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12319 (v).
Postmasters and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14679 (vi).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14032 (vi).
Post office Removal, Pet. *re* (remarks) 14661 (vi).
Post office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).
Privilege, Ques., of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., "Grafters," 10529 (v).
Public Accounts Com., Meeting concurrently with Sittings of Hse. (remarks) 8334 (iv).
——— Producing Census Schedules, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7066 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14697 (vi).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14450 (vi).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3727, 4706 (ii) 6183; (telephones) 5535 (iii).
——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).
——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14321 ; (auditing books by Aud. Gen.) 14518 (vi).
——— (supplies for I.C R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12963 (vi).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c., Res. of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1894 (remarks) 14365 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10963, 11115, 11438, 11624; (Kent) 11567; (Toronto) 11744; on M. for 3°, 12419; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 12486 (v).

Revenue and Expenditure, Amount for 1903 (Ques.) 12715, 13370 (vi).

Ronan, W., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. John Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323.

St. John Valley, Fredericton to Woodstock Ry., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

St. Peters and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Sand, Indian Boy, adopted by Mr. Johnston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6473, 7212 (iii).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (aids to societies) 4432; (archives) 4429; (census) 4594, 4800; (census, cost, &c.) 4816; (census schedules) 4635 (ii), 7066 (iii); (classification of patents) 4433 (ii); (cold storage) 7088, 7623; (creameries, N.W.T.) 7632 (iv); (dep. minister) 4357; (exhibitions) 4600; (experimental farms) 4551; (fumigating stations) 4434; (general statistics) 4430; (health act) 4440; (imperial institute) 4436; (Japan exhibition) 4631 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7646 (iv); (prof. Shutt's rep.) 4556; (San José scale) 4434; (St. Louis exhibition) 4600; (Tracadie lazaretto) 4439; (Treadgold exhibit) 4614; (Washington, Mr., Rep., &c.) 4430; (*Year Book*) 4429 (ii).

Canals, Generally (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (toll collectors) 12929; Chambly (tow paths) 12906; Rideau (Hog's Back, swing bridge) 12904 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 332; (salaries) 323 (i); Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 235, 241; Interior (salaries) 271; Public Works (salaries) 333; Railways (salaries) 334 (i).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3783 (ii); (Dresden, port of entry) 3960; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3950; (salaries, &c.) 3909; (Walpole office) 3961; (Yukon expenditure) 3968 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Long Lake & Saskatchewan ry. surveys) 6941; (Teulon road) 6927 (iii).

Immigration (on ques. of order) 6855 (iii).

Indians (St. Regis lock-up) 6415; (Walpole islands) 6412 (iii).

Justice—Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3532; (Manitoba) 3534 (ii).

Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).

Miscellaneous (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14653 (vi); (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590; (Micmac dictionary) 12592 (v); (naturalization act, expenses) 6953; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6957 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6947.

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence transportation) 4043 (ii).

Post Office (country postmasters) 6033; (Lambton postmaster, dismissal) 6166; (letter carriers, salaries) 6033; (mail bag repairs) 6148; (Ottawa Supply Co., &c.) 6148 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (architect's office) 961; (caretakers, &c.) 1018; (clerks of works) 964; N.B. (Richibucto) 412; (St. John, quarantine water service) 420; N.W.T. (Red Deer, court house) 960; N.S. (Halifax) 412; Ont. (Ft. William) 636; (renewals) 636; (Toronto Dom. buildings, renewals) 650; (Toronto post office) 957; (Toronto Junction post office) 650; (Wallaceburg) 505; Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 344; (Major's Hill Park) 1016; (Royal Mint) 351; (telephones) 1014; Que. (Grosse Isle) 426 (i).

Dredging (dredges, repairs) 2619 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665; (ii); (repairs, &c.) 1185; N.B. (Shippegan harbour) 1183; (Negro Point breakwater) 1182 (i); N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13143; (Breton Cove) 13151 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102; Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185; (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1191 (i); (Pembroke, wharf) 13248; (Point Edward, dredging) 13249; (Sydenham river) 13250 (vi); Que. (Chateauguay river) 3209; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2644 (ii).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (clerical assistance) 2753; (engineers, salaries) 2726 (ii); (Ottawa river surveys) 13342 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2720; (temporary clerks) 2733 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2690.

Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2993; (Magdalen islands) 2714 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 5507; (hog cholera) 5507 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3699; (Levis accommodation) 3706 (ii); (North Sydney improvements) 12598; (power saw) 12607; (Rivière du Loup, engine houses) 12593; (St. John, increased accommodation) 12596 (v); Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12920 (vi).

Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6932 (iii).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Timegami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco, Duty on foreign Leaf (Ques.) 446 (i).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

Walpole Islands, Adoption of Boy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Yukon Post Office, Deficit (remarks) 14015 (vi).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *S. Waterloo.*

Ayr Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1195 (i).

Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1°*, 1023 (i).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10736 (iv).

Free List, Changes in Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10060 (iv).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Waterloo) 11641 (v).

Robson, Michael, Dismissal from Ayr Post Office (Ques.) 1195 (i).

SUPPLY :

Customs (salaries at ports, &c.) 3917 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3531 (ii).
Post office (country postmasters) 6056 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (coal contract 1066; Ottawa (astronomical observatory, 343; (census building) 991; (furniture, &c.) 984; (rentals, &c.) 989; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 1071; (Church Point breakwater) 1078; (Drumhead breakwater) 1085; (Glace Bay) 1093 (i); Ont. (Port Arthur) 3353 (ii); Que. (Father Point, pier) 1513 (i); (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 3326 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 8271 (iv).

Tariff Changes, Free List, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *W. Toronto.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Publication of Cor., Objection (remarks) 14690 (vi).

——— Summary published, &c. (remarks) 10536 (v).

Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 1296; on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).

American Exporters, Discriminating Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13674, 13681 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5963 (iii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies, &c., Miscellaneous, &c,'

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11166 (v).

Audit Act *re* Civil Servants, Extra Work (remarks) 13992 (vi).

Auditing Deptl. Finances, System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Barr Colony, Mr. Haultain's Speech (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6354 (iii).

Bayfield and Can. Navy: *See* 'Navy.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7303, 7313 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Binder Twine, Average Price for Sisal, &c. Ques.) 7566, 8085 (iv).

——— Quantity imported from U. S. (Ques.) 7566 (iv).

See Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B. B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8236 (iv), 10719 (v).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7412; on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7346 (iii).

Budget, The, 2206 (i).

Business of the House, &c. (remarks) 2301 (i).

Cable News from England: *See* 'British,' &c.

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'British,' &c.

Can. Iron Foundry Strike, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res,, 4368, 4961, 5089, 5108 (ii); in Com. on B., 5597 (iii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; in Com., 2303.

Can. and S. Africa SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on Can. and France Subsidy, 10820 (v).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company's incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com. (amt.) 7479; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7485; Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).

Census Expenditure 1901, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13708 (vi).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 55) 1°*, 707 (i).

Chambers of Commerce Delegates: *See* 'Delegates,' &c.

Cigarettes: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 215,' &c.

Citizens' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 213) 1°*, 5679; in Com., 7478 (iii).

Civil Servants, Canvassing for Outside Business, &c. (remarks 13992 (vi).

——— and Guarantee Companies, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

——— Imperial Decorations: *See* 'Imperial,' &c.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12510, 12535 (v), 13822; on M. for 3°, 13946 (vi).

Coal imported in Ont. from June 1901 to March 1903, and June 1902 to March 1903 (Ques.) 669 (i).

Coleman, Mr. A. B., Tender *re* Toronto P. O., Mr. Gouinlock's Letter (read) 13096 (vi).

Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4685 (ii).

Commercial Travellers, Reduced Ry. Fares, &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5680 (iii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3263, 3274 (ii).

Corn Duties, Abolition by Imp. Parlt. (remarks) 1681 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 5582; in Com., 6640, 7491 (iii); (cigarettes) 10750 (v).
Current Wages and P. O. Contracts: *See* P. O. 'Supplies.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3045, 3088, 4012 (ii).
Customs and Excise, *per capita* Revenue from 1896 to 1903 (Ques.) 13935, 14284 (vi).
Debates, Translators, Rent of Building, &c. (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Delegates from Chambers of Commerce, Ill-treatment at Newport, Vt., Par. in Newspapers, &c. (read) 12495 (v).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) 13674, 13681 (vi).
Dom. Day, Adjnmt. (remarks) *re* Business for Thursday, 5589 (iii).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr *Fielding*) in Com., 6914 (iii).
Dredges building at Sorel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012, 4680 (ii).
Dundonald: *See* 'G. O. C.'
Electric Lighting of Chamber, Change of Lamps, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).
Excise Taxation, Revenue 1896 and 1903 (Ques.) 13935, 14284 (vi).
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6899 (iii).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10814; in Com. on B., 12295 (v).
Freight Rates Discrimination against Canadians. *See*: 'Discriminating,' &c.
Fuel Contracts, Interest on unpaid Accounts, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).
G. O. C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2417 (i).
German Surtax: *See* 'Customs,' &c.
Good Shepherd Reformatory, St. John, N.B., B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4840 (ii).
Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*, Par. in Ottawa *Free Press* (remarks) 8405 (iv).
Grain Inspection, Cost per Car, &c. (Ques.) 4837.
Grain Inspection, Toronto Board of Trade, Res. *re* Grain Standards (remarks) 11177, 12535 (v).
G. T. Ry. Rates, Discrimination between Americans and Canadians, Tel. read, 10745 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5139 (iii), 7820, 7829, 7846 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10308, 10317; in Com. on B., 10453, 11192, 11294, 12076, 12143, 12241 (v).
G. T. P. Bill and Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections (amt.) 13272 (vi).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 14765 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677.
Hibernian SS., Wreck: *See* 'Shipping,' &c.
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 794 (i).
Immigration, Medical Inspection, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ques.) 2756 (ii).
Immigration Office in Ireland, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 1031 (i).
Imperial Service Orders to Civil Service (Ques.) 12715, 13669, 13936 (vi).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3257 (ii).
Insurance Rates *re* Ocean Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3677 (ii).
——— Official Guide, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 9582.
——— Private Cars: *See* 'Official.'
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3301, 3398 (ii).
See 'Windsor.'
Japan Trade *re* Customs Duties (Ques.) 8617 (iv).
——— *re* U.S. Products (Ques.) 9217 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12301 (v).
——— B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10764, 10776 (v).
King's S. A. Medal, Pet. from N.C.Os., &c. (Ques.) 10491 (v).
Kingston Locomotive Works, Purchase of Engines for I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iii).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10489 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8197 (iv).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
Letter Carriers, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5672. *See* 'Supply—Postoffice,' &c.
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13833 (vi).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 663 (i).
See 'Mowat.'
Listowel Postoffice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2504, 2518 (ii).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14222, 14542 (vi).
——— Special Trains, &c. (remarks) 14680, 14688.
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5100 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Tel. System, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vi).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 226 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6917 (iii).
Meteorological Service, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6435 (iii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5729 (iii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt.-Gov. of Ont., Decease of (remarks) 1579 (i).
See 'Lt.-Gov.'
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 4700 (ii), 6081, 6112 (iii).
Murray, Immigration Agent, Scotland (cor. &c.) in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
Naval Defence, Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 949 (i).
Navy Training Ships, Establishment, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5295 (iii).
Nelson Postoffice, B. C., Racine Bros. Claim (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iii), 8126 (iv).
Newspaper Despatches from G.B : *See* 'British,' &c.
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10742 (v).
Official. &c., Cars, Haulage paid, &c. (Ques.) 9682 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup.. 13065 (vi).
Parliament Buildings, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).
See 'Supply—Public Works. Buildings,' &c.
Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4220, 4675 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8262 (iv).
Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit: *See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Pilotage Act Amt. B. (remarks) on M. to wthdr. Res., 12493 (v),
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Matters (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5658 ; in Com. 5659 (iii).
Post Office Clerks, Promotions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
P.O. Supplies and Current Wages, Declaration, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iii).
Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Origin (remarks) 3583 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Suit by Can. Employment Bureau (remarks) 12220 (v).
Printing Bureau and Typographical Union, &c. (Ques.) 4182, 4444 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafters,' 10517 (v).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5972; in Com., 5979 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr, *Blair*) in Com., 3988, 4697, 4728 (ii), 5326, 5680, 6080, 7300 (iii), 7610, 8126 (iv); (telephones) 5538 (iii), 8142; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* 2 cent fares, to M. for 3°, 8349 (iv) ; on Sen. Amts., 13836.
Railway Accidents, Duties of Public Officials (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Railway Accidents in Canada, Official Inquiry, &c. (Ques.) 9217 (iv).
See 'West Lorne,' &c., 'Windsor,' &c.
Ry. Accidents. Investigation, &c. (remarks) 1329.
——Loss of Life, &c. (Ques.) 873 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2575 ; in Com., 2580 ; on M. for 3°, 3004, (ii).
Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7132 (iii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10899; 10958, 11125, 11431, 11503 ; (Kent) 11579 ; (Toronto) 11693, 11732 ; (York) 11665 ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12459; on M. for 3°, 12438 (v).
Ronan, W., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v).
St. Lawrence Navigation, Quotations from London Newspapers ; in Com. of Sup., 4133 (ii).
Salmon Canning Industry, B. C. (remarks) 10241 (v).
——Complaints *re* (remarks) 9978 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Transportation (remarks) 12940 (vi).
Scotch Iron Moulders and Toronto Strike (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12994 (vi).
Sisal, Price per Pound for Binder Twine, &c. (Ques.) 8085 (iv).
See 'Binder Twine.'
Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11827 (v).
S. Africa and Can. SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on France and Can. Subsidy, 10820 (v).
S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, &c. (remarks) 1027 (i).
South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv) 10491 (v).
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).
——B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6915 (iii).
——B. 237 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 12494 (v).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Stock Gambling, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7204 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Poultry Farming) 7649 (iv.)

Canals: Galops (deepening, &c.) 8269 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (Thompson, Mr. P., remuneration) 7152 (iii); Post Office (promotion, &c.) 13998 (vi).

Customs (contingent expenses. Toronto, &c.) 3901; (preferential tariff) 3926; (salaries, &c.) 3901 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Teulon, North road) 6930 (iii).

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., rep.) 5382 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5295, 5299; (Ottawa) exhibit) 5308 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6669; (agents, old country, &c.) 6726; (exodus to U. S.) 6727, 6874; (Galicians) 6863; Glockling's Mr. Robert, cor., &c.) 6728; (Murray, agent, Scotland) 6827; (settlers' effects) 6727; (trachoma, &c.) 6696; (Ques. of Order *re* quoting Speeches) 6873 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7784 (iv); (Man. Grain Act) 13698 (vi).

Justice, Administration of: Exchequer Court (salaries) 3406 (ii); Miscellaneous (revision of statutes) 14643 (vi); Supreme Court (law books, purchase) 3405; (reps. binding, &c.) 3405; Yukon (Dugas, judge) 3413; judges' living allowance) 3413; (sheriffs' salaries, &c.) 3410; (living allowances, &c.) 3509; (telegraph operators) 3419, 3509; Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3516; (general expenses) 3511 (ii).

Labour Dept. (fair wage schedule) 7174; (Racine Bros. claim) 7174 (iii).

Legislation: H. of C. (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence, improvement) 4133; (St. Lawrence, lighting, &c.) 4133 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13677 (vi); (Can. and G. B.) 5997, (iii) 7573; (Can. and S. Africa) 7747 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str,) 6003 (iii), 13697; (Magdalen Islands) 13676; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 13694; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi); (St. John and Digby) 7739 (iv); (St. John, N,B., and Glasgow) 13674 (vi); (St. John and London) 7739; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740 (iv); (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694 (vi); (wrecking plant) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

Militia (grants to associations) 3773; (pay and allowance) 3590; (Toronto drill shed) 3614 (ii), 13086 (vi); (Valleyfield strike) 3590, 3754 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit 6966 (iii).

N. W. M. Police, (compensation for injuries) 5264; (pay of force) 5262; (Yukon, salaries) 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence transportation) 4044 (ii).

Post Office (affidavits *re* supplies) 6138; (automobiles, &c.) 6050; (boots, &c., purchased in Aurora) 6142 (iii); (cities, promotions, &c.) 14009; (inspectors' salaries) 14001 (vi); (letter box collections) 6139; (letter carriers, Toronto) 6005; (mail bag repairs, &c.) 6142; (mail service) 6065; (ry. transfer agents) 6136 (iii); (statutory increases) 14006 (vi); (superannuation, letter carriers) 6113 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (architect's staff) 963; (caretakers) 1022; (Toronto armoury) 972 (i); **N.B.** (Campbellton P.O.) 13037; (St. John, drill hall) 13042; (St. John, immigrant shed) 13040; (quarantine station, water service) 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039; (Woodstock, armoury) 13040; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13041; **N.S.** (Antigonish, post office) 13034; (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 13030; (Halifax custom house) 13031; (Halifax. immigration shed) 13033; (Sydney Mines) 13029; (Sydney, post office) 13035; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Bowmanville) 510; (Clinton P.O.) 534 (i); (Cobourg P.O.) 13118 (vi); (Dom. exhibition) 534 (i); (Guelph, armoury) 13083; (Kingston, barracks) 13119; (Kingston, military college) 13094 (vi); (Kingston, military stables) 639 (London, drill hall) 646 (i); (Peterborough, armoury) 13083; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 13107 (vi); (Toronto, custom house) 648, 957; (Toronto, Dom. exhibition) 534; (Toronto, drill hall) 3614 (ii), 13086; (Toronto, examining warehouse) 13118; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086, 13115; (Toronto P.O., addition) 13096; (Toronto, postal station) 13112 (vi); (Toronto, renewals) 956, 957 (i); **Ottawa** (additional rooms) 13006; (coal sheds) 13115, 13116 (vi); (elevators) 1012; (grounds) 1015; (heating, &c.) 1008; (lighting, &c.) 975; (Major's Hill Park) 1015 (i); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996 (i); (steel shelving) 13089 (vi); (telephones) 1013 (i); **P.E.I.** (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; (Charlottetown, Dom. buildings) 13036; **Que.**, (Levis, P.O.) 13053; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13070; (Magog, P.O.) 13081; (Montmagny, P O.) 13066; (Montreal, barracks) 13077; (Que. Citadel drill hall) 13053, 13057, 13078; (Que., military buildings) 13054; (St. John's, P.O.) 13060; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (Three Rivers, heating, &c.) 13069 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Anderson Lake) 1451; (Columbia river) 1451 (i); (dredging, plant, &c.) 13311 (vi); (Mr. Sinclair's dismissal) 1451 (i); **Generally** (dredges, repairs) 2619; **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2668 (ii); (hydraulic dredge) 13312; **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 13006; (Dalhousie wharf) 13233; **N.S.** (Abbot's Harbour) 13141; (Abram's river, wharf) 13141; (Bayfield, wharf) 13142; (Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; (Breton's Cove, 13151, 13152 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1077 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Pembroke, breakwater) 13205; (Pleasant Bay) 13205; (Port Hood, pier) 13206 (vi); **Ont.** (Belle Riviére) 1191; (Bowmanville, pier) 1352; (Burk's Falls) 1359; (Depot Harbour) 1364; (general repairs) 1373 (i); (Goderich, breakwater) 13242 (vi) (Goderich harbour) 1365 (i); (Kaministiquia river, dredging) 13013; (Kingston graving dock) 13024; (Little Current) 13245; (Magann & Phinn, claims) 13255 (vi); (Midland Harbour) 1376; (Petewawa narrows) 1427 (i); (Port Arthur) 2636, 3350 (ii); (Point au Baril route) 1365; (St. Lawrence, dredging) 1442; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1432 (i); (Toronto, Magann & Phinn claims) 13255; (Toronto, pier) 13254 (vi); (Wendover, wharf) 1441 (i); **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13313; (Skinner's Pond) 13309 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallee, pier) 1520 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3320 (ii);

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys, &c.) 13340.
Telegraph Lines, N.W.T. (Edmonton and Athabaska) 13335; (Edmonton agency) 13334; P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13327 (vi).
Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5492; (smallpox) 5492 (iii).
Railways (Murray Harbour branch) 7537 (iii).
Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations) 6933 (iii).
Surtax: *See* 'Customs,' &c.
Tariff and N.W.T. Immigration, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iii).
Telegraph Operators, Yukon, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3419, 3509 (ii).
Telephone Cos. in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2585 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii), 5555 (iii); in Com., 9421 (iv).
——— on M. to resume adjnd. deb., 6198 (iii).
——— on M. to ref. back to Com., 7813 (iv).
——— (Remarks) 6102 (iii).
Toronto and Niagara Power Co., 6116 (iii).
Toronto Island, Damage by Storms, &c. (Ques.) 5589 (iii).
Toronto, Labour Council and Tel. *re* Mechanics from Eng. (Ques.) 1854 (i).
——— Military Stores Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i), 3614 (ii), 13055, 13086, 13115, (vi).
——— Post Office, A. B. Coleman's Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
——— Toronto St. Ry. (remarks) 4700 (ii), 6082 (iii).
——— Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment, &c. (Ques.) 5588 (iii).
Transportation Commission, Meetings, Business transacted, &c. (Ques.) 13027 (vi).
U. S. Immigration Officers at Newport, Treatment of English Delegates (remarks) 12495 (v).
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Payment of Militia (Ques.) 13371 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'
Valleyfield Post Office, Tenders *re* (remarks) 11187 (v).
West Lorne Investigation, Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 6168 (iii).
——— Jury's Verdict, &c. (Ques.) 3231 (ii).
——— Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4726 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Accidents.'
Windsor Junction Ry. Accident, Rep. of Commissioner, Inquiry for, 3496, 3712 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

Cochrane, Mr. E., *E. Northumberland, Ont.*
Allan SS. Co., Reductions of Sailings from St. John (remarks) 14077 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4236 (ii).
Apples, Canadian Packing, Mr. Preston's Interview, &c. (remarks) 11184 (v).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11176 (v).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bill (remarks) 485 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5059 (ii), 5424, 5072 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Campbellford Post Office, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Public Works,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5103 (ii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3227 (ii).
Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5483 (iii).
Chickens, Fattening of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Cobourg Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13084 (vi).
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.
Cumberland Ry. & Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14426 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3026 (ii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 293, 625 (i).
Ferries: *See* 'Navigable.'
Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11180 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5167 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10440, 11190, 11362 (v).
G. T. P. Bill, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13280 (vi).
Johnson, W. H., Purchase of House on Murray Canal (remarks) in Com of Sup., 14143, 14147 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759 (v).
Le Journal, Canvassing for: *See* 'Pelletier,' 'Political,' &c.
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14551 (vi).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights & Measures B. 20.'
Murray Canal, Supt.'s duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12780, 12987 (vi).

Owen Sound, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13064 (vi).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L. and Canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13982 (vi).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13630 (vi).

Political Partisanship *re* Govt. Officials (remarks) 13991 (vi).

Postal Scales: *See* 'Weights & Measures B. 188.'

Postmasters in Rural Districts, Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

Preston, Mr. and Can. Apples: *See* 'Apples,' &c.

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4222 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14755 (vi).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5981.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3833, 4706 (ii), 6210 (iii), 8130 (iv); (drainage) 4756 (ii).

Ry. Act (supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12962 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14464, 14506 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10979, 11139, 11468, 11625; (Toronto) 11720 (v).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7221 (iii).

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (aids to societies) 4433; (census enumerators) 4817; (census, Haldimand) 4822 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7641 (iv).

Canals: Generally (toll collectors) 12931; (Johnson, W. H., purchase of house) 14143, 14147; (wire fencing) 14151 (vi); Welland (Dunnville dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Interior (Mines branch, salaries) 13769 (vi).

Customs (Campbellford collector) 3913; (salaries) 3913 (ii).

Dom. Lands (tree culture) 6780 (iii).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., fishery inspector) 5124; (steamers, B. C.) 5278 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6699; (agents' expenses) 6887; (Cory, W. W., &c.) 6853; (White, W. J., agent) 6853 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6345; (medical attendance) 6345 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7768; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7768 (iv).

Legislation: House of Commons (*Montreal Herald*, printing) 5271; (printing, &c.) 5271 (voters' lists) 5275 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str.) 5745 (iii); (Marconi stations) 13645 (vi).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7581 (iii); (freight rates, &c.) 7586 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13675 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7737 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt steamers, supplies, &c.) 4086 (ii); (masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi).

Public Works: Buildings, N. B. (St. John, drill hall) 13044 (vi); Ont. (Campbellford) 504; Ottawa (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1002 (i); Que. (hospital for trachoma) 14245; (military buildings) 13054 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton, wharf) 13230; (damages to schooner) 13231 (vi); **N.S.** (Amagandus wharf) 1069 (i); (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146 (vi); (Big Pond, wharf) 1073; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Cow bay) 1079; (Economy wharf) 1087 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182; (Glace Bay, wharf) 13190 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1095; (Green Cove harbour) 1101; (Kingsport pier) 1104; (Larry's River) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Necum Teuch wharf) 1139; **Ont.** (Bronte harbour) 1355; (Depot Harbour) 1362 (i); (Moira river, flooding) 13470 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3346 (ii); (Trenton, dredging) 1434; (Wendover wharf) 1436 (i); **Que.** (Cacouna wharf) 5898 (iii); (Chateauguay river) 3211 (ii); (Grand Vallee pier) 1515 (i); (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13465; (Port Daniel wharf) 13468; (Rimouski pier, &c.) 13469; (Rivière Verte) 13470; (St. Andre de Kamouraska pier) 13492; (Ste. Anne de la Perade) 13488; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 13497 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3219, 3308, 3327 (ii); (Sabrevois wharf) 13485; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12855 (vi).

Miscellaneous (engineers, salaries) 13340; (Ottawa river surveys) 13345 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2715 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2692 (ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2689 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Magdalen is'ands) 2714; (Mar. Provs. cable lines) 2701 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (general vote) 12881; (Moncton, locomotives, &c.) 14093; (Pictou accommodation) 14089; (sidings, additional) 14057, 14082; P. E. I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14110, 14116; (Murray Harbour branch) 12832 (vi),

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Treadgold Commission, par. in Dawson newspapers (remarks) 11082 (v).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i).

——— (postal scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4188 (ii).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby.*

County Court Judges, N. S., Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

Dodd, Judge of County Court No. 7, N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13505 (vi).
Fisheries (fish hatcheries) 13660 ; (sardine industry) 13653 (vi).
Justice, Administration of : N.S. (county court judges) 14259 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lurcher's shoal lightship) 4173 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14251 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Meteghan Cove) 1135 (i); (Victoria beach wharf) 13214 (vi).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Civil Service (superannuation) Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 597 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9064 (iv).
Home Rule for Ireland (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 720; Agreed to (Y. 102, N. 41) 812 (i).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com. (objection) 5971 ; in Com., 5978, 6399 (iii).
Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 197) 1°*, 4262 (ii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 367 ; on M. for 2°, 630 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com. on Private Bills, 664 (i).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *S. Essex.*
Detroit River, &c., International Waters, &c., U. S. Govt. Work (M. for. cor.*) 2778 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 894 ; in Com., 908 (i).
Drainage across Ry. Properties (B. 19) 1° m., 202. *See* 'Ry. Act. B. 21.'
Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 149) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Huron, Erie and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 123) 1°*, 1764 (i); in Com., 4588 (ii).
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 1°*, 1675 (i).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2718 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 254 (i) ; in Com., 4726 ; (drainage) Amt., 4729 (ii) ; 5325, 6178 ; (farm crossings) 5774 ; (screens, &c., 6072 ; (Toronto and Niagara Power Co.) 6115 (iii) ; (race horse *Henry R.*) 8191 (iv).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 102) 1°*, 1295 ; 2° m., 1812 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10883; in Com., 10993 (v).

Cowan, Mr. M. K.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (exhibitions) 4624 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2947 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry., 6118 (iii).
Treadgold Commission, Pars. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Culbert, Mr. J., *Brockville.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11485 (v).

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5877 (iii).
Autonomy for N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13896 (vi).
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6391 (iii).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) 1°*, 2582 (ii) ; (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5238 ; 3° m., 5988 (iii).
Budget, The, 1715 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (Ques.) 14286 (vi.)
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 1462.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4371, 5100 (ii); in Com. on B., 5611, 5650, 5799 (iii).
Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 159) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
Canals in Ont. and Que., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3179 (ii).
Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13567 (vi).
Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 707 (i).
Grain Blockade : *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11181.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5145 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10019 ; ('red headed boy') 10020, 10035 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 11250, 11989, 12048, 12231, 12268 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Alternative Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 13028 (vi).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6571, 6596 (iii).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1580 (i).
Mailing and Franking Privilege: *See* 'Campaign.'
Man. and N.W.T., Ry. Co.'s. Land Subsidies granted by Govt. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7993 (iv).

Davis, Mr. T. O.—*Con.*
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12321 (v).
Public Works, Generally, Amount expended in Provs. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Ry., &c., on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10501, 10507 (v).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5682, 6274 (iii); (amt. *re* fire-guards) 8173 (iv).
Railway Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* received (Ques.) 13028 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies (money) paid by Govt. in Provs. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
See 'Man. & N.W.T.' &c.
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2455 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11033, 11115, 11460, 11718; (Dauphin) 11757; (Macdonald) 11781; (Winnipeg) 11787; (York) 11688 (v).
Senate Representation in N. W. T., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 471 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
Stewart River Development Co.'s incorp. (B. 160) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6687 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (post offices) 532 (i).
Tariff Protection, Govt. Policy: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6691 (iii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11086 (v).
—— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4544 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Delisle, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*
Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 3°, 13940 (vi).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St. John and Iberville.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (seconded) 18 (i).
C.P.R. car 001, Improvements to, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 837 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7505 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13571, 14410 (vi).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. (B. 155) 1°m., 2501 (ii), 2°m, 8243; in Com., 8244, 8361 (iv).

Demers, Mr. L. P.—*Con.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4784 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 928 (i).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 654 (i).
Private Bills, Notices, &c., Rep. of Com. *re* Revision of Rules (M.) 12216, 13547 (vi).
See 'Rules,' &c.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (drainage) 4752 (ii); (fire indemnification) 6299 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8349 (iv).
Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. (B. 23) 1°m., 283 (i); 2°m., 2780 (ii).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1257 (i); in Com., 11034.
Rules of the Hse. (M.) to amend, 12216 (v), 13547 (vi).
Rules, Revision, &c. *re* Pets. for Private Bills (M.) for Sel. Com., 4441 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (experimental farms) 4548 (ii).
Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 22) 1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4901 (ii).
Tarte, Hon. J. I., and C.P.R. Car 001, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).

Desjardins, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Terrebonne (M. for cor.*) 288 (i).
Jesus River, Deepening, &c. (M. for cor.*) 289.
Terrebonne Post Office Buildings, &c. (M. for cor.*) 289 (i).

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 8th Rep. (M.) to conc., 13788 (vi).
—— 8th Rep. (binder twine) M. to conc., 14043, 14047 (vi).
Binder Twine Inspector's Rep., Distribution, &c. (M.) 13788 (vi).
—— Rep. of Com. on Ag., Distribution of Copies (M.) to conc., 14043 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5812 (iii).
C. P. Ry. and Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 2306 (i).
Elevator Rates, Advance, &c. (remarks) 11062.
Great North-west Central and C. P. R. Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 2306 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7994 (iv); on Sen. Amts. (amt.) 13625.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5785, 6233 (iii).
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2478 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie incorp. (B. 104) 1°*, 1295 (i); in Com., 6655 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 1204 (i).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 1204 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14399 (vi).

Nepigon Iron Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 170) Pet. (presented) 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14399, 14436 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Duncan, Mr., inspector, Georgian Bay) 5134 (ii).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5015 (ii).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*

B. C. Fisheries Commission, Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 1199 (i).

Canning Industry in B. C. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

See 'Salmon,' &c.

Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal of Flagship (remarks) 10957 (v).

False Creek Lease, Cor., &c., (M. for copies*) 2337 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3129 (ii); 5513, 6354.

——— Lease to Kelly and Burnett (Ques.) 7565.

Flagship at Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal, &c. (remarks) 10957 (v).

Fraser River Canning Industry, &c. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

Kelly & Burnett, Lease of False Creek, &c. (Ques.) 7565 (iv).

See 'False Creek.'

Labour Commission B.C., Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8116.

Port Moody, Military Reserve, &c. (Ques.) 446.

Quesnel Dam, B.C., Obstructions *re* (Ques.) 11557 (v).

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

Salmon Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, Letter from Canners Ass'n. (read) 9968 (iv).

Salmon shipped to France, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (exhibitions, Treadgold exhibit) 4614 (ii).

Fisheries (steamers, B.C.) 5278 (iii).

Indians—B.C. (agents, travelling expenses) 7262; (Clayoquot school) 7269; (fishing, &c., investigation *re*) 7264; (reserves, re-allotment, &c.) 7263; (reserves, sale of, &c.) 7268; (Songhees, removal, &c.) 7258 (iii).

Earle, Mr. T.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 5050 (ii),

Post Office (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6151 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Esquimalt graving dock) 5919; (Hardy Bay wharf) 5916; Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5899; Telegraph Lines, B. C (Alberni Clayoquot) 5918; (Quesnel Atlin branch) 5827 (iii).

Trade and Commerce (preferential tariff in France) 7799 (iv).

Emmerson, Mr. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12570 (v).

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 1115 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 14409 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5190 (iii), 7891 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8706, 8718 (iv); in Com. on B., 11389 (v); on M. for 3°, 12731 (vi).

Harvey and Salisbury Ry. Subsidy, Remarks, &c. 14471 (vi).

Immigrants for Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 1855 (i).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2375 (i).

I. C. R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3682 (ii).

International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).

Pensions to S. A. Veterans, by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14599 (vi).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12798 (vi).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14679 (vi).

P. E. I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 180) 1°*, 3391 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914 (iv).

P. E. I. Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1049 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (N.B.) 11818 (v).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).

St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14324 (vi).

St. John Valley, Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3596 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton, P.O.) 13038; (St. John, drill hall) 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039 (vi).

Railways: I. C. R. (Eel River, agent's house) 12600; (Metis station) 12605; (Moncton accommodation) 12599; (Truro accommodation) 12604 (v).

Emmerson, Mr. H. R.—*Con.*
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).
Ties on Govt. Rys., Importations, &c. (Ques.) 1679 (i).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Erb, Mr. D. K., *S. Perth.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5441 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6216 (iii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4777 (ii).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 264) 1°*, 12993 (vi).
Rivière du Nord Fish Ladders, &c. (M. for copies of reps., &c.) 2778 (ii).
Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, Ques. of Privilege, 7567 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6637 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, on Notice of M. (Mr. *Borden*) 14765 (vi).
——— *See* 'Joint-High,' &c.
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
Allan SS. Co., Reduction in Sailings from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13937, 14064.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1509 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1807 (i).
Audit Act Amt. (B. 251) Com., 11159 (v).
——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 13258 (vi).
Auditing Deptl. Finances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).
Auditor General and Finance Dept. (remarks) 11423 (v).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circulars, &c. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Auditor General and Treasury Board *re* Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (v).
Auditor General, on Inquiry for Cor., 11427 (v).
Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Bankers' Association, Inspection Duties, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).
Bankers, Private, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 285 (i).
Bank Failures since Confederation, &c. (Ans.) 6435 (iii).
Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Rep. (presented) 3804 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Bass River, N.S., Marine Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
Beersville Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Belmont Disaster Victims, Compensation *re* Injuries (remarks) 14156 (vi).
See 'Crandall.'
Binder Twine Bounties (B. 233) prop. Res., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300; 1°*, 7382; 2°*, 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii).
———on Ques. of Order, 7308 (iii).
———Inspection and Penalties collected, &c. (remarks) 14048 (vi).
Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 12217 (v).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 6522 (iii).
Boyd, Sir John, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 5990 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7400 (iii).
———on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7342 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement, 1378 (i).
Condition of Country, 1378; Details of Revenue, comparison with 1900-1, 1379; Excise, 1379; Post Office Dept., 1381; I.C.R. Revenue and Expenditure, Consolidated Fund, 1382; Capital and Consolidated Fund, Expenditures, 1383; Revenue for 1902-3, Estimate of, 1385; Public Debt, 1897-1903, 1385; Public Debt, reduction of, 1387; Surpluses, 1387, 1390; Net Debt. per capita, 1388; Chartered Banks Deposits, 1389; Increase in paid up capital and note circulation, 1395; Total Trade, Tables, 1389; Public Accounts, 1391; Iron Bounties, 1391; Reasons for borrowing while Finances are prosperous, 1392; Redemption of Treasury Bills before maturity, 1392; Loans, maturing, 1392; New sources of revenue by sale of C.P.R. lands, 1394; Increase in circulation of Dominion notes, amts. to Currency Act, 1396; Tariff amts. and free list not practicable at present, 1398; Trade Relations with England, Preference should be reciprocal, 1400; Preferential trade, memo. of Mr. Gerald Balfour, 1402; memo of Can. Ministers at Colonial Conference, 1404; Colonial Conference, 1400-1406; U.S. relations, 1406; Cor. between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and U.S. Senator Fairbanks *re* Joint High Commission and Alaskan Boundary, 1407; Tariff Policy of Govt., 1409; German Surtax, 1412-1418; Cor. with Mr. Bopp, 1414; Steel Rail industry and Sault Ste. Marie works, bounties to, 1419; Lead Industry of B.C., 1419; Binder Twine, 1420; Foreign Built Ships, and registration in Can., coasting privileges, 1420; Beet Root Sugar Machinery, 1421; Alluvial Gold Mining Machinery, 1421; Transportation Problem, Canal tolls, 1422; Resolutions *re* Customs Tariff Amt., 1423 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 410, 1114 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order, 1743 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 871, 1110, 2395, 2501 (i), 3969, 5051 (ii), 5510, 5581, 5959, 6352, 7090, 7201 (iii), 7728, 7812 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Business of the House. Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 484 (i).
——— Late Sittings (remarks) 3207 (ii).
——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4347 (ii).
——— *re* Suppl. Estimates (remarks) 4957 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Butter sold at Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1593, 1857 (i).
Cable News Service between Can. and G. B. (B. 240) prop. Res., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of Bill, 8243 (iv); 2° m., 10715; in Com., 10718 (v).
——— Brierly, Jas. S., Letter read, 10739 (v).
Canada Central Ry. and Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Amalgamation, Compensation to Municipalities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5613 (iii).
Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2304 (i).
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
C. P. R. (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
C. P. R. Steamers sailing from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
C. P. R., Transcontinental Ry. Trains, Water Supply (remarks) 9457 (iv).
Canadian Press Despatches: *See* 'Cable,' &c.
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5556, 5884 (iii).
Canals in Ont. and Que., Amount expended (Ans.) 1594 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 375 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (papers laid on Table) 591 (i).
——— (remarks) 267 (i), 14054 (vi).
Cattle-Guard Commission, Rep. laid on Table, 14758 (vi).
——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 14686 (vi).
Census of 1901, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 203,286, 1593 (i).
——— (remarks) 204 (i).
——— Cost, on M, for Ret. (amt.) 289 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 479 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5960, 6199 (iii).
Chambers of Commerce, Delegates, Treatment by U. S. Immigration Officers at Newport (remarks) 12496 (v).
Chambly Canal, Collector, Superannuation (Ans,) 7203 (iii).
——— *See* 'Moreau.'
Chartered Banks, List of Shareholders (presented) 1575 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c, (remarks) 4427 (ii).
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act (general increase) Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12494, 12538 (v).
——— (superannuation) Amt. (B. 49) prop. Res., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B,, 597; 2° m., 1116 (i).
Civil Service Employees, Classification, Salary, &c. (Ans,) 9682 (iv).
——— Temporary, &c, (remarks) in Com. on P. O, Bill, 5869 (iii).
Civil Service Examiners List (presented) 479 (i).
Clergue Steel Works at the Sault, Contract, &c. (Ans,) 13668 (vi).
——— *See* 'Steel.'
Cochrane, Hon. Senator, Tel. *re* (read) 3000 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4681 (ii).
——— *See* 'Dry Docks Bill.'
Colonial Conference, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 853 (i).
——— *See* 'Alaskan.'
Congratulations to Prime Minister *re* Twenty-five years as Member, 11690 (v),
Consolidated Revenue: *See* 'Audit,' &c.
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. B. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) in Com., 3223 (ii).
Corry & Laverdure, Award, &c., *re* Trent Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
Crandall, Brakeman on I. C. R., injured at Belmont (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
——— *See* 'Belmont.'
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s (Parrsboro) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Cummings, Jas., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 9458 (iv).
Customs Act Amt, (The Tariff) Prop. Res., 1423 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3058; in Com. on B., 4038 (ii).
——— (B. 273)—(surtax) in Com., 14755 (vi).
Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 9349 (iv).
Debert Coal Mines and I. C. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14328 (vi).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 587.
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 914 (i); M. for Sel. Com., 3001 (ii); in Com., 13591 (vi).
——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 12720 (vi).
——— (M.) to add Name *re* Sel. Com., 6734 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 704 (i).
Dom. Notes Security (B. 222) prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; in Com., 6913 (iii).
Drummondville Siding Accommodation (remarks) 14081 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction (B. 178) prop. Res., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; in Com., 4678 (ii), 5871 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.' Subsidy, in Com. on Res,, 14341 (vi).
Election Law, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12218 (vi).
——— *See* 'Dom. Elections.'
Election Printing in *Advocate*, Prince Albert, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).
Electric Lighting, Cardinal and Iroquois Canals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).
Estimates, The (presented) 90 (i).
——— Suppl., 1903 (presented) 707 (i), 4956 (ii).
——— Suppl., 1904 (presented) 12868 (vi).
——— Further Suppl. (presented) 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— (remarks) 5002, 5122 (ii).
Experimental Farms Report (presented) 1937 (i). *See* 'Butter, &c.'
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic.'
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14617 (vi).
Fisher, Chas. A. L., Inspector of Public Works, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1592 (i).
Fishing Industry in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vi).
France and Canada ss. Service (remarks) 4968 (ii).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2100 (i).
Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i), 2789 (ii).
——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3285 (ii).
Galops Rapids, Deepening (M.) to conc., agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4785 (ii).
German Surtax, in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).
——— *See* 'Budget.'
——— Cor., &c., papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).
Govt. Business (remarks) 13547 (vi).
——— *See* 'Business of the House.'
Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8405 (iv).
Govt. Official Cars, Amounts paid for Haulage (Ans.) 9682 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Order for Com., 4132 (ii); in Com., 5147, 5236 (iii), 7901; on M. for 3°, 8328 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 235) prop. Res., 7915; on. M. for 1°, 7725; on M. for Com. on Res., 8546 (iv); in Com. on Res., 10420; in Com. on B. 10588, 10614, 11191, 11302, 11838, 12076, 12168 (v); on M. for 3°, 12694 (vi).
G.T. Pacific Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections (Ans.) 13027 (vi).
——— Parishes crossed, Levis to Temiscouata (Ans.) 8117 (iv).
——— Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (remarks) 5734 (iii).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
——— Surveys, Reps., &c, (remarks) 8231 (iv).
——— Ways and Means *re* Surveys (M.) for Com., 14765 (vi).
G. T. Ry., and C. P. Ry. Fiscal Bookkeeping, Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vi).
G. T. Ry. Rates, Discrimination between Americans and Canadians (remarks) 10745 (v).
——— Loans by Govt. (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
——— and Two Cent Rate, *re* Original Charter (Ans.) 11556, 11828 (v).
Halifax Cotton Co., Loan of Rails, &c. (remarks) 14478 (vi).
——— Elevator, Land Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).
——— Marine and Fishery Office, Removal, &c. (remarks) 14279 (vi).
——— Museum, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— P. O., Pet. *re* Salaries of Employees (remarks) on Conc., 14759 (vi).
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 676, 1057 (i).
Herald Printing Co., Montreal, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8330 (iv).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).
Imperial Defence *re* Lord Rosebery's prop. Res. (remarks) 411 (i).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2373 (i).
Insurance Cos. of Canada, Abstract of Statements (presented) 1025 (i).
——— Rep. of Supt. (presented) 9350 (iv).
I.C.R., Pension System, &c. (Ans.) 9216 (iv.)
——— *See* 'Trackmen.'
——— Stations, Restaurants, &c., Fire Protection (Ans:) 14664 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 705 (i).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. (B. 238) prop. Res., 6629 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7923; 1°*, of B., 7988 (iv); 2°m., and in Com., 10799 (v).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4278 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4040 (ii).
——— Bounty Payments (Ans.) 6435 (iii).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).
Japanese Tariff *re* U. S Products (Ans.) 9217 (iv).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Joint High Commission *re* Par. in Toronto *World* (remarks) 14054 (vi).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) wthdn., 634 (i).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (Dawson) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14518; (Amt.) 14519 (vi).
Lachine Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 14140 (vi).
Lake Superior Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Lead Bounties (B. 239) prop. Res., 6169; in Com. on Res., 8195 (iv); in Com. on B., 10798 (v).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14300 (vi).
Lime Ridge, Megantic Co. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2350 (i).
Locomotive Contracts *re* I. C. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).
Long Wharf, St. John, Lease by Govt. (Ans,) 11829 (v).
Lumber Combines, N.W.T., Investigation (Ans.) 6168 (iii).
——— (remarks) 1580 (i).
Lumber Trade in B. C. and U. S. Importations (remarks) 14766 (vi).
Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14326 (vi).
Manufacturers' Delegation *re* Tariff (remarks) 266 (i).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commission, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 90,707 (i), 4956 (ii), 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Middleton and Victoria Beach Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
Midland Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).
Militia Defalcation, Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iii).
Militia Estimates (remarks) 13369 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 5719 (iii).
Milk Can. Bill: *See* 'Weights.'
Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c. (remarks) 90 (i).
——— on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 164. (i).
Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan (B. 201) prop. Res., 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445 (ii); in Com., 5417; 3°m., 5657 (iii).
Montreal Locomotive Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
Moreau, H., Salary as Collector on Chambly Canal (Ans.) 8488 (iii), 12497 (v).
——— *See* 'Chambly.'
Napanee and Deseronto Ry. Co.'s Charter (Ques.) 8084 (iv).
Newspaper Despatches from England B.: *See* 'Cable.'
N. S. and Dom., Financial Terms, &c. (Ans.) 3001 (ii).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
N. W. T., Financial Aid (B. 256) prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°*, of B., 12330 (v); in Com., 12843 (vi).
——— Autonomy to N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13918 (vi).
——— *See* 'Provincial.'
North-west Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2754 (ii).
Ottawa Experimental Farm: *See* 'Butter.'
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. (B. 223) prop. Res., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6449; 1°*, of B., 6456; in Com., 6806 (iii).
Ottawa, Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14319 (vi).
Ouelle River, I. C. R. Branch Line, Total Cost (Ans.) 10491 (vi).
Patent Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 97 (i).
Patent Relief Bill (remarks) 2397 (i).
Penny Banks (B. 198) 1°m., 4175 (ii); in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793 (v).
Posters, Handbills, Exclusion, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5240; in Com., 5662, 5869 (iii).
P. O. Savings Bank (B. 220) 1°m., 6353; in Com., 6814 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

P. O. Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations of Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14276, 14655 (vi).

Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G. B. (remarks) 3220 (ii).

Preferential Trade and Mr. Chamberlain's Proposals (remarks) 13936 (vi).

Press Gallery Representatives, Payment as Sessional Clerks (remarks) 14114 (vi).

Prince Albert *Advocate : See* 'Election Printing.'

P. E. I. Ry. Subsidies to Branch Lines (remarks) 14474 (vi).

Printing Bureau and Union Organizations (Ans.) 4180 (ii).

Private Cars : *See* 'Govt. Official,' &c.

Prorogation (remarks) 14763 (vi).

Provincial Autonomy, N. W. T., Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6892 (iii).

——— *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.

Public Accounts (presented) 89 (i).

Public Debts, Amount of Decrease (Ans.) 14665 (vi).

Public Works, Preservation of Health, Regulation, &c. (Ans.) 1858 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidies Agreement (B. 272) in Com. on Res., 14690 ; 1°* of B., 14734 : 2° m., 14734 (vi).

——— Papers laid on Table, 14521 (vi).

——— Application for Further Aid (Ans.) 10496.

——— Subsidy paid by Govt. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14450 (vi).

Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iii).

Questions by Members, Answers *re* (remarks) 544 (i).

Railway Accidents in Canada, Official Inquiry, &c. (Ans.) 9218 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) B. 21 (M.) for Com. to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14520 (vi).

——— (M.) to appoint Managers to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14690 (vi).

——— Rep. of Special Com. (presented) 14663.

——— (remarks) *re* Conference with Senate, 14740.

Ry. Act (fire guards) Amt. B. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, 871 (i).

Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. B, 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1060 (i).

Railway Appropriations *re* Expenditure, Transfer to other Votes (remarks) 14055 (vi).

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).

Railways constructed without Govt. Aid, Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 8488 (iv).

Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).

Ry. Policy, Govt. Announcement (remarks) 6426.

Railway Subsidies (B. 270) prop. Res., 13549 ; M. for Com. on Res., 14053 ; in Com. on Res., 14314, 14428 ; (auditing Co.'s books, &c.) 14516 ; (location of rys.) 14514 ; (payment of subsidies,

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies—*Con.*

&c.) 14511 ; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14515 ; 1°* of B., 14519 ; 2°m. and in Com., 14735 ; (Amts.) 14740 (vi).

——— Cost of Bridges, Safeguard *re* (remarks) 14512 (vi).

——— granted to provs., Amounts to each, &c. (remarks) 14484, 14687 ; Stmnt. (presented) 14852 (vi).

——— Payments of, Safeguarding, &c. (remarks) 14513 (vi).

——— voted by Govt., 1900-1902 (Ans.) 13027, 13259 (vi).

——— in 1901-2-3, &c. (Ans.) 13934 (vi).

——— Amounts paid since 1900 to 1903 (Ans.) 12842, 13370 (vi).

——— voted for past ten Years, &c. (Ans. 13934.

Railway Act (Supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. (B. 258) prop. Res., 8332 (iv) ; 10715, 11189 ; in Com. on Res., 12574 ; 1°* of B., 12584 (v) ; in Com., 12944 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1812 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11032 ; (N. S.) 11800 ; on M. for 3°, 12482 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12445 (v).

——— (remarks) 408 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for (remarks) 544 (i).

Revenue and Expenditure, Amounts collected, &c., for 1903 (Ans.) 12715, 13370 (vi).

Rideau Canal Employees, Delay in Paying (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Rosebery and Imperial Defence : *See* 'Imperial.'

St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

St. John, Long Wharf : *See* 'Long.'

See 'Allan,' 'C.P.R.', &c.

St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements, in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

St. Louis Exposition, Canadian Exhibits (Ans.) 3001 (ii).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4589 (ii).

St. Peter's and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, &c. (remarks) 9970 (iv).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com, on Res., 14325 (vi).

Sinclair, James : *See* 'Patent.'

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8266 (iv).

S. A. War, Supplies purchased by Imp. Gov., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for O. Cs., &c., 2761.

See 'Hay,' &c.

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Steel Rails and Clergue Govt. contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

See 'Clergue,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7028 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Supplies to I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

Supply (M.) for Com., 89 (i).

Supply (B. 206) 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 5243 (iii).

Supply (B. 218) prop. Res., 6003; conc. (M.) 6069; in Com., 6170 (iii).

Supply Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5995 (iii).

—— (remarks) *re* one-fifth Vote, 6408 (iii).

—— (B. 241) 1°m., 8404 (iv).

—— (B. 271) prop. Res., 14767; 1°* of B., 14768.

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census) 4597, 4644, 4801; (census, N.B., religions) 4810; (gold exhibits) 4617; (Stuart, Capt. dismissal) 4353 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (electric station by-wash) 12906; (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12908; (macadamizing tow path) 14151; (tow paths) 12906 (vi); **Cornwall** (electric equipment) 14134; (enlargement) 12895; **Farran's Point** (acetylene gas plant) 14155 (vi); (enlargement) 7565 (iii); 12898, 14150; **Galops** (channel completion) 14644 (vi); (deepening, &c.) 8268; conc., 8374; (enlargement) 7804 (iv); 12899, 14141 (vi); (north channel) 7803 (iv); 14142 (vi); **Generally** (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157; (operating expenses) 12920; (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (surveys, &c.) 12900; (tolls, collectors) 12929; **Grenville** (guide pier) 12909; (investigation *re* supt.) 14157 (vi); **Lachine** (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv); 14142; (enlargement, &c.) 12903; (hydrographic surveys) 12904; (lock gate protection) 14142; (masonry walls) 12906; (Mill Street paving) 14153; (Lake St. Francis dam) 14152; **Miscellaneous** (engineers, &c., salaries) 12910; (general vote) 12910; (Heath, Geo., compensation) 14155; (litigation expenses) 12911; **Murray** (Johnson's purchase of house) 14145; (wire fencing) 14151 (vi); **North Channel** (dam construction) 7803; **Rideau** (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); (Hog's Back, swing bridge) 12904; (swing bridge at Concession St., Ottawa) 14150; **St. Ours** Lock (stop logs) 12908 (vi); **Sault Ste. Marie** (construction) 7560 (iii); 12904; **Soulanges** (bank repairing) 14154 (vi); (construction) 7549 (iii); (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (O'Leary's claims) 14651 (vi); **Trent** (construction) 7551 (iii); 14645; (Corry & Laverdure claims) 14651; (Peterborough pier) 14645 (vi); **Welland** (deepening, &c.) 7804 (iv); (deepening long level) 14148; (drainage) 12905 (vi); (Dunnville dam) 7809 (iv); (electric lighting) 12900, 14148; (elevator foundations) 14149 (vi); (land damages) 7805 (iv); (land surveys) 12905 (vi); (mitre sills) 7804 (iv); 14148; (Port Colborne improvements) 12902; (Port Colborne, rock cut) 14148; (protection walls) 12905 (Ramy's Point obstruction) 12902; (summit level) 12903; (Townsend valve, lock gates) 12905; **Williamsburg** (gate lifter) 14149; (scow) 14154; (overseer's house) 14150 (vi).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes, printing, &c.) 5135 (ii), 14252 (vi); (Receiver General) 12584 (v).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.: Aud. General (promotion) 14255, (vi); Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 320; Finance (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 224 (i); (Insurance) 12586; Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 207 (i); (High Commissioner's Office) 12586 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239; Interior (salaries) 269 (i); Railways and Canals (2nd-class clerk) 14055 (vi); (salaries) 335; Sec. of State (printing, &c.) 223 (i); (2nd-class clerks) 14254 (vi); (salaries) 222 (i).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (miscellaneous expenditure, &c.) 3967; (preferential tariff) 3940 (ii).

Fisheries (fishery officers) 5050; (inspectors' salaries) 5128 (ii); (lighthouses, &c.) 5312 (iii); (lobster hatcheries) 13661 (vi); (salaries) conc., 6070 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6668; (exodus, &c.) 6729 (iii); (general expenses) 2299 (i); (repatriation, &c.) 6716 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7772; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).

Justice, Administration of (Henry, Justice, retiring allowance) 14662 (vi).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4173 (ii); (Halifax harbour buoys) 13638 (Marconi stations) 13647 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 5005 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan Boundary commission) 2299 (i); (arbitration, Dom. and Prov.) 12590 (Art Gallery) 12589 (v); (Barton, Sir Edmund, expenses, &c.) 6952 (iii); (classifying records) 12592 (v); (Martineau defalcations) 6991 (iii); (Micmac Dictionary, printing) 12592; (Mining Institute) 12591 (v); (naturalization act, expenses) 6952 (iii); (Paris agency) 12589 (v); Petersen, Tate & Co., deposit) 6953 (iii); (Prince Albert *Advocate*, printing) 14652 (vi); (Printing Bureau plant) 12587 (v); (St. Lawrence Islands, improvements) 14661 (vi); (S. African memorial association) 6992 (iii); (tobacco commission) 8267 (iv); (trade combinations investigation) 14654 (vi); (unforeseen expenses) 6951 (iii), 12588 (v); (Victoria Memorial, Can. contribution) 14655); Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce, compensation) 14274 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. (general expenses) 6889 (iii); (salaries, &c.) 13787 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4043; (St. Lawrence, transportation) 4044; (supplies) 5046 (ii).

Post Office: Outside Service (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i); (Halifax custom house) 13031; (Halifax, immigration shed) 13033 (vi); **Ont.** (rural mail delivery) 515 (i); **Ottawa** (buildings) 5007 (ii); (census building) 992 (i); (Rideau Hall grounds) 5006 (ii); (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996; (Royal mint) 346 (i)

Docks (commission's rep.) 2982 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2644 (ii); **N.B.** (St. John River, wharfs) 1180; **N.S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1071 (i); (Breton's Cove) 13167 (vi); (Cow Bay) 1079; (Drumhead Breakwater) 1087 (i); (Frudes Point, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1088 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1096; (Green Cove, harbour) 1100; (Kingsport, pier) 1104; (Lunenburg, harbour)

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
1108; (Three Fathoms, harbour) 1149 (i); (Victoria Beach, wharf) 13125 (vi); (West Baccaro, channel) 1150; **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191; **Que.** (Grande Vallee, pier) 1552 (i); conc., 6070 (iii); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2271 (i).
Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (Dixon, F. A.) 2729; (temporary clerks) 2732 (ii).
Slides and Booms (repairs) 2980 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (Belle Isle) 2712; (Marconi system) 2712; (Mar. provs.) 2711; (telegraph lines, St. Lawrence) 5007 (ii).
Quarantine (small-pox) 5011 (ii).
Railways—G. T. Pacific (surveys) 14646; (G.T. R., rental) 12887 (vi); **I.C.R.** (air brakes, freight) 7527 (iii), 8281; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (v); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093; (car shops, machinery) 14106 (vi); ('Chapman' ball-bearing apparatus) 8283: (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8315 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi); ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8284 (iv); (Connolly's claim and interest) 14103: (double tracking, &c.) 14062 (vi); (draw bars) 7520 (ii), 8288 (iv); (Eastern Extension, award, &c.) 7529 (iv); (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 (v); (general vote) 12873; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14094 (vi); (Halifax accommodation) 7522 (iii), 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080; (Halifax terminus) 14646 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7520 (iii); (machinery for shops) 8290 (iv), 14106; Metapedia station) 14096 (vi); (Metis station and road) 12604 (v), 12828 (vi); (Miramichi bridge) 8307 (iv); (Moncton accommodation) 12600; (Moncton, freight sheds) 14090 (vi); (Moncton workshops) 8312; (Muhlfeld's rep. *re* 'Cleveland' cylinder) 8284 (iv); (New Glasgow, freight shed) 14095 (vi); (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v); (North Sydney, station) 14089 (vi); (operating expenses) 7811(iv); (Ouelle river branch) 7526 (iii), 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi); (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Point Tupper improvements) 8309 (iv); (power saw) 12607 (v); (Restigouche bridge) 8304 (iv); (Riviere du Loup engine house) 12593 (v); (Rivière du Loup, work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8309 (iv); (River Ouelle, spur line) 7526 (iii), 12599 (v); (rolling stock) 8292 (iv), 14100; (St. Flavie. accommodation) 12602 (v); (St. John, accommodation) 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063; (*Scotia* Str., salvage) 14107 (vi); (steel rails) 5005 (ii); (Stellarton, increased accommodation) 8296 (iv); (sidings, additional) 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi); (Truro, accommodation) 12603 (v); (vestibule equipment) 7529 (iii), 12600 (v); (Windsor station) 14097 (vi)
Miscellaneous (gratuities) 14155; (ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).
P.E.I. (Albany station) 14133; (Alberton station) 14132 (vi); (Blue Shank line, straightening) 7530 (iii), 14133; (Charlottetown station) 14131; (general vote) 12891; (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 14115; (Kensington accommodation) 12840; (Kinkora accommodation) 12841; (Montague bridge) 14132 (vi); (Mount Stewart, freight house) 7530; (Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge) 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108; (Northam and Richmond stations) 12841 (vi); (steel rails) 7803 (iv); (Summerside, coal sheds) 12828; (water service) 12841 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).
Superannuations (Casselman, W. J., lockmaster) 14272 (vi).
Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7795; (preferential tariff in France) 7799 (iii).
Unprovided Items, 6993 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act Amt, B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2369 (i).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4920, 4937 (ii).

Tariff Act Amt. B. 273 (surtax) in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

——— Revision, Inquiry for Cor., &c., 3003 (ii). *See* 'Budget,' &c., 'Customs,' &c.

Telephone Legislation (remarks), 409 (i).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14134, 14380 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco Excise Duties, Par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks), 5702 (iii).

Tobacco in Foreign Countries, &c., Amt. paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas *re* Trip (Ans.), 1035 (i).

Tobin Co. and Subsidy to Trois Pistoles Ry. (remarks) 14462 (vi).

Trackmen on Govt. Rys., Increase of Salaries (remarks), in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14086 (vi).

Transcontinental Ry., &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*), 7727 (iv).

——— *See* 'G.T. Pacific.'

Transportation Commission, Formation, &c., (remarks), 9819 (iv).

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, *re* Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks), 854 (i).

Treadgold Commission, Tel. from W. A. Beddoe *re* Refusal of Commissioner to produce Files (remarks) 9818 (iv).

Trent Canal, Medical Officer (Ans.) 8117 (iv).

——— Payment to Thos. Dodds (Ans.), 8118 (iv).

——— Rep. of W. McLeod *re* Route, &c. (Ans.) 12716 (v).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Tyerman, P. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.), 286 (i).

United Empire Life Insurance Co,'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*), in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*), in Com., 4587 (ii).

Veterinary Inspectors, Salaries, &c. (Ans.), 1591 (i).

Voters' Lists: *See* 'Electora..,' &c.

Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Ways and Means (Res. for Com.), 89 (i).
—— The Tariff (M.), 1378 (i).
See 'Customs,' 'Budget,' &c.
Ways and Means re G.T.P. Surveys, in Com., 14765 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans), Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2341 (i).
Welland Canal, Lock Tenders (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 12923 (vi).
Wheat Freight Rates for Export to Montreal, &c. (Ans.), 11188 (v), 11426 (v).
Wheat Freight Rates, Res. of Morden Board of Trade (Ans.), 12074 (v).
Williamsburg Canal, Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12923 (vi).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mackinnon*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).
Wood Alcohol manufactured, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).
See 'Supply—Civil Govt., Inland Revenue.'
Yukon Supplies, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4071 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*
Agricultural Lecturers, Names, &c. (Ans.), 8615 (iv).
American Cattle purchased for British Govt. (remarks, 5415 (iii).
Anderson, Mr. J. G., Allegations *re* Inspection of Fruit (remarks), 13508 (vi).
—— Appnmt. as Fruit Inspector (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases (B. 194), 1° *, 4003; 2° m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690 (ii).
Archives, Rep. (presented), 5417 (iii).
Art Gallery and Can. Artists, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13515 (vi).
Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14050 (vi).
Burrard, B.C., Census, McCraney's Letter *re* Enumerators (remarks), in Com of Sup., 7079 (iii).
Business of the House, Misleading Statements (remarks), 4348 (ii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention (B. 207) prop. Res., 4960; in Com. on Res., 5052; 1° m., 5240; in Com., 5419, 5846 (iii).
Butter and Cheese Weighing, Rep. *re* (Ans.), 5414 (iii).
Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, &c., (remarks), 10746 (v).
Canadian Exhibit at Imp. Institute, London (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13509 (vi).
Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*), to Com. of Sup., 5467 (iii).
Census, Burrard: *See* 'Burrard.'
Census, Carleton, &c., N.B., Classification, &c. (Ans.), 4004 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13707 (vi).
—— Grand Manan, N.B., Religious denominations, &c. (Ans.) 3801 (ii).
—— 1901, New Basis *re* Work of Staff (Ans.) 13936 (vi).
—— St. John, N.B., Religious Denominations, &c. (Ans.) 3801 (ii).
—— Schedules, Halton, Cardwell and Peel, for 1891 (Ans.) 6894 (iii).
—— *See* 'Halton,' &c.
—— Sunbury, &c., N.B., Religious Classification (Ans.) 4005 (ii).
—— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture,' 'Pub. Accts.' &c.
Fruit Inspector Anderson: *See* 'Anderson.'
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3810 (ii).
—— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3826 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9512 (iv); in Com. on B., 11296 (v).
Hagar, Miss, Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 5316 (iii).
Halton, Cardwell and Peel, Census Schedules (Ans.) 6436, 7092 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
Herald Co., Ques. of Privilege, 5314 (iii).
Imperial Institute Exhibit: *See* 'Can. Exhibit.'
Kelly, Wm., Census Commissioner for N. Hastings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
Patent Act Amt. (B. 184) 1° m., 3622; in Com., 4213, 4674 (ii).
Preston, Mr., and Can. Butter: *See* 'Butter,' &c.
Privilege (Ques. of), Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 5314 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Census Schedules, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).
Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
St. Louis Exposition, Live Stock Exhibit (Ans.) 4837 (ii).
San José Scale, *re* Nursery Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13502 (vi).
Schell, J. T., M.P., Goods supplied to Govt. (Ans.) 4959 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 5084; 1° m., 4442 (ii); in Com. on B., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn., 12493 (v).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Acadian historical data) 13505 (vi); (aid to societies) 4432; (archives) 4429 (ii), 13503 (vi); (Canadian exhibit at Imperia Institute) 4435 (ii), 13509 (vi); (census) 45941 (census, Côté circular) 4657; (census enumerators) 4646; (census, N.B.) 4801; (census

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Agriculture—Con.

schedules) 4635 (ii), 7053 (census, total cost) 7053 (iii); (classification of patents) 4433 (ii); (cold storage) 7086 (iii), 7670; (creameries, N.W.T.) 7632 (iv); (criminal statistics) 4429; (dairying branch) 4671; (exhibitions) 4599; (experimental farms) 4548; (fumigating stations) 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi); (general statistics) 4429; (Health Act) 4440, 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii); (Japan Exhibition) 4626; (patent branch, salaries) 4350 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7641 (iv); (Prof. Shutt's report) 4556; (St. Louis exhibition) 4599; (San José scale) 4434; (Stuart, Capt., dismissal) 4354 (ii); (Toronto Industrial exhibition) 13501 (vi); (Tracadie lazaretto) 4439; (Treadgold exhibit) 4612 (ii); (tuberculosis, aid to Can. Association) 13517 (vi); (*Year Book*) 4429 (ii).

Immigration (exodus to U.S.) 6875; (repatriation, &c.) 6713 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (freight rates, &c.) 7583 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Magog P.O.) 13081 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5502; (diseased immigrants) 5492; (hog cholera) 5505 (iii); (public health) 4440 (ii), 5490 (iii); (public health, small-pox) 5007 (ii); (small-pox) 5491 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14308 (vi).

Tuberculosis, Aid to Can. Association, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles (Minister of Justice), *Quebec County.*

Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) in Com., 5361 (iii).

Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5875 (iii).

Anglo-American Cable Co. and P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13332, 13338 (vi).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 155, 14771 (vi).

Binder Twine, Average Price, &c. (Ans.), 7566 (iv).

——— Average Price for Sisal, &c. (Ans.), 8085 (iv).

——— Circular *re* Sales, &c. (Ans.), 4182 (ii).

——— Cost, &c. (Ans.), 2311 (i).

——— Mr. Haycock's Powers under Act (remarks) 14047 (vi).

——— Residences of Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 4183 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries,' &c.

Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., O. Cs., &c., 105 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan. B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5121 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Lands, School Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360, 5556 (iii).

Capital Cases, Commutations, &c. (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Carver *vs.* King, Commutation of, Reps. *re* (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 604 (i).

Columbia River Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 150) in Com., 5559 (iii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3281 (ii).

County Court Judges, Appnmt. from local Bars (remarks) 5582 (iii).

——— Appnmts., Retirements, &c. (Ans.), 4960 (ii).

——— *See* 'Judges'.

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 95; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i).

——— (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 2779, 3242 (ii).

——— (general) Amt. (B. 215) 1° m., 5581; 2° m., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746; (cigarettes), 10748 (v); Order dschgd., 14768 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4023 (ii).

Desjardins Canal (B. 183) 1° m., 3393; in Com., 4213 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 906 (i); (compulsory voting), 13583, 14405 (vi).

——— Controverted Elections Act Am. (B. 13) 1° m. 95; 2° m., 635; in Com., 1115, 2239 (i).

——— Elections Act Amt., B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 1061; in Com., 1062 (i); Amt., 3236 (ii).

Dorchester Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Fuel (Ans. 10101 (v).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 109) 1° *, 1378 (i).

Election Bills: *See* 'Dom.' &c.

Empire Accident Surety Co.'s incorp. B. 107 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 2755 (ii).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8244, 8360 (iv).

Expropriation Act Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 93; in Com., 291, 613, 634 (i).

Gagetown, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.), 1676 (i).

Good Shepherd Reformatory N.B. (B. 199) 1° m., 4178; in Com., 4840 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5216 (iii); 7817, 7824, 7845 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9006 (iv); in Com. on B., 10424, 10568, 10619, 10649, 11190, 11210, 11319, 11833, 11864, 12063, 12074, 12164; (amt. to amt. *re* securities), 11963 (v).

——— Legal Opinions (read) 11335 (v).

——— Pets. *re* on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13269 (vi).

——— 2-cent a mile rate, 10465, 12225 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Taylor, 10564 (v).

Haycock: *See* 'Binder Twine.'

Hêtu, R., Pardon, &c. (Ans.), 7915 (iv).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*), 788 (i).

Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3258 (ii).

Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927 (i).

Judges appointed from Local Bars: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 208 (i).

Judges of the Superior Courts, Retiring Allowance (B. 7), 1° m., 93; prop. Res., 203 (i); (M.) to discharge Res., 2582 (ii).

Judges Retiring Allowance (B. 243) prop. Res., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8087, 8369; 1° * of B., 8372 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14296 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 250), prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 10759; 1° *, 2° *, and in Com., 10792, 11406 (v).

Judges of Provincial Courts (Quebec) B. 255, in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° of Res. m., 11833; in Com. on B., 12301 (v).

Judges of N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 259) 1° m., 12610; in Com., 13853, 14287 (vi).

Judges of Ont., Judges' Salaries, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 96 (i).

——— of County Courts, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3628 (ii).

——— *See* 'County,' &c.

Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented), 90 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 10) 1° m., 94; in Com., 314 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Groceries, &c. (Ans.), 10100 (v).

Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for cor., 100 (i).

Librarians of Parlt. (B. 267) prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com., 14299 (vi).

Lt.-Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113, 661 (i).

Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

Man. Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
See 'Myers.'

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5100 (ii).

Miller Bros., P.O. Saving Bank Deposits, Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14659 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4465 (ii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver, and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113, 661 (i).

Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada's B. 65 (Mr. *Bruce*) in Com., 2304 (i).

Myers, Appnmt. as Judge in Man. (Ans.) 285 (i).
See 'Man.,' &c.

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) M. to ref. back to Com., 2753 (ii).

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6432 (iii).

N.W.T. Representation in Senate (B. 253) 1° m., 11691; in Com., 12302 (v).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. 2717 (ii).

Pardons, Prerogatives, &c. of His Ex., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Ret., 567 (i).

———Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 96 (i).

Penitentiary Act Amt. (B. 217) 1° m., 5763 (iii) 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v).

Penitentiaries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. (B. 182) 1° m., 3392, 4203 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii).

Public Works Dept., Control and Transfer (B. 269) 1° m., 14281; in Com., 14741; (Amt.) 14755 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. *Power*) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14705 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14455 (vi).

Quebec Judges and Legal Business, &c. (Ans.) 14665 (vi).
See 'Judges' B. 255.'

Ry. Act (commission) Amt. B. 21, Salaries (prop. Res.) 8085; (M.) for Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).

Ry Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2599, 3847, 3886, 4126, 4578 (ii) 5780, 7299, 7609, 8125 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Two Cent Rate to M. for 3°, 8357 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13834 (vi).

——— on Conference with Senate Managers *re* Amts., Report of Progress, 14740, 14761; Rep. (read) 14844; M. to conc., 14844 (vi).

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, Iberville) on M. for 2°, 2784 (i).

Ry. Debts Bill; *See* 'Exchequer,' &c.

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14429, 14507; in Com. on B., 14736 (vi).

Reformatory Prisons (B. 221) 1° m., 6427 (iii); in Com., 8087 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Registrar of Supreme Court Salary (B. 268) in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com. on B., 14300; (Amt.) 14403 (vi).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 719; on M. for 2°, 1230 (i); in Com., 10943, 10976, 11490; (Quebec) 11792; (Toronto) 11735; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12435 (v).
Representation of P.E.I. and N.B. (Ans.) 5316 (iii).
———Papers *re* N.B. (remarks) 1110 (i).
———*Re* P. E. I. and N. B., Cor. respecting (remarks) 876 (i).
Revised Statutes; *See* 'Statutes,' 'Supply—Justice, Miscellaneous.'
St. James Division (Electoral) Vacancy (remarks) 409 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Acting Warden, &c. (Ans.) 10832 (iv).
———Hospital, &c. (Ans.) 13669 (vi).
———Investigation of 1898 (Ans.) 14285 (vi).
Schell, Mr., M.P., (M.) to ref. Stmnt. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 5417 (iii).
Saunders, Mr. C. E., Appnmt. at Experimental Farm, &c. (Ans.) 1676 (i).
Scotia, Str. Salvage Claims, &c. (remarks) 7206 (iii) 14107 (vi).
Senate Representation of N.W.T.: *see* 'N.W.T.'
Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13000 (vi).
South Shore Ry., Working, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 450 (i).
Statutes, Revised, Publication, Act Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 94; in Com., 634 (i).
Statutes, Revision (B. 265) 1° m., 13667; in Com., 14297 (vi).
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7034, 7047 (iii).
Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14429 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143 (vi).
Charges of Management (public debt) 14253 (vi).
Civil Govt.: Customs (salaries) 321; Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 208 (i); (McGillivray, A. J.) 14255; (Morris, Thos.) 14255; (Messrs. Power and Fraser) 14255; (Miss Quain) 14255 (vi); (salaries) 207 (i).
Customs (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3951 (ii).
Indians (legal expenses) 6418; (Waby trial) 6418 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7776; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Ad Hoc Judges) 3402; **B.C.** (judges' travelling allowances) 3400; **Exchequer Court** (Admiralty accommodation) 3409; (Admiralty, registrar) 3408; (reports) 3407; (registrar) 3407; (salaries) 3406; (travelling expenses) 3407; (execution
D
Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Justice, Administration of—Con.
expenditure) 3401; **Man.** (judge's travelling expenses) 3399 (ii); **Miscellaneous** (Statutes, revision) 14643; **N.B.** (divorce court) 3401 (ii); **N. W. T.** (fees, &c.) 14257 (vi); (Prince Albert court, clerk) 3401; (prisoners in N.W.T.) 3398; (Regina jail, land purchase) 5135 (ii); (Supreme Court judge) 14257 (vi); **N. S.** (county court judge Dodd) 14259; **Ont.** (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); **Supreme Court** (contingencies) 3404; (law books) 3405; (library) 3403 (ii); (reports) 14257 (vi); (Reps., binding, &c.) 3405; (reporter) 3402 (ii); (Taschereau, E. R. A.) 14257 (vi); **Yukon** (clerk of court) 3411; (Dugas, judge) 3411; (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3410, 3414, 3507; (judges living allowances) 3411; (law library) 3506 (ii), 14267 (vi); (police magistrates) 3416; (Taylor, Geo. L.) 3416; (travelling allowances) 3409 (ii).
Dom. Police (salaries) 3511 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3511; (general expenses) 3511; (Kingston) 3511; (Manitoba) 3534; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3534 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4171; (pilotage *re* St. Lawrence) 4144; (St. Lawrence, improvements) 4144 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi).
Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3589, 3600 (ii).
Miscellaneous (British American Bank Note Co.) 14279; (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election pet.) 14251 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4068 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Levis) 431 (i); Harbours and Rivers: Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633; Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); N. S. (Neil's Harbour) 1141; Que. (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Chateau Richer) 13456 (vi); (Le Tableau wharf) 2254 (i); (Ste. Anne de la Perade, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Famille pier) 13489; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 13495; (St. Louis River, improvements) 13473; (Seven Islands wharf) 13480 (vi); Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2688 (ii); Telegraph Lines, Que. (Belle Isle system) 13332; (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332 (vi).
Rys. and Canals: Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A. D.) 2729 (ii); (litigation expenses) 12911; (Stewart *vs.* King) 12913 (vi).
Trade and Commerce (iron bounties, legal expenses) 7797 (iv).
Supreme Court of Ontario, Judges' Salaries B., prop. Res., 10102 (iv).
See 'Judges' B. 250.'
Supreme Court Registrar (B. 268); in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com., 14300 (Amt.) 14403 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12305 (v).
Ticket-of-Leave System, Releases, &c. (Ans.) 96.
Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4533 (ii).
Two-cent Ry. Rate: *See* 'G. T. P. R.,' &c., 'Ry. B. 21.'
Valiquette, Mr. J. A., Appnmt. as Stenographer, Yukon (Ans.) 4005 (ii).
Yukon Ter. Act (summoning of jurors) Amt. (B. 9) 1°m., 94; in Com., 313 (i).
——— (Court of Appeal—quorum)—(B. 254) 1°m., 11692 (v).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's (N.B.)*
Albert, N.B., Harbour Master, Capt. Bishop, Dismissal (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
Allan Line Steamships, Withdrawal from St. John (remarks) 13937 (vi).
——— Reduction of Sailings from St. John, N.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14064 (vi).
Aylesworth, Mr. A. B., Reported Interview *re* Alaskan Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi)
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6384 (iii).
Bathurst, N.B., Fishery Overseer, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14686 (vi).
See 'Daly.'
Beersville Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).
Belmont Disaster Victims, Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
See 'Crandall.'
Bishop, Capt., Harbour Master at Albert, N.B., Dismissal (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
Bloomfield Postmaster, N.B., Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 818 (i).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
C.P.R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
C.P.R. (Medicine Hat) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii).
Charbonneau, Miss Edna, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12498, 12716, 13968 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12336, 12500; I. C. R. trackmen, 12561 (v); on M. for 3°, 13942 (vi).
Crandall, Brakeman on I. C. R., Inquiries at Belmont (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
See 'Belmont.'
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s (Parrsboro') Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Daly, M. T., Bathurst, Harbour Master, N.B. (Ques.) 2919 (ii).
See 'Bathurst.'
Demurrage Regulations, I.C.R. (Ques.) 4672, 4952 (ii).
Digby Port Wharf, Extension, &c. (Ques.) 2101.
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7604 (iii), 13687 (vi).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13570, 14405 (vi).
Elgin and Havelock Ry. Co.'s (B. 142) 1°*, 2237.
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8255, 8257 (iv).
Ferries on St. John River: in Com. of Sup., 13696 (vi).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Freight Rates on Ocean Vessels, Discrimination: *See* 'Discriminating.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5173 (iii); in Com., 7844, 7883; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8055, 8067, 8321 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10243; in Com. on B., 10670, 11215, 11876, 12045 (v); on M. for 3°, 12744; (amt.) 12709 (vi).
Hatfield's Point, Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
House of Commons Officials, Salaries: *See* Civil Service B. 257.'
Indian Medical Attendant, Kings, N.B. (Ques.) 2502 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
I. C. R. Demurrage of Cars, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 4672, 4959 (ii).
——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3675 (ii).
——— Private Cars: *See* 'Private.'
——— Supplies entered Duty Free (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
See 'Trackmen.'
International, Dredge leased by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 12218 (v).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8110 (iv).
Kars, Census Enumeration, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3804 (ii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).
Lake Superior, &c., Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Long Wharf, St. John, Lease by Govt. (Ques.) 11828 (v).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
Nobles, Israel, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory (remarks) 13979 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6457 (iii).
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. 5659 (iii).
Post Office Revenue, Increase, &c. (remarks) 14019 (vi).
Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14658 (vi).
P.E.I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7914 (iv).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Private Cars, I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2309 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14708, 14717 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5329, 5566 (iii).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 2924 (ii).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5630 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).

Ry. Wrecks, in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10953, (N.B.) 11809; on M. for 3°, 12490 (v).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. John, Long Wharf: *See* 'Long Wharf.'

——— Allan Line, &c., Withdrawal: *See* 'Allan.'

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Schell, J. T., M.P., Goods supplied to Govt. (Ques.) 4959 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale, B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6474 (iii).

Small-Pox Patients, Gloucester, N.B., Contribution by Govt. towards Expenses *re* (remarks) 14688.

Springhill Public Building, Explosion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—N.W.T. (fees, &c.) 14257; N. S. (county court Judge Dodd) 14259; Ont. (Nipissing Judgeship) 14258; Supreme Court (salaries) 14257; Yukon (law library) 14267 (vi).

Agriculture (census, N.B., religions) 4801 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7647 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (landing wharfs) 12908; Grenville (Tucker, Henry, services *re* investigation) 14157 (vi); Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (promotions) 14256; Public Works (architect's salary) 13499; (contingencies) 13500; (Hunter, J. B., salary) 13499 (vi).

Dom. Lands—(Banff bath house) 13956 (vi).

Excise (analysts, &c.) 5399 (iii); (inspectors salaries) 13974 (vi); (liquor inspection) 5399 (iii); (salary of private sec.) 13968 (vi).

Immigration (Barr colonists) 6696 (iii).

Indians—Mar. Provs. (schools) 6409 (iii).

Legislation—Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14269 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7604 (iv); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696; (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 13695 (vi).

Militia (rifle associations) 3768 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13957; (Miller Bros., P. O. Savings Bank defalcations) 14658 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 13543; (life-saving awards) 13544; (masters and mates examination) 13524; (naval militia reserve and school of navigation) 13545; (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 13545 (vi).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (architect's staff) 961; (dismissals, &c.) 1019; (furniture) 1006; Generally (armouries) 965; (clerks of works) 963; (experimental farms) 973; (Nappan farm) 973; (Sussex armoury) 965 (i); N. S. (Arichat) 5828 (iii); Ottawa (census building) 982; (furniture, &c.) 974, 979; (heating, &c.) 1010; (ventilation, &c.) 974 (i); Que. (trachoma hospital) 14245 (vi).

Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Windsor, sheer dam) 14248 (vi); Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1523; (Le Tableau wharf) 2250 (i); (Mont Louis wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13462; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463; Notre Dame du Portage) 13463 (vi); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 (i); (St. André de Kamouraska pier) 13492; (Ste. Anne de la Pérade) 13488; (Ste. Anne de Sorel) 13489; (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gédéon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13490; (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 (vi); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2263 (i); (St. Maurice, dam) 13492; (St. Michel de Bellechasse, pier) 13494; (St. Simeon, wharf) 13493 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2298 (i).

Slides and Booms (Gagner, Mr., salary) 2976; (Gatineau River) 2977; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Marconi stations) 2991 (ii).

Railways—Generally (wrecks, investigations *re*) 14154; I.C.R. (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (vi); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Eel river, agent's house) 12600; (Halifax accommodation) 12597; (Métis station) 12604; (v); (North Sydney improvements) 12598; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8292 (iv); (Rivière Ouelle, spur line) 12599 (v); (rolling stock) 8293 (iv); (St. John accommodation) 12597 (v); (St. John accommodation) 14063 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8296 (iv); (Sussex accommodation) 12601 (v); P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7539 (iii).

Sussex Armoury, Overseer's Qualifications *re* Constructions, &c. (Ques.) 8331 (iv).

——— Brigade Camp (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

——— I.C.R. Roundhouse, Gates, &c. (Ques.) 4672 (ii).

——— Station Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tiffin, Genl. Manager, I.C.R., and Private Cars (Ques.) 2309 (i).

Trackmen on I.C.R., &c.: *See* 'Civil Service B. 257.'

White, Albert S., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4673 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*

Alliance Bank of Canada Incorp. B 212 (Mr *Russell*) in Com., 7477 (iii).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5969 (iii).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Rep. of Com. (presented) 7202 (iii).

Fraser Mr. D. C.—*Con.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7330 (iii).

Brockville, Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*), M. for Com., 7339 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7340 (iii).

Budget, The, 2131 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5079 (ii); in Com. on B., 5453 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry, Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5631, 5820 (iii).

Canadian Steel Co.'s (B. 185) 1°*, 3708 (ii).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., Ques. of Order, 7483 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5557 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7495 (iii); in Com. (cigarettes) 10749 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1203 (i), 13579, 14407 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6443 (iii).

Erie, Ontario, Power Co's incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3580 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8254, 8361 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6908 (iii).

Fishing Industry N.S., Accommodation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13159 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5229 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7829.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10643, 12236 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., M.P., Beauharnois, Rep. of Com. (presented) 7202 (iii).

Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).

Privileges and Elections Com., M. to employ stenographer, 7202 (iii).

Public Accounts Com. (M.) 367 (i).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5977; in Com., 5983 (iii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3731 (ii), 5776 (iii) 8128, 8170.

Ry. Debts. B.: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14327.

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11115, 11501 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7249 (iii).

Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. 14297 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Public Works (architects' salary) 13499 (vi).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Immigration (repatriation, &c.) 6718 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7788 (iv).

Justice—Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3517 (ii).

Legislation—House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5270 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—N.S. (Guysborough) 5839 (iii); Ottawa (electric lighting) 988; Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176 (i); N.S. (Big Harbour wharf) 13147; (Breton's Cove) 13159 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1076; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Larry's River) 1104; (New Harbour) 1145 (i); (Paspebiac, landing pier) 13467 (vi).

Yukon Govt. (hospital grants) 7293 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9421 (iv).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9151 (iv).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, St. Anne.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 227 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13825 (vi).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507.

Macdougall, James Sinclair, Patent Relief (B. 169) Pet. presented, 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12783 (vi).

Postmasters Salaries, Increase of 10 per cent (remarks) 14025 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13506 (vi).

Canals—Generally (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157 (vi).

Excise (liquor analysis) 5393 (iii).

Militia (military properties) 3620 (ii).

Public Works—Docks (Montreal dry dock) 2987; Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 3376 (ii).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Yale and Cariboo.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7313, 7326 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to ref. back to Com., 5239; in Com., 5986 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7143, 7403; 3° m., 7468 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).

Budget, The, 2062 (i).

Columbia River Improvement Co.'s Limited incorp. (B. 150) 1°*, 2396 (i); on Sen. Amts., 6847; (amt.) 6894 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14415 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5228 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10464, 10690 (v).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8096 (iv).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8203 (iii).

Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.'s (B. 216) 1°*, 5679 (iii).

Midway to Vernon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14594 (vi).

Nelson Post Office, Claims of Racine Bros. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7170 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 3°m., 6428, 6432 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Pacific Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 164) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14677 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5661, 5862 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5341, 5570, 5766 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2784 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2553 (ii).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5661 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14337, 14489 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (Racine Bros. claim) 7170 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5290 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6726; (on ques. of order) 6873 (iii).

Indians: B.C. (Agassiz reserve, &c.) 7266; Ont., (Dr. Secord) 6341; Ont. (medical attendance) 6341 (iii)

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6989 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 1451; (Sinclair's dismissal) 1451 (i); Generally (dredging) 2650 (ii).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11085 (v).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Cattle Guard Commission, Appnmt. of Mr. Geo. Robertson, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Census, Grand Manan, N.B., Religion, &c. (Ques.) 3801 (ii).

——— St. John, N.B., Religious Denominations, &c. (Ques.) 3800 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9327 (iv).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7759 (iv).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Arsenault, Capt., damages, &c.) 13231; (Black Brook) 13227; (Campobello, breakwater) 13228; (Campbellton, wharf) 13229; (Cocagne wharf) 13231; (Grand Manan, wharf) 13234; (Richibucto, pier) 13235 (vi).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Gaspé & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 166) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

I. C. R., Shops at Rivière du Loup, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 12497 (v).

Lighthouse Keepers, Pets. *re* Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivière du Loup) 13477 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*

Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 29) 1°*, 367 (i).

Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 156) 1°*, 2582 (ii); in Com., 5558 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3216 (ii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12856 (vi); Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2970 (ii).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 452.

South Shore Ry., Complaint *re* Safety (remarks) 205 (i).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5807 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 3126 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7500 (iii).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 2100; in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9708 (iv,)

Hamilton, Lake Erie Power Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*. 2582 (ii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 707 (i).

Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 154) 1°*, 2501 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3574, 4577 (ii), 5259, 5778, 6071, 6243 (iii).

Ry. Act (fire compensation) Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 3291 (ii)

German, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7561 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredges, repairs) 2619 ; Ont. (Port Colborne) 3371 (ii).

Gibson, Mr. A., Jr., *York, N.B.*

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14342, 14488 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John river wharfs) 1180 (i).

York and Carleton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., on Res., 14488 (vi).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *E. Middlesex.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5421, 5432 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3822, 3827 (ii).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8097 (iv),

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12311 (v).

Permanent Force, Increase of Pay (Ques.) 13371.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4573 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. '66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10879 ; in Com., 10975, 11585 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12467 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6478, 7213 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (creameries) 7635 (iv).

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (London, magazine) 13115 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5502 (iii).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9992 (iii).

Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1° *, 707 (i).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6487 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. John) 2245 (i).

Gould, Mr. I. J., *W. Ontario.*

Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 165) 1° *, 2582 (ii), in Com., 5361 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10896 (v).

Gourley, Mr. S. E., *Colchester.*

Accommodation for Members in H. of C. (remarks) 14577 (vi).

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*), 14824 (vi).

——— Reported Interview of Mr. Aylesworth (remarks), 13961 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay, &c., by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14204 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6369 (iii).

Bass River, N.S., Marine Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks), 12816 (vi).

Brookfield Station Enlargement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

Budget, The, 1657 (i).

Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., in Com. on Res., 4975 (ii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*), to Com. of Sup., 5469 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), in Com., 10747 ; (cigarettes) 10749 (v).

Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

Customs Tariff Act (surtax) Amt. B. 273 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 14756 (vi).

Debert Coal Mine Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14328 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*), in Com., 13615 (vi).

Door-keeper of H. of C., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

Election Pamphlets : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 308 (i).

Govt. Officials canvassing for newspapers : *See* 'Political,' &c.

G.T. Pacific Ry, Co.'s incorp, B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5164 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com on Res., 10353 ; in Com. on B., 10674, 11234, 11385, 11977 ; 'Shadow of Cox,' &c., 11859, 12056, 12146 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13282 (vi).

——— on M. to adjn. debate (remarks) 8807 (iv). *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14335 (vi).

House of Commons, Door-keeper's Salary : *See* 'Door-keeper.'

I.C.R. Pension System, &c. (Ques.), 9216 (iv).

——— (remarks) 14727 (vi).

——— Trackmen and Labourers, Increased Wages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

Gourley, Mr. S. E.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7944, 7972 (iv).
James Bay Ry Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14317 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759, 10769; in Com. on B., 11416 (v).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8100 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14294 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14542, 14577 (vi),
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13626 (vi).
Maps, Printing and Publishing for Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand), 5717 (iii).
North Pole Expedition: *See* 'Bernier, Capt.'
N. W. T. Act Amt B. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14288 (vi).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi)
Parrsboro to Truro, Ry. Subsidy: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Political Partisanship *re* Govt. Officials canvassing, &c. (remarks) 13983 (vi).
Post Office Revenue, on Statement of P.M.G. (remarks), 14022 vi).
P. O. Savings Banks, Defalcations of Postmaster (remark) in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14708, 14726 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5779, 6308 (iii), 8178 (iv).
Ry. Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7135 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14317, 14491 (vi).
——— General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14377 (vi).
——— for N. S., Colchester County (remarks) 14491 (vi).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11618 (v).
Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 473 (i).
Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14297 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: N.S. (county court judges) 14265 (vi).
Canals: Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv); Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143 (vi).
Dom. Lands (maps, printing) 14272 (vi).

Gourley, Mr. S. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Fisheries (dog-fish pest) 13656; hatcheries 13661; (steamers, new) 13569 (vi).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7787; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).
Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268; H. of C. (door-keeper's salary) 14115 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 13642 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and London) 7736; (St. John and Halifax) 7743 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13961 (vi).
Public Works: Buildings, generally (immigrant buildings) 14247 (vi); Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 490 (i); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Five Islands, wharf) 13180; (Georgeville, wharf) 13198; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203; (Port au Pique, wharf) 13210; (Port Hood, pier) 13209; (Swim's Point, wharf) 13212; Ont. (Burlington channel, piers) 13237; (Goderich, breakwater) 13241; Que. (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461; (Newport breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (Perce pier) 13467; (River du Loup) 13477; (Saguenay dredging) 13473; (Seven Islands wharf) 13480; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13355 (vi).
Railways: I. C. R. (siding facilities) 14083 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8298 (iv); (Truro accommodation) 12603 (v).
Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7796 (iv).
Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).
Tariff (N. S. steel industry) Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4919 (ii).
Tatamagouche Postmaster, Letter *re* Insurance Fund (remarks) 14660 (vi).
Truro to Parrsboro Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14492 (vi).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *N. Ontario.*
Budget, The, 2109 (i).
Eureka, str., Loaned by Govt. (Ques.) 14285 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections, &c. (Ques.) 13027 (vi).
Judges in Quebec as Bank Directors, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).
Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands (M. for copies of reps., &c.) 2762 (ii).
Quebec Judges and Legal Business, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10993 (v).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Investigation, 1898 (Ques.) 14284 (vi).
Toronto Public Works, Amount expended since 1890 (M. for stmnt.*) 1203 (i).
Transcontinental Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections (Ques.) 13027 (vi).

Guthrie, Mr., H., *S. Wellington.*
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3277 (ii).
Crown Bank of Canada (B. 129) 1°*, 1936 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H.—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9082 (iv).
Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 1764 (i).
Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3251 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8113 (iv).
Niagara Welland Power Co.'s Limited, Change of Name (B. 90) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 7610, 8145, (amt.) 8153 (iv).
——— (employees) Amt. (B. 74) 2°m., 3247 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 13083 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E., *W. Prince, (P.E.I.)*
Alberton Ry. Station, P.E.I. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., P.E.I. and the Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vi).
Annandale Pier, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c. (Ques) 2921 (ii).
——— Range Lights, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).
Archives and Mr. Casey: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Art Gallery and Can. Artists (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
Ballot Boxes in P.E.I.: *See* 'Latour.'
Bonded Warehouses, P.E.I., Rental, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 12073 (v).
Brecken, Mr., P.O. Inspector, P.E I. (remarks) 14001 (vi).
Brennan, Mr. J. P., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13994 (vi).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10725 (v).
Budget, The, 2017 (i).
Buote, Mr. J., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 405 (i).
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Mail Delivery (remarks) 13806, 14010 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12535 (v); in Com. on B., 13824; on M. for 3°, 13947 (vi).
Conroy, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13993 (vi).
Currie, Mr. James, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13992 (vi).
DesRoches, John M., Alleged Fraud *re* Fishing Bounties (Ques.) 10955 (v).
Dominion Elections Act, Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 901 (i); in Com., (compulsory voting) 13569 (vi).
Fishery Guardian, John M. DesRoches, Alleged Fraud, &c. (Ques.) 10955 (v).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Frozen Fish, &c., Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7880; (amt.) 7909; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8326 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9459 (iv); in Com., 10637 (v); on M. for 3°, 12740 (vi).
G.T.P. Bill, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13270 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Agreement, &c., Amt. paid (Ques.) 2758 (ii).
——— Preparation of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4444 (ii).
See 'Supply—Railways.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 731 (i).
——— (remarks) 13894 (vi).
House of Commons, Official's Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service B.'
Keith, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).
Larkin, Capt. W. S., Complaints against (Ques.) 2922 (ii).
Latour, Mr., Absence from Dept. to canvas for *Le Canada* (remarks) 14006 (vi).
Mutch, Mr. H. W., P.E.I., Increase of Salaries (remarks) 13824 (vi).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks) 12822 (vi).
O'Leary Station, P.E.I., Branch Line (Ques.) 6168 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory, P.E.I. (remarks) 13978 (vi).
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Portage, P.E.I., Opening of Post Office (remarks) 14008 (vi).
Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British,' &c.
P.E.I. Coal Fields, &c. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
Prince Edward Island Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).
P.E.I, Fishing Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vi).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
See 'Winter,' &c. 'Supply—Ocean and River Service,' &c.
P.E.I. Ry., Sale of Tickets, &c. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
P.E.I. Telegraph System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii); 13333 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Roche*, Hfx.) *re* Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization,' 13375 (vi).
Queens, West, P. E. I., Representation in Parlt. (remarks) 13378 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10900; in Com., 11030; (amt.) 12432 (v).
Representation in the Cabinet from P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, P.E.I., par. in Charlottetown *Patriot*, 13806 (vi).
See 'Charlottetown.'
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday (Ques.) 1858 (i).
Semaphore Lights, P.E.I. Ry., Discontinuance, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii).
Skinner's Pond, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 13445 (vi).
Station Agents, P.E.I. Ry., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4361 (ii).
Telegraph Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii), 13333 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13505; (archives) 13504 (vi); (Census, Cote's circular 4657; (census, P.E.I.) 4656 (ii).
Civil Govt., Indian Affairs (salaries) 282 (i).
Customs (Curry, Mr., superannuation, &c.) 3918; (salaries, &c.), 3918 (ii).
Excise (salaries, P.E.I.) 13978 (vi).
Fisheries (Provincial claims) 5311 (iii).
Immigration (agents, P.E.I.) 6884 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and Ss. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6001; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 6001 (iii); (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 13676 (vi).
Militia (pay and allowance) 13442 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13534; (Govt. Strs., repairs, &c.) 13519 (vi); (Govt. steamers, service, &c.) 4059; (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4081 (ii).
Post Office (letter carriers, P.E.I.) 6058; (mail service) 6066; (P.E.I. winter service) 5944 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, P.E.I., (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi); **N.S.** (Big Pond wharf) 1072 (i); (Breton Cove) 13152; (Broad Cove) 13200; (Duncan's Cove, wharf) 13179; (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge) 1095; (Green Cove Harbour) 1101 (i); (Kingsport, pier) 13202; (L'Ardoise, breakwater) 13201; (Livingstone Cove) 13201; (Margaretsville, breakwater) 13202; (Middle river, dam) 13202; (Ogden's Pond) 13204; (Oyster Pond) 13204; (Pleasant Bay) 13205; (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1151; **P. E. I.** (Aitkin's wharf) 1159 (i); (Beach Point) 13218 (vi); (Belfast Pier) 1153 (i); (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Carleton Point) 13220 (vi); (Cascumpec Harbour) 1153; (Cove Head Harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber, &c.) 1155 (i); (dredging, &c.) 13310; (dredging plant) 13313 (vi); (Gaspereaux Harbour) 1155; (Higgin's shore pier) 1159 (i), 13222 (vi); (New London) 1160; (piers, repairs) 1161 (i); (Richmond Bay) 13223; (Skinner's Pond) 13308; (Summerside breakwater) 13226 (vi); (Tignish breakwater) 1162 (i); **Que.** (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13448; (Caplin breakwater) 13448 (vi); (Father Point pier) 1513; (Grand Vallee pier) 1515 (i); (Mont Louis wharf) 13462; (Newport breakwater) 13463; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463); (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; **Yukon** (Lewes and Yukon river) 13306 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Miscellaneous (Ottawa River surveys) 13341.
Roads and Bridges (Bryson, approaches) 13321 (vi).
Telegraph Lines—P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13326 (vi); (P.E.I. tel. lines) 2707 (ii); (P.E.I. and mainland) 5917 (iii); Que. (Marconi, Murray Bay, &c.) 13326 (vi).
Quarantine (Pethick, Dr., expenses) 5505; (veterinary division) 5504 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8275 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 12603; (Metis, station) 12604 (v); **P. E. I.** (general vote) 12891; (Hillsborough bridge) 12833; (Kinkora, accommodation) 12841 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7534 (iii), 12833; (Northam and Richmond stations) 12841 (vi); (O'Leary's station) 7538 (iii).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes*) for Cor., 1040 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply,' &c.
Winter Navigation, P.E.I., Construction of Str. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. John, *South Lanark.*
Alaskan Boundry Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14778 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14287 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5873 (iii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5962 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7392 (iii).
——— Res., on Ques. of Order, 7308 (iii).
Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Ry. Bill, 12751 (vi).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342, 7352 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Budget, The, Rep. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 410 (i).
Business of the House, on M. to take in Mondays, 3711 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7812 (iv).
——— *See* 'Govt.'
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5846 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4962, 4993, 5090 (ii), 5590, 5786 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr *Oliver*) in Com., 3226, 3982 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Chapman Double Ball-Bearing Co., &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4424 (ii).
Chinese Restriction Act Amt. B. 82 (Sir *Wilfrid*

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Laurier) in Com. on Res., 610; in Com. on B. 2241 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12337 (v); in Com. on B., 13810 (vi).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4680 (ii).
Corry & Laverdure, Contracts *re* Trent Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. (immoral entertainments) B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 316 (i), 7514 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3065, 4024 (ii).
Dom. Coal Co. and Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13192 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1202 (i), 13561, 14406 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3024; in Com. on B., 4680 (ii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8250, 8360 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 291, 618 (i).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12295 (v).
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 5890 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal. *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 940 (i).
——— *See* Business.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5159 (iii), 7816, 7845, 7867 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*), 7827 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8680; on M. for 1°, 7717 (iv); in Com. on B., 12096, 12289 (v); on M. for 3°, 12676, 12757 (vi).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Par. in Toronto *Globe re* Scheme, 5892 (iii).
——— Surveys, Information, &c. (remarks), 8230 (iv).
——— Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for cor., 448 (i).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental'.
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14331 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
I. C. R., Book-keeping: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'
——— Freight Cars on connecting Lines, &c. (M. for ret. *) 3805 (ii).
——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3657 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3537 (ii).
I.C.R., Mr. Pottinger's Rep. (M. for copy) 3806(ii).
——— Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'
——— Ties issued, purchased, used, &c. (M. for ret.*), 3805 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7926 (iv).
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14317 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt, B. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (Quebec) 12301 (v).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).
Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 315 (i).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks), 658 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks), 2523 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8041 (iv).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks), 1590 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks), 14543 (vi).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13626 (vi).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 78 (Mr. *Borden*, Kings) in Com., 1117, 2240 (i).
Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) on M. to introduce, Ques. of Order, 14281 (vi).
Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. 3221 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. of Res., 14337 (vi).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6433 (iii).
N.W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12313 (v).
——— Sen. Representation B.: *See* 'Senate.'
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res,, 14327 (vi).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1311 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6809 (iii).

Ottawa, Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

——— *See* 'Waltham.'

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14461 (vi).

Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3623 (ii).

Perth Public Building, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5240, 5661; on M. for 2°, 5658; in Com., 5854 (iii).

Procedure, Ques. of, 5892 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Res., 14691 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5972; in Com., 5984 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt B 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 250 (i); in Com., 2597, 3542, 3720, 3830, 3885, 3975, 3985, 4124, 4573, 4696 (ii), 5256, 5681, 6197 (iii), 8125, 8133 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13836 (vi).

——— Commissioners' Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8120 (iv).

——— *See* Ry. Act (consolidation).

——— Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2577 (ii).

——— (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546; in Com., 550, 1059; on M. for 3°, 1199 (i).

——— Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14314, 14428 (vi).

——— (supplies for Govt. rys.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12944 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 5892 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 720; on M. for 2°, 1259 (i); on M. for Com., 10885; in Com., 10975, 12294; (Kent) 11577; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12404, 12427; neg. (Y. 28; N. 65) 12431 (v).

——— (remarks) 408 (i).

Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry. Fredericton to Woodstock, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Sault Ste. Marie Labour Disturbances and Militia (remarks) 12940 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6469 (iii).

Senate Representation in N.W.Ter., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry. Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 454, 458 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6542 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Supplies to I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census enumerators) 4656 (ii).

Canals—Galops (deepening) 8268; conc., 8374; (enlargement) 7803; Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806; North channel (dam) 7803; Rideau (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563; (construction) 7560; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7557; (Corry & Laverdure, contract) 7557 (iii); Welland (deepening, &c.) 7804; (Dunnville bridge) 7809; (land damages) 7805; (mitre sills) 7804 (iv).

Charges of Management (public debt) 14253 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (promotions) 14255 (vi); Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 322; Interior (salaries) 270 (i); Justice (salaries) 14255 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342; (salaries) 341 (i); Public Works (contingencies) 5824 (iii); Railways (salaries) 334 (i); Sec. of State (2nd class clerks) 14254 (vi).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7799 (iv).

Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 6762 (iii).

Excise (Perth, salaries) 13969 (vi).

Inspection of Staples (Man. Grain Act) 7798.

Justice, Administration of: N.S. (county court judges) 14261; Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Yukon (Dugas, Judge) 3430; (sheriffs' salaries) 3410 (ii).

Legislation: H. of C. (debates, amamuenses) 14243; (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii), 13693 (vi); (Can. and G. B.) 5998; (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249; (St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election pet.) 14252 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268.

Public Works: Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 412; (St. John, immigration) 413; (St. John, quarantine water service) 415 (i); **N.S.** (Halifax) 411 (i); **Ont.** (Guelph armoury) 13084 (vi); **Ottawa** (Royal mint) 349 (i); (steel shelving) 13094 (vi); (Victoria museum) 366 (i), 14243 (vi); **Que.** (citadel, drill shed) 13057; (Longueuil P.O.) 13075 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. Andrew's wharf) 5894, (St. John tributaries) 5895 (iii); **N.S.** (Glace Bay wharf) 13192 (vi); (Necum Teuch wharf) 1137; (Neil's Harbour) 1141; **Que.** (Isle aux Coudres) 2242; (Lake St. John wharf) 2243; (Laprairie ice piers) 2249; (Le Tableau wharf) 2249; (L'Ile d'Alma) 2257; (repairs, improvements) 2242 (i); (rivière du Nord) 5908; (St. Laurent wharf) 5906 (iii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2257 (i); (St. Lawrence

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

ship channel) 3307 (ii); (St. Maurice river) 5904 (iii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12848 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5906 (iii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2678; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (air brakes to freight cars) 7528 (iii); 8281; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (book keeping) 12876 (vi); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii); (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8314; ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8285; (draw bars, exchange) 8289 (iv); (Eastern Extension, award, &c.) 7528 (iii); (G. T. R. rental) 12887 (vi); (Halifax, accommodation) 8316 (iv); (Lévis, accommodation) 7522 (iii); (machinery for shops) 8291; (Miramichi bridge) 8307; (Moncton workshops) 8312; (operating expenses) 7811 (iv); (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii); (Pictou, accommodation) 8317; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Restigouche bridge) 8304; (Rivière du Loup, work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8309; (rolling stock) 8293; (St. John, accommodation) 8315; (Stellarton accommodation) 8296 (iv).

P. E. I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7530 (iii) 7801; (steel rails) 7802 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7796 (iv).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301, 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314, 14382 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii).

Transcontinental Ry. and Sir William Mulock's Speech (remarks) 367 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M, for Com. of Sup., 3444 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Sorel Wharf, 12854 (vi).

——— *re* Speech from the Throne (remarks) 6404 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4536 (ii).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

Waltham to Ferguson, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Cc.'s incorp. B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. to refer to Com., 664 (i).

Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Yamaska to Lotbinière Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14318 (vi).

Hale, Mr. F. H., *Carleton (N.B.)*

Census, Carleton, &c., N.B., Religious Classification, &c. (Ques.) 4004 (ii).

Hale, Mr. F. H.—*Con.*

Drill Shed, Woodstock, N.B., Purchase of Site, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3236 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5191 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, 12733 (vi).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3734 (ii); (telephones) 5534 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7230 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Woodstock, N.B., Post Office, Repairs, &c. (Ques,) 672 (i).

——— Retaining Wall, &c. (M. for ret.*) 705 (i).

Harty, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 591 (i).

Queen's College of Kingston (B. 190) 1°*, 3864 (ii),

SUPPLY:

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4169 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Alliance Bank of Can. incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) on M. for 2°, 5585; in Com., 7470 (iii) (amt.) 7477 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4224 (ii).

Atlantic, Quebec & Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1806 (i).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circular from Aud. Gen. (remarks) 11553 (v).

Bank Act Amt. (B. 234) 1° m., 7565 (iv).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6404 (iii).

Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks) 12813 (vi).

Binder Twine Inspector, Authority as to Penalties, &c. (remarks) 14048 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to ref. back to Com., 5239; in Com., 5985; on M. for 3° (amt.) 5988 (iii).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10721 (v).

Brockville & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7464; on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7345 (iii).

Bruce Mines & Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).

Budget, The, 2076 (i).

Burrard, B.C., Census, Letter of Mr. McCraney *re* Enumerators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7077 (iii).

Business of the House *re* Printing of Bills (remarks) 2394 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5062 (ii); in Com. on B., 5422, 5452, 5850 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, &c. (remarks) 10712, 10745 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5626 (iii).

C.P.R to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Can. Associated Press Despatches B.: *See* 'British.'

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5584 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5468 (iii).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13730 (vi).

See 'Burrard,' &c., 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c.

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5969, 6199 (iii).

Citizen's Bank of Canada incorp. B. 214 (Mr. *Clarke*) 7478; (amt.) 7479 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12359 (v).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3261 (ii).

Country Postmasters, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5676 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5582, 6654, 7503 (iii); (cigarettes) 10756 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com, on Res., 3050; in Com. on B., 4036 (ii).

See 'German,'

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. 1062 (i); (compulsory voting) 13575, 14423 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3009 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) 4782 (ii).

German Surtax, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).

See 'Customs.'

Govt. Railways Act (supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12582 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7820, 7856 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9942 (iv); in Com. on B., 10687, 11911, 11934 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12770 (vi).

——Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13271 (vi).

Imports for 1903, Duty collected and Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 13935 (vi).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 3297 (ii).

I.C.R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Govt.,' &c.

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7974 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties paid 1890-1903 (Ques.) 11556 (v).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8111 (iv).

Lac Bouchette Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8007 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14400 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights.'

Niagara, Queenston & St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6431 (iii).

North-West Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2753 (ii).

N.W.T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12327 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4871 (ii).

Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6457 (iii).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13631 (vi).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14680 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5676, 5859 (iii).

Preferential Tariff Imports: *See* 'Imports.'

Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British,' &c.

P. E. I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4223 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14711, 14731; on M. for 2°, 14734 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14454 (vi).

Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3737 (ii), 6102, 6119, 6173, 6323; (telephones) 5553 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14315, 14428, 14736 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14347 (vi).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1812 (i).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10851; in Com., 11541, 11584, 12294; (Brant) 11111, 11152; (Toronto) 11747; (Waterloo) 11643, 11652 (v).

Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5085 (ii); in Com. on B., 6470 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5845 (iii).

Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14457 (vi).

Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 634 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7040 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14315 (vi).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14428 (vi).

Sugar entered for Home Consumption, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 14285 (vi).

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi); (census schedules) 7076 (iii); (deputy minister) 4356; (experimental farms) 4557 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7653 (iv); (Shutt's, prof., report) 4557 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Public Works (contingencies) 5824.

Excise (liquor inspection) 5402 (iii).

Fisheries (bait freezers) 13655 (vi).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6707 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7765 (iv).

Justice, Administration of: Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3415; Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3525 (ii).

Legislation (voters' lists) 5276 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Bronte lighthouse) 5755 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 7754 (iv).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590; (Printing Bureau plant) 12587; (unforseen expenses) 12588 (v).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4088; (meteorological service) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4116 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Man. (immigration building) 5844 (iii); N. B. (Campbellton, P.O.) 13037 (vi); N. S. (Arichat) 5833; Ont. (Clinton, P. O.) 519 (i), 5834 (iii); (Guelph) 638; (London drill hall) 642 (i); Ottawa (electric lighting, transformers) 5843; Que. (Montmagny) 5841 (iii).

Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte harbour) 1355 (i); (Burlington channel piers) 13238 (vi); (general repairs) 1374 (i); (Kaministiquia river) 5-25 (iii); (Oakville pier) 1376 (i); P. E. I. (Summerside, breakwater) 13227 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river) surveys) 13357; (transportation commission) 13363 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2691 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I.C.R. (Canso ferry service) 12603 (v).

Tariff and Taxation *re* N. W. Immigration: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6866 (iii).

Tariff Policy of Govt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iii).

———*See* 'Customs,' &c.

Textile Fabrics B.: *See* 'Inspection.'

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14737; (amt.) 14739 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco Duties collected, 1902 (Ques.) 2103 (i).

——— 1903 (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Tobacco Excise Duties, Par. in *Globe* (remarks) 5701 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) Inquiry *re* resuming adjnd. deb., 5882 (iii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13363 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14465 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2341 (i).

Halliday, Mr. J., *N. Bruce.*

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10952 (v).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *S. Brant.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com, on Res., 7319, 7361, 7391 (iii).

Binder Twine, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2311 (i).

Budget, The, 1764 (i),

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5073, 5082 (ii).

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. on Sup., 13724 (vi).

——— New Basis *re* Work of Staff (Ques.) 13935 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 838 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8323 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9505 (iv); in Com. on B., 10556, 10669, 11969, 12032, 12242 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 13286 (vi).

———*See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7975 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4338 (ii).

Loan Companies, Extension of Powers B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2350 (i).

Heyd, Mr. C. B.—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2523 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8055 (iv).

National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P. R.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6433 (iii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4746 (ii), 5554, 6127, 6274 (iii), 8168 (iv), 12964 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* 2 cent fares, to M. for 3°, 8346 (iv).

Railway Policy of Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7126 (iii).

Railway Subsidies for past ten Years, voted by Parlt. (Ques.) 13934 (vi).

Rathbun Co.'s (B. 122) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10893, 10922, 11088, 11657 (v).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5087 (ii); in Com. on B., 7219 (iii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Railways (salaries) 338 (i).
Customs (contingent expenses) 3794 (ii).
Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6334; (medical attendance) 6334 (iii).
Inland Revenue (wood alcohol) 239 (i); (Keilty, Mr., appnmt.) 5370 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7768, 7773 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7603 (iv).
Post Office (letter carriers, salaries) 6022 (iii).
Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 8276 (iv).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9427 (iv).

Two cent Ry. Passenger Fares: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Holmes, Mr. R., *W. Huron.*

British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8239 (iv).

Budget, The, 1953 (i),

Can. Associated Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'British,' &c.

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13733 (vi).

Chickens, Fattening of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 824 (i).
See 'Criminal,' &c.

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3266 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes), 10752 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13570 (vi).

Holmes, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3014 (i).

Fattening of Chickens: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Fire Protection of Parliament Buildings: *See* 'Ottawa.'

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on M. for 2°, 3819 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*), to Com. of Sup., 4771 (ii).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ques.) 542 (i).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10049 (iv).

——— Member (Mr. *Taylor*) asked to keep to Clause under Discussion, 10565 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Kemp, 11987 (v).

Huron Judgeship, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt (remarks), 220 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks), 12814 (vi).

Ottawa Govt. Buildings, Rep. *re* Martineau Investigation and Security from Fire (Ques.) 4673 (ii).

Press Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (under-crossings, &c.), 6202 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Huron), 11003 (v).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7038 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Poultry Farming*) 7644 (iv),
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 220 (i).
Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.), 5288 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7778 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5272 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Clinton, P.O.) 520 (i); N.S. (Breton's Cove), 13164 (vi); Ont. (Goderich, breakwater), 13241 (vi).

Vegetable Duties: *See* 'Garden,' &c,

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's* (*P.E.I.*).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10731 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*), on M. for 3°, 13944 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting) 13590 (vi).

Elmira Branch Line on P.E.I. Ry. (marks), in Com. of Sup., 12836 (vi).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com., 6903 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*), on M. for 3°, 8329 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for Com. on Res., 9183 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Post Office Revenue, on Postmaster General's Statement (remarks), 14021 (vi).
P.E.I. Ry., Total Cost, Misrepresentation, &c. (remarks), 1679 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for 3°, 12451 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale, B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7235 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Post Office—Outside Service (P.E.I. winter service) 5948 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside breakwater) 13227 (vi); Telegraph Lines (P.E.I. cables), 2710 (ii).
Railways—P.E.I. (Elmira Line), 12836; (Murray Harbour branch), 12832 (vi).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies), 1036, 1051 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S., *N. Victoria (O.).*
Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*), 14786 (vi).
Art Gallery, Expenditure on Paintings, &c. (Ques.), 12717 (vi).
See 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*), in Com., 5970 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11165 (v).
Bedford Basin, I.C.R., Land acquired (remarks), 14062 (vi).
Belmont Disaster, Widows' Gratuities (remarks), 14157 (vi).
Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties collected (remarks), 14048 (vi).
Bracebridge, Post Office Building (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi),
Bridges over Canals, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 10716 (v).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Artists and King Edward's Portrait, &c. (Ques.), 13026 (vi).
Canadian Beef supplied to British Troops (remarks), 483 (i).
Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).
Can. Central and O. & B. Ry. Amalgamation, Compensation, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Can. Foundry Co.'s strike: *See* 'Scotch,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii); 5648 (iii).
C.P.R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
C.P.R. (Medicine Hat) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
C.P.R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Can. Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'British.'
Can. S.A. Constabulary, Attestation, Discharge, &c. (Ques.), 14287 (vi).
Canal Locks, Opening, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 14158 (vi).
Cartoons in *Military Gazette*, &c. (Ques.), 2103 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 400 (i).
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).
Civil Service B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res. (M.) that Com. rise, 12562 (v).
Coldstream Guards Band, Arrangements *re*, &c. (Ques.) 9683 (iv).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4687 (ii).
Clergue Steel Works, Labour Disturbance (remarks) 12610 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7501 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3065 (ii).
Debert Coal Mines Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Dixon, Capt., Rep. *re* Canadians in S.A. (Ques.) 7914 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Sel. Com., 3002 (ii); in Com., 14422 (vi).
Dom. Lands, Sale, Locations, Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 670 (i).
Drill Sheds established, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13068 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4687 (ii).
Dundonald, Lord: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Election Printing in Prince Albert *Advocate*, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Elevator Accident, &c. (remarks) 5417 (iii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 615 (i).
False Creek, B.C., Agreement, &c. (remarks) 2758 (ii).
Ferries Regulation B.: *See* 'Navigable.'
Franking of Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Freight Rates, Discrimination: *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Furniture Trade with Australia, 13679 (vi).
G.O.C., Rep., &c., Publishing of (Ques.) 669 (i).
——— Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton *re* Defence Scheme, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2406 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'
Good Shepherd Reformatory, N.B., B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4841 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Gordon Highlanders' Trophy (remarks) 7253 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5152 (ii), 5171 (iii), 7816, 7880; on M. for 3° (amt.) 8065 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Wilmot's Amendment, 8067 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 7826 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8874 (iv); in Com. on B., 10421, 10586, 11238, 11887, 11346, 11887, 11901, 11950 (v); on M. for 3°, 12736, 12762 (vi).
G.T.P. Ry., Mr. Hays' Statement *re* Plans for Completion, &c., 14648 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Privs. and Elections Com., 13272 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt. for S.A. War, Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
Hides, Trade with Australia. *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 769 (i).
——— (personal explanation) 871 (i),
House of Commons Elevator: *See* 'Elevator.'
Hutton, Maj.-Gen., Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 206 (i).
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14447 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (Dawson) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14300 (vi).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Lindsay Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2530 (ii).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14239 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14540 (vi).
Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands, on M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Copies of Reps., &c., 2764 (ii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7992 (iv).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14399 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Military Gazette Cartoons: *See* 'Cartoons.'
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction (Ques.) 669 (i).
——— Estimates (remarks) 13368 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia,' &c., 'Personal,'&c.
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12985 (vi).
Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).
Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'
Nicola, Kamloops and Similakameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
N.W.M. Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10741 (v).
——— Appnmts, Promotions, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).
Ninety-fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (iv).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
Painting of King: *See* 'Portrait.'
Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14461 (vi).
Patent Act. Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4674 (ii).
Patent Relief Bills (remarks) 2397 (i).
Pensions to S.A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14597 (vi).
——— *See* 'S. A.,' &c.
Personal Explanation, *re* Misprint in Speech on Militia Service, 14850 (vi).
Portrait of His Majesty, King Edward VII and Canadian Artists (Ques.) 13026 (vi).
Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).
Press Despatches from G. B.: *See* 'British.'
Press Gallery Representatives, Payment as Sessional Clerks (remarks) 14114, 14242 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate*, Printing, &c.: *See* 'Election.'
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134, 3136 (ii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3728, 3750, 4124, 4703, 4728 (drainage) 4752 (ii); 5354 (iii).
Ry. Rates, Control by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14502 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order, Ruling asked for, 14360 (vi).
Ry. Wrecks Investigation: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10892; in Com., 10951, 10957, 11439, 11505; on M. for 3°, 12478 (v).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 6997 (iii).

St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13265 (vi).

Sault Ste. Marie Disturbances, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12610 (vi).

Scotch Labourers, &c., Return to Old Country (remarks) 7206 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7238 (iii).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reps., &c. (remarks) 11823 (v).

S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, reinstated, &c. (Ques.) 1026 (i).

——— Hay : *See* 'Hay and Oats.'

——— Pensions to Canadians (Ques.) 2920 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pensions.'

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).

——— B. 225 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6916 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7038 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census enumerators) 7083 (iii); (census, N. Ont.) 4826; (imperial institute) 4437 ; (patent branch, salaries) 4350 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing tow path) 14152 ; Cornwall (electric lighting) 14139 ; Farran's Point (acetylene gas plant) 14155 ; Grenville (Tucker, Henry, investigation services) 14157 ; Lachine (Guilbault, Mr., gratuity) 14157 ; Lake St. Francis (dam) 14152 ; Murray (purchase of Supt.'s house) 14146 ; (wire fencing) 14151 ; St. Ours (landing wharfs) 14154 (vi) ; Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7560 ; Trent (construction) 7553 (iii) ; 14645 ; (Peterborough pier) 14645 ; Williamsburg (overseer's house) 14150 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Finance (Insurance) 12586 ; Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v) ; Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 207 (i) ; High Commissioner's Office, 12585 (v) ; Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 241 (i).

Dom. Lands (fire regulations) 6775 ; (half-breed schools, salaries) 6772 (iii) ; (homestead entries) 13966 (vi) ; (roads, &c.) 6772 ; (surveys) 6768 ; (tree culture) 6775 ; (Winnipeg office) 6767 (iii).

Electric Light (inspections) 5407, 5412 (iii).

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., rep., &c.) 5387 ; (grain weighing machine) 5387 ; (liquor inspection) 5401 ; (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373 ; (wood alcohol) 5375 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5278, 5288 ; (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6677 ; (creed lines) 6698 ; (mechanics, &c.) 6832 ; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6849 ; (tents, &c.)6849 ; (N.W.T. expenditure, &c.) 6882 ; (on ques. of order) 6871 (iii).

Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., shortage) 5406; (retirements, &c.) 5404 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7774 (iv).

Interior (Amos Barnes) 6925; (Liard River miners) 6926; (meteorological observatory) 6793 ; (squatters' claims) 6925 (iii).

Justice Administration of: Miscellaneous (prisoners. N.W.T.) 3398 (ii).

Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7198 (iii).

Legislation—House of Commons (messengers, &c.) 5267 (iii) 14243 ; (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi) ; (voters' lists) 5275 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 13678 (vi) ; (Can. and G.B.) 5998 (iii), 7582 ; (Can. and S. Africa) 7746 ; (freight rates, &c.) 7582 (iii); (wrecking plant) 13698 (vi).

Militia (defence scheme) 3763 (ii) ; (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii) ; (G.O.C.) 3779 ; (pay and allowance) 3755 (ii), 13434 (vi) ; (rifle associations) 3767 ; (target practice) 3772 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3754 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 12589 (iv) ; (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14652 (vi) ; (Art gallery) 12589 (v) ; (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984 (iii) ; (Paris agency) 12589 ; (printing bureau plant) 12588 (v) ; (S. A. memorial association) 6992.

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4078 (ii).

Post Office (letter boxes) 6153 ; (letter carriers) 6037 ; (locked boxes, H. of C.) 6026 ; (Mallon, A. D., retirement, &c.) 6037 ; (ry. mail clerks) 6026 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (Winnipeg, immigration stations) 13126 ; **N B.** (Campbellton, P.O.) 13037, 13040 ; (military buildings) 13041 ; (quarantine station, water service) 13042 ; (St. John drill hall) 13042 (vi) ; (St. John immigration) 414 (i) ; (St. John immigration shed) 13040 (vi) ; (St. John, quarantine water service) 415 (i), 13042 ; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13038; **N.W.T** (Strathcona Horse barracks) 13130 ; (Moosejaw, P.O.) 13130 ; (Prince Albert court-house) 13129 ; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13082 (vi) ; (Bowmanville) 510 ; (Guelph, armoury) 13084 ; (Kingston, barracks) 13118 ; (Military college, Kingston) 13094 ; (Peterborough, armoury) 13083 (vi) ; (Toronto Junction post office) 651 (i) ; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120 ; (Woodstock armoury) 13125 ; **Ottawa** (additional (bath rooms, H. of C.) 13006 (vi) ; (ventilation of Chamber) 13011 ; (ventilation, lighting, &c. of H. of C.) 13087 ; (Victoria museum) 14244 ; **P. E. I.** (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035 ; **Que.** (Levis, P. O.) 13053 ; (Longueuil, P. O.) 13072 ; (Magog, P. O.) 13081 ; (military buildings, arsenals, &c.) 13054; (Montreal, barracks) 13076 ; (Quebec drill hall addition) 13077 ; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067 ; (St. John's, P. O.) 13059 ; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 1457 (i) ; (Victoria harbour, dredging) 13306 ; **Man.** (dredging plant) 13311 (vi) ; (snag boat) 2673 (ii) ; (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i) ; **Mar. Prov.** (dredging plant) 2665 (ii) ; **N.W.T.** (repairs, &c.) 1450 (i) ; **N.S.** (Abbott's Harbour) 13141 ;

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
(Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 13235; (Blind river, wharf) 13235 (vi); (Bowmanville pier) 1354 (i); (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bronte harbour) 1357 (i); (Burlington channel, piers) 13237; (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland, wharf) 13239; (Goderich, breakwater) 13240; (Parry Sound) 13248 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3342 (ii); (Port Perry) 13249; (Rosedale, wharf) 13249; (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13314 (vi); **Que.** (Father Point, pier) 1514; (Grande Vallee pier) 1516, 1521 (i); (Quebec harbour improvements) 3341; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3306; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2657 (ii).
Roads and Bridges (Bryson, approaches) 13321; (Edmonton, flooring) 13323; (Moisie Post Road) 13322; (Peace River, pack trail) 13323 (vi).
Telegraph Lines, Que. (Anticosti, Fox River) 13325; Yukon (working expenses) 14041 (vi).
Railways: G. T. Pacific (surveys) 14646 (vi); I. C. R. (air brakes, freight cars) 7527; (Canso ferry service) 12602; (Chaudière Junction, engine house) 12594; (Rivière du Loup, engine houses) 12593; (Halifax accommodation) 12597 (v); (investigation *re* wrecks) 14154 (vi); (Metis station) 12604 (v); (miscellaneous, gratuities) 14155 (vi); (Ouelle River, spur line) 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 14088 (vi); (power saw) 12608 (v); (rolling stock) 14100 (vi); (St. Flavie accommodation) 12602 (v); (sidings, additional) 14058 (vi); (vestibules) 12600 (v); P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14119 (vi).
Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).
Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6932 (iii).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4889 (ii).
Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).
Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14381, 14388 (vi).
Trent Canal, Medical Officer, &c. (Ques.) 8117 (iv).
——— Payment to Thos. Dodds (Ques.) 8118 (iv).
——— Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2324 (i).
Toronto Armouries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13085 (vi).
Toronto, Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).
Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14 48 (vi).
Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Yamaska to Lotbinière Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14319 (vi).
Yukon Ry. through Can. Ter. (remarks) 14497 (vi).

Hyman, Mr. C. S., *London.*
Bills withdrawn (M.) 7203 (iii).
Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4591 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.), Meeting concurrently with Sittings of the Hse., 8405 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 4441 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10860; in Com., 10942, 10958, 11584, 12293; (Brant) 11098; (Toronto) 11698; (Waterloo) 11642; (York) 11682; on M. for 3°, 12408, 12416, 12463 (v).
——— Rep. of Tel. Com. (presented) 7293 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (London drill hall) 641 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *E. Elgin.*
Alien Labour Act, Prosecutions, &c. (Ques.) 3971 (ii).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 42 8 (ii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1510 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6976 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1808 (i).
Bankers Association, Inspection Duties, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).
Brockville and Sault St. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7340 (iii).
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14499 (vi).
——— (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 401 (i).
Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. in Com. on Res., 611 (i).
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12494, 12517 (v).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3183 (ii).
——— (Ques. of Order) 3107 (ii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i); in Com., 3260 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7519 (iii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3243 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3103; in Com. on B., 4011 (ii).

Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 896; in Com., 905 (i); on M. for Sel. Com., 3003 (ii).

——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com., 1062 (i).

Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6914 (iii).

Dorchester Penitentiary, Tenders for Fuel (Ques). 10101 (v).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3009 (ii).

Elgin County, Redistribution, &c., Par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 6540 (iii).

Fast Atlantic: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6905 (iii).

German Surtax: *See* 'Customs.'

Gerrymander Bill: *See* 'Representation B. 66.'

Glace Bay, N.S., Wharf, Letter of Mr. Shields (read) 13185 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7819, 7843, 784 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10425, 10613, 10671, 11297, 12240 (v).

——— on M. to adjn. Debate (remarks) 8807 (iv).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 68 (i).

Hog Cholera, Outbreak in Yarmouth, Ont. (M. for ret.*) 1058 (i).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 809 (i).

Imperial Building, Ottawa, Govt. Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 3803 (ii).

Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3172 (ii).

Interior, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).

Judges appointed from Local Bar, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2516, 2532 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, *re* (remarks) 14224 (vi).

Manufacturers' Delegation *re* Tariff (remarks) 265 (i).

Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3802 (ii).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 5725 (iii).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 1811 (i).

Order, Questions of, on Mr. Speaker's Rulings (remarks) 10537 (v).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6810 (iii).

Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3624; in Com., 4217 (ii).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8233 (iv).

Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4177 (ii).

Post office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5869 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11563 (v).

——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys. 'Grafters,' 10521 (v).

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (ii).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1334 (i).

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8122 (iv).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 250 (i); in Com., 3839, 3891, 4128 (ii), 5765, 6133, 6217, 6259, 6324 (iii).

Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2 60; in Com., 2581, 2924 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14499 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., Blockade, &c., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2492.

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10879; in Com., 10940, 10981, 11014, 11140, 11456, 11496, 11157, 11 87, 11 24, 11637, 11662; (Brant) 11099, 11110; (Toronto) 11713; (Waterloo) 11662; on Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) to M. for 3°, 12489 (v).

Rural and Free Mail Delivery (remarks) 516 (i).

St. James Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (remarks) 13378 (vi).

St. Thomas, Armoury Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).

Schooley, Wm. Francis, Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 3224 (ii).

S. A. Constabulary, Information *re* Grievances, &c. (Ques.), 1027 (i).

Springhill Boiler Explosion (remarks) 13258 (vi).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7052 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (patent branch, salaries), 4350 (ii).
Canals—Welland (Dunnville dam) 7810; (land damages) 7805 (iv).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con*

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 272; Justice (salaries) 211; Militia (salaries) 222; Privy Council Office (salaries) 207 (i).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3785; (salaries, &c.) 3907 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff hot springs) 6789 (iii).

Geological Survey (geologist, international boundary survey) 6825; (new building) 6824 (iii).

Immigration (exodus to U. S.) 6880; (general expenditure) 6880; (on ques. of order) 6862; (Ques. of order, quoting speeches) 6871; (U.S. agents) 6849 (iii).

Labour Dept. (B.C. labour commissioners) 7198 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4172; (lightkeepers, salaries, &c.) 4166; (St. Lawrence navigation) 4150 (ii).

Militia (defence scheme) 3765; (G.O.C.) 3782; (grants to associations) 3770 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13396 (vi); (transport and freight) 3752, 3767 (ii).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6985; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6976 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. (general expenses) 6858 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4084 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 1068; (furniture) 1006; (heating, &c.) 1066; (postmasters) 1020 (i); **Mar. Provs.** (renewals, &c.) 422 (i); **Ont.** (Alexandria, P. O.) 506; (architects) 524; (Clinton P.O.) 522 (i); (Oshawa P.O.) 13111; (St. Mary's P.O.)13109(vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 651 (i); **Ottawa** (heating) 1009; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1003; (telephones) 1013 (i).

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 1455 (i); **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1174; (Great Salmon river) 1177; (Negro Point, breakwater) 1181; (Richibucto, pier) 1177; (Shippegan, harbour) 1184 (i); **N.S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1069); (Cow Bay) 1081; (Drumhead, breakwater) 1083 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1097 (i); (Indian harbour, wharf) 13199 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102; (Kingsport, pier) 1103; (Larry's River) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105; (Margaree, wharf) 1133; (Meteghan Cove) 1134; (Neil's Harbour) 1140; (New Harbour) 1144; (Port Hawkesbury) 1148 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13209 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1151 (i); **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185; (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1192 (i); (Burlington channel, piers) 13237 (vi); (Depot Harbour) 1361; (general repairs) 1369; (Goderich harbour) 1368 (i), 13240; (Kingsville) 13244; (Little Bear Creek) 13245; (Port Stanley) 13249 (vi); (Sarnia, dredging) 2638 (ii); (Wendover wharf) 1439 (i); **P.E.I.** (Anderson's Hollow) 1164; (Cove head, harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber) 1155; (New London, wharf) 1160; (piers, repairs, &c.) 1161 (i); **Que.** (Chateauguay River) 3211 (ii); (Cross Point, pier) 1513 (i); (dredging plant) 2674 (ii); (Esquimaux Point) 2278; (Father Point, pier) 1513; (Grande Vallée, pier) 1515; (Murray Bay, wharf 2269; (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Law) rence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St-

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3306 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 2286; (Sorel, wharf) 2295 (i); (Temiscamingue Lake, dredging) 2246 (i); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2639 (ii).

Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2725; (salaries, engineers, &c.) 2731; (temporary clerks, &c.) 2731 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 2700; (Portage du Fort) 2696 (ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2689 (ii).

Tel. Lines (Belle Isle) 2712; (B.C.) 2992; (Magdalen islands) 2714; (Mar. Provs.) 2709 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes, freight cars) 8282 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 3700 (ii); 8270, 8273; ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8284; (draw bars, exchange) 8289 (iv); (Levis accommodation) 3704 (ii); (steel rails) 7803; (Sydney accommodation) 3698 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6993 (iii).

Surtax: *See* 'Customs.'

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14738 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9422 (iv).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspaper (remarks) 11081 (v).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mackinnon*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Johnston, Mr. A., *Cape Breton.*

Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7476 (iii).

Glace Bay Wharf, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13185 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11348 (v); on M. for 3°, 12700 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, Member reading Speech, 10249 (v).

I.C.R. Extension from N. Sydney Junction to North Sydney (M. for cor.*) 447 (i).

Ry. Act (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12972 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11028, 11534; (N.S.) 11798; on M. for 3°, 12484 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5836 (iii); (Sydney Mines) 13030; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13144; (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi).

Railways—I. C. R. (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v); (Sydney accommodation) 3697 (ii).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4921 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. R., *Cardwell.*
Alton and Caledon Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14019 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7318, 7367 (iii).
Boyd, Chief Justice, Relatives in Govt. Employ (Ques.) 4185 (ii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5080 (ii); in Com., 5436 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10640, 12109, 12252.
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13285 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5732 (iii).
Montreal Northern Ry. and St. Agathe Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 564 (i).
——— (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4711 (ii); 6135, 6217 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14483 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11746; on M. for 3°, 12428.
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (census enumerators) 4825 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c. 4114 (ii).
Postoffice (country postmasters) 6037 (iii), 14019.
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4943 (ii).
Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14483 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *Lambton, W.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10096 (v).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5435 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4426 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 839 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).
Cornwall Road and Mahone Bay Postal Service (remarks) 14038 (vi).
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10755 (v).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3099 (ii).
Dog Fish: *See* 'Supply—Fisheries.'
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14423 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6897 (iv).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E.—*Con.*
Fishing Industry, N.S., Accommodation to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vi).
Glass Factory, Pictou, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7892; on M. for 3°, 8323 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12062, 12254 (v).
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Judge's Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8102 (iv).
Lunenburg Marine School, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13534 (vi).
Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5992 (iii).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4176 (ii).
Postmasters in Country Postoffices, in Com. on Postoffice Bill, 5662 (iii).
——— Increase of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
Post Office Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. (country postmasters), 5662, 5864 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14699 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6919 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (experimental farms) 4555 (ii).
Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658; (Behring Sea arbitration) 13658; (dog fish pest) 13651; (hatcheries, Lunenburg) 13660 (vi).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 6817 (iii).
Immigration (repatriation, N.S.) 6722 (iii).
Indians: Mar. Provs. (schools) 6415 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour lightship) 4165 (ii); (Marconi stations) 13646; (Nfld., aids to Navigation) 13647 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 7751 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Micmac dictionary, printing) 12592 (v).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13532; (naval reserve, school of navigation) 13546 (vi).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—**N.S.** (Breton's Cove) 13167 (vi); (Larry's river) 1104; (Lunenburg harbour) 1106 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206; (Tancock breakwater) 13217; (Victoria, beach wharf) 13214 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1152 (i); (Yarmouth bar) 13218 (vi); **Ont.** (Port Arthur) 3350 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *E. Toronto.*
Budget, The, 2050 (i).
Canadian Freight Classification, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 3537 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5595 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3046; in Com. on B., 4035.

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Freight Classification (Canadian) O.C., &c. (remarks) 3302 (ii).
See 'Can. freight, &c.' Supply—Mail Subsidies,' 'Ry. Bill 21.'
German Discrimination and Bond-Hay Treaty, Inquiry for Papers, 1324 (i).
German Tariff, Cor., &c., laid on Table (remarks) 1460 (i).
Grain Standards, Samples *re* &c. (remarks) 11179.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5211 (iii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 8066 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9152 (iv); in Com. on B., 10450, 10478, 10538,10569, 11280, 11310, 11360, 11973, 11984 (v), 12102, 12180, 12274; on M. for 3°, 12729 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Grafter,' 10190 (v).
See 'Privilege.'
G. T. Pacific Subsidy, Par. in Ottawa *Journal*, 5733 (iii).
See 'Ry. Policy.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 766 (i).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
I. C. R. & G. T. R., Traffic Arrangements (Ques.) 2759 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928, 7956 (iv).
Militia Force, Condition, &c. (remarks), 5733 (v).
Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 10509 (v).
Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks), 1334 (i).
Ry. Commission B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), on M. for Com., 2589; in Com. (express rates), 2596, 3539 (ii); (freight rates) 5685, 6285 (iii); 8125 (iv).
Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7127 (iii).
Railway Sidings for Private Corporations, &c. (remarks), 14061 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com., 11051; (Toronto) 11695; (Winnipeg) 11791; (York) 11667; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12467 (v).
——— Printing of Amendments, &c. (remarks), 11424 (v).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12851 (vi).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'
SUPPLY:
Customs (contingencies, &c.) 3903; (preferential tariff) 3921; (salaries, &c.) 3911 (ii).
Justice—Penitentiaries (binder twine), 3518 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.), 7574; (freight rates, &c.) 7588 (iv).
Militia (Valleyfield strike, pay), 3602 (ii).
Postoffice (letter carriers, &c.), 6009 (iii).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings (Toronto custom house), 647.
Harbours and Rivers—**Man.** (St. Andrew's Rapids), 3355, 3364 (ii); **Ont.** (Depot Harbour), 1361; (Goderich harbour) 1366; (Toronto, harbour) 1433; (Wendover wharf) **Que.** (Quebec harbour improvements)1439; 3338; (Sorel, deep water wharf), 3374 (ii); 12851 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, fees), 7529 (iii); (sidings, additional) 14061 (vi).
Trade Commissioner in London, Eng. (remarks), 3497 (ii).
Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks), 865 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3470, 3486 (ii); 12851 (vi).
United Counties Ry., Letter of E. D. Lafleur (read) in Com. of Sup., 12852 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*), on M. for 2°, 2340 (i); on M. to refer to Special Com., 3247 (ii).
Wheat, Export Freight Rate to Montreal, &c. (Ques.), 11188, 11425 (v).

Kendall, Mr. A. S., *Cape Breton.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com., 6900 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com., 11298, 12052 (v).
Insurance Rates *re* Ocean Steamers (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 7598 (iv).
I.C.R., Coal Rates, &c. (Ques.), 6167 (iii).
——— Trackmen, Wages, &c. (Ques.), 1297 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Res., 7972 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax), 4288 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8102 (iv).
Labour Commission, 1886, Names, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.), 8083 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks), 2525 (ii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), in Com., 3744 (ii), 5340 (iii), 8143, 8165 (iv); (telephones) 5521 (iii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com. (N.S.), 11794 (v).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, N.S. (county court judges), 14267 (vi).
Fisheries (dog-fish pest), 13653 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations), 13646 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.), 7598 (iv); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14250 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination), 13528 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, **N.S.** (Cow Bay), 1082 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1090 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13196 (vi); (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi).
Quarantine (small-pox), 5021 (ii).

Kidd, Mr. E., *Carleton, (O.).*
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Montreal harbour), 3367 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4231 (ii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5887 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5816 (iii).
Cattle Guards : *See* 'Ry. B.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup. 3158 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7516 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3063, 3114 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 908 (i), 13577 (vi).
Drainage across Rys. : *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4681 (ii).
Fishing Rights, James and Hudson's Bays, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3815 (ii).
Grand River, Dredging at Dunnville (Ques.) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 7827 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9909 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10627 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12720 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13293 (vi).
Hamilton Electric Light & Power Co., Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3803 (ii).
Hamilton and Grimsby Electric Line (remarks) 6084 (iii).
James and Hudson's Bays, Fishing Rights, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 3806 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8112 (iv).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario, Appnmt of Administrator (remarks) 112 (i).
Macnee Fishing License, Inquiry for Ret., 4727 (ii).
McDermid, Ellen, Relief (B. 229) in Com., 9148 (iv).
Mowat, Lt.-Gov. : *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
Post Offices, Opening and Closing Hours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5931 (iii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93 ; 2° m., 552 (i).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. 2591, 3571, 3717, 3881, 3883, 3888, 3974, 4001, 4121, 4565, 4691, 4748 (ii), 5323, 5539, 5563, 5766, 6071, 6084, 6204, 6305 (iii), 8128 (iv) ; (cattle guards) 5774, 6204—6250 (iii) ; (drainage) 4748 (ii) ; (telephones) 5539 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 13845 (vi).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1250 (i) ; in Com., 11157 11435 (v).
Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7232 (iii).
Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 635 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals : Chambly (By-wash station) 12906 ; (tow path) 12907 ; Generally (operating expenses) 12920 ; Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12912 (vi) ; Welland (deepening, &c.) 7804 (iv) ; (drainage improvement) 12905 ; (electric light) 12900 ; (land surveys) 12905 ; (Port Colborne improvements) 12903 ; (protection walls) 12904 ; (Ramy's Point obstruction) 12902 ; (Townsend valve, lock gates) 12905 (vi).
Civil Govt. : Public Works (architect's salary) 13499 (vi).
Customs (inspection, preventive service, &c.) 3953 (ii).
Excise (analysis, food, &c.) 5402 (iii).
Interior (Liard River miners, relief) 6926 (iii).
Justice, Administration of : Yukon (law library) 14268 (vi).
Militia (annual drill) 3604 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3599 (ii).
Post Office (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6151 ; (inspectors' salaries) 5931 ; (ry. mail service) 5956 ; (salaries) 5925 (iii).
Public Works : Buildings, **N.S.** (Arichat) 5829 (iii) ; **Ont.** (Cayuga P.O.) 502 ; (Clinton P.O.) 526 ; (Cobourg armoury) 639 ; (London drill hall) 641 ; **Que.** (L'Assomption) 428 (i). Harbours and Rivers, **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 1164 ; (Caraquet wharf) 1173 (i) ; **N.S.** (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146 (vi) ; **P.E.I.** (New London 1160 (i) ; **Que.** (Rimouski pier, &c.) 13469 ; (Rivière du Loup) 13476 ; (Rivière Verte) 13470 ; (Ste. Famille, pier) 13489 ; (Ste. Fidèle, wharf) 13493 ; (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491 ; (St. Gedeon Islands, wharf) 13491 ; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13489 ; (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 ; (St. Louis river) 13473 ; (St. Maurice, dam) 13491 ; (Sabrevois, wharf) 13488 ; (Sacre-Cœur, wharf) 13478 ; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13482 ; (Shegawake, harbour) 13479. Miscellaneous (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi).
Steamboat Inspection (boiler inspectors) 13649.
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11083 (v).
Welland Canal Lock Tenders, Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— Water Power, O. C.'s *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1859 (i).
——— rep. of Board of Trade of St. Catharines, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Lang, Mr. John, *East Peterborough.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11013; (Peterborough) 11625.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Assiniboine and Red River Nav. Rep. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ques.) 1859 (i).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5558, 5887, 5960 (iii).
Business of the House, *re* Private Bills Procedure (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5852 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5790 (iii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
See 'P. O. Bill,' 'Memorial,' &c.
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 319 (i).
Customs Warehouse at Winnipeg, &c. (Ques.) 6268 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14406 (vi).
Emerson Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
German Surtax, Purchases previous to (Ques.) 3394 (ii).
Half Breed Claims, Commissions, Applications for Scrip, &c. (M. for ret.*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).
Interior Dept., Permanent Officials, &c., Date of Appnmt. (M. for list*) 2338 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10791.
Judges' Salaries, County Courts, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3628 (ii).
——— Increases (remarks) 5242 (iii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7919 (iv).
Lumber Combine in N. W. T and Man. (remarks) 1585 (i).
Man. and N. W. T. Postmasters' Association Memorial *re* Remuneration (Ques.) 13259 (vi).
Memorial of Man. Postmasters' Association (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13994, 14020 (vi).
Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 88) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Naturalization Act, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 2015 (i).
Paradis, Amable, Claim against Pub. Works (M. for cor.*) 2337 (i).
Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10794 (v).
Postmasters' Association, Memorial from Man. and N W. T. (Ques.) 125 (i), 13259 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677, 5865 (iii).
Private Bills, Order of Procedure (remarks) 5137.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11034; (Dauphin) 11770; (Portage LaPrairie) 11782 (v).
Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots, &c. (Ques.) 5319 (iii).
St. Boniface Money Order Branch, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
——— Postal Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 13949 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Postoffice (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13996 (vi).
Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13956 (vi).
Post Office (salaries *re* transfers) 13994; (Winnipeg, dead letter branch) 13995 (vi).
Winnipeg P. O.: *See* 'P.O Bill 208,' 'Supply—'Post Office.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *E. Quebec.*
Address, on The, 40 (i).
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6635 (iii).
Agriculture and Colonization Sel. Com. (M.) to add name, 5679 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission *re* Lord Alverstone (remarks) 13963 (vi).
——— Aylesworth, Mr., Alleged Interviews (remarks) 13668, 13957 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi).
——— Award, Govt. Responsibility, &c., Reply to Mr. Borden, Halifax, 14810 (vi).
——— Official Information (remarks) 14523, 14529 (vi).
——— Award, &c. (remarks) 14280, 14287 (vi).
——— Bond-Hay Treaty, &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 878, 1324 (i).
——— Convention respecting Treaty (remarks) 481 (i).
——— Cor. *re*, Papers laid on Table, 14688 (vi).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to review Case, 14764 (vi).
——— Refusal of Can. Commissioners to sign Award (remarks) 14403, 14689 (vi).
——— Summary published, &c. (remarks) 10536 (v).
——— Tel. from Lord Alverstone (read) 13806 (vi).
——— Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 14529 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5136; in Com., 5872, 5874 (iii); 3°m., 5991 (iii).
Alverstone, Lord: *See* 'Alaska Boundary.'
Ascension Day Adjournment (M.) 3127 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allan Co. (Ans.) 7092 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to Com of Sup., 14171 (vi).

Lavish expenditure criticised by opposition, 14171 ; not satisfactory service, 14172 ; efforts by former Govts., 14173 ; Mr. Foster's scheme in 1888, 14173 ; no tenders received—offer by Allans, 14174 ; conditions, 14174 ; Petersen, Tate & Co., Tender, 14175 ; obvious reasons for doing nothing 1899 to 1902, 14176 ; negotiations in Eng. with different firms 1902, 14176 ; invitations for tenders in March, 1902, 14176 ; Toronto speech, 14177 (vi).

——— (remarks) notice of M., 13948 (vi).

——— Tenders, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11165 (v) ; wthdn., 13444 (vi).

Aylesworth, &c.: *See* 'Alaska Boundary.'

Banff Coal Reserve, Mining Leases, &c. (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Bass River, N. S., Marine Light (remarks) 14249 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties, on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Binder Twine, Prices for current Year (Ans.) 203 (i).

Beauharnois District, Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 7106 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (announcement) 6540 (iii).

——— (explanation) 6735, 6754 (iii).

Blankets, Web cloth, &c., purchased by Govt. (Ans.) 10101, 10410, 10714 (v).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. : *See* 'Coasting.'

Bopp, Mr.: *See* 'Can. & German,' &c.

Boyd, Chief Justice, Relatives in Govt. Employ (Ans.) 4185 (ii).

B. C. Legislation, Disallowance, on Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7489 (iii).

——— Visit to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 2105 (i).

Business of the Hse. (M.) 3127 (ii).

——— Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4349 (ii).

——— Procedure on Order Paper (remarks) 2302.

——— (remarks) 1204 (i).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Cabinet Changes : *See* 'Ministerial Changes.'

Calgary and Edmonton Mortgage Deed, Regulations *re* Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Can. and German Fiscal Policy, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Herr Bopp (remarks) 12220 (v).

Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, &c. *re* St. Francis River Bridge, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

Canadian Mails via New York, Tons, &c. (Ans.) 10713 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., 209, in Com. on Res., 4963, 5000 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14500 (vi).

Canals Tonnage Dues, Abolition (Ans.) 874 (i).

Cargill, Henry, late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 12937 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 388 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission, on Inquiry for Rep. (remarks) 3396 (ii).

Census Schedules, Questions in Peel, Halton, &c. (Ans.) 11425 (vi).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, Speech *re* Canadian Tariff 13376 (vi).

Chamber of Commerce at Paris, &c. (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Charbonneau, Miss Edna, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486, 14510 (vi).

Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v), 12716 (vi).

Chinese Restriction Immigration Act Amt. (B. 82) prop. res., 265 ; in Com. on Res., 597 ; 1°*, 945 ; in Com., 2241, 2399 (i) ; on Sen. Amts , 5872 (iii).

Cigarettes Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 1°, 2014 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 845 (i).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3198 (ii).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Companies (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 257) prop. res., 10410 (v) ; on Sen. Amts. 14845 (vi).

Civil Service List (presented) 125 (i).

Clergue Steel Works, Labour Disturbances (remarks) 12611 (v).

——— *See* 'Sault.'

Coasting Laws, U. S. Privileges, &c. (remarks) 12714, 12758 (vi).

——— *See* 'U. S.'

Cold Storage and Fruit: *See* 'Fruit.'

Coldstream Guards Band, Arrangements *re* Visit to Can. (Ans.) 9683 (iv).

Colonial Conference, Report, &c. (remarks) 3633 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial.'

Committee, Joint Printing, List (presented) 244(i).

Committees, Sel. Standing, to prepare Lists (M.) 5 (i).

———Lists presented, 197 (i).

———Meeting concurrently with sitting of (Hse.) (remarks) 8333 (iv).

Corn Duties, Abolition by Imp. Parlt. (remarks) 1681 (i).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Act Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1324 (i).

———(immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 319 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Coal Lands, Application *re* (Ans.) 12217 (v).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 5 (i).
———6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 7922 (iv).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 573 (i).
Dom. Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 5589 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1200 (i); 13583, 14407; M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; Order dschgd., 14769 (vi).
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 945 (i).
Dundonald, Lord: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Easter Adjournment (M.) 1115 (i).
Electoral Lists, N.S., Changes since Printing (Ans.) 8331 (iv).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal of Flagship (remarks) 10957 (v).
Estimates, Suppl., on Inquiry for (remarks) 10832 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) (M.) to place on Govt. Orders, 8115; 2° m., 8243 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
False Creek, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
Farquharson, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5512 (iii).
Ferries Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'
France and Canada SS. Service B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10802, 11422 (v).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T., Tel. from Board of Trade, &c. (read) 2106 (i).
———Tel. to Dep. Min. of Int. (read) 2238 (i).
See 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on M. for 2°, 3257 (ii).
Fruit Shipments in Cold Storage, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).
General Inspection Act (weigh-masters) Amt. B. (prop. res.) 13264 (vi.)
See 'Inspection.'
G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2420 (i).
German Discrimination and Bond-Hay Treaty, on Inquiry for Papers, 1324 (i).
Germans in Canada, Recruiting for Naval Service (remarks) 8717 (iv).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Monday (M.) 3708 (ii).
———Precedence on Thursdays (M.) 940 (i).
———Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 1114 (i).
———Redistribution Bill (remarks) 204 (i).
———Stmnt. *re* further Business (remarks) 13559 (vi).
Gov. Gen's Speech at Banquet of Chambers of Commerce (Ans.) 10101 (v).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Grain Inspection *re* Standard Samples (remarks) 11179 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5158, 5218 (iii), 7847; on M. for 3°, 8060 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Maclean*) 7815 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 235) M. for Com. on Res., 8406; 1° m., 7658; ('mountains of information') 7679 (iv); in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°* of B. and in Com., 10412; in Com. on B., 10540, 11191, 11247, 11273, 11312, 11969, 12015, 12055; (two-cent rate) 12233 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12644, 12730, 12758; on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 12743; on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
———Alternative Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 13028 (vi).
——— Distribution of Bill among Members (remarks) 8918 (iv).
———Govt's. Intention *re* Quebec to Moncton Scheme, 10537 (v).
———Govt. Policy, &c. (Ans.) 2308 (i).
———Delay, &c. (remarks) 6806, 6922, 7299, 7399, 7488 (iii).
———Papers laid on Table, 11302 (v).
———Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to refer to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13267, 13560 (vi).
———Plans by E. A. Hoare (presented) 8082 (iv).
———Sir William Mulock's Speech, Par. in 'Citizen' (remarks) 368 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. Deb., 8806 (iv).
——— (remarks) 8086 (iv).
See 'Ry. Policy.'
Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13764 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 679 (i).
Herchmer, L. W., Pension, &c. (Ans.) 5322 (iii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 778 (i).
——— Address to His Maj. (M.) 1193 (i).
Imperial Conference Cor., Can. Govt.'s Refusa to publish, &c. (remarks) 3633 (ii), 7923, 8230, 9458 (iv).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 9582 (iv).
Imperial Service Orders to Civil Servants, &c. (Ans.) 12715 (vi).
——— Names of Officials, &c. (Ans.) 13669, 13936 (vi).
I.C.R., Shops at Rivière du Loup, Construction (Ans.) 12497 (v).
——— Lévis Accommodation: *See* 'Lévis.'
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3398 (ii).
Internal Economy Com. (M.) 91 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2787, 3248 (ii).
Insolvenèy Act, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 818 (i).
Inspection General Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) prop. Res., 13264; in Com. on B., 14311 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Japanese Immigration (remarks) 3713 (ii).
Jonquières to Ha Ha Bay, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11408 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Superior Court, Que. (prop. res.) 11426; Res. 2° m., 11833 (v).
Judges Retiring Allowances on Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4262 (ii); in Com. on Res., 8090 (iv); (M.) to conc. in Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).
—— Increase of, &c. (remarks) 14307 (vi).
Judgeship offered by Mr. Dansereau to Conservative (remarks) 13805 (vi).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2779 (ii).
Labour Day Adjournment (M.) 10742 (v).
—— (remarks) 10189, 10712 (v).
Lac Bouchette Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
Lake St. John Ry. and La Tuque, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Le Canada, Mr. Latour's Canvass: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Lévis, Land purchased for I.C.R., on M. for O. Cs. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14299 (vi).
Library of Parlt. Com. (M.) 244 (i).
Lt. Governor of Ont. and Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
—— (remarks) 111, 656, 1206 (i).
—— *See* 'Mowat.'
Loan Companies Extension Act Amt. B. 35 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2504, 2517, 2677 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7918 (iv).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to adjn., 14571 (vi).
—— Refund of Express Charges (remarks) 14684 (vi.)
—— Use of certain Rooms, &c., 14534 (vi).
Man. Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi).
Man. and N.W.T., Increased Representation in the Senate (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Man. School Lands, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 6169 (iii).
Maps for Geological Survey, Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 14272 (vi).
Martineau, Mr. P. R., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 10242 (v).
Matane and Gaspé Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14484 (vi).
Members of H. of C. Appnmts. to Govt. Positions (Ans.) 3632 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1204 (i).
Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of (remarks) 2794 (ii).
Mining Cos. Incorporation (remarks) 14850 (vi).
Ministerial Changes, Explanations, &c. (remarks) 6, 110, 130, 159 (i); 6735 (iii).
Ministers, Reduction of Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).
Minto, Earl of: *See* 'Gov. Gen.'
Montreal and Atlantic and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4470 (ii); in Com. on B., 5419 (iii).
Montreal *Star*, Par. *re* Judgeship: *See* 'Judgeship.'
Morning Sittings (M.) 8333 (iv).
Mortimer & Co.'s Fire, Govt. property destroyed (Ans.) 4836 (ii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt. Governor of Ontario, Decease (remarks) 1575 (i).
See 'Lt.-Gov.'
Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14596 (vi).
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Naturalization of Aliens Act Amt. (B. 204) 1° *, 5136 (iii).
—— *See* 'Aliens.'
Naval Defence, Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 945 (i).
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 12992; Order dschgd., 14768 (vi).
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for 2°, 1328 (i).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6429 (iii).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
North Atlantic Transportation Co., on Inquiry (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) for Papers, 13667, 13933 (vi).
—— Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. (B. 242) 1°m., 8321 (iv); 2°m., and in Com., 10741 (v).
—— Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) M. to introduce, 14281 (vi).
North West Mounted Police, Deptl. Rep. (presented 92 (i).
—— Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 2921 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12321 (v).

North West Provincial Autonomy, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1296 (i).

Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°* *pro forma*, 4 (i).

Order in the House (remarks) 12723 (vi).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for copies, 1303 (i).

Ottawa Valley Fire Sufferers, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3134 (ii).

Pacific Cable, & Eastern Tel. Co.'s Concessions, &c. (remarks) 2676 (ii).

Paris Chamber of Commerce : *See* 'Chamber.'

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation of Lawn (remarks) 242 (i).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) M. to dschg. Order, 13444 (vi)

Pensions to S. A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14596 (vi).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 138 (M.) to dschg. Order for 2°, 11302 (v).

Post office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5241 (iii).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14671 (vi).

Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G. B. (remarks) 3221 (ii).

——— *See* 'Chamberlain,' &c., 'South Africa,' &c.

Preston, W. T. R., Suit by Can. Employment Bureau (remarks) 12221 (v).

Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1192 (i)

Printing Bureau and Indebtedness of Members (Ans.) 4180 (ii).

Printing Bureau and Union Employees (Ans.) 4182 (ii).

Private Bills, on M. to extend Time, 10490 (v).

——— (remarks) 2396 (i) ; 4959 (ii).

——— Order of Procedure (remarks) 5137 (iii).

——— *See* 'Rules,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Par. in *La Patrie*, 6803 (iii).

——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors (remarks) 11563 (v).

——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' &c., Western Rys., 10515 (v).

Provincial Autonomy to N. W. T., Papers laid on Table, 5512 (iii).

——— N. W. T. Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6893 (iii).

——— *See* 'N. W. T. B. 256.'

Provincial Subsidies Increase, &c. (Ans.) 5764 (iii).

Public Documents, Distribution to Boards of Trade (remarks) 1378 (i).

Pulp Wood, Duty by U. S. (remarks) 4363 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Duties, B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14748 (vi).

Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Agreement, &c. (prop. res.) 14523 (vi).

——— (remarks) 14280 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Queens, P.E.I., Representation in Parlt. (remarks) 13378 (vi).

'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134 (ii).

Ry. Act B. 21, Salaries of Commissioners, in Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephone, &c.) 5531 (iii) ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8350 (iv).

——— Ry. Conference with Senate (remarks) *re* Procedure, 14760 (vi).

Ry. Debts Bill : *See* 'Exchequer.'

Railway Policy of Govt., Delay in bringing down, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to adjn. Hse., 7115 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 551 (i).

Railway Subsidies (B. 270) in Com. on Res., 14314, 14329 ; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14516 (vi).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10956 (v), 12805 (vi).

Representation in the House of Commons (B. 66) 1°m., 708 ; 2°m., 1207, 1218, Agreed to (Y. 72, N. 37) 1292 (i) ; M. for Com., 10832, 10848 ; in Com., 10912, 10953, 10957, 11114, 11508, 11621, 12293 ; (Kent) 11567 ; (Norfolk) 11427 ; 3°m., 12372 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12432 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1284 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Mr. *Tisdale*, 11474 (v).

——— Evidence *re*, &c. (remarks) 11423 (iv).

——— Schedules, Maps, &c. (remarks) 877 (i).

——— Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Pugsley *re* N. B., 943 (i).

Returns ordered, Complaint (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 13140 (vi).

River du Loup Ry. Shops : *See* 'I. C. R.'

Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Ross Rifles, Examination, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).

Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (remarks) 13376 (vi).

——— Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 6998 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday (Ans.) 1858 (i).
Salmon Canning Industry in B.C. (remarks) 10102 (v).
Saturday Sittings (M.) 13264 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Govt. Proposals (remarks) 12718 (vi).
—— Labour Troubles, Wages, &c. (remarks) 12941 (vi).
See 'Clergue.'
Sec. of State Deptl. Rep. (presented) 125 (i).
Senate Representation of N.W.T.: *See* 'Man. and N.W.T.'
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 465 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13952 (vi).
Slater Shoe Co. and Alien Labour, Res. *re* (remarks) 14669 (vi).
Small-pox Patients in Gloucester, N.B. (remarks) 14688 (vi).
Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11826 (v).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12845, 12850 (vi).
S. Africa and Can. SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on France and Can. SS. B., 10821 (v).
S. African Colonies and Preferential Tariff, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ans.) 1679 (i).
—— Hay: *See* 'Hay and Oats.'
South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).
Speech from the Throne (M.) 5 (i).
Steel Industry: *See* 'Iron and Steel.'
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 13772.
Indian Affairs (contingencies) 13760 (vi); (salaries) 274 (i).
Interior (clerical assistance) 13769; (salaries) 13761; (Mines branch, salaries) 13762 (vi).
Geological Survey (A. P. Low, salary) 13770; (salaries) 13769, 13966; (technical officer, salary) 13772 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police (Drake, E. F., salary) 13761; (salaries) 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
Privy Council Office (salaries) 207 (i).
Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13955; homestead entries) 13966; (maps, printing, &c.) 14272, (salaries, outside service) 13773, 13966; (surveys, printing, &c.) 13777; (tree culture) 13775, 14272 (vi).
Geological Survey (maps, lithographing, &c.) 13778; (metallurgical, salaries) 13778 (vi).
Govt. of N. W. T. (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).
Indians—B. C. (Hazelton hospital) 13787; (medical attendance) 13785; (salaries) 13785; (schools) 13786; (steam launch) 13787 (vi).
Man. and N.W.T. (agricultural implements) 13782; (industrial schools) 13784; (medical attendance, Dr. West) 13784; (surveys, &c.) 13784; (triennial clothing) 13783 (vi).
N. B. (fire damages) 13782; (salaries) 13782.
N. S. (land purchase) 13781 (vi).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
Ont. and Que. (Doncaster reserve, roads) 13779; (Rama reserve, roads, &c.) 13781; (roads, repairs) 13779 (vi).
Justice, Administration of—Miscellaneous (N. W. T., expenditure) 3398 (ii); Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3423 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13957; (Assay Office, B.C.) 13965; (Canadian Mining Institute) 13965; (Turtle Mountain, land slide) 13965 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 5264; (pay of force) 5262 (iii); (Yukon) 5003 (ii); (Yukon, salaries) 5262 (iii).
Pensions (Lady Lafontaine) 14252 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (trachoma hospital) 14246 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12845 (vi).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2932 (ii).
Tariff Policy of Gov., Ques. of Order *re* Quotations, 4843 (ii).
—— (remarks) 4263 (ii).
Tarte, Mr., Resignation: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Telephone Legislation (remarks) 291 (i).
Thanksgiving Day Adjournment (M.) 13790 (vi).
—— (remarks) 13379 (vi),
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to refer back to Com., 7813 (iv).
Trans-Canada Ry., Sale to G.T. Pacific (remarks) 7567 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. (B. 235) 1° m., 7658 (iv).
See 'G.T. Pacific.'
—— Govt. Policy (remarks) 5765 (iii).
Translation of Parliamentary Documents (remarks) 545 (i).
Transportation Commission, Appnmt of Commissioners (notification) 5137 (iii).
—— Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 9582 (iv).
—— Appnmt. of Sir Wm. VanHorne (remarks) 7297 (iii).
—— (Ans.) 8330 (iv).
—— Further Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 9458 (iv).
—— O.C., Cor. *re* Appnmts. (M. for copies) 1324 (i).
—— Names of Commissioners (remarks) 4727.
—— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 7206 (iii).
—— Rep. *re* Commission (remarks) 1199 (i), 3129 (ii), 12850 (vi).
Transportation and Treadgold Commissions (remarks) 4840, 4960 (ii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii), 12850 (vi).
Treadgold Commissioners, Appnmt. of (notification) 5136 (iii).
—— Appnmt., &c. (remarks) 3713 (ii).
—— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4541 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Treadgold Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2880 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 2424, (i), 3298, 3397, 3870 (ii).
——— and Dawson Board of Trade (remark) 1025 (i).
——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 4120, 4564 (ii).
——— Names of Commissioners (remarks) 4727.
——— Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11065 (v).
——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).
——— Tel. read from Dawson Board of Trade *re* Scope (Ans.) 1196 (i).
——— (remarks) 8086 (iv).
——— Terms of Commission (remarks) 4120, 4564 (ii).
——— and Transportation Commission (remarks) 4840, 4960 (ii).
——— (remarks) 13792 (vi).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).
Turnpike Trust, Montreal, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 676 (i).
U.S. Coasting Laws, &c., Regulations *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).
See 'Coasting.'
Voters' Lists: *See* 'Electoral.'
Wiallard, Paul, Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11188 (v).
Woodmen of the World B. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 1854 (i).
Yamaska and Lotbiniére Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14318 (vi).
Yukon Ry. through Can. Ter. (remarks) 14497 (vi).
Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

Lavell, Mr. J. R., *Leeds & Grenville.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in in Com. on Res., 3054 (ii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. No. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9431 (iv); in Com. on B., 10648, 11401, 12186 (v).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3140.
SUPPLY:
Justice, Administration of: Yukon (living allowances) 3419 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5500 (iii).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond & Arthabaska.*
Drummondville Ry. Sidings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14081 (vi).
Mathurin, Jos. A., Death Sentence, Judge's Rep., &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
Standard Car Truck Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 105) 1°*, 1295 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (Drummondville sidings) 14055 (vi).

Law, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*
Can. Temperance Act Amt. (B. 14) 1°*, 113 (i).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4101 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers (dredges, repairs) 2629 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *E. Prince* (*P.E.I.*)
Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212) Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7476 (iii).
Anglo-American Tel. Co. and P. E. I. Monopoly (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7380 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7351 (iii).
Cape Tormentine Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
Charlottetown, Ry. Station, P.E.I., Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 4442 (ii).
——— Wharf and Dock Accommodation (remarks) 14132 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12537 (v).
Dom. Coal Co., and Glace Bay Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13189 (vi).
Elmira Branch Line on P. E. I. Ry., Res. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
Frozen Fish, &c., P.E.I., Claims for Damages *re* (Ques.) 13373 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13522 (vi).
——— Losses, &c., Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3394 (ii).
Georgetown, P.E.I. Ry. Warehouse Accommodation (remarks) 14088 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9529 (iv); in Com. on B., 10601 (iv).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13275 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Contractor's Name, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
See 'Supply—Rys.'
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
Kinkora Station, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8209, 8223 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, P E I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14126 (vi).
Oyster Fishing, P. E. I., Pet., &c. (Ques.) 2920.
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13522 (vi).
See 'Winter.'
P. E. I. Ry., Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry. Subsidies to Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) 14472 (vi).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P. E. I., Winter Communication by Str. *Stanley* (Ques.) 4006 (ii).

——— Winter Communication (M.) for Copies of Pets., &c., 2765 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14472 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1269 (i); on M. for 3°, 12432, 12446; (amt.) to M. for 3°, 12454 (v).

Representation in the H. of C. for P. E. I. and N. B. (Ques.) 5316 (iii).

Richmond and Northam Station, P.E.I.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 472 (i).

Shippers of P. E. I., Claims for Damages (Ques.) 13373 (vi).

See 'Frozen Fish.'

Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., P. E. I., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).

Summerside Breakwater, P.E.I, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5300 (iii).
Geological Survey (explorations) 6824 (iii).
Immigration (repatriation, &c.) 6725 (iii),
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse construction) 5762 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and G. B.) 7744 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4049 (ii); (masters' and mates' examination) 13529 (vi); (*Stanley*, repairs, &c.) 4049 (ii).
Post Office (Kelley's Cross P. O.) 6064; (P.E.I. letter carriers) 6063; (P.E.I. winter service) 5937 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ottawa (coal sheds) 13116; P.E.I. (Charlottetown, Dom. building) 13036 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Cape Tormentine) 13228 (vi); **N.S.** (Glace Bay, wharf) 13189; **P.E.I.** (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Cape Traverse, survey) 13219; (Carleton Point) 13219; (North Cardigan) 13223; (Summerside breakwater) 13223 (vi); (Summerside harbour) 3367 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (P. E. I. and mainland) 2988; (P. E. I. cables) 2702 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5505; (Pethick, Dr., allowance) 5505 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8271 (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii), 14094; (Halifax accommodation) 12827; (locomotives, &c.) 14093 (vi); (Moncton accommodation) 12600; (North Sydney station) 12597 (v); 14090; (St. John accommodation) 12823 (vi).
P.E.I. (Alberton station) 14132; (Charlottetown, accommodation) 14131; (Elmira line) 12835; (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 14108, 14111, 14126; (Kensington accommodation) 12840 (vi); (Kinkora accommodation) 12841; (Montague bridge) 14132 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7535 (iii); (Summerside coal sheds) 12828 (vi).

Trackmen on Govt. Rys., Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14472 (vi).

Winter Communication with P. E. I., Memorial from Emerald, &c. (M. for copies of pets., &c. 2765 (ii).

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*

Agricultural Lecturers, Que., Names, Counties, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (iv).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6962 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 367; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806 (i).

Aylesworth, Mr. A. B., Reported Interview *re* Alaskan Commission (remarks) 13960 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5238 (iii).

Budget, The, 2167 (i).

Canadian (New) Company Limited incorp. (B. 83) 2°m., 1328 (i).

——— *See* 'New.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4977 (ii).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J., and Pref. Trade: *See* 'Preferential.'

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6645 (iii).

Dom. Subsidies to Provinces, Increase, &c. (M. for cor.) 691 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iii).

Fishermen in Gulf of St. Lawrence, Pet. (Ques.) 2917 (ii).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c. (Ques.) 665 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8776 (iv).

Lecturers on Agriculture, Names, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (iv).

Lighthouses, Floating, Applications, &c. from Captains (Ques.) 665 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2505 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1023; 2°m., 1328 (i); in Com., 3221 (ii).

Ottawa and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6625 (iii).

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

Pilots on River St. Lawrence, &c. (Ques.) 2915 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5658 (iii).

Lemieux, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Preferential Trade, Mr. Chamberlain's Colonial Scheme, Mr. Fielding's Remarks *re*, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13936 (vi).

Provincial Subsidies, Increase, &c. (M. for cor.) 691 (i).

——— (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6301 (iii).

——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2783 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 7000 (iii).

St. Lawrence Gulf Fishermen, Pet., &c. (Ques.) 2917 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Pilots, &c. (Ques.) 2915 (ii).

St. Louis International Exhibition, Can. Exhibits (Ques.) 3001 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Hospital, &c. (Ques.) 13669 (vi).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., *re*, on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7032, 7045 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6674; (Fabre, Mr., salary) 6674 (iii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates, &c.) 5265 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6956 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, &c.) 4058 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Lake St. John, wharf) 2244; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2248; (Magdalen island) 2265; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2269; (Rivière aux Renards) 2279; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3309 (ii); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13480 (vi); (Sorel, wharf) 2291 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2950 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).

U. S. Indemnity to Fishermen, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).

Lennox, Mr. H., *S. Simcoe.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iii).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6358 (iii).

Barrie Wharf, Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 13452 (vi).

Brockville & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7402 (iii).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1348 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5449 (iii).

Canadian Construction Co. and Farran's Point Contract (M. for ret.*) 1323 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4368, 4973, 5116 (ii); in Com. on B., 5632 (iii).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., 7482 (iii).

Cattle Guards Commission, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt and Retirement of Mr. Robertson, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 1059 (i).

———Names, &c. (Ques.) 874 (i).

———Rep., &c. (Ques.) 669 (i).

———Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

———Inquiry for Papers, 3396 (ii).
See 'Ry. Bill.'

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5484 (iii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6200 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 831 (i).

Correspondence Clerk, Ry. Dept., Name, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Corridors of Hse., and Visitors, Ques. of Priv., 11558 (v).

County Court Judges, Appnmt. from local Bars (remarks) 5582 (iii).

———Appnmts., Retirements, &c. (Ques.) 4960 (ii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646, 7514 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4027 (ii).

Dixon, F. A., Chief Clerk in Ry. Dept., &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

———Promotion as Chief Clerk, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1058 (i).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 580 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 312 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7888 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8808 (iv); in Com. on B., 10488, 10583, 10698, 11341, 11394, 11839, 11867, 12006 (vi).

Hawkestone Wharf, Govt. Aid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 681 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3251 (ii).

Insolvency Act, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 818 (i).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7966 (iv).

Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8114; in Com. on B., 11421 (iv).

Judges appointed from Local Bar, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 210 (i).

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Lt. Governor of Ontario and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 661 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8069 (iv).

Metropolitan Ry. Co., running on highway (remarks) 6099 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt. Gov.'

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11557 (v).

Public Accounts Com., producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7060 (iii).

Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) 13451 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1341 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4121, 4573, 4712, 4738 (ii), 5251, 5332, 5524, 5560, 5680, 5698, 6080, 6189, 6219, 6298, 7201, 7299 (iii), 8160 (iv); (cattle guards) 6244, 6253; (drainage) 4738 (ii); (telephones, &c.) 5524 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11427; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12488 (v).

———Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Campbell, 11710 (v).

Robertson, Geo. *re* Cattle Guard Commission (Ques.) 874 (i).

———Withdrawal from Cattle Guard Commission (Ques.) 1034 (i).

See 'Cattle Guards,' &c.

Saskatchewan Land Company, Inquiry for Ret., 7108 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5086 (ii); in Com. on B., 7225 (iii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census schedules) 7060 (iii); (general statistics) 4431 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 210; Railways (salaries) 334 (i).

Dom. Lands (homesteads) 6771; (inspector's expenses) 6766; Long Lake, &c. (Saskatchewan Ry. survey) 6942 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5290 (iii); (Hurley, J. M., fishery inspector) 5126 (ii), 5283 (iii).

Indians: Man. and N.W.T (medical attendance) 6350; Ont. (medical attendance) 6327 (iii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of: Exchequer Court (reports) 3408; Penitentiaries (Kingston, binder twine) 3518; (Regina jail, Land Purchase) 5135; Sup. Court (reps., binding, &c.) 3405; Yukon (judges' living allowances) 3412; (sheriffs' salaries) 3411; (telegraph operators) 3421 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, binding, &c.) 5267; (Room 56, furniture) 5266 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6966 (iii).

Postoffice (Barrie branch) 6062; (rural mails) 6137 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, **Dom.** (electric power) 1068; **Ont.** (Alliston) 495; (Clinton P. O.) 521; Ottawa (census building) 992; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1003; (Royal Mint) 358; **Que.** (Levis) 432; (quarantine, Grosse Isle) 425; (renewals, &c.) 424; (St. Hyacinthe) 439 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, **Man.** (St. Andrews Rapids) 3364 (ii); **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2669 (ii); **N.B.** (Anderson's Hollow) 1163; (Campbellton wharf) 1165; (St. John river wharf) 1178, 1186; **N.S.** (Amagandus wharf) 1069; (Big Pond, wharf) 1072, 1074; (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074; (Cow Bay) 1079; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Neil's Harbour) 1142; **Ont.** (Barrie wharf) 1186; (Petewawa narrows) 1426; (Port Hope, pier) 1425 (i); (Sault Ste. Marie, improvements) 13252 (vi); (Southampton, harbour) 1429; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1432; (Wendover, wharf) 1434; **P.E.I.** (Cascumpec harbour) 1154; (Gaspereaux, harbour) 1156; (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i); **Que.** (Caplan, breakwater) 13451 (vi); (Father Point, pier) 1514; (Grande Vallée, pier) 1515 (i).

Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13364 (vi).

Railways: I.C.R. (Sydney accommodation) 3698 (ii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276; (roads and bridges) 7285 (iii).

Telegraph Operators, Yukon: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13364 (vi).

Wharf Building by Public Works Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Binder Twine, Circular issued *re* Sales, &c (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

——— Residence of Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 4182 (ii).

Civil Service Employees, Classification, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 9681 (iv).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 592 (i).

Duchesneau, Dr., Warden of St. Vincent de Paul, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 286 (i).

Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 288 (i).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100 4799 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry. B. 235, French Translation (remarks) 8118 (iv).
Latour, L. J., Circular issued *re Le Canada*, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Le Canada, Circular issued to Postmasters, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Market Gardeners: *See* 'Garden Products,' &c.
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6531 (iii).
Postal Facilities to Parishes near Montreal, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 12498 (v).
Public Works Employees, Dismissals, Promotions, &c. (M. for ret.) 1058 (i).
St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 7001 (iii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Acting Warden, &c. (Ques.) 10831 (v).
——— Resignation of (Ques.) 286 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Rivière Jesus, dredging) 13470 (vi).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2361 (i).

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14203 (vi).
Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5475 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4404 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 833 (i).
——— *See* 'Criminal,' &c.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12559 (v).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3279 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10753 (v).
Cumberland Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10813 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5184 (iii); on M. for 3°, 8324 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9238 (iv); in Com. on B., 12043, 12116 (v).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13290 (vi).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Judgeship, Offer by C. A. Dansereau to Conservative, Par. in Montreal *Star* (remarks) 13805.
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10789 (v).

Logan, Mr. H. J.—*Con.*
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2526 (ii).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 141) 1° *, 2237 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act. Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6455 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677 (iii).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 135) 1° *, 2100 (i); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978; (amt.) in Com., 6399 (iii).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2581; in Com., 2923 (ii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, 12450 (v).
Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Co.'s (B. 116) 1°*, 1575 (i).
St. Joseph's Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 151) 1° *, 2396 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) 1° *, 2396 (i).
Springhill, N.S., Boiler Explosion in Dom. Building (remarks) 13257 (vi).
Steel Co. of Can., Loan of Rails, &c. (remarks) 14482 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Geological Survey (exploration, information, &c.) 6823 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7602 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (Victoria museum) 365; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Victoria beach, wharf) 13214 (vi).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 4261 (ii).
Trackmen on I.C.R., Salaries, &c., 12559 (vi).
Truro to Parrsboro Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14494 (vi).

Loy, Mr. G. M., *Beauharnois.*
Beauharnois Canal, Damages *re* Floods (remarks, in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, Statement (read) 7102 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Lake St. Francis (dam *re* flooding) 14153 (vi).
Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3594 (ii).

Mackie, Mr. T., *N. Renfrew.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5426 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9414 (iv).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8107 (iv).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1321 (i).

Mackie, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11157 (v).

Mackinnon, Mr. D. A., *E. Queen's, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7615 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4083, 4105 (ii).
Post Office: Outside Service (P.E.I. winter service) 5940 (iii).
Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7539 (iii).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s (B. 26) 2° m., 630 (i).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *N. Perth.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5075 (ii); in Com. on B., 5426 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9898 (iv).
Listowel Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephones) 5542 (iii).

SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich, breakwater) 1366 (i); 13242 (vi).

Maclaren, Mr. W. S., *Huntingdon.*
Budget, The, 1937 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5434 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. B 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3086 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10139 (v).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6187, 6307 (iii); (drainage) 4758 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7226 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *E. York (O.)*
Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) in Com., 5361 (iii).
Bell Telephone Agreement: *See* 'Telephone,' 'Ry. B. 21.'
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7304 (iii).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bills (remarks 482 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5431 (iii).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4369, 4379 (ii).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360, 5555 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 381 (i).
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 318 (i).
Crisis in Ont.: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3045; in Com. on B., 4038 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 308 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7814, 7821; on M. for 3°, 8056 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 7825 (iv).
——— (M.) that Com. rise in order to get Speaker's decision *re* Ques. of Order, 7831, 7832 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10429; (two-cent rate) 10462, 12221 (v).
G. T. R. Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 448 (i).
G. T. Ry. Two-Cent Fare, Repeal of Clause in Original Charter (Ques.) 11556, 11828 (v).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
Hudson's Bay Change of Name (B. 173) 1°m., 2794 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11416 (v).
Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7991 (iv).
Ministerial Changes, Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 166 (i).
Montreal-Longueuil Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 156 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5558 (iii).
Mowat, Lt. Gov. of Ont.: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6082 (iii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6430 (iii).
N. W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12309 (v).
——— Representation in Senate B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12302 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6453 (iii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2597, 3538 (ii), 5344, 5352, 5561, 6082, 6173, 6253, 6271 (iii), 7609, 8126 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5513 (iii); on M. for 3°, 8334; (amt.) *re* two-cent rate, 6271 (iii); 8334; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 45) 8359 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).

Railway Subsidies (B. 270) in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 410 (i).

St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6485 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 478 (i).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 455 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7042 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Excise (liquor analysis) 5395 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7581 (iv).

Militia (pay and allowance) 3592; (Valleyfield strike) 3597 (ii).

Post Office (rural mails) 6137 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (mail delivery) 506; (amt.) 511; Ottawa (additional land) 353; Que. (Montreal renewals) 437; (Valleyfield P. O.) 444 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Arthur) 3352; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3305 (ii).

Telephone, Bell, Agreement with C. P. R., &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5513 (iii).

Telephone Co.'s (B. 4) 1°*, 92; 2°m., 700 (i).

——— (B. 5.) 1°m., 92; 2°m., 701 (i).

Telephone Legislation (remarks) 291, 409 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. (remarks) 6091 (iii).

Toronto, Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Two-cent Ry. Fare: *See* 'G. T. P. Ry. B. 235,' 'Ry. B. 21.'

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Burrard.*

Alaskan Boundary Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14789 (vi).

Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5876 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7353 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com on Res., 4398 (iii).

Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5487 (iii).

Chinese Immigration: *See* 'Aliens,' 'G. T. P. B. 235.'

Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13575, 13593 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. Res., 3014; in Com. on B., 4683 (ii).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup.. 4798 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9218 (iv); in Com. on B., 12046, 12205 (v).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 949 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8209 (iv).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature (remarks) 14232 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9976 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 237 (i).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6685 (iii).

Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1111 (i).

Vancouver Land Acquisition (B. 76) 1°*, 872 (i).

Yukon Coast Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 446 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *N. Simcoe.*

Barrie Wharf, Govt. Aid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Canada Industrial Corporation Limited incorp. (B. 112) 1°*, 1462 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5625 (iii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5584.

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3265 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10753 (v).

Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief (B. 127) 1°*, 1853 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3015 (ii).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. (B. 48) 1°m., 592 (i), 2°m., 2786 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 707 (i), Order for Com., 4132; in Com., 4871 (ii), 5138 (iii), 7814-7913; 3°m., 8055, 8321 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wilmot*) Ques. of Order, 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11358 (v).

Hawkestone Wharf, Govt. Aid (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8108 (iv), 10772, 10777; in Com. on B., 11410 (v).

Lt. Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113 (i).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 707 (i); in Com., 2716 (ii).

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation of Lawn (remarks) 2422 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6237, 6305 (iii); (drainage) 4741 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 136) 1°*, 2100 (i), 2°m., 3288 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Post Office (Barrie, branch P.O.) 6062 (iii).
Winnipeg Western Land Corporation Limited Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 707 (i).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *W. Northumberland (O.)*
Alnwick, Mississaga Indians, Claims, &c. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 121) in Com., 3223 (ii).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14446 (vi).
Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 1462 (i).
Nipissing and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 591 (i).
Nipissing Surveys on Ottawa River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Miscellaneous (Ottawa river survey) 13350 (vi).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).
Waltham to Ferguson, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

McCormick, Mr. G., *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wendover, wharf) 1441 (i); Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 2977; (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).
Yukon Govt. (roads and bridges) 7289 (iii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F., *Selkirk.*
Allen, Wm., Relief (B. 196) 1° m., 4179 (ii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5888, 5961 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7361 (iii).
Binder Twine, Prices fixed (Ques.) 1595 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5846 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 1294 (i).
Canada Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4388, 5117 (ii); in Com. on B., 5806 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3982 (ii).
C.P.R. Expenditure for Rolling Stock in 1902-3 (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Fyfe, Mr.: *See* 'Weights B. 188.'
Grain Weighing in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4198 (ii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5151, 5227 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10417 (v); on M. for 3°, 12684 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13279 (vi).
Great North-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 541.
Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1123 (i).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10742 (v).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2523.
Lumber Combine in N.W.T. (remarks) 1585 (i).
Magness, Mr.: *See* 'Weights B. 188.'
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14221 (vi).
Man. School Lands, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6169 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4481 (ii).
Northern Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 51) in Com., 2753 (ii).
Osler, Mr.: *See* 'Privilege.'
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14856 (vi).
Père Marquette International Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 2014 (i).
Postmasters, Country, Salary Increases (remarks) 14011 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafter,' 10523, 10529 (v).
Ry. Act. (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 251 (i); in Com., 3539 (ii), 6275 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14338, 14494 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies for Man. Rys., &c. (remarks) 14494 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11041; (Dauphin) 11774; (Portage La Prairie) 11782; (Toronto) 11743; Winnipeg) 11789 (v.)
Revenue contributed by Man., &c. (remarks) 14495 (vi).
St. Andrews Rapids, Bridge Construction (Ques.) 14284 (vi).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7217 (iii).
S. African Colonies and Preferential Tariff, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ques.) 1678 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).
Steele, James Reid, Relief (B. 195) 1°*, 4178 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Customs (stationery, &c.) 3966 (ii).
Dom. Lands (homestead entries) 13966 (vi).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works: Buildings—**Man.** (Winnipeg, immigrant shed) 13126 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2645 (ii); **Man.** (Dauphin Lake) 1448 (i); (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3356; (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i); **Ont.** (Port Arthur) 3345 (ii).
Quarantine (public health) 5016 (ii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).
Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4099, 4198 (ii).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14388 (vi).

McEwen, Mr. G., *S. Huron.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7362 (iii).
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13753 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10755 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7998 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Joseph wharf) 3382 (ii).

McGowan, Mr. J., *C. Wellington.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).
Bankers, Private, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 285 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5442 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 396 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 930 (i).
Private Bankers: *See* 'Bankers.'
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11027 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6470 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Customs (linseed oil, seizure) 3935 (ii).
Post Office (postal mail service) 6053 (iii).
Public Works: Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2685 (ii).

McGugan, Mr. M., *S. Middlesex.*
London Loan Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 1295 (i).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 63) 1°*, 707 (i).

McIntosh, Mr. J., *Sherbrooke.*
Eastern Township's Bank (B. 25) 1°*, 367 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii).
Keller Heating Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 231) M. to rec. Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294 (iii).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F.—*Con.*
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (B. 177) M. to rec. Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 131) 1°*, 2014 (i); in Com., 5093 (ii), 5359 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, **N.S.** (Bayfield, wharf) 13141; (Benoit's Cove) 13143 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallée, pier) 1544 (i).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*
Euxine, Scuttling of Schr. (M. for cor.) 699 (i).
SUPPLY:
Postoffice: Outside Service (ry. mail service, N.S.) 5949; (postal service, Inverness) 6051 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredges, repairs) 2628 (ii); **N.S.** (Broad Cove) 13199 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1095; (Margaree, wharf) 1133 (i); (Pleasant Bay) 13205 (vi); (Port Hawkesbury) 1146 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206 (vi).

Madore, Mr. J. A. C., *Hochelaga.*
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 1461 (i).
Sugar imported into Canada, 1902 (M. for stmnt.*) 3236 (ii).

Malouin, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9882 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1506; (amt.) 664 (i); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6621 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806 (i).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., and Sen. Amts. to Exchequer Court Amt. B. 155 (remarks) 14770 (vi).
——— *See* 'Exchequer B. 155.'
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims' &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3299 (ii).
Baie de Chaleur Ry.: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8241 (iv).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342 (iii).
Campaign Literature and Improper Use of Mail Bags, Complaint, &c. (remarks) 14219 (vi).
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 11459 (vi).
Can. Associated Press Despatches: *See* 'British.'
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8259 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9351 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 751 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507 (ii).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaint *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 14219 (vi).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from England: *See* 'British.'

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 1327, 1511 (i); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6530, 6621 (iii).

Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British.'

Public Works Dept., Control of, &c.: *See* 'Supply —Public Works.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi).

Justice, Administration of: Supreme Court (library) 3404 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756 (iv).

Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3754 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446; (Caplan breakwater) 13449 (vi); (Cross Point pier) 1513; (Grande Vallée pier) 1515 (i); (Maguasha pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13463; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle breakwater) 13490; (Shegawake harbour) 13479 (vi); (transfer of works to Marine Dept.) 2649 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Restigouche bridge) 8304 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. J. E., *Bagot.*

G. T. P. Ry. B., Pets. from Bagot (ques. of privilege) 12941 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6502 (iii).

Matheson, Mr. J., *Richmond (N.S.)*

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6911 (iii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13172 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11029; (N.S.) 11797 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5828 (iii); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Breton's Cove) 13172 (vi); (Janvrin's Island wharf) 1102 (i).

Meigs, Mr. D. B., *Missisquoi.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10472 (v).

Monet, Mr. D., *Laprairie and Napierville.*

Pensions to S. A. Contingent by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14598 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3895 (ii).

Monet, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6506 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7035, 7043 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6687; (creed lines) 6698; (repatriation agents) 6700 (iii).

Militia (military properties) 3620; (properties) 3613 (ii).

Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 861 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Address, on The, 55 (ii).

Alaskan Boundary: *See* 'Colonial,' &c.

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 2°m., 664 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iii).

Beauharnois Electoral District Representation, and Independence of Parliament Act (M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com.) 7095 (iii).

Boards of Trade and Distribution of Public Documents (remarks) 1378 (i).

Bonaventure Station, Terminal Facilities, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

——— (Ques.) 666 (i).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 10715; in Com., 10718 (v).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on M. for 3°, 7468 (iii).

Business of the Hse, Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1343 (i).

——— (remarks) 5051 (ii); 11062 (v).

Butter and Cheese Weighing, Rep. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5414 (iii).

Butter sold at Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1593, 1857 (i).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'

Canadian Chamber of Commerce at Paris, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).

Can. Press Despatches: *See* 'British,' &c.

Cartierville Workmen, Treatment by Govt. Contractors (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11288 (v). *See* 'Racine,' &c 'Nelson,' &c.

Census Commissioners for Prov. of Que., Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 1058 (i).

Census Expenditure, Notice of M., 13368 (vi).

Census 1901, Cost to Date, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, Speech *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13375 (vi).

Chambly Canal, Collector, &c., Superannuation (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Rickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B., on M. (Sir *William Mulock*) to wthdrw., 11301 (v).

Colonial Conference, Bond-Hay Treaty and Alaska, Inquiry for Ret., 853 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Committees meeting concurrently with Sittings of the Hse. (remarks) 8333 (iv).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3261 (ii).
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. B. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) in Com., 3223 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7498 (iii).
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1326 (i), 3241 (ii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3100; in Com. on B., 4010 (ii).
Customs Employes, Transfers, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3006 (ii).
Dugas, Mr. Blaise, Amount paid *re* Trip in Foreign Countries (Ques.) 1034 (i).
Dundonald, Earl: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3582 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry for, 10832 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8360 (iv).
Fair Wage Clause in Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
——— *See* 'Nelson,' &c.
Fisher, Chas. A. L., Inspector of Public Works, Salary, Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).
France and Canada SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10804 (v).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).
G. O. C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2413 (i).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7821, 7858; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8324 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8526 (iv); 10411; in Com. on B., 10412, 10574, 10650, 11287, 11302 (v).
——— on M. for Com. on Res., Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 10315 (v).
——— Order, Ques. of, Ruling asked *re* reporting debates of Com., 10633; Ruling of Chairman (Mr. *Belcourt*) sustained (Y. 52; N. 30) 10654 (v).
——— Govt's Intention *re* Quebec to Moncton scheme, 10537 (v).
——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 5765, 7487 (iii).
——— Subsidy from Govt., &c. (Ques.) 671, 1031 (i).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14647 (vi).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental.'

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
G. T. Ry., Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, &c. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c. (M. for ret.) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 66) 690 (i).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, &c., on M. for Sup., 6612 (iii).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3258 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4008 (ii).
Insolvency Act Amt. (B. 53) 1° m., 654 (i); 2° m., 2373 (i), 2787, 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
I. C. R. and G. T. Ry., Terminal Facilities at Bonaventure, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).
——— *See* 'Bonaventure,' 'G.T.R.'
I. C. R., River Ouelle, Branch Line, Total Cost (Ques.) 10490 (v).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 125; 2. m., 566, 705, 916 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7953 (iv); in Com. on B., 10799 (v).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759, 10768 (v).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10712, 10743 (v).
L'Assomption Post Office, Site, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
——— Letters, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
——— Receipts, Cheques, &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10799 (v).
Lévis, Land purchased for I.C.R., on M. for O. Cs. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3806 (ii).
Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 659 (i).
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Govt. Action (remarks) 2504 (ii).
——— *See* 'Montreal.'
Loy, Geo. M., M.P., Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) 7095 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com. (amt.) 8008 (iv).
——— (M.) to print Evidence, 7917 (iv).
Martineau, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 10242 (v).
Mayrand, Denis, Petition *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 9082 (iv).
Ménard, Denis, Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 90, 179 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4448, 4482 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Payment of Militia (Ques.) 4006 (ii).

——— *See* 'Longshoremen.'

Montreal Post Office Buildings, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

——— Investigation *re*, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).

——— *See* 'Post Office.'

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 672 (i).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Murray Bay and St. Denis Wharf SS. Service, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 10496 (v).

Nelson P.O., B.C., Labourers, Claims *re* Contractors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

——— Agreements between Employees and Contractors (read) 7162 (iii).

——— Letters read from Labour Dept., &c., 7164 (iii).

See 'Cartierville,' &c., 'Racine.'

New Canadian Company, Limited, B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2° m., 1328 (i).

Newspapers in United Kingdom, France and U.S., Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for stmnt.*) 706 (i).

See 'British.'

North Halfway Point, Lightkeeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10741 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Be'court*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 707; 2°m., 1327 (i); (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87) 6537 (iii).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10794 (v).

Petersen-Tate: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 138, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to wthdrw. B., 11302 (v).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677 (iii).

Post Office Buildings, Montreal, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

See 'Montreal.'

Post Office Employees, Holidays, &c. (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

Post Office Savings Banks B. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6815 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Preferential Tariff, Speech of Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain (remarks) 13375 (vi).

Préfontaine, Mr., and Speech *re* 'Transcontinental Ry.': *See* 'Transportation,' &c.

Printing of Bills: *See* 'Business,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafters,' 10531 (v).

——— (ques. of order) 10505 (v).

Public Accounts Com. producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7059 (iii).

Public Documents, Distribution to Board of Trade (remarks) 1378 (i).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 1°, 3970 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14746 (vi)

Public Works, Preservation of Health, Regulations *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1857 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14697, 14700 (vi).

Quebec Bridge, Application for Further Aid (Ques.) 10496 (v).

Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Racette, V., Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 3231 (ii).

Racine Bros., Claims against Contractors *re* Nelson Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

See 'Cartierville,' 'Nelson,' &c.

Ry. Commissioners, Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3549, 3832, 4728 (ii), 5694 (iii), 8134, 8170 (iv).

——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2782 (ii).

——— (fire guards) Amt. B. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, 871 (i).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2564 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546; in Com., 550; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 551 (i).

Railway Subsidies, Inquiry for, 10955 (v).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., Grain Blockade, on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. to Sup., 2472 (i).

Richelieu River Inundations, &c. (Ques.) 10496.

Reports, Deptl., French Translation, Delay in Issuing (remarks) 479 (i).

Representations in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10832; in Com., 10958, 11028, 11114 (v).

St. James (Montreal) Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (M.) 707, 940 (i).

——— (remarks) 40.) (i), 6995 (iii), 13376 (vi).

St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupore & Malone (M. for copy of contract*) 706 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. (M.) that Com. rise, 6496 (iii).

Session of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i).

Slater Shoe Co. and Alien Labour, Res. of Shoemakers Union (read) 14666 (vi).

S. African Contingent, Saddles and Bridles, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).

S. A. War, Supplies purchased by Imp. Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for O. Cs., 2761 (ii).

See 'Hay,' &c.

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 457 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Steel Rails, Contract, Price, &c. (Ques.) 285 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7036 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (archives) 4429; (criminal statistics) 4429 (ii); (Drolet, census schedules) 7055 (iii); (experimental farms) 4548; (general statistics) 4432; (imperial institute) 4435 (ii).

Canals: Chambly (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12909; Generally (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (toll collectors) 12929 (vi).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. ('Gazette' correspondents, Montreal) 7155 (iii).

Customs (inspectors, preventive, &c.) 3949; (preferential tariff) 3943; (stationery, printing, &c.) 3963 (ii).

Geological Survey (Dr. Bell's appnmt.) 6816; (explorations, &c.) 6816; (instruments purchased) 6820 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6660; (expenditure) 6615; (Fabre, Dr., medical inspector) 6662, 6850; (Hungarians, &c.) 6694; (medical inspection) 6852; (trachoma, inspection) 6668; (U. S. agents) 6850 (iii).

Indians: Yukon Ter. (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7271; (travelling expenses) 7272 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (Genelle *vs.* The King) 6795; (Keewatin govt., expenses) 6798; (litigation expenses) 6795; (maps, engraving, &c.) 6800 (iii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (Statutes, Revision) 14644 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Anticosti lightship) 5737; (*Bayfield*, str., reps. *re*) 5748; (light houses construction) 5737; (St. Lawrence route) 5758 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal ports) 7591 (iv).

Militia (annual drill) 3607 (ii); (Cole *vs.* Cooke, costs) 6950 (iii); (Cottee, Herbert, salary, &c.) 3610; (pay and allowance) 3586; (properties) 3612; (stores branch) 3609; (Valleyfield strike) 3586 (ii).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6986; (naturalization act, expenses) 6953; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6962 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, repairs) 5033; (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4041; (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4047; (St. Lawrence, obstruction, &c.) 4041 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 422 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

N.B., St. John (quarantine, water service) 415, 486 (i); (St. John water service) 486.

N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i).

Que. (Lévis) 431; (Montreal examining warehouse) 433; (Montreal, renewals) 436; (renewals, &c.) 422; (St. Hyacinthe) 441; (Valleyfield P. O.) 443 (i).

Docks (commissioner's reps.) 2984 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3354 (ii).

Ont. (Port Arthur) 3348 (ii).

Que. (Montreal harbour, 3365; (Quebec harbour improvements) 3336; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3304; (Sorel deep water wharf) 3376 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration and awards) 13339 (vi); (general expenditure) 2925 (ii); (Ottawa river surveys) 13341 (vi); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2925 (ii); (transportation commission) 13365 (vi).

Slides and Booms (repairs, &c.) 2979 (ii).

Telegraph Lines: N.W.T. (Wood Mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi).

Railways: I.C.R. (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii); Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12913 (vi); P.E.I. Ry. (Murray Harbour branch) 7534 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7275; (govtl. expenses) 6802 (iii).

Tarte, Mr., Resignation: *See* 'Ministerial.'

Telegraphic System, N.W.T. and C.P.R. Connection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vi).

Tobacco (Canadian) in Foreign Countries, Sale, &c., Amounts paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

Tobacco Combine, Rep. (Ques). 1297 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Application for Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 1026 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry., Sale to G.T. Pacific Co., Par. in Toronto *News*, 7566 (iv).

Transcontinental Ry., Govt. Policy (remarks 5765 (iii).

———Proposals to Govt. (Ques.) 874 (i).

See 'G.T.P.R.'

Translation of Deptl. Reports: *See* 'Reports.'

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 853 (i).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13365 (vi).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. on Sup., 4505 (ii).

———(remarks) 3876 (ii).

———Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11064 (v).

Trent Canal Surveys, &c. on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2330 (i).

Turnpike Trust, Montreal, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 672 (i).

Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7569 (iv).

Valleyfield P.O., Erection, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Veterinary Chief Inspectors, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Victoria Bridge, Montreal, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 3245; on M. to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Wiallard, Paul, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

Yukon District Newspapers, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for stmnt.*) 706 (i).

Morin, J. B., *Dorchester.*

Budget, The, 2034 (i).

Chabot, Mr. F.X., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2015 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12553 (v).

Employees in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7903 (iv.)

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12053 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12774 (vi).

———Parishes crossed, Lévis to Temiscouata (Ques.) 8117 (iv).

——— on Pets. presented (remarks) 12942 (vi).

———Surveys, in Com. of Sup., 14647 (vi).

House of Commons, Employees: *See* 'Employees.'

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5726 (iii).

Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville, &c. (Ques.) 8616 (iv).

Moreau, Dr., Appnmt. at Chambly Canal (Ques.) 8331, 8488 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Subsidy paid, &c.(Ques.) 10496 (v).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1337 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1815 (i).

Ross Rifle, Examination, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 2758 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6517 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (U.S. agents) 6857 (iii).

Legislation: H. of C.(tradesmen, &c.) 14115 (vi)

Post Office (country postmasters) 6060 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—**N.W.T.** (Yorkton court-house) 961; **Que.** (L'Assomption) 429; (Levis) 432 (i); (Levis, P.O.) 13055; (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066; (St. John's, P.O.) 13060 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—**Que.** (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 13445; (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446 (vi); (Cacouna, wharf) 5897 (iii); (Caplan, breakwater) 13451 (vi); (Chateauguay River) 3209 (ii); (Chateau Richer) 13455 (vi); (Crane Island, wharf) 1513 (i); (Desjardins, Allumette, wharf) 13457; (Grand Rivière, wharf) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallee, pier) 1514 (i); (Grosbois Isle) 5902; (Hull, wharf) 5902 (iii); (Kamouraska, pier) 13458; (Mistook, wharf) 13461; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3305 (ii); (St. Laurent, wharf) 5907; (St. Jerome, wharf) 5909; (St. Maurice River) 5905; (St. Nicholas, pier) 5905 (iii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 3374 (ii); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5905 (iii)

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2678, 2689.

Telegraph Lines (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334 (vi).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5925 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Chaudière, engine-house) 14106 (vi); Ouelle River Branch) 7527 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7280 (iii).

Trottier, Louis M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8488 (iv).

Valleyfield Strike, 1900 (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 654 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 591.

Century Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 175) 1°*, 3126.

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 611 (i), 5555, 5583, 6199 (iii).

Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering (B. 32) 1°*, 367 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6901 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8859 (iv).

Japanese Immigration (remarks) 3713 (ii).

Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 33) 1°*, 367 (i).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 591 (i).

Man. and North-western Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 44) 1°*, 591 (i).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261 (iv).

Private Bills (M.) to extend Time, 10489 (v).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints, &c. (remarks) 9970 (iv).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 249) 1°*, 10744; (M.) to receive Pet., 10744 (v).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Management, &c., Par. in *Post Intelligencer*, 7003 (iii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm., K.C.M.G. (Postmaster General) *North York, O.*

Alliance Bank of Canada's incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7471 (iii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Alien Labour Act, Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 3971.
See 'Naturalization.'

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 3285 (ii).

Ashcroft-Barkerville Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6958, 6966 (iii).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies,' &c.

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11171 (v).

Auditor General and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com., 13809 (vi).

Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract (Ans.) 13263 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6383 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7367 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 6758 (iii).

Bloomfield Postmaster, Charges against, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).

Brecken, Mr., P.O. Inspector, P.E.I. (remarks) 14002 (vi).

B. C. Labour Troubles, Commissioners' Appnmt. (Ans.) 1596 (i), 8116 (iv).
See 'Labour.'

Brockvillle and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7445 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c, (remarks) 1346 (i).
——— (remarks) 3794 (ii), 7487 (iii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5064 (ii).

Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (Ans.) 14286 (vi).
——— and Mail Bags, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14222 (vi).
——— Govt. Ownership (Ans.) 14286 (vi).
See 'Mail Bags.'

C.A.R. Section-Men's Strike (remarks) 2303 (i).

Canada Foundry Co'.s Strike (remarks) 7205 (iii).
See 'Scotch,'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5105 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands in Man. Exempt from Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).
See 'Lands.'

Cane Bros., Timber License, &c. (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

Cartierville Workmen, Treatment by Govt. Contractors (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11288 (v).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5480 (iii).

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Delivery, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).

Chevrier Family, Number in Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 245) 1°m., 9079 (iv), wthdn., 11301 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 257) Res. prop., 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330, 12493, 12500, 12574 (v), 13809, 13833 (vi); 3°m, 13942 (vi).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3176, 3185 (ii).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Companies (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks Bill.'

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for 2°, 3259 (ii).

Conciliation Boards, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).

Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).
——— (Ans.) 2308 (i).

Cutler, Spanish Mills, &c., Tender (Ans.) 2308.

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3098 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Man. and N.W.T. Sale, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 671, 816 (i).

Doukhobors, Homestead Entries, &c. (Ans.) 542.
——— Pilgrimage, Expenses, Losses, &c. Ans.) 542 (i).
——— Govt. Action, &c. (Ans.) 1031 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3021; in Com. on B., 4682 (ii).

Enterprise Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14008 (vi).

Ernestown Station, Postmaster, Change, &c. (Ans.) 1034 (i).

Fair Wage Schedule on Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
See 'Labour,' &c,

False Creek Lease to Burnett & Kelly (Ans.) 2758 (ii).

Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.

Govt. Business: *See* 'Business.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii); in Com., 7836, 7877 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9751 (iv); in Com. on B., 10564, 10624, 11190, 11288, 11348 (v).
See 'Transportation,' &c.

Half-Breeds Claims Commission, on Inquiry for Ret., 3397 (ii).

Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13767 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 685.

House of Commons, Ventilation: *See* 'Ventilation'

Immigration, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1127 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Immigration into Can. Nationality, &c. (Ans.) 2310 (i).

——— Number refused admittance, &c. (Ans.). 2310 (i), 2502 (ii).

Immigration into Man., Houses and Fuel (Ans.) 542 (i).

——— Medical Inspection, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

Immigration Office for Ireland, Closing, &c. (Ans.) 1032 (i).

Immigration for Ont., Govtl. Action (Ans.) 1593 (i).

Immigration, Provision for Settlers on C.P.R. Trains, &c. (remarks) 868 (i).

——— Total Number, Origin, Expenditure, &c. (Ans. 1035 (i).

Imperial Agency incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).

Indian Agents, Guardians, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).

Indian Medical Attendant, Kings, N.B. (Ans.) 2502 (ii).

Insurance Rates on Ocean Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 705 (i).

Interier, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ans.) 3972 (ii).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14391 (vi).

Jonasson, Mr. S., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Labour Commission, B.C., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1596 (i), 8116 (iv).

Labour Commission of 1886, Names, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8083 (iv).

Labour Council, Toronto: *See* 'Toronto.'

Labour Disputes, Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 4003 (ii). *See* 'Ry. Labour Disputes,' 'Fair Wage.'

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iii).

Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 951 (i).

——— (Ans.) 1596 (i).

Lambton Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6166 (ii), 14278, 14651, 14661 (vi).

Lands (Govt.) available for Settlers, in B.C., &c. (Ans.) 4836 (ii).

——— Grants to Rys., Areas, &c. (Ans.) 2102 (i).

——— Sales, Winnipeg, Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 1858 (i).

——— Subsidies to Rys. unearned (Ans.) 3797 (ii). *See* 'C.P.R.,' &c., 'Rys,' &c.

Latour, Mr., Absence from Dept. to canvass for *Le Canada* (remarks) 14002 (vi).

——— *See* 'Postmasters in Que.'

Letter Carriers, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5672 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Lime Rock, N.S., Postmaster's Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2515 (ii).

Macleod, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 8083 (iv).

McNulty: *See* 'Lambton.'

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14222 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Special Trains, 14681 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Threats to Express Cos., 14851 (vi).

——— (remarks) 14540 (vi).

——— *See* 'Campaign.'

Mails carried by Rys., &c. (Ans.) 6268 (iii).

Mails carried *via* New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).

Mail Cars, N.W.T., Insufficient Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iii).

Mail Clerks: *See* 'P.O. B. 208.'

Maps, Printing and Publishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14273 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5099 (ii).

Miller Bros. and P.O. Bank Deposits, Defalcation of Postmaster, 14274, 14655 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4483 (ii).

Montreal Post Office, Enlargement of Building, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).

——— Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3973 (ii).

Naturalization Act, Regulations, &c. Ans.) 2015 (i).

——— *See* 'Aliens,' &c.

Nelson Post Office, B.C., Claims of Labourers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii). *See* 'Cartierville.'

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14396 (vi).

Nesbitt P.O., Man., Postmaster Watson, as Lib. Candidate (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Newmarket Office Specialty Co. (personal explanation) 13256 (vi).

N.W.T., Postal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14040 (vi). *See* 'Mail Cars, &c.'

Orleans Island Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 670 (i).

Ottawa Supply Co. *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

Parkhill Mail Contract, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Personal Explanation *re* Newmarket Specialty Co., 13256 (vi).

Petersen-Tate Deposit: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Picton Mail Service, Irregular Delivery, &c. (remarks) 13135 (vi).

Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13993 (vi).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.--*Con.*

Portage, P.E.I., Opening of Post Office (remarks) 14008 (vi).

Postal Facilities *re* Parishes near Montreal (Ans.) 12498 (v).

Postal Newspaper Boxes, Manufacture, &c. (Ans.) 14283 (vi).

Postal Service N.W.T. : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Postmasters' Association, Memorial *re* Salaries (Ans.) 129 (i), 13263 ; (remarks) 14016 (vi).

Postmasters' Bonds and Insurance Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Postmasters, Country, Increases in Salaries (remarks) 6038 (iii) ; 14012 (vi).

Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
——— (remarks) 879 (i).

Postmasters in Man. and N.W.T., Pet. *re* Salaries (Ans.) 129 (i) ; 13263 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14672 (vi).
——— *See* 'Latour.'

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 208) 2° m., 5657 ; in Com., 5659 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep., Distribution, &c. (presented) 89 ; (remarks) 879 (i).

Post Office Employees, Holidays granted, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

Post Offices in Cities, Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).

Post Office Insurance Fund, Rep. *re* (remarks) 14661 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
——— Statement *re* Progress, in Com. of Sup., 14012 (vi).

Préfontaine, Mr., Speech *re* G. T. P. Ry. : *See* 'Transportation.'

P.E.I. Coal Fields, &c. (Ans.) 2504 (ii).
——— *See* 'Winter Communication.'

Protective Tariff, Govt. Policy, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6689 (iii).

Public Works, Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (iv).

Racine Bros. : *See* 'Nelson,' &c.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 7609, 8125 (iv).

Ry. Labour Disputes (B. 17) 2° m., 2535 ; in Com., 2580, 2923 ; 3° m., 3004, 3298 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Ry. Land Subsidies in Man. N.W.T., reserved, &c. (Ans,) 2307 (i).
——— Unpatented (Ans.) 2583 (ii).
——— Subsidies voted, &c., Govtl. Action *re* Selection (Ans.) 4832 (ii).
See 'Saskatchewan,' 'Lands,' &c.

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office Amt. B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— *See* 'P.O. Bill 208.' 'Supply,' &c.

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.--*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14349 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14349 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies granted to Provs. (remarks) 14485 (vi).

Ry. Transportation Policy : *See* 'Transportation.'

Rainy River Mail Service (remarks) 6890 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10881 ; in Com., 10924 ; (Norfolk) 11117 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12470 (v).

Robson, Michael, Dismissal from Ayr Post Office (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Ronan, Mr., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery (Ans.) 13259 (vi).
——— P.E.I. (remarks) 13806 (vi).
——— *See* Supply—'Post Office,' &c.

St. Boniface, Postal Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 1859 (i).

St. Chrysostôme Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 7772 (iv).

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sales, &c. (Ans.) 2502 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s Property (Ans.) 2306 (i).

Scotch Iron Moulders and Toronto Strike (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iii).
See 'Can. Foundry.'

Scotia, Str., Salvage Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7151 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Agricuture (exhibitions) 4624 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 272 (i).
Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 234 (i).
Interior (salaries) 267 (i).
Labour Dept. (*Gazette* cors., Montreal) 7154, 7155 ; (salaries) 7151 ; (Thompson, Mr. P., remuneration) 7152 (iii).
See 'Labour Dept.'
Post Office (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13995 ; (mail clerks) 13997 ; (Smith, F. H., salary) 14000 (vi).
Dom. Lands (maps, printing, &c.) 14273 (vi).
Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5125 (ii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6689 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7772 ; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7784 (iv).
Justice, Administration of, Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14259 (vi).
Labour Dept. (B. C. Commissioners) 7198 ; (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).
See 'Civil Govt.,' 'Labour.'
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7597 ; (G. B. and Can.) 7728 (iv).
Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984 ; (Martineau defalcations) 6991 (iii) ; (Post office, Miller's claims *re* Savings Bank) 14274, 14655 (vi) ; (Petersen, Tate and Co.'s deposit) 6958, 6966 (iii).
Post Office (automobiles, &c.) 6050 ; (Barrie branch) 6063 ; (box rents) 6139 (iii) ; (cities, promotions) 14009 (vi) ; (country postmasters) 6038 ; (Dawson and Eagle City) 5923 ; (Halifax, salaries) 6004 (iii) ; (inspectors' salaries) 14001 (vi) ; (jubilee stamps) 6061 ; (letter carriers, increases) 6004 ; (letter carriers,

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office—Con.

P.E.I.) 6058; (letter carriers, Toronto) 6005; (letter carriers, Winnipeg) 6006; (mail bag repairs) 6139; (mail marking machines) 6159; (mail service) 6065 (iii); (outside service, additional salaries) 14010 (vi); (outside service, Ottawa Supply Co.) 5936; (outside service, salaries, &c.) 5925 (iii); (pneumatic tube service) 13998 (vi); (postal service, Inverness) 6051; (postmasters, arrears of salaries) 5921; (P.E.I. winter service) 5943; (ry. mail clerks) 5928, 6026 (iii); (ry. mail clerks, Man. and N.W.T.) 14041 (vi); (ry. mail transfer agents) 6136; (rural mail delivery) 6137 (iii); (statutory increases) 14006 (vi); (superannuation, letter carriers) 6013 (iii); (temporary employees, promotion) 14001; (Vancouver, inspector) 14000; (Winnipeg, dead letter branch) 13995; (Winnipeg, inspector's office) 14001 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (furniture, &c.) 1007; (Orillia caretaker) 1017; (Ottawa, furniture, &c.) 978; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 993 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, **Ont.** (Port Arthur, dredging) 13021 (vi); **P.E.I.** (Gaspereaux harbour) 1156; **Que.** (Murray Bay wharf) 2270 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Ouelle River branch) 7527 (iii).

Tariff: *See* 'Customs,' 'Protective,' &c.

Tarte, Mr., Reference to in Toronto *Star* (explanation) 6758 (iii).

Tatamagouche Post office, Insurance Fund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

Telephone Co.'s B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 700 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 5555 (iii); in Com., 9424 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5883 (iii).

Toronto and James Bay Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14358 (vi).

Toronto Labour Council, Tel. *re* Mechanics from Eng. (Ans.) 1855 (i).

See 'Labour,' 'Can. Foundry,' &c.

Transportation Commission, &c., Par in Montreal *Herald re* Mr. Prefontaine (remarks) 858 (i).

Transportation Policy, *re* Speech from Throne (remarks) 6405 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4499.

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2826 (ii).

——— Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 3303 (ii).

——— Sec. 14, &c. (remarks) 4593 (ii).

Valleyfield Strike, 1900 (Ans.) 2760 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 6406 (iii).

Watson, Postmaster, and Man. Elections: *See* 'Nesbitt.'

Whitney Pier, N.S., Dismissal of Postmaster Carlin (Ans.) 130 (i).

——— Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 668 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 1045 (i).

Wood Alcohol, Contract with Standard Chemical Co., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

Wright, A. W., Amounts paid to (Ans.) 8116 (iv).

Murray, Mr. T., *Pontiac.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1011 (i); in Com. on B., 10552 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 767 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10792 (v).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c. (M. for copies) 1299 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13362; (transportation commission) 13367 (vi).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *E. Hastings.*

Banff Coal Reserve, Lease for Mining, &c. (Ques.) 13026 (vi).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3269 (ii).

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11182.

G. T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9039 (iv); in Com. on B., 10419, 10658, 11191, 11353, 11856, 12198, 12261 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12711 (vi).

Hetu, Rudolph, Pardon, &c. (Ques.) 7915 (iv).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3680 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11407 (v).

Lt.-Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup., 123 (i).

Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 183 (i).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters.' Western Rys., 10522, 10534 (v).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i); in Com., 10987, 11542; (Brant) 11107 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (post offices) 517 (i).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4951 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4525 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3879 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*

Advocate, Prince Albert: *See* 'Supply.'

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°*, 11176 (v).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

Autonomy for N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13883 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7374 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 7309 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7437 (iii).

Budget, The, 1799, 1816 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4391, 4996 (ii); in Com. on B., 5803 (iii).

Canadian North-West Irrigation Co.'s (B. 143) 1°*, 2300 (i); in Com., 3226 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands and School Taxation (Ques.) 4006.

Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp, (B. 140) 1°*, 2236 (i); in Com., 4591 (ii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5488 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13586, 13593, 14427 (vi).

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 446 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 111) 1°*, 1462 (i).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Frank, Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2106. 2238 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5162 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8805 (iv); in Com. on B., 11352, 11946, 12145 (v).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, &c., on M. for Sup., 6562 (iii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7961 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4336 (ii).

Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10742 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8219 (iv).

Lumber Combine in N.W.T. and Man., Cor. read, &c., 1580 (i).

Lumber Combine Investigation, &c. (remarks) *re* B.C. Lumber Trade, 14767 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand) 5727 (iii).

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14592 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12316 (v).

Prince Albert *Advocate*, Printing: *See* 'Supply,' &c.

Provincial Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (fire-guards) 8187 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5522 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 2236 (i); in Com., 4588 (ii).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11825 (v).

S.A. War, Cattle for S.A.: *See* 'Cattle.'

———Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8266 (iv).

———Pensions to disabled Soldiers (remarks) 14592 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Dom. Lands (fire regulations) 6776; (tree culture) 6776 (iii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3479 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *W. Toronto.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6972 (iii).

Campbell, D. J., Postmaster at Macleod, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 8082 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation Co.'s (B. 54) in Com., 2303 (i).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4417 (ii).

Civil Service Act (superannuation) Amt. B. 49, in Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 595 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6649, 7492 (iii).

Defalcations in Deptl. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 623 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iii).

Fishing Industry, N.S., Accommodation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13163 (vi).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12300 (v).

Goods imported direct into Can., Value of Duty, &c. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9281 (iv); in Com. on B., 10600, 10650, 11279, 11320, 11972, 12038, 12062, 12161, 12286 (v); on M. for 3°, 12691; (amt.) 12693; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12703 (vi).

———Customs Duties *re* Clause 17, Legal Opinions (read) in Com. on B., 11320 (v).
See 'Ry. Policy.'

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4293 (ii).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8094 (iv).

Letters signed by Minister, stamped, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2527 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8054 (iv).

Macleod, N. W. T., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 8082 (iv).

Martineau, Defalcation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 195 (i).

Moosonee Diocese Trust Funds (B. 148) 1°*, 2396 (i).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12310 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of, Mr. Scott's Attack *re* Western Rys., 10497 (v).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Memo of Mr. Kingsmill *re* Bonds, &c. (read), 14588 (vi).

——Ques. of Privilege, *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6321 (iii).

——Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2559 (ii).

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7125 (iii).

See 'Transportation.'

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Toronto) 11701; (York) 11671; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12462; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12437 (v).

Scotia, Str., Salvage Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7156 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7220 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7024 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (wharfs, &c.) 7564 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 240; Justice (salaries) 212 (i); Labour Dept. (Thompson, P., remuneration) 7154 (iii).

Dom. Lands (Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. surveys) 6940; (surveys) 6939 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6326; (medical attendance) 6409; Ont. and Que. (medical attendance) 6326; (schools) 6409; Que. (medical attendance) 6408 (iii)

Legislation (voters' list) 5275 (iii).

Militia (Cooke *vs* Cole, costs) 6950; (Winnipeg barracks, paving streets) 6949 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co's deposit) 6956 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 5043 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg, armoury) 640; (London, drill hall) 641; (Toronto Junction, post office) 651 (i).

Harbours and Rivers: N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13144; (Breton's Cove) 13163 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13342.

Telegraph Lines: (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2993; (Marconi stations) 2991; (Yukon) 2993 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations) 6933 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (ii).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3490 (ii).

See 'Ry. Policy.'

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10157 (v).

Printing Com., 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 5314 (iii).

——— 4th Rep. (M.) to conc., 5581 (iii).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 460 (i).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5268 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 988 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William (Minister of Customs) *N. Wentworth and Brant.*

Agricultural Implements, Rebates for 1901-2 (Ans.) 3803 (ii).

Aluminum, Oxide of, imported into Can., Ports of Entry, &c. (Ans.) 1035 (i).

Audit Act and C. S. Employees, 13990 (vi).

Bananas imported into Dom., Value, &c. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Bauxite, Tons imported into Canada, 1902 (Ans.) 1678 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7385 (iii).

Binder Twine, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 7566 (iv).

Bonded Warehouses, Rental, Closing, &c. (Ans.) 12074 (v).

Bonding Privileges with U. S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

Bourgeois, M. E., Sub-collector of Customs at Tracadie, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 543 (i).

Budget, The, 2176 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5061 (ii).

Chevrier, F. L., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Cos. (Ans.) 3233.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12507 (v); in Com. on B., 13826 (vi).

Coal imported in Ontario from June, 1901, to March, 1902, and June, 1902, to March, 1903 (Ans.) 669 (i).

Coasting Laws, U. S., and Bonding Privileges, &c. (remarks) 13135 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. (B. 174) Prop. Res., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; in Com. on B., 4010; 3°m., 4187 (ii).

Customs Employees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 5318.

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*

Customs and Excise, *per capita* Revenue from 1896 to 1903 (Ans.) 13935 (vi).

Euxine, Scuttling of Sch., on M. (Mr. *McLennan*) for Cor., 699 (i).

German Surtax, Purchases previous to (Ans.) 3395 (ii).

See 'Preferential,' &c.

Goods imported direct into Can., Value, &c. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Grain Receipts through Western Lake Ports (Ans.) 97 (i).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 543 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10275; in Com. on B., 10549, 11360, 12025, 12170 (v); on M. for 3°, 12698, 12755 (vi).

Grant, J. G., Sureties *re* defaulting Customs Collections (Ans.) 5991 (iii).

Imports for 1903, Duty collected and Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ans.) 13935 (vi).

See 'Preferential,' &c.

Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7959, 7979 (iv).

'Jesse James' Stories, Importation Free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 11426 (v).

King's Warehouse at Winnipeg (Ans.) 6268 (iii)

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8217 (iv).

Le Canada Newspaper: *See* 'Pelletier,' &c.

Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5994 (iii).

Montreal Customs Dept., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 8115 (iv).

Nova Scotia Bank, Customs Duty *re* Safe, &c. (remarks) 13988 (vi).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980 (vi).

Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Origin (remarks) 3584 (ii).

Preference Tariff *re* German Goods (Ans.) 5322 (iii).

——— *See* 'Goods.'

Questions put by Members, Answer *re* (remarks) 544 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14375 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14375 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10918, 11489; (Brant) 11098, 11149; on Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) to M. for 3°, 12488 (v).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Sugar for Home Consumption, Quantity entered (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 (iii); Welland (Dunnville dam) 7810 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 319 (i).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3782, 3897; (Dauphin port) 3898; (Gananoque port) 3897; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3949 (ii); (Kilroy, Mr., payment for services) 13993 (vi); (linseed oil fraud) 3935; (locks, printing, &c.) 3962; (Montreal contingencies) 3785; (preferential tariff) 3921; (printing, &c.) 3962; (salaries, &c.) 3897 (ii); (salaries, overtime) 13980 (vi); (Yukon expenditure) 3968 (ii)

Electric Light (inspectors) 5409 (iii).

Immigration (repatriation, &c.) 6710 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (medical attendance) 6345 (iii).

Justice, Administration of: Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3427 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7592 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4098 (ii).

Post Office: Outside service (ry. mail service) 5956; (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5832.

Surtax Bill: *See* 'Customs.'

Tariff Charges, Free List, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).

Tobacco Duties collected for 1903 (Ans.) 12217.

Trade and Navigation Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Trade Commissioner in London, Appnmt., &c., (remarks) 3497 (ii).

U.S. Coasting Laws, &c., Regulations *re* (read) 13135 (vi).

Windsor Junction Accident, I.C.Ry., on Inquiry for Papers, 3496 (ii).

Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 284 (i).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Mr. Aylesworth, reported Interview (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4229 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5419, 5431 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5464; (Neg. Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).

Chickens, 'Wringing Chickens' Necks': *See* 'Supply—Agriculture'

Immigrants, Provision for Settlers (remarks) 868.

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. to Sup., 4341 (ii).

Latour, Mr., Leave of Absence and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980, 14002 (vi).

Le Canada and Mr. Pelletier's Canvassing, &c. (remarks) 13980 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

Mail Clerks, Promotions, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 13997 (vi).

Pope, Mr. R. H.—*Con.*

Ministerial Changes, on Explanations, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 191 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. E., and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980, 14002 (vi).

Postal Service in N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).

Poultry Fattening: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Pulp Wood, Duty by U.S. (remarks) 4362 (ii).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) for Com. of Sup., 2484 (i).

Sorel Wharf, Cor., Reps., &c., Inquiry for Papers, 2302 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Poultry Farming*) 7644.

Civil Govt.: Post Office (mail clerks, salaries) 13997 (vi).

Customs (salaries for overtime) 13980 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Bennett, Mr., salary increase) 13967 (vi).

Excise (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (close season, investigation, &c.) 13650; (dog-fish pest) 13651 (vi).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 6734 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 13640 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13963 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4064 (ii).

Post Office (dead letter branch, Winnipeg) 13995; (pneumatic tube service) 13998; (statutory increases) 14007; (Vancouver inspector) 14000; (Winnipeg, inspector's office) 14001 (vi).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan channel) 2280; (Chateauguay river) 2280; (Grande Vallee, pier) 1538; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie, ice piers) 2248; (Magdalen islands) 2265; (Maria, pier) 2265; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Orleans, wharf) 2290; (Rivière aux Renards) 2280; (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Francis, ice pier) 2282; (St. Jerome, wharf) 2291; (St. Lawrence, lower) 2257; (Sorel, wharf) 2291; (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2298; (Touladie river) 2286 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2961 (ii).

Slides and Booms (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974; (salaries) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Yukon working expenditure) 14042 (vi).

Quarantine: (diseased immigrants) 5492 (iii).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *W. Hastings.*

Ashley, Harford Relief (B. 236) 1°*, 8115 (iv).

Belleville Harbour Boundaries, &c. (Ques.) 5588.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9597.

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 775 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8092 (iv), 10786 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8078 (iv).

Napanee and Deseronto Ry. Co.'s Charter, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Quinté Bay Buoys, Payments for Services, &c. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5342 (iii).

Rathbun Co.'s Ry. Charter, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11548 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Generally (Belleville armoury) 969 (i).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Rep. of W. McLeod, &c. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).

——— Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2334 (i).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Maisonneuve.*

Alaska, Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 6629 (iii).

Annandale Range Lights, Amount expended (Ans.) 2922 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Bathurst Harbour Buoys (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Bayfield, Str., Sale, &c. (Ans.) 5586 (iii).

——— Reps. of Mr. Evans and others (read) in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).

Belleville Harbour Boundaries (Ans.) 5588 (iii).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks) 12820 (vi).

Bishop, Capt., Harbour Master, Albert, N B. (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

B. C. Fisheries, Rep. of Commissioners (remarks) 1199 (i).

C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Coal Oil as Fuel on Steamers: *See* 'Steamboat Inspection Bill.'

Daly, M. T., Harbour Master at Bathurst, N.B. (Ans.) 2919, 3630 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8259, 8360 (iv).

False Creek, Kelly & Burnett's Lease (Ans.) 7565 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3129 (ii), 5515, 6354 (iii).

Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 224) 1°m., 6538; in Com., 6896 (iii).

Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Fisheries Protection Service, Officers Mess, Regulations *re* (Ans.) 9820 (iv).

Fishery Rights between Dom. and Provs. (M.) for Memorandum, 7923 (iv).

See 'Supply—Fisheries.'

Fishing Rights, James and Hudson's Bay (Ans.) 1194 (i).

See 'James.'

Fishing within Three Mile Limit, N.B. (remarks) 4179 (ii).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10813 (v).

Frozen Fish, Goods, &c., Claims for Damages (Ans.) 13373 (vi).

——— Losses, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3394 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 5890 (iii).

Govt. Fishery Steamers, Names of Commanders, &c. (Ans.) 446 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8325 (iv).

G. T. R. Transcontinental Line, Speech in Montreal *Herald*: *See* 'Transportation.'

Harrison, Capt., Reimbursement to *re* Costs, &c. (remarks) 10240 (v).

Hatchey, Nazaire, Appnmt. as Harbour Master (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

James Bay Fishing Rights, on Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).
See 'Fishing.'

Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Kelly & Burnett: *See* 'False Creek.'

Latour, L. J., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Lighthouse Keepers, Pet. *re* Salaries (Ans.) 14666 (vi).

Macnee Fishing Licenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 4728 (ii).
See 'Fishing.'

Marine Deptl. Rep. (presented) 244 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificate B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) prop. Res., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6544; in Com. on B., 6917 (iii).

Mayrand, Denis, Petition *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 9082 (iv).

Mehan, Dr., Meteorological Service, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Ménard, Denis, Lightkeeper, Charges against (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

Meteorological Service, Removal to Ottawa, &c. (Ans.) 6435 (iii).

Midland Water Front (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
See 'Pratt.'

Minto, Govt. Steamer, Passengers carried (Ans.) 3632 (ii).

Miscou Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).

Monterey, Str., Wreck, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 6803 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4474 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8084 (iv).

Montreal Northern Ry. and Ste. Agathe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Moreau, Dr., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8331 (iv).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Naval Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5296 (iii); 13545 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. (B. 260) in Com. on Res., 12779; in Com. on B., 12984 (vi).

Navy Training Ships, Establishment, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5296 (iii), 13545 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Nobles, Israel, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to, &c. (remarks) 12820 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, N.B., Dismissal of Miles McMonagle (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6533 (iii).

Oyster Fishing, P.E.I., Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2920 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 138) 1°*, 2100 (i).

——— Montreal and Quebec Districts Amt. (B. 261) in Com. on Res., 12781; in Com., 13627; 3° m., 13937 (vi).

——— Prop. Res. wthdn., 12493 (v).

Pratt & Co., Water Frontage, Lease, Midland: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5294 (iii).
See 'Midland.'

P. E. I. Winter Communication, *re* Str. *Stanley* (Ans.) 4007 (ii).
See 'Winter,' 'Supply,' &c.

Quesnel Dam, B.C., Obstructions, &c. (Ans.) 11557 (v).

Quinté Bay Buoys, Payments for Service, &c. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Policy of Govt.: *See* 'Transportation.'

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14317, 14508 (vi).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. Lawrence Gulf Fishermen, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 2917 (ii).

St. Lawrence Navigation, Rep. of Lloyds, &c. (read) 4138 (ii).
See 'Supply,' 'Lighthouses,' &c.

St. Lawrence River Pilots, &c. (Ans.) 2916 (ii).
See 'Pilotage Bill.'

Safety of Ships Act Amt. (B. 179) 1°m., 3298 (ii); in Com., 6918 (iii).

Salmon Canning Industry, B. C (remarks) 10241 (v).

——— Rep. (M.) 7109 (iii).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) 9974 (iv).

——— Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 12073 (v).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. (B. 263) in Com. on Res., 12801, 12894; 3°m, 13560 (vi).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Stanley and *Lansdowne*, Str., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

Stanley, *Minto*, Strs. in the Ice, Telegram read, 6 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

——— (B. 225) prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; in Com. on B., 6915 (iii).

——— Amt. (B. 237) 1°m., 12494 (v); in Com., 12777 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5033 (ii); (salaries) 13663 (vi).

Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658 (vi); (Bance, Mr. promotion) 5277; (*Bayfield*, str.) 5278 (iii); (Behring sea arbitratin) 13658 (vi); (Canadian fishery exhibit) 4175 (ii); (close season, investigation, &c.) 13650 (vi); (fish-breeding establishments) 4175; (fish-ways) 4174; (hatcheries) 4174 (ii); 13660 (vi); (Hurley, J. M., inspector, &c.) 5123 (ii); 5283, 5306; (intelligence bureau reps.) 5277 (iii); (lobster factories inspection) 5123 (iii); (Ottawa exhibit) 5308 (iii); (protection service, B.C.) 4174 (ii); (provincial claims) 5311; (steamers, construction) 5278; (U.S. licenses, expenses) 5309 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agency, Montreal) 13632 (vi); (aids to navigation) 5736; (*Bayfield*, reps. *re*) 5740; (Bronté lighthouse) 5756 (iii); (Canadian coast lighting 4164 (ii); (gas lights) 13633; (Halifax harbour buoy service) 13638 (vi); (light-keepers' salaries) 4132; (lighthouse supplies) 4168; (Lurcher's shoal lightship) 4173 (ii); (Marconi stations) 13640 (vi); (Montreal pilot commissioners) 4173 (ii); (St. Lawrence lights) 13632 (vi); (St. Lawrence, navigation, &c.) 4135 (ii); (sweeping boats) 13636; (telephone service, Port Atkinson and Vancouver) 13638; (wireless stations) 13639.

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 4116 (ii). 13543; (Couillard, Alfred, gratuity, 13546 (vi); (Dom. steamers, repairs) 5034; (Govt. steamers, repairs) 4041 (ii); 13518 (vi); (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4048 (ii); (life saving awards) 13543; (marine biological station) 13543; (master and mates examination) 13524; (vi); (meteorological service) 4118 (ii); (naval militia and school of navigation) 13545 (vi); (St. Lawrence, lighting, &c.) 4042; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4114 (ii); (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 13545 (vi); (wrecks, investigation) 4116 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Que. (Longueuil, P.O.) 13072; (St. Louis de Mile End, P.O.) 13080 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12848 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept., 2939 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection (boiler inspectors) 13648.

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6993; (time ball, Halifax) 6993 (iii).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. (B. 262) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v); 12800; in Com. on B., 12993 (vi).

—— Prop. Res. withdn., 12492 (v).

Swinehammer, Geo., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 2312.

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 855 (i).

Venoit, P. I., Absence from Duty, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).

Yamaska to Lotbiniere, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14319 (vi).

Winter Communication, P.E.I., Construction of Str. (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1055.

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Cornwall and Stormont.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4230 (ii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7145, 7400 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5808 (iii).

Cattle Guard Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 14686 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) 14136 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for Com. (M.) to refer back to Com. on Rys., &c., 4871; Neg. (Y. 55, N. 102) 4874 (ii); in Com., 5208 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10118 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13281 (vi).

See 'Transportation,' &c.

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14699, 14725 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Cornwall (electric lighting) 14136 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 487. Que. (L'Assomption) 428 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3493 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2842 (ii).

Puttee, Mr. A. W., *Winnipeg.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s (B. 192) in Com., 5588, 5960 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7324 (iii).

B. C. Labour Troubles, Appnmt. of Commission (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Budget, The, 2149 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5447 (iii).

Canada Foundry Co., Toronto, Strike, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7194 (iii).

See 'Immigration, Inadequate Inspection.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5108 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands in Man., Exemption from Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act, Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 610 (i).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3181 (ii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. (B. 95) 1°m., 1193 (i); 2°m., 2790, 3259; in Com., 3260 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6643 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 13572 (vi).

Fair Wage Schedule on Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7159 (iii).

Grain Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9120 (iv); in Com. on B., 11281 (v).

Immigration, Accommodation for Settlers, 1126 (i).

——— Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6567 (iii).

——— Provision for Settlers on Trains, &c. (remarks) 866 (i).

Labour: *See* 'B. C.', 'Can. Foundry,' 'Conciliation,' 'Fair Wage,' 'Ry. Labour B., 'Supply, —Civil Govt.', 'Workmen,' &c.

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 950 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2509.

North Pole Expedition, Aid to Capt. Bernier, &c. (remarks) 12819 (vi).

Post Offices in Cities, Stmnt. of Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

Preston, Mr., and Interference in Can. Labour Affairs: *See* 'Immigration, Inadequate Inspection.'

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4207 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6263 (iii), 8136 (iv).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2549 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., Car Shortage, &c., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2468 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 65 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10900; (Dauphin) 11748; (Winnipeg) 11784 (v).

St. Andrews' Locks Contract, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 287 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids, Expiration of Contract (Ques.) 10490 (v).
See 'Supply.'

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 242 (i); Labour Department (*Gazette*) 7154 (iii).

Post Office (letter carriers, Winnipeg) 6006 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military stores) 13126; (Winnipeg, P. O.) 438 (i), 13127 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews Rapids) 3354; (snag boat) 2672 (ii).

Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5496 (iii).

Winnipeg and Assiniboine Water Power Co.'s (B. 192) 1°*, 3970 (ii).

Winnipeg P. O., Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Workmen on G. T. P.Ry., Construction, Protection to, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11281 (v).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *S. Grenville.*

Alert, Str., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

Alexandria Wood Export Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).

Bank Failures since Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S., 12761 (vi).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5060 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5112 (ii).

Cardinal Canal, Toll Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12929 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12336, 12546 (v).

Clergue Co., Reorganization and Govt. Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14098 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

——— Supt's Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4019 (ii).

Damages to Vessels at Govt. Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Electric Lighting, St. Lawrence Canals at Iroquois (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

Fiddler's Elbow, Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10821 (v).

Galops Rapids, Deepening, &c., Contract, &c., Cor. (read) on conc., 8375 (iv).

Galops Rapids, Dam. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12608 (v).

Gananoque and Brockville Channel, Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13320 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12262 (v); on M. for 3°, 12699, 12743, 12761 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13277 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 787 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Locomotive Contract: *See* 'Locomotives.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759 (v).

Kingston and Brockville Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

Kingston Locomotive Works and Tenders for I. C. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Lachine Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14140 (vi).

Litigation Expenditure, Fees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12916 (vi).

Locomotive Contracts *re* I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5419 (iii).

Montreal Locomotive Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

Morrison, Mrs., Claim *re* Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Public Works Dept. and Transfer to Mr. Prefontaine, 2645 (ii).

Public Works let by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6208, 6296 (iii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 2924 (ii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11487, 12295 (v).

Schell, Mr.: *See* 'Alexandria,' &c.

Stewart, Mr., Supt. of Murray Canal, 12927, 14146 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census enumerators) 4820 (ii).

Canals—**Chambly** (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12908; (tow paths) 12906; **Cornwall** (electrical equipment) 14134; (enlargement) 12896; **Farran's Point** (enlargement) 12898; **Galops** (dam) 12608 (vi); (deepening) conc., 8374 (iv); (enlargement) 12899, 14141; (north channel) 12899, 14142; **Generally** (operating expenses) 12924; (repairs. &c.) 12924; (salaries) 12934; (surveys, dredging, &c.) 12900; (toll collectors) 12929; **Grenville** (guide pier) 12909; **Lachine** (electrical equipment) 14142; (enlargement, &c.) 12903; (masonry walls) 12906; **Lake St. Francis** (dam) 14152; **Lake St. Louis** (hydrographic survey) 12904; **Miscellaneous** (engineers, &c., salaries) 12910; (litigation expenses) 12911; **Rapide Plat** (enlargement) 12898; **Sault Ste Marie** (construction) 12904; **Welland** (Port Colborne, entrance) 12902; **Williamsburg** (gate-lifter) 14149; (overseer's house) 14150; (scow) 14154 (vi).

Customs (salaries for overtime) 13984 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13956 (vi).

Excise (salaries *re* C. S. Act) 13967; (salaries, Prescott) 13968 (vi).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5129 (ii), 5281; (intelligence bureau reps.) 5277; (steamers, B.C.) 5278 (iii).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6332; (medical attendance) 6332 (iii).

Inland Revenue (excise inspections) 5364; (Keilty, Mr., Appnmt.) 5365, 5378 (iii).

Legislation (voter's lists) 5276 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4047, 4091, 5042 (ii).

Post Office (Doyle, Mr.) 5928; (Ottawa Supply Co.) 5936, 6153; (postmasters' arrears of salaries) 5923; (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (post office), 530 (i).

Docks (Montreal dry dock) 2988 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Generally (dredges, repairs) 2626 (ii); **B.C.** (Columbia river) 1455; **Man.** (Dauphin lake) 1448 (i); **N.B.** (Arsenault, Capt., damages to schooner) 13231; **Ont.** (Depot harbour, breakwater) 13239 (vi); (dredging plant) 2671 (ii); (Petawawa narrows) 1442 (i); (Prescott, dredging) 5916 (iii); (transfer to Marine dept.) 2645 (ii); (Wolfe Island, dredging) 1442 (i), 13252; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13319 (vi); **Que.** (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Sabrevois wharf) 13485; (Sacré-Cœur wharf) 13479 (vi); (St. Louis river) 13475 (vi); (Valleyfield dredging) 5905 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13344, 13347; (transportation commission) 13364 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 2977; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2975 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—**Mar. Provs.** (Deer Island and Eastport) 13325 (vi); **Que.** (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13326 (vi); (Marconi stations) 2991 (ii).

Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5492; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5497 (iii); (small-pox) 5012 (ii); (trachoma epidemic) 5493 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3702 (ii); (Canso ferry service) 14094; (Connolly's claim, &c.) 14103; (general vote) 12874; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14095 (vi); (Levis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (New Glasgow, freight shed) 14096; (rolling stock) 14100; (*Scotia*, salvage) 14107; (steel rails) 14099; (Windsor station) 14097; P. E. I. (Hillsborough, bridge) 12839, 14108; (Murray Harbour branch) 12833, 14123 (vi).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4884 (ii).

Telephone Service in the H. of C. (remarks) 5088 (ii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13364 (vi).

Williamsburg Canal, Electric Light, &c. (remarks) 14136 (vi).

——— Collector's Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).

——— Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

Richardson, Mr. M. K., *S. Grey.*

Art Gallery, Can. Collection of Paintings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13513, 13517 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7378 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7465 (iii).

Richardson, Mr. M. K.—*Con.*

Budget, The, 1946 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7504 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 14415 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 632 (i).

Flesherton Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10040 (iv); in Com. on B., 10625 (v); on M. for 3°, 12701 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs, and Elections, 13274 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6573 (iii).

Lands available for Settlers in B. C., &c. (Ques.) 4836 (ii).

Mint Building, Progress, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1339 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

——— General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14345 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11000, 11525 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6472 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. Exhibit, Imp. Institute) 13509 (vi); (exhibitions) 4602; (Japan exhibition) 4635; (St. Louis exhibition) 4602 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Justice (salaries) 212 (i).

Dom. Lands (buffalo herd, &c.) 6790 (iii).

Fisheries (close season, investigation, &c.) 13649 (vi).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7776, 7778 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 13640 (vi).

Militia (pay and allowance) 13428 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4087 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, **Ont.** (Clinton P. O.) 521; (Durham) 506; (Ottawa, Rideau Hall, drainage) 647 (i); (Wingham, P. O.) 13122 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, **N. B.** (Caraquet, wharf) 1173; **N. S.** (Drumhead, breakwater) 1086; (Lunenburg, harbour) 1107 (i); **Que.** (Chateauguay river) 3210 (ii); (Grande Vallée, pier) 1534 (i); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13479 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys), 13350 (vi).

Robinson, Mr. Jabel, *W. Elgin.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Bananas imported into Can., Value, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Budget, The, 1825 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5064 (ii); in Com. on B., 5426 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 384 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission Rep., Publishing, &c. (remarks) 14758 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Act.'

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6645 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3085 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 573 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 902 (i); in Com. (compulsory voting) 13582, 14415 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6439 (iii).

Elgin County Centenary Celebration (remarks) 3129 (ii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., 13164 (vi).

Gates over Ry. Crossings, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5775 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9228 (iv); in Com. on B., 12233 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 740 (i).

Immigrants for Ont., &c. (remarks), 1131 (i).

Immigrants for Ont., Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1593 (i).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3694 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7985 (iv).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10781 (v).

——— Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8069, 8372 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

McCraney, Mr. W., Letter *re* Legislation (read) 5362 (iii).

Mail Delivery, Free, Establishment, &c. (remarks) 14011 (vi).

——— *See* 'Rural.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452 (iii).

Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14855 (vi).

See 'Sessions.'

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4176 (ii); in Com., 6459 (iii).

Robinson, Mr. Jabel.—*Con.*

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5867 (iii).

Printing Bureau and Indebtedness of Members (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Attendance in House (remarks) 2015 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guard) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).

——— (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 258 (i); in Com., 4567 (ii), 5767, 6184, 6241, 6307 (iii), 8188 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5519 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Passenger Rates, to M. for 3°, 8346 (iv).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14431 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11523 (v).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of (Ques.) 285 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

——— *See* 'Mail.'

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7224 (iii).

Session of the House, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 473 (i).

——— *See* 'Parliament.'

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7035 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibit at Imp. Institute) 13511 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239 (i).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas lights) 13636 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7584; (Can. and S. Africa) 7752 (iv).

Post Office (free mail delivery) 14011 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1165 (i); N.S. (Breton's Cove) 13164 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14431 (vi).

Robinson, Mr. James, *Northumberland, N.B.*

Aluminum, Oxide of, Imports into Can. Ports, &c. (Ques.) 1035 (i).

Bauxite, Tons, Imports into Can. for 1902 (Ques.) 1678 (i).

Roche, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allans, &c. (Ques.) 7091 (iii).

——— Delay by Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14185 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7312 (iii).

Budget, The, 1891 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12358 (v); on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).

Roche, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche*, Marquette) to Com. of Sup., 3197 (ii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., Accommodation, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13157 (vi).

——— *See* 'Privilege.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5194 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9553 (iv).

Immigration, Inspection, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6557 (iii).

Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7952 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* N.S. Fishermen on 'Outskirt of Civilization,' &c., 13373 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 13666 (vi).

Fisheries (dog-fish pest) 13650 (vi).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6667; (agents, &c.) 6835; (trachoma, inspection, &c.) 6667 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Sable Island, Marconi service) 13648 (vi).

Militia (pay and allowance) 13394 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6958 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—**Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 13319; **N.S.** (Breton's Cove) 13157; (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217 (vi).

Quarantine (small-pox), 5020 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Agricultural Implements, Rebate for 1901-2 (Ques.) 3803 (ii).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c. on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 850 (i).

Autonomy to N.W.T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 13905 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 253.'

Budget, The, 1876 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4996, 5109 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 402 (i),

Civil Servants, Interference in Man. Elections (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3141; Neg. (N. 71; Y. 22) 3206 (ii); (notice of motion) 3126 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Coal Lands, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Dom. Lands, Man. and N.W.T., Sale, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).

Ewart, Mr., and Adress to Judge Perdue, 11071, (v).

Govt. Appnmts. of Members, &c. (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Grain Weighing Machines : *See* 'Automatic.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7844, 7875 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9727 (iv); in Com. on B., 10444, 12267 (v); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12706; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709; on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 12734 (vi).

—— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections 13278 (vi).

Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers, Par. in Winnipeg *Telegram*, 1121 (i).

Jerome, Martin, M.P.P., and Man. Elections, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Jonasson, Mr. S., Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Land Sales, Winnipeg, Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).

—— *See* 'Dom.', 'N.W.T. Grazing,' &c., 'Saskatchewan.'

McDonnell, Geo., Lease of, Grazing Lands, &c. (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

Man. and N.W.T. School Land, Sale, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Man. Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).

Members appointed to Govt. Positions (M. for ret.*) 3805 (ii).

Members appointed to Offices, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 9582 (iv).

—— (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

Myers, Appnmt. as Judge in Man. (Ques.) 285 (i).

Nesbitt, Man., Postmaster Watson as Lib. Candidate (Ques.) 1196 (i).

N.W.T. Grazing Lands, Lease to Geo. McDonnell (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

N.W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12323 (v).

—— Senate Representation : *See* 'Senate.'

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Land Grants, &c. (M. for O.Cs., &c.*) 2338 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 4363 (ii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11032, 11743; (Dauphin) 11748; (Macdonald) 11781; (amt.) to M. for 3°, 12476 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Property, &c. (Ques.) 2306 (i).

See 'Qu'Appelle.'

Senate Representation of N.W. T., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (St. Louis exhibition) 4611; (Treadgold exhibits) 4621 (ii).
Civil Govt. : Justice (salaries) 214 (i).
Customs (Dauphin port) 3898 (ii).
Fisheries (inspectors, Man.) 5127 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration shed) 13127; Harbours and Rivers—Man. (dredging plant) 13311; (Mossy river, dredging) 13312 (vi).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).

Watson, John, Lib. Candidate in Man. (Ans.), 1196 (i).

Roddick, Mr. T. G., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 832 (i).

Rosamond, Mr. B., *N. Lanark.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4998 (ii).

City and County Bank of Can. incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10752 (v).

Electric Lighting, Public Buildings, Ottawa, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com , 5234 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11927, 12089 (v).

Herald Printing Co., Montreal, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8329 (iv).

Lobster Packing Factory in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11490, 11650; (Brant) 11106; (Toronto) 11723; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12492 (v).

SUPPLY :

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146; (Breton Cove) 13152 (vi); Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3320; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Ross. Mr. J. H., *Yukon Territory.*

Hydraulic Leases, Yukon, O. C's., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1323 (i).

Ross, Hon. Wm., *Victoria (N.S.)*

Allan SS. Service, Reduction in Sailings from St. John (remarks) 14080 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6983 (iii).

See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7327 (iii).

British Members of Parlt., Visit to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 2105 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5080 (ii); in Com. on B., 5435 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., in Com. on Res., 4991 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 396 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 841 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock* in Com. on Res., 12504 (v); in Com. on B., 13825 (vi).

Ross, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Civil Service Act (superannuation) Amt. B. 49, (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 594 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3065 ; in Com. on B., 4015 (ii).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 575 (i).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 309 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com,, 6897 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5198 (iii), 7884 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9583 (iv).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 772 (i).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6576 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7942 (iv).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8371 (iv).
Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 955 (i).
Letter Carriers, &c., in Com. on Post Office B., 5660 (iii).
Markland, Schr., Seizure, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5994 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6545 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5660 (iii).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5982 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3736 (ii), 5351, 5573, 5778, 6311 ; (telephones) 5553 (iii) ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Passenger Rates, to M. for 3°, 8358 (iv).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv),
Schooley, Wm. Francis, Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 3225 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7221 (iii).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).
Steel Bounties : *See* 'Iron,' &c.

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (*Poultry Farming*) 7656 (iv).
Civil Govt. : Customs (salaries) 325 (i).
Customs (contingent expenses) 3787 (iii).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 6817 (iii).
Inland Revenue (Inspectors, N.S.) 5409 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7783 (iv).
Justice : Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3521 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5881 (iii), 13679 (vi) ; (Can. and G. B.) 7595 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6983 (iii).

Ross, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 4081, 5043 ; (*Stanley*, repairs, &c.) 4055 (ii).
Post Office : Outside Service (P.E.I., winter service) 5945 (iii).
Public Works : Buildings—Ont. (rural mail delivery) 514 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally (hydraulic dredge) 2621, 2625 (ii) ; N.S. (Bridgewater dredging) 1075 ; (Campbellton wharf) 1143; (Green Cove harbour) 1100 ; (Neil's harbour) 1139 ; (Washabuck wharf) 1150 (i) ; Que. (Le Tableau wharf) 2255 (i) ; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3314 (ii).
Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2751 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8273; (Stellarton, accommodation) 8301 (iii).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4926 (ii).

Ross, Mr. W., *S. Ontario.*

Budget, The, 2036 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5433 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4369 (ii).
Clergue Steel Works, Sault Ste. Marie, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ques,) 13668 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646, 7503 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10754 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting) 14420 (vi).
Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 707 (i).
Immigration Statistics, Total Number, Origin, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1035 (i).
Inspection, General Act (weighmasters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14312 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9927 (iv).
North-west Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2754 (ii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2609 (ii), 5349, 5771 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6468, 7228 (iii).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 477 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7613 (iv) ; (experimental farms) 4551 ; (Shutt's, Prof., report) 4559 (ii).
Excise (analysts, food, &c.) 5395 (iii).
Justice, Administration of—Yukon (living allowances) 3417 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Oshawa P.O.) 13111 (vi).

Russell, Mr. B., *Hants.*

Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 212) M. to receive Pet., &c,, 4958 (ii) ; 1°*, 5512 ; 2° m., 5585 ; in Com., 7470 (iii).

Russell, Mr. B.—*Con.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4385 (ii).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 608 (i).

Church Missionary Society of Canada incorp. (B. 202) 1°*, 4727 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8255 (iv).

Fire Guards on Ry. Lands: *See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'

Good Shepherd Reformatory B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4841 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7869 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8907, 8919 (iv).

Harrison, Capt. of Str. *Grecian*, Reimbursement *re* Costs, &c. (remarks) 10239 (v).

Home Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 191) 1°*, 3970

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2383 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com. *re* Beauharnois P. O. Site, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7920 (iv).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 72 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (tolls) 5576; (cattle guards) 6249; (2-cent rate) 6278; (fire guards) 6315 (iii).

Ry. Debts: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9423 (iv).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Alexandria Wood Export Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12926 (vi).

See 'Privilege.'

Bell Telephone: *See* 'Dundonald, Earl.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7321 (iii).

Budget, The, 2025 (i).

C. A. R. Section-Men's Strike (remarks) 2303 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4401 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14419 (vi).

Dundonald, Earl, Telephone Mess. *re* Scottish Demonstration (remarks) 10536, 10744 (v).

Glengarry Scottish Demonstration re Tel. Message to Lord Dundonald (remarks) 10536 (v).

Privilege (ques. of) *re* Govt. Purchases, 5416 (iii).

——— *See* 'Alexandria.'

——— *re* Mr. Stewart's Appointment, 14599 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (drainage) 4754 (ii).

Stewart, Mr., Appnmt. as Supt. of Williamsburg Canal, Ques. of Priv., 14599 (vi).

Schell, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals—Generally (operating, &c., expenses) 12926 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 488; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1518 (i).

Scott, Mr. W., *W. Assiniboia.*

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1° *, 591 (i).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 880 (i).

Autonomy for N.W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Hâlifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13914 (vi).

——— Correction in Press (remarks) 14855 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 259.'

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7329, 7357 (iii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Mortgage Deed, Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 13024 (vi).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.

Campaign Literature and Mail Bags, Complaint, &c. (remarks) 14220 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4387, 5102 (ii); in Com. on B., 5786 (iii).

C. P. R. and Car Shortage in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation,' &c.

C. P. R. (Kirkella and Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (amt.) 14501 (vi).

C. P. R. (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. Res., 14504 (vi).

Century Life Ins. Co., B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5583, 6201; (amt.) 5360 (iii).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3056 (ii).

Dime Novels: *See* 'Weekly Publications.'

Engineers, Marine, Certificates to: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Fire Guards along Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Bills.'

Frank Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2100 (i).

Freight Rates, Govt. Control: *See* 'Ry. Rates.'

Fyfe, Mr.: *See* 'Grain Weighing, &c., 'Supply—Excise.'

German Goods, 'Teapot,' Importation, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) 3056 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 5322 (iii).

Grain Blockade in the N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation,' &c.

Grain Weighing Scales in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4202 (ii).

——— *See* 'Automatic.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10173; Grafters,' 10189; in Com. on B., 10710, 12276 (v).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Graves, Florence D., Relief (B. 214) 1° *, 5581 (iii).

Herchmer, Lt.-Col., Pension, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. (B. 137) 1° m., 2101 (i) : 2° m., 3294 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys., Areas, &c. (Ques.) 2101 (i); 3797 (ii).

——— *See* 'Rys.', &c.

Land Titles Amts. to N.W.T. Bill : *See* 'N.W.T. B. 259.'

Lumber Combines, N.W.T., Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 6168 (iii).

——— (remarks) 1579, 1589 (i).

MacLeod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1° *, 814 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14220 (vi).

Mail Cars, overcrowding, &c. (remarks) in Com. on P.O. Bill, 5870 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).

See 'Supply—Post Office.'

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7994 (iv).

Man. and N.W. Volunteers, Land Scrip., &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificates B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6545 (iii).

Mounted Police Act (pensions) Amt. Bill, M. to introduce, 14280 (vi).

Northern Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 51) 1° *, 654 (i).

Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1° *, 813 (i).

N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. (amts.) 13853, 14287 (vi).

N. W. T. Snow Storms, False Reps., &c. (remarks) 11822 (v).

Novels, Dime : *See* 'Weekly Publications.'

Osler, Mr. E. B., Attack *re* Qu'Appelle Ry. Bonds, &c., Ques. of Priv., 14583 (vi).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle,' &c., 'Privilege,' &c.

Parliament, Date of Convening (remarks) 14855 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. 5863, 5870 (iii).

Preference Tariff *re* German Goods (Ques.) 5322 (iii).

——— *See* 'German,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 10530, 10533 (v).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle.'

——— *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates,' &c., 14583.

Provincial Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s Contract, 'Grafters,' &c. (remarks) on G.T. Pacific Bill, 10189 (vi).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Mortgage, Regulations *re* Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 13024 (vi).

——— on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) 10500 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (fire-guards) 5782 ; (cattle-guards) 6242, 6321 (iii), 7610 (iv).

Ry. Act (fire guards) Amt. (B. 16) 2° m., 871 (i).

Rys. Land Grants in Man. and N.W.T. and rest of Can., Mileage, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1677 (i).

——— Man. and N.W.T., Area reserved and patented, &c. (Ques.) 2307 (i).

——— Area unpatented, &c. (Ques.) 2583 (ii).

——— Govtl. Action *re* Selection, &c. (Ques.) 4831 (ii).

See 'Lands,' &c. 'Railway Subsidies in Land,' &c.

Ry. Rates, Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies in Land and Money in N.W.T. and Man. (Ques.) 1677 (i).

——— paid by Govt. since Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Ry. Transportation, N.W.T., Congestion (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2424 (i).

Regina & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 43) 1°*, 591 (i).

Scrip to Volunteers : *See* 'Man. and N.W.T.' &c.

Snow Storms in N. W. T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11822 (v).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (census, &c.) 4643 (ii).
Dom. Lands (surveys, printing, &c.) 13777 (vi) ; (tree culture) 6781 (iii).
Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5381 ; (grain weighing machine) 5381 ; (inspectors' salaries) 5381 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6673 : (agents, &c.) 6836 ; (Barr Colony) 6870 ; (diseased immigrants) 6858 ; (exodus to U.S.) 6876; (expenditure, &c.) 6867 ; (ques. of order) 6854 ; (Galicians) 6863, 6878 ; (U. S. agents, &c.) 6858 (iii).
Indians : Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6343 (iii).
Post Office (Moosejaw postmaster) 6048 ; (postmasters, salaries) 6048 ; (ry. mail service, N.W.T.) 5835, 6048 (iii).
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (St. Joseph wharf) 3384 (ii).
Tel. Lines (N.W.T.) 2715 (ii).

Tariff and Immigration into N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iii).

Textile Fabrics : *See* 'Inspection Act.'

Trant, Mr. (remarks) 3060, 3167 (ii).

Volunteers of Man. and N.W.T., Land Scrip, &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Weekly Publications, 'Jesse James Series', Customs Duty (Ques.) 11426 (v).

Weights and Measure Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4202 (iv).

Scott, Mr, W.—*Con.*

Wright, A. W., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 8116 (iv).

Sherritt, Mr. J., *N. Middlesex.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4246 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5463 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 393 (i).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13737 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 787 (i).

Parkhill Mail Contract, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich, breakwater) 13242; (Grand Bend, pier) 13239 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3373; (St. Joseph's wharf) 3387 (ii).

Quarantine (hog cholera) 5506 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Toronto stockyards) 8317 (iv).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford (Minister of the Interior) *Brandon.*

Alnwick Band, Mississaga Indians, Claims, &. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5965 (iii).

Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'Provincial.'

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6355, 6375 (iii).

See 'Supply—Immigration,' &c.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5606, 5793 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserves, Complaints *re* trespassing (Ans.) 7915 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act. B. (M.) dropped, 13444 (vi).

Doukhobors, Loan to by Govt. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) *re* one-fifth Vote, 6408 (iii).

Fire Guards: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8617 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure for 1902-3 (Ans.) 6269 (iii).

——— Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6603 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

Indian Boy, Sand: *See* 'Sand.'

Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

International Congress of Geology, Visit to Can. (Ans.) 8117 (iv).

McDonnell, Geo., Lease of Grazing Lands, &c. (Ans.) 8330 (iv).

Man. Grain Act (1900) Amt. (B. 232) 1° m., 7294; 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991 (iii); 9350 (iv).

Man. School Lands, on Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*

Moose Deer Point Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iii).

Pigeon Lake Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Provincial Autonomy, N.W.T., Further Cor., &c. (remarks) 7295 (iii).

——— Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6947 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).

See 'Supply—Dom. Lands.'

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5784 (iii).

Saskatchewan Land Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 7108 (iii).

Sand, Indian Boy, adopted by Mr. Johnstone (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii).

Scotch Labourers, Return to Old Country (remarks) 7206 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (boundary delimitations) 6790; (buffalo herd) 6790; (commissioner's salary) 6765; (half-breed schools, salaries) 6773; (homestead inspectors) 6766; (homestead lands) 6787; (inspector's expenses) 6766; (irrigation, &c.) 6764; (military asylum pensions) 6788; (roads, &c.) 6772; (Long Lake and Saskatchewan ry. surveys) 6940; (surveys, &c.) 6758, 6939; (swamp land expenditure) 6927; (Teulon road) 6927; (tree culture) 6774; (Winnipeg office) 6767; (Yoho Park roads, &c.) 6790 (iii).

Geological Survey (Bell, Dr., appnmt.) 6816; (coal, Sudbury) 6824; (geologist, international boundary survey) 6825; (instruments purchased) 6820; (plans, plottings, &c.) 6826; (surveys, exploration, &c.) 6815 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6658; (Barr colonists) 6696; (Cory, W. W., &c.) 6854; (Devlin, Mr., successor) 6732; (Ellis, Dr., inspector) 6702; (expenditure) 6615; (general expenses) 6827; (homestead entries) 6704; (Lake St. John Col. Co.) 6888; (mechanics, &c.) 6833; (medical inspection) 6695, 6851; (Murray, agent, Scotland, cor., &c.) 6827; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6849; (tents, &c.) 6849; (trachoma) 6695; (U. S. agents) 6848; (White, Mr. W. J., expenses) 6733, 6853 (iii).

Indians: B. C. (Clayoquot school) 7269; (fishing, &c., investigation *re*) 7265; (reserves, sale of, &c.) 7267; (salaries) 7257; schools, &c.) 7254, 7260; (Songhees, removal, &c.) 7258; (travelling expenses) 7262 (iii).

Generally (agency inspectors) 6425; (chiefs' salaries) 6410; (general vote) 6425; (land fund) 6415; (legal expenses) 6416; (medical attendance) 6421; (Robinson treaty payments) 6410; (Stewart, E., extra expenses) 6416; (survey reserves) 6411 (iii.)

Man., &c. (agricultural implements, &c.) 6422; (medical attendance) 6329, 6350 (iii).

See 'N.W.T.' &c.

Mar. Provs. (schools) 6409 (iii).

N. B. (St. John river, pet., &c.) 6352 (iii).

N. S. (seed grain relief) 6417 (iii).

N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 6348; (supplies, &c.) 6422 (iii).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—Con.

Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6326, 6344; (medical attendance) 6409 (iii).

Ont. and Que. (blankets, clothing, &c.) 6409; (medical attendance) 6326; (schools) 6409 (iii).

Que. (medical attendance) 6408; (St. Regis lockup) 6415 (iii).

Yukon Ter. (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7270 (iii).

Interior (Alaskan boundary commission) 6931; (Amos Barnes, claim) 6922; (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6791; (astronomical work) 6790; (Banff museum) 6927; (Bow River, bridge) 6925; (Casca Transportation Co.) 6926; (Howie, F. W., legal expenses) 6795: (Keewatin, govt.) 6797; (Keewatin, lunatics) 6798; (Liard river, miners) 6926; (litigation expenses) 6794; (maps, engraving, &c., N.W.T.) 6800 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6946; (general expenses) 6888 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher, expenditure) 6949, 7275; (govtl. expenses) 6802; (hospital grant) 7291; (Lithgow, Mr., controller) 7287; (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6931; (roads and bridges) 7283 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Corrected Answer, 6803 (iii).

——— Free Representations, &c. (Ans.) 5990 (iii).

——— Personnel of Commission *re* (remarks) 7297 (iii).

——— Telegram *re* Free Representations, 6427 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D., *S. Wentworth.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7364 (iii).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7488 (iii).

Butter, Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5430 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5477 (iii).

Cold Storage: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4035 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. (B. 86) 1°*, 1023; 2° m., 2387 (i), 2788; on M. for 2°, 3807 (ii).

——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) 2° m., 3823 (ii).

Fruit Shipments in Cold Storage to Europe, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 3805 (ii).

——— Value, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 3708 (ii).

Permanent Corps, Qualification of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).

See 'Royal.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3550, 3714, 3850 (ii), 6208; (telephones) 5553 (iii).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2469 (i).

Royal Canadian Regiment, Strength, &c. (Ques. 3801 (ii).

See 'Permanent.'

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7236 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage, &c.) 7086 (iii), 7610, 7655; (creameries, &c.) 7633 (iv); (fumigating stations) 4434 (ii).

See 'Mail Subsidies.'

Customs (receipts, &c.) 3923; (salaries, &c.) 3923 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff springs) 6789; (boundary delimitations) 6791; (irrigation, surveys, &c.) 6764; (tree culture) 6774 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6774 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii); (Can. and G. B.) 7573 7590 (iv).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John river) 5896; Ont. (Midland, dredging) 5911 (iii); (Port Colborne) 3373 (ii); Que. (Cacouna, wharf) 5900; (Hull, wharf) 5902 (iii).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5032 (ii).

Smith, Mr. R., *Vancouver.*

Alien Restriction Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2390 (i).

Canada Foundry Co.'s Strike, Representations to Dept. of Labour (remarks) 7205 (iii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup (remarks) 945 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2512 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety (B. 77) 1°m., 872; 2°m. 2386, 2387 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock* on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. L. P. Brodeur) *Rouville.*

Address, The, Reply from His Ex. (read) 1204 (i).

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) Members remarks checked, 3282 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 665 (i).

Bills, Royal Assent Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 5315, 5427, 6353 (iii), 8642 (iv), 14844 (vi).

Bills withdrawn, on M. (Mr. *Hyman*) 7203 (iii).

Binder Twine Inspector's Rep., on M. to suspend Rule (remarks) 13789 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan, &c., B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*) ruling, 5989 (iii).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7488 (iii).

Brunet: *See* 'Order,' 'St. James,' &c.

Budget, The, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 1735, 1742 (i).

Butter Adulteration Act (remarks) 4960 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

Brockville and North-west Ry. Co. s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 ; (ruling) 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Appeal to Speaker (ruling) 7342 (iii).

——— Translation of Bill (remarks) 7468 ; (ruling) 7469 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, Members remarks checked, 10746 (v).

Campaign Literature and Sessional Messengers (Ans.) 14286 (vi).

——— *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Apples, Packing, &c., Members called to Order, 11185 (v).

Cattle Guard Commission, Members remarks checked, 3396 (ii).

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 3286 (ii).

Clerk of the House (notification of appnmt.) 1 (i).

Columbia River Improvement B. 150 (Mr. *Gallicher*) on Sen. Amts. (ruling) 6847 (iii).

Door-keeper of H. of C., Salary, &c. (remarks) 14115 (vi).

Dundonald, Lord, Telephone Message from Alexandria (ruling) 10536 (v).

Election Petitions, Judge's Reports (notification) 2 (i).

Elevator Accident in House (remarks) 5417 (iii).

Garden Products, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) Members remarks checked, 4768, 4779 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 941 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 8058 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) and M. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise (ruling) 7832 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wilmot*) Ruling, 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific B. 235, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) that Committee not properly constituted (ruling) 10634 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, Order, Ques. of, Ref. to previous Debate, 12742 (vi).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Irregularity of Proceeding, 7727 (iv) ; (ruling) 12774 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Irregularity of Proceeding, 13266 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, Member called to Order, 13271 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) *re* Affidavits being read (ruling) 14847 (vi).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Marcil*) 12941 (vi).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

G. T Pacific B. 235, onQues. of Order, Member reading Speech (ruling) 10250 (v).

——— Ruling, on M. to receive Pets., &c., 12715 (vi).

——— *re* Vote of Mr. Cargill (remarks) 10538 (v).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (ruling) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).

——— Members remarks checked, 3248 (ii).

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. B. 137, on M. for 2° (ruling) 3297 (ii).

Laval Electoral District, Judge's Certificates (notification) 1 (i).

Library of Parlt., Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, &c. (ruling) 110 (i).

Loy, Geo. M. and Election Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence (ruling) 7918 (iv).

McCraney, Mr. W., Letter *re* Legislation (ruling) 5363 (iii).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Member (Mr. *Taylor*) called to Order for ref. to past Debate, 14553 (vi).

——— Use of Rooms in H. of C. (stmnt.) 14565 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, on Mr. Taylor asking Question, 14684 (vi).

See 'Campaign.'

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13624 (vi).

Members, New, Certificates of Election (notification) 3 (i).

Members rights to speak, &c. (ruling) 10536 (v).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 4, 90, 707, 1204 (i), 4957 (ii), 14042, 14662 (vi).

Messengers of House and Mail Bags : *See* 'Campaign.'

Mounted Police Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 1°, 14281 (vi).

Mount Royal Savings Bank B. 153 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to withdraw Bill, 10831 (v).

Mowat, Sir Oliver : *See* 'Lt. Gov.'

Ontario Electoral District, Certificate : Notification, 367 (i).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3° (ruling) 4871 (ii).

Order of the House, &c., Remarks of Mr. Borden *re*, 12724 (vi).

Order, Ques. of *re* Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Election (ruling) 108 (i).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Bennett*) Irrelevancy of Deb. *re* Mr. Oliver (ruling) 11564 (v).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Monk*) on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) ruling, 10505 (v).

Order, Questions of (Mr. *Ingram*) on ruling (remarks) 10537 (v).

See 'Privilege,' &c.

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation, &c., Members remarks checked, 2398 (i).

Petitions presented, Rules, &c. (remarks) 6 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

Petitions received *re* G. T. P. Ry. (ruling) 12715 (vi).

Petitions *re* Subsidies, Rejected, 654 (i).
See 'Subsidies.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1° (ruling) 5241 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep., Distribution, &c. (remarks) 880 (i).

Press Gallery Representatives, Sessional Allowance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14243 (iv).

Preston, Mr., and Can. Butter : *See* 'Butter.'

Private Bills, Notice, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to revise Rules, 12216 (v), 13549 (vi).

——— Rules *re* presenting (remarks) 482 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) Statement of member must be accepted, 10503 (v).

——— (Mr. *Clancy*) *re* member reading a letter from Hugh Sutherland, Ruling, 10530 (v).

——— (Mr. *Roche*, *Halifax*) 'Outskirts of Civilization,' on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13374 (vi).
See 'Order,' &c.

Procedure, Ques. of, 5892 (iii).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 14844 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, (ruling) 8351 (iv).

——— Mess. from Senate *re* Conference on Amts., 14734 (vi).

——— on Conference with Senate *re* its Amts., Names of Managers (read) 14740 ; M. to suspend Sittings of Hse., 14740 (vi).

——— Procedure, Bourinot quoted, &c. 14760 (vi).

Railway Policy of Govt., Member (Mr. *Sproule*) must not refer to previous Debate, 7121 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (ruling) 548 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66, on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) Ruling, 12432, 12435 (v).

Royal Assent to Bills, Com. from His Ex. (read) 5315 (iii).
See 'Bills,' &c.

Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v), 13549 (vi).

Russell Electoral Division, Notification of Vacancy, 1023 (i).

St. James Division, Montreal, Judge's Certificates (notification) 1 (i).

——— Judgment of Supreme Court, (notification) 91 (i).

——— Vacancy (remarks) 410, 1023 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, Members remarks checked, 7044 (iii).

Subsidies for Public Highways, Pets., &c. (ruling) 591 (i).
See 'Petitions.'

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Legislation : House of Commons (debates, &c.) 5265 (iii) ; (debates, amanuenses) 14243 (vi) ; (messengers) 5265 ; (printing, &c.) 5267 (iii) ; (salaries, increases) 14112 ; (sessional clerks) 14113, 14242 ; (sessional messengers) 14243 (vi) ; (voters' lists) 5274 ; Library of Parlt., 5267 ; Senate (contingencies) 5264 (iii).

Telephone Service in H. of C. (remarks) 5088 (ii).

Terrebonne Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 7 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 5555 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) Ruling reserved, 7727 (iv).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, Ques. of Order (ruling) 7571 (iv).

Vacancies, Notification, 2 (i).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (remarks) 630-1 (i).

——— on M. to ref. to Private Bills Com. (ruling) 664 (i).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Members remarks checked, 7005 (iii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (Mr. P. Macdonald) *E. Huron.*

Anglo-American Cable Co., Irrelevancy of Debate, 13338 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) on Amt. (Mr. *LaRivière*) ruling, 5559 (iii).

——— (ruling) *re* Notice of Amt., 5970 (iii).

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co. (ruling) 852 (i).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1808 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties, Ques. of Order, Remarks checked, 7305 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) read, 7400 ; (ruling) 7401 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) Irregularity of Deb. in Com., 5616 (iii).

——— Members' remarks checked, 4991 (ii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2303 (i).

Century Life Ins. Co.'s B. 175, on Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) ruling, 5360 (iii).

——— on Amt. of Mr. Morrison (ruling) 6199 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 843 (i).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Ques. of Order, 3167 (ii).

Civil Service B. 257, on Com. on Res., Members' remarks checked, 12338, 12561 (v).

Conciliation Act Amt. B. 95, Irrelevancy of Debate, 3262 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt., Irrelevancy of Deb. (ruling) 3058 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3, in Com. (ruling) 910 (i).
——— (remarks) 13569 (vi).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) ruled out of order, 14424 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) (remarks) 1062 (i).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5170 (iii).
——— in Com., Members' remarks checked, 7825; (ruling) 7814, 7826 (iv).
——— on Remarks *re* Par. in *Globe* (Mr. *Haggart*), Irrelevancy of Deb. (ruling) 5894 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members' remarks checked, 10622, 10640, 11292, 11980, 11987, 12231, 12250 (v).
——— (amt.) read, 11834 (v).
——— Two-cent rate (ruling) 12235 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., Ques. of Order, ref. to past Debate, 8212; (ruling) 8214 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (estimates, suppl.) 12869 (vi).
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr *Lemieux*) 2° m., 1328 (i).
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256, Members' remarks checked, 12326 (v).
Order, Ques. of, (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Criminal Code Amt., 318 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208, Irrelevancy of Debate, 5868 (iii).
Ry. Act B. 21 (ruling) on Amts., 6220, 6272, 6311 (iii) 8143 (iv).
——— Com. from Senate insisting on its Amts., 14519 (vi).
——— Discussion *re* Private Bill (ruling) 6106 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Telephones (ruling) 5548 (iii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 5167 (iii).
Ry. Act (govt. supplies) B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., Members' remarks checked 12982 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies B. 2 (ruling) 551 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12293 (v).
——— Irrelevancy of Debate, 10966 (v).
——— Members' remarks checked, 11617 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 11470, 11474 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Lennox*) 11710 (v).
St. Chrysostôme Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com. (remarks) 7771 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection B. 200, Members' remarks checked, 6478 (iii).
——— (remarks) 7215, 7218 (iii).
Skinner's Pond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi)

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Justice (ruling) 209 (i); Public Works (remarks) 5824 (iii).
Fisheries: Members' remarks checked, 5294, 5296 (iii).
Immigration (observance of rules) 6862; (quoting from speeches) Ruling, 6870-6874; Remarks *re* Discussion, 6708, 6724, 6854 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) Members' Remarks checked, 7778 (iv).
Interior (Liard River miners) remarks, 6926 (iii).
Militia (stores branch) Amt., 3609 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (members' remarks checked) 4043 (ii).
Post Office (irrelevancy of debate) 5954 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (ruling) 516 (i). **N.B.** (Campbellton) Members' Remarks checked, 13043, 13052; **Ont.** (ventilation of Chamber) 13010; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120 (vi). Harbours and Rivers: Generally (irrelevancy of debate) 2638, 2669 (ii). **N. S.** Members' Remarks checked, 13171 (vi). **Ont.** (Bayfield, pier) 1189 (i). **Que.** (irrelevancy of debate) 2270 (i). Members' Remarks checked, 3367 (ii).
Railways: P.E.I. Ry. (M.) to reduce Vote, 7539 (iii).
Sydney Harbour Commission B., in Com. on Res. (ruling) 12306 (v).
Telegraphic Systems, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., Members' Remarks checked, 13330 (vi).
Toronto and James Bay Ry., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) (ruling) 14360 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Irregularity of Debate (ruling) 3470 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *E. Grey.*

Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6630 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Refusal of Can. Commissioners to sign the award (remarks) 14402 (vi).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
Allan Line Steamers, Rate of Speed (remarks) 13672 (vi).
Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7473 (iii).
Anthrax in Cattle, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 10102 (v).
Assiniboine River and Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 6846 (iii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay of Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14178 (vi).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 664, 1509 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1806 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, &c. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T. (remarks) 885 (i).
Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6394, 6400 (iii).

Bass River (N.S.) Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fieldimg*) in Com. on Res., 7314, 7384 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties, &c., on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Binder Twine Inspector's Rep. (M.) for Distribution, 13789 (vi).

Binder Twine, 8th Rep. of Com. on Ag., on M. to conc., 14043 (vi).

——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* Mr. Haycock's Powers, 14047 (vi).

See 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.'

British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 236 (iv).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7400; on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 7343, 7469, (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14437 (vi).

Budget, The, 1740 (i).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 871, 2501 (i).

——— Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1350 (i); 6352 (iii).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 3711 (ii).

——— Ry. Resolutions, &c. (remarks) 11422 (v).

See 'Govt.'

Butter Adulterations, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5054; in Com., 5422; (amt.) 5430 (iii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Can. Associated Press Despatches: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5596, 5616 (iii).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., 7484 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5555 (iii).

Canals, Tonnage Dues, Abolition of (Ques.) 874 (i).

Casey, Mr., and Archives, 13505 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 376 (i).

——— Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 14054 (vi).

Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5473 (iii).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 290 (i).

See 'Pub. Accts.'

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13710, 13721 (vi).

See 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5360, 5584 (iii).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 843 (i).

——— *See* 'Criminal Code B. 215.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12368 (v); in Com. on B., 13813, 13834; on M. for 3°, 13946 (vi).

Clergue Contract with Govt. for Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks.'

Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5678 (iii).

Cricket Playing on Parlt. Grounds: *See* 'Parliament,' &c.

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7491, 7501 (iii); (cigarettes) 10748 (v).

Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4010 (ii).

Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 9350 (iv).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13688 (vi).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 894 (i); in Com., 13584 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3010, 3026 (ii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Embargo on Cattle: *See* 'Cattle.'

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3226, 3580, 3751 (ii).

Ewart, Mr., Address to Judge *re* Treadgold Commission, &c. (remarks) 11072 (v).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 296 (i).

Fast Atlantic: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Fitzgerald, W. W., Homestead Pre-emption (M. for cor.) 289 (i).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10811; in Com. on B., 12299 (v).

Franking of Provincial Documents, 14036 (vi).

Freight Rates: *See* 'Rys.,' 'Discriminating,' &c.

Geological Survey, Maps: *See* 'Maps.'

Germans in Canada, Recruiting for Naval Service (remarks) 8717 (iv).

German Tariff Cor., Papers laid on Table (remarks) 1460 (i).

Govt. Business, &c. (remarks) 13547 (vi).

——— Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Govt. Business, &c. *See* 'Business of the House,' &c.

Grain Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grain Weighers: *See* 'Inspection.'

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8057 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8746 (iv); in Com. on B., 10424, 10635, 11307, 11390, 11393, 11967, 11975, 12064, 12111, 12206, 12235 (v); on M. for 3°, 12657 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, *re* Irregularity of Introduction of B., Speaker's ruling asked for, 7726 (iv), 12774 (vi).

——— 'Hansard' Reporters not reporting Com., Mr. Speaker's ruling asked for, 10633 (v).

——— (M.) that Com. rise, 10633 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13268, 13273 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets., Ques. of Order, 13266 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

G. T. P. Bill 235, Distribution to Members (remarks) 8919 (iv).

Halifax Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).

'Hansard' Reporters not reporting Com., Mr. Speaker's ruling asked for, 10633 (v).

Haycock, Mr., Inspector of Binder Twine, Authority to Inflict Penalties, Opinion of Min. of Jus., 14044 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 679 (i).

Hides Inspection, Tel. from W. F. Maclean, M.P. (read) 3969 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 742 (i).

Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 1642 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6590 (iii).

——— *See* 'Barr.'

Imperial Defences, and prop. Res. of Lord Rosebery (remarks) 410 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3249 (ii).

Inspection, General, Act (weighmasters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14311 (vi).

Intercolonial Conference, Cor. *re* (remarks) 8230 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10799 (v).

Joint High Commission, Letter *re* Reciprocity (read) 14053 (vi).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10788; in Com. on B., 11418 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (Quebec) 12301 (v).

——— Retiring Allowances B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8103, 8371 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14290 (vi).

Kingston Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Groceries, &c. (Ques.) 10100 (v).

——— *See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.'

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res, 14490 (vi).

Lake St. John Ry. to La Tuque, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8201 (iv).

Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13832; in Com. on B., 14299 (vi).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup,, 121 (i).

——— (remarks) 663, 1206 (i).

Loan Companies, Extension of Powers B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2351 (i).

Lumber Combine in N. W. T. (remarks) 1587 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14225 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Maps, Printing for Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Geological.'

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5097 (ii), 5359 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Lighthouse,' &c,

Martineau, Inquiry for Papers, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'

Matane and Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14484 (vi).

Meaford, Ry. to Wharf, &c. (remarks) 14507 (vi).

Midway to Vernon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5715 (iii)

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *F. W. Borden*) on M. for 1°, 872; in Com., 2240 (i).

Milk Cans B.: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).

Montreal and Atlantic and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Montreal *Herald* and Mr. Fisher: *See* 'Privilege.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5418 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14593 (vi).

Nationality of Mr. Gallery, 13506 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779.

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Newspaper Postage: *See* 'Post Office B. 208.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 5511 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12310 (v).

Ottawa Buildings, Govt. Offices rented, leased, &c. (M. for ret.) 588 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1314 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on B., 6806 (iii).

Ottawa Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) 2° m., 1511 (i).

Parliamentary Documents, Postage *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation, &c. (remarks) 2398, 2421 (i).

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10797 (v).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12782; in Com., 13630 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5241; in Com., 5667 (iii).

Post Office Revenue, Increase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 14033 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks B. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6814 (iii).

Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B. (remarks) 3219 (ii).

Press Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Prime Minister, Congratulations *re* twenty-five years as Member (remarks) 11690 (v).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (remarks) 2396 (i); 4958 (ii); 10490 (v).

——— Notices, &c., on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend Rules; Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13548 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11563 (v).

——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10503, 10513 (v).

Procedure *re* Adjournment of Hse. (remarks) 6630 (iii).

Provincial Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Public Accounts Com., producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Resolutions (remarks) 14042, 14280, 14402 (vi).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 563 (i).

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8122 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 264 (i); in Com., 3542, 3716, 3834, 3856, 3883, 3991 (ii), 5250, 5568, 5688, 6121, 6174, 6203, 6279 (iii), 8194 (iv); (telephones) 5519 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8352 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13835 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. *re* Senate Amts., 14520 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order *re* (Mr. *Campbell*) 6105 (iii).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2557 (ii).

Railway Appropriations voted by Parlt., Transferred to other Appropriations, 14060 (vi).

Railways constructed without Govt. Aid, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 8487 (iv).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5667 (iii).

Ry. Policy, Announcement by Govt. (remarks) 6426 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7118 (iii).

Ry. Rates, Control by Govt., Sec. 6 of Res. (remarks) 14502 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies by Provs., Amounts to each Prov., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14484 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies, General Policy (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14363 (vi).

——— (inquiry) 11422 (v).

——— Payments of, &c. (remarks) 14513 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14320, 14431; (cost of ry. bridges) 14512; auditing books by Aud. Gen., 14516 (vi).

Ry. Transportation in N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2496 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S. and Joint High Commission, Letter from an M.P. (read) 14053 (vi). *See* 'Joint.'

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

Representation in the House of Commons, B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 713; on M. for 2°, 1282; (amt.) 1284; neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 1292 (i); in Com., 10944; 10958, 11057, 11470, 11511, 11584, 11628, 12294; (Brant) 11105; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12433 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Representation in the House of Commons, Evidence, Papers, &c. (remarks) 11424 (v).

Representation in H. of C. from Ont., Cor., &c. (M. for copies *) 2337 (i).

Rosebery and Imperial Defence : *See* 'Imperial.'

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9979 (iv).

San José Scale *re* Nursery Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13502 (vi).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3225 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); in Com. 6481, 7212 (iii).

Senate Amts. to Money Bills, Unconstitutionalty of (remarks) 14290 (vi).

Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Sup., 13950 (vi).

Shipping Federation of Canada incorp. B. 93 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 2° m., 1328 (i).

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8267, 8320 (iv).

See 'Hay,' &c.

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 457 (i).

Statutes, Revision Commission, Names, Progress, &c. (Ques.) 1029 (i).

Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 634 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6542 (iii).

Steel Rails, Clergue's Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7046 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Bill 218 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6171 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* one-fifth vote, 6408 (iii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13506; (archives) 13503; (Can. exhibit at Imp. Institute) 13511 (vi); (census schedules) 7054; (census, total cost) 7053; (cold storage) 7637; (creameries) 7636 (iv); (fumigating stations) 13502; (Toronto industrial exhibition) 13051; (tuberculosis, aid to Can. association) 13517 (vi).

Canals (Galops rapids, deepening, &c.) 8396 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling facilities) 7561; (construction) 7560 (iii).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes, printing) 14252; (public debt) 14254 (vi).

Civil Govt. : Aud. General (promotions) 14256 (vi); Customs (salaries) 319 (i); Geological Survey (Low, Mr., salary) 13771; (salaries) 13770, 13771 (vi); High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 13772 (vi); Indian Affairs (salaries) 282 (i); 13760 (vi); Interior (salaries) 13762; (Mines branch, salaries) 13764 (vi); Labour Dept. (salaries) 7151 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342 (i); (salaries) 13663 (vi); N.W. Mounted Police (salaries) 13761 (vi); Public Works (architect's salary) 13499

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Con.

(salaries) 13500 (vi); Railways and Canals (2nd class clerk) 14055 (vi); (salaries) 333 (i); Sec. of State (clerks' salaries) 14254 (vi).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3782, 3787, 3901; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3952; (preferential tariff) 3932; (stationery, &c.) 3964 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (boundary delimitations) 6791; (commissioner's salary) 6765; (inspectors' expenses) 6766 (iii); (maps, printing, &c.) 14272; (salaries, outside service) 13772 (vi); (surveys, &c.) 6759 (iii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 13777 (vi); (tree culture) 6779 (iii).

Excise (analysts, &c.) 5393; (inspectors' salaries) 5381; (liquor analysis) 5396 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5279, 5293 (iii); (fish hatcheries) 13660 (vi); (salaries) conc., 6069; (steamers, construction, &c.) 5296 (iii); (steamers, new) 13659 (vi); (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Geological Survey (coal discovery, Sudbury) 6824; (exploration, &c.) 6822 (iii); (maps, lithographing, &c.) 13778 (vi); (plans, plottings, &c.) 6827 (iii).

Govt. of N. W. T. (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6658; (Ellis, Dr., inspector) 6702; (expenditure) 6616 (iii); (general expenses) 2300 (i); (trachoma, &c.) 6843 (iii).

Indians: B.C. (medical attendance) 13785 (vi); (schools, medical attendance) 7255 (iii); (steam launch) 13787 (vi).

Generally (agency inspectors) 6425; (general vote) 6425; (legal expenses) 6418 (iii).

Man., &c. (agricultural implements, &c.) 6422; (medical attendance) 6351 (iii); (agricultural implements) 13782; (industrial schools) 13784; (medical attendance, Dr. West) 13784; (surveys) 13784; (triennial clothing) 13783 (vi).

N. W. T. (supplies) 6422 (iii).

N. S. (medical attendance and medicines) 6421; (seed grain, relief, &c.) 6417, 6420 (iii).

Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6327 (iii).

Ont. and Que. (Doncaster reserve road) 13780 (vi); (medical attendance) 6327 (iii); (Rama indians, roads, &c.) 13781; (roads, repairs) 13779 (vi).

Que. (St. Regis lockup) 6416 (iii).

Yukon (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7270 (iii).

Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., guarantee policy) 5407; (Ferguson, Mr., legal services) 5412 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6791; (Keewatin govt.) 6797; (Keewatin lunatics) 6798; (litigation expenses) 6794; (telescope for observatory) 6792 (iii).

Justice, Administration of: B. C. (Judges' travelling allowance) 3400 (ii).

Exchequer Court (salaries) 3406 (ii).

Generally (executions, expenditure) 3401 (ii).

N.W.T. (Supreme Court judge) 14258 (vi).

Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi).

Supreme Court (library) 3404 (ii).

Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3414 (ii); (law library) 14267 (vi); (living allowance, judges) 3411; (living allowances, officials) 3411 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3513; (Kingston) 3511; (Manitoba) 3534; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3534 (ii).
Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14269 (vi); (messengers, &c.) 5265 (iii), 14243 (vi); (printing, advertising, &c.) 5268 (iii); (salaries, increases) 14112 (vi); (voters' lists) 5274 (iii).
Library of Parlt., 5267 (iii).
Senate (contingencies) 5264 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agency, Montreal) 13632; (gas lights) 13635; (Halifax harbour, buoys) 13639; (Marconi stations) 13640; (St. Lawrence lights) 13632; (sweeping boats) 13636 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13678 (vi); (freight rates, &c.) 7586 (iii); (G.B. and Can.) 13672; (Magdalen islands) 13676 (vi); (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13674; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677; (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694; (wrecking plant) 13698 (vi).
Militia (annual drill) 3606, 5005; (cadet training) 3773 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (Esquimalt defences) 3778; (G.O.C.) 3780; (grants to associations) 3773; (Martineau investigation) 3752; (pay and allowance) 3601; (Valleyfield strike) 3753 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election petition) 14251 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268 (iv); Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce) 14274 (vi).
N.W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 5264 (iii); (Yukon) 5003 (ii); (Yukon, salaries) 5263 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (life-saving awards) 13544 (vi); (masters and mates examination) 13525 (vi); (St. Lawrence transportation) 4046 (ii); (surveys, northern coast) 13760; (wrecks, investigation) 13545 (vi).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 972 (i).
N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; (St. John quarantine water service) 415 (i).
N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i).
Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 494; (Bowmanville) 510; (Clinton P.O.) 523; (Cobourg armoury) 640; (Dom. renewals, &c.) 636; (Ft. William) 636; (Guelph P.O.) 638; (Kingston military stables) 639; (London, drill hall) 645; (Toronto, custom house) 649; (Toronto, post office) 956; (Toronto Junction, post office) 650 (i).
Ottawa (additional land) 353; (astronomical observatory) 342; (electric lighting) 988; (furniture, &c.) 980; (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, drainage) 647 (i); (Rideau Hall grounds) 5006 (ii); (Royal Mint) 348; (Victoria museum) 365 (i), 14243 (vi).
Que. (hospital for trachoma) 14246 (vi); (Thetford Mines) 441; (Valleyfield P.O.) 444 (i).
Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978, 2979 (ii).
Dredging (dredge vessels) 2612; (new dredges) 2673 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Arrow Lakes) 13305; (Columbia River) 13304; (dredging plant, &c.) 13311; (Fraser river, improvements) 13305; (Quatsino, wharf) 13305; (Williams Head, wharf) 13306;

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
(general vote) 13308 (vi).
Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2650 (ii).
Man. (Dauphin Lake) 1448; (Gull Harbour) 1448; (Hnausa, wharf) 1448; (Manitoba Lake) 1449 (i); (St. Andrews Rapids) 3356; (snag boat) 2672 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i).
Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2669 (ii); (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi).
Ont. (Bowmanville, pier) 1353; (Depot Harbour) 1359 (i); (dredging plant) 2672 (ii); (general repairs) 1372; (Goderich harbour) 1368; (Lake Temiscamingue, wharf) 1376; (Petewawa narrows) 1425, 1442, 1447 (i); (Port Arthur) 3348 (ii); (Point au Baril route) 1365; (Port Elgin, dredging) 1424; (Port Hope, pier) 1425; (Rivière aux Puces) 1425; (Rondeau harbour) 1427 (i); (St. Joseph's wharf) 3385 (ii); (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431; (Southampton, harbour) 1428; (Thornbury, harbour) 1432 (i); 13450 (vi); (Wendover, wharf) 1438 (i).
P. E. I. (dredging plant) 13314 (vi).
Que. (Barachois de Malbaie) 13445 (vi); (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446; (Caplan, breakwater) 13449; (Chambord, wharf) 13454; (Chateau Richer) 13456; (Douglastown, isolated block) 13457 (vi); (Esquimaux Point) 2278 (i); (Gatineau River, C.P.R. Bridge) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallée, pier) 1514, 1523; (Grosse Isle) 425; (Kamouraska, pier) 13458 (vi); (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2247; (Le Tableau, wharf) 2256 (i); (Lotbinière wharf) 13460; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2269; (Newport, breakwater) 2277; (Nicolet River) 2278; (Pointe St. Pierre) 2279; (repairs, improvements) 2241; (Rivière aux Renards) 2280; (St. Francis, ice pier) 2284 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3310 (ii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258; (St. Maurice, dredging) 2286 (i); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13483; (Sorel, wharf) 12856, 12869 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2297 (i).
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307 (vi).
Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13363 (vi).
Roads and Bridges, N.W.T. (Peace River, pack trail) 13324; (Pelly River bridge) 13368; Ottawa (Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).
Slides and Booms (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2975 (ii).
Telegraph Lines—B.C. (working expenses) 13368 (vi).
Mar. Provs. (Chatham to Tracadie) 13325 (vi).
Que. (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13325 (vi).
Yukon (generally) 2994 (ii); (Yukon, working expenses) 14041 (vi).
Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 5503; hog cholera) 5505 (iii); (public health) 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii); (small-pox) 5007 (ii), 5491 (iii).
Railways—G.T.R. (rental) 12887 (vi).
I.C.R. (Connolly's claims) 14105 (vi); (draw bars, exchange) 8289; (Halifax, accommodation) 8316 (iv); 12825; (general vote) 12877 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8313; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8292; (rolling stock) 8294

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—Con.

(iv); 14100; (St. John accommodation) 12823; (sidings, additional) 14055 (vi); (steel rails, &c.) 5006 (ii); 14097 (vi); (Toronto stock yards) 8317 (iv).

P. E. I. (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 12838, 14117 (vi).

Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 13367 (vi); (Eldorado Gusher) 7277; (hospital grants) 7291; (roads and bridges) 7283 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14308, 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (ii).

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14385 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).

Tobin Co. and Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14462 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9425 (iv).

Transcontinental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°; Ques. of Order, 7726 (iv).

——— *See* 'G.T.P. B. 235.'

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13363 (vi).

——— Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (ii).

——— Par. in Montreal *Herald re* Mr. Préfontaine's Speech (remarks) 865 (i).

——— *See* Rys.,' &c.

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson newspapers (remarks) 11070 (v).

——— (remarks) 13792 (vi).

Trent Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2331 (i).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2343 (i).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 249 (Mr. *Morrison*) on M. to receive Pet., 10744 (v).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14339 (vi).

York and Carleton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act (approval of regulations) in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Yukon, Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Stephens, Mr. G., *Kent (O).*

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 171) 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 841 (i).

Stephens, Mr. G.—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9963 (iv).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8103 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11005; (Kent) 11576 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6183 (iii); (drainage) 4751 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7213, 7235 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4097 (ii).

Stewart, Mr. D. A., *Lisgar.*

Automatic Grain Weighers in N. W. T., Rep. of Inspector, &c. (M. for ret.) 847 (i).

Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) in Com., 5985 (iii).

Grain Weighing in Man. and N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4194 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10235 (v).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co. (B. 124) 1°*, 1764 (i).

Morden Board of Trade, Res. *re* Wheat Freight Rates (Ques.) 12074 (v).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).

SUPPLY:

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary) 5384 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4194 (ii).

Wheat Freight Rates, Res. of Morden Board of Trade (Ques.) 12074 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James (Minister of Public Works) *N. Oxford.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Reported Interview of Mr. Aylesworth (remarks) 13961 (vi).

Amherst, Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1591 (i).

Anglo-American Tel. Co. and P. E. I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vi).

Annandale ier, P. E. I., Amount expended (Ans.) 2921 (ii).

Armouries Construction: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Generally.'

Arsenault, Capt., Compensation for Damages to Schooner (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Art Gallery, Expenditure on Paintings, &c. (Ans.) 12717 (vi).

Assiniboine and Red Rivers Navigation, Improvement, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).

——— Rep. of Board of Trade, Winnipeg (Ans.) 1860 (i).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5888, 5961, 6846 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11171 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Representation and Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7103 (iii).

Blind River Wharf, Contracts, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 6656 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).

C. P. R. car 001, Improvements to, &c. (Ans.) 14282 (vi).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14498 (vi).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5885 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B, 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12502 (v).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

Digby Port, Wharf Extension, &c. (Ans.) 2101 (i).

Dredges at Midland, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (iii).

Dredges, New, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).

Dunnville Dredging: *See* 'Grand River.'

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Electric Lighting of Buildings, Ottawa (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Electric Lighting of Chamber, Change of Lamps, &c. (Ans.) 816 (i).

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Bldgs., Ottawa.'

Emerson Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

Eureka, Str., Loaned by Govt. (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 14687 (vi).

Fielding, Dredge, Plans for Construction, &c. (Ans.) 14283 (vi).

Fishing Industry in N. S., Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vi).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).

Fuel Contracts, Interest on unpaid Accounts (Ans.) 5318 (iii).

Gananoque and Brockville Channel, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13320 (vi).

Geological Museum, Construction (Ans.) 11188 (i).

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Bldgs., Ottawa.'

Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vi).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 941 (i).

Grain Blockade in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grand River, Dredging at Dunnville, &c. (Ans.) 12498 (v), 13027 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5154, 5233 (iii), 7856 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Maclean*) 7815 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10593, 11202 (v).

Harrison, Mr., Resignation as Inspector of Fisheries (Ans.) 288 (i).

Immigrants at Quebec, Medical Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 5318 (iii).

Imperial Building, Ottawa, Govt. Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3803 (ii).

I. C. R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

International Dredge Leased by Govt. (Ans.) 12218 (v).

Isle of Orleans, Cable: *See* 'Submarine.'

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Jerome, Martin, and Man. Elections, &c. (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

King Edward VII., Portrait: *See* 'Portrait.'

Lake Superior Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Charges against (Ans.) 2922 (ii).

L'Assomption Post Office, Site, &c. (Ans.) 3230 (ii).

Le Canada and L. J. Latour *re* Circular issued, &c. (Ans.) 1033 (i).

Listowel Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

Lobster Packing Factory in N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Lotbinière and Megantic Ry. Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).

Loy: *See* 'Beauharnois.'

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands, on M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2764 (ii).

Marine Engineers B.: *See* 'Steamboat,' &c.

Martineau Commission Report, and Fire Protection: *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.

Medical Examiner at Quebec of Immigrants (Ans.) 3536 (ii).

Midland Water Front, Lease to Pratt & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).

Mint Building, Establishment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 344 (i), 14244 (vi).

Mint, Canadian, Erection of (Ans.) 10955 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4457 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Sheds, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 14282 (vi).

Napanee Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Nepean Point, Ottawa, Improvement, &c. (Ans.) 11829 (v).

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Ottawa Buildings, Leases and Rentals for Govt. Offices, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) for Ret. *re*, 589 (i).

——— Fire Protection, Rep. *re* Martineau Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 4674 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial,' 'Woods,' &c.

Owen Sound Harbour, Water Lot, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (iii).

Parliament Buildings, Lighting: *See* 'Electric.'

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i), 13119 (vi).

Portrait of King Edward, Painting, &c., by Canadian Artists (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. (B. 208) 1°m., 5240 (iii).

P. E. I. Telegraph System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Tel. Lines,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters' and Western Rys., 10511 (v).

Public Works Act Amt. (B. 193) 1°m., 3970; in Com., 4221 (ii).

Public Works, Deptl. Report (presented) 6 (i).

Public Works Employees, Dismissals, Promotions, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Léonard*) 1058 (i).

Public Works, Amount expended by Govt. in Provs. (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Quebec Harbour Pier, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3972 (ii).

——— Construction of, &c. (remarks) 2238 (i).

Racette, Vital, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3559 (ii),

——— supplies for I. C. R. Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12959 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14382, 14428, 14505 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2489 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10964, 11436, 11462, 11572, 11622; (Brant) 11109; (Dauphin) 11748; (Portage la Prairie) 11781; (Toronto) 11693; (Waterloo) 11647; (York) 11665; on M. for 3°, 12395; on Amt. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) to M. for 3°, 12458; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12468 (v).

——— Printing of Evidence *re* (remarks) 11423 (v).

Richelieu River Inundations, &c. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots (Ans.) 5320 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment (Ans.) 285 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids, Bridge Construction (Ans.) 14284 (vi).

——— Contract, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).

——— Expiration of Contract (Ans.) 10490 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

St. Boniface, Money Order Branch, Closing (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Gananoque,' 'Supply—Harbours and Rivers, Quebec.'

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4590 (ii).

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Sir Wilfrid Laurier Dredge, Sinking in Lake Ont. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Skinner's Pond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

Sorel Wharf, Cor., &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 2302 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Harbonrs and Rivers, Quebec.'

Springhill, N.S., Explosion in Dom. Building, Report *re* (read) 13257 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3293 (ii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7027 (iii).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14428 (vi).

Submarine Cable to Isle of Orleans (Ans.) 11187 (v).

Summerside, P.E.I., Breakwater, Completion of Work, &c. (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Welland (Dunnville, dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 332 (i).
Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239 (i).
Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342; (salaries) 341 (i).
Public Works (architect's salary) 13498 (vi); (contingencies) 5824 (iii); (Hunter, J. B., salary) 13499; (salaries) 333 (i), 13500 (vi).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5129 (ii).

Justice, Administration of: Supreme Court (library) 3403 (ii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert printing) 14271 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Pratt & Co.'s lease of water front) 5751 (iii); (St. Lawrence navigation) 4148 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 13676 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4071; (meteorological service) 4118 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, B.C. (Nelson P. O.) 13131; (Rossland, armoury) 13133; (Rossland P. O.) 13131; (Vancouver P. O.) 13132 (vi).
Dom. (architect's office) 961; (caretakers) 1021; (electric power) 1067; (furniture) 1006; (heating, &c.) 1065; (lighting, &c.) 1067; (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 (i); (rents, &c.) 13133 (vi); (water supply) 1067 (i).
Generally (armouries) 965; (clerks of works) 963; (experimental farms) 972 (i); (immigrant buildings) 14247 (vi).
Man. (immigration, hospitals, &c.) 5845 (iii); (Winnipeg, immigration station) 13126; (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13127; (Winnipeg, military stores) 13126; (Winnipeg P.O.) 13127 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 422 (i).

N.B. (Campbellton P.O.) 13037 (vi); Dom. buildings) 421 (i); (Fredericton, military buildings) 13041 (vi); (Marysville) 5841 (iii); (Moncton P.O.) 13038; (Newcastle, improvements) 13038 (vi); (Richibucto) 412 (i); (St. John, drill hall) 13042 (vi); (St. John, immigrant shed, &c.) 412 (i), 13040 (vi); (St. John, quarantine water service) 414, 486 (i), 13041; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13038; (Woodstock, armoury) 13039; (Woodstock P. O.) 13041 (vi).

N. S. (Antigonish, post office) 13034 (vi); (Arichat) 5827 (iii); (Digby) 13034 (vi); (Guysborough) 5830 (iii); (Halifax, building) 411 (i); (Halifax, custom house) 13031; (Halifax, immigration shed) 13033 (vi); (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 412 (i); (Middleton, armoury) 5841 (iii); (North Sydney, post office) 13035; (Springhill, repairs) 14247; (Sydney Mines) 13028; (Sydney, post office) 13035 (vi).

N.W.T. (court-houses, &c.) 958 (i); (Edmonton jail) 13129 (vi); (Macleod, court-house) 959 (i); (Moosejaw P.O.) 13130; (Prince Albert court-house) 13129 (vi); (Red Deer, court-house) 960; (renewals, &c.) 959 (i); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 13130 (vi); (Yorkton, court-house) 961 (i).

Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 487; (architects) 524 (i); (Belleville, armoury) 13082 (vi); (Bowmanville) 508 (i); (Brantford, drill hall) 13108; (Bridgeburg, P.O.) 13113 (vi); (Clinton P. O.) 518; (Cobourg armoury) 640 (i); (Cobourg, P.O.) 13118 (vi); (Deseronto) 5842 (iii); (Deseronto, P.O.) 13112 (vi); (Dom. buildings, renewals) 636 (i); (Fort William) 636 (i); (Guelph, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Guelph P.O.) 637 (i); (Hamilton, building) 13113 (Hawkesbury, P.O.) 13119; (Kingston, barracks) 13118 (vi); (Kingston military stables) 638 (i); (Kingston, military school) 5842 (iii), 13094; (Kingston, military college stables) 13117 (vi); (London drill hall) 641 (i); (London, magazine) 13115 (vi); (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 (i); (Oshawa, P.O.) 13110; (Picton, P.O.) 13113; (St. Catherines, drill hall) 13106; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P. O.) 13107; (Sarnia, P. O.) 13118; (Stratford, armoury) 13125; (vi); (Toronto, branch post office) 5920 (iii); (Toronto custom-house) 648, 958 (i); (Toronto, drill hall) 13115; (Toronto examining warehouse) 13118; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086, 13115 (vi); (Toronto, post office) 956 (i), 5842 (iii); (Toronto P.O., addition) 13096; (Toronto postal station) 13112 (vi); (Toronto, rec. gen.'s office, vault) 5842 (iii); (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 956; (Toronto Junction, post office) 650 (i); (Windsor, P.O.) 13113; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120; (Woodstock, armoury) 13125; (Woodstock, P. O.) 13108 (vi).

Ottawa (additional land) 353 (i); (additional rooms, H. of C.) 13006 (vi); (astronomical observatory) 342 (i); (bacteriological laboratory) 5842 (iii); (census building) 991 (i); (coal sheds) 13115 (vi);

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con*

Public Works—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Ottawa—*Con.*

(electric lighting) 988 (i); (electric light; ing, transformers) 5843 (iii); (elevators-1012 (i), 13115 (vi); (furniture, &c.) 973; (geological museum) 352; (grounds) 1015; (heating, &c.) 1008; (light, maintenance) 974, 1012; (Major's Hill park) 1015 (i); (paving, tar macadam) 13119 (vi); (post-office, elevator) 5844 (iii); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, drainage) 647; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 995 (i); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 13087 (vi); (Royal Mint) 344 (i); (steel shelving) 13087 (vi); (telephones) 1013 (i); (ventilation of chamber) 13011 (vi); (Victoria museum) 365 (i), 14243; (Western Block, heating) 13087 (vi).

P. E. I. (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; (Charlottetown, Dom. building) 13036 (vi).

Que. (Acton Vale P.O.) 13059 (vi); (Grosse Isle) 425; (L'Assomption) 427; (Lévis) 431 (i); (Lévis, P.O.) 13053, 13055; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13070; (Magog, P.O.) 13081 (vi); (Montmagny) 5841 (iii); (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066; (Montreal, barracks) 13076 (vi); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 433 (i), 13058; (Montreal, P.O.) 13067; (Montreal, postal station) 13081 (vi); (Montreal, renewals, &c.) 437 (i); (Quebec, citadel) 13053; (Quebec, citadel drill shed) 13056; (Quebec, drill hall addition) 13077; (Quebec, hospital for trachoma) 14245; (Quebec, marine stores) 13053; (Quebec, military buildings) 13054; (Quebec, military iron foundry) 14247 (vi); (Quebec, renewals, &c.) 422; (St. Hyacinthe) 439 (i); (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (St. John's examining warehouse) 13069; (St. John's P.O.) 13059; (St. Louis de Mile-End, P.O.) 13080; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi); (Thetford Mines) 441 (i); (Three Rivers, custom house), 13080; (Three Rivers, heating, &c.) 13069 (vi); (Valleyfield, P.O.) 443 (i).

Yukon (White Horse, P.O.) 13133 (vi).

Docks (commission's rep.) 2983 (ii); (Kingston graving dock) 13023 (vi); (Lévis graving dock) 2979 (ii).

Dredging (vessels repairs) 2612; (dredges, new, Que.) 2674; (Ont. and Que. dredging plant) 2671 (ii).

Generally (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii), 13024 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Anderson Lake) 1451 (i); (Arrow Lakes) 13304 (vi); (Columbia river) 1451 (i), 13304; (dredging plant, &c.) 13311 (vi); (Esquimalt, graving dock) 5919 (iii); (Fraser river, improvements) 13305; (Hardy Bay, wharf) 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi); (Mr. Sinclair's dismissal) 1451; (Quatsino, wharf) 13305; (Victoria Harbour, dredging) 13306; (Williams Head quarantine wharf) 13306 (vi).

Generally, 13308 (vi); (new dredges) 2673; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633; (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii), 13024 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Man. (Dauphin lake) 1448 (i); (dredging) 2665 (ii); (dredging plant) 13311 (vi); (Gimli, wharf) 1450; (Gull Harbour, wharf) 1448; (Hnausa, wharf) 1448; (Lake Francis outlet) 1449 (i); (*Manitoba*, dredge) 13311 (vi); (Manitoba Lake) 1449; (repairs, &c.) 1448 (i); (St. Andrews Rapids) 3354 (ii); (Selkirk, wharf) 1450 (i); (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i).

Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); (dredging, &c., salaries) 13309 (vi); (hydraulic dredge) 2612 (ii), 13312 (vi); (repairs, &c.) 1185 (i).

N. B. (Alma Pier) 1184; (Anderson's Hollow) 1163 (i); (Arsenault, Capt., damages, &c.) 13231 (vi); (Bay du Vin) 1164 (i); (Black Brook) 13228 (vi); (Campbellton, wharf) 1164 (i); 13005, 13229; (Campobello, breakwater) 13228; (Cape Tormentine) 13228 (vi); (Caraquet wharf) 1173 (i); (Chatham, lightship) 13231; (Cocagne wharf, damages, &c.) 13231; (Dalhousie wharf) 13233; (Dipper Harbour, breakwater) 13233; (Grand Manan, breakwater) 13234 (vi); (Great Salmon River) 1177 (i); (Hopewell Cape, wharf) 13233 (vi); (Lord's Cove, wharf) 1177 (i); (Miscou, wharf) 13234 (vi); (Negro Point breakwater) 1181; (Oromocto, wharf) 1181 (i); (Petit Rocher) 13234; (Pointe du Chêne) 13235 (vi); (Richibucto wharf) 1177 (i); 13235 (vi); (St. Andrews wharf) 5894 (iii); (St. John harbour) 1183; (St. John river wharfs) 1178; (St. John tributaries) 1177 (i); (Shippegan harbour) 1183 (i).

N. S. (Abbot's Harbour) 13141; (Abram's wharf) 13141 (vi); (Amagandus wharf) 1068 (i); (Arichat) 13217 (vi); (Bailey's Brook, wharf) 1072 (i); (Baxter's, breakwater) 13142; (Bayfield, wharf) 13141; (Benoit's Cove) 13143; (Berlin, breakwater) 13180; (Big Harbour, wharf) 13143 (vi); (Big Pond, wharf) 1072, 1073 (i); (Breton Cove) 13151 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (Cariboo island, causeway) 13179; (Chegoggin, pier) 13179; (Chéticamp, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Cheverie breakwater) 1078 (i); (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217 (vi); (Church Point, breakwater) 1078 (i); (Cow Bay, breakwater) 1078 (i); 13178 (vi); (Digby pier) 1083 (i); (Donald's Head, breakwater) 13179 (vi); (Drumhead, breakwater) 1083 (i); 13179; (Duncan's Cove, wharf) 13179; (East Bay, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Economy, wharf) 1087 (i); (Finlay Point) 13181; (Five Islands, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Fort Lawrence, pier) 1087 (i); 13181; (Freeport, pier) 13182 (vi); (Friar's Head, harbour) 1087 (i); (Frudes Point, wharf) 13180; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182; (Georgeville, wharf) 13198 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1087 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang, entrance) 1095; (Grand Narrows, wharf) 1094 (i), 13198 (vi); (Grand River, entrance) 1094 (i); (Granite Village, pier) 13182 (vi); (Green Cove, harbour) 1100 (i); (Hall's harbour) 13198 (vi); (Hawk Point Inlet, channel) 1102; (Herring Cove, breakwater) 1102 (i); (Indian harbour, wharf) 13199; (Iona, harbour) 13200 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102 (i); (Jeddore, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Judique, breakwater) 1103 (i); (Ketch, harbour) 13202 (vi); (Kingsport, pier) 1103 (i), 13202; (L'Ardoise, breakwater) 13201 (vi); (Larry's River, breakwater) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105 (i); (Livingstone Cove) 13200; (McKay's Point, wharf) 13201; (McNutt's Island, beach) 13201; (Main-à-Dieu) 13201; (Malagawatch, channel) 13203; (Malignant Cove) 13201 (vi); (Margaree, wharf) 1133 (i); (Margaretsville, breakwater) 13202; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203 (vi); (Meteghan Cove) 1133 (i); (Middle river, dam) 13202; (Morrison's point, wharf) 13203; (Musquodoboit, harbour) 13202; (Necum Teuch, wharf) 1137 (i), 13203 (vi); (Neil's Harbour) 1139; (New Campbellton, wharf) 1142; (New Harbour) 1144 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Ogden's Pond) 13204; (Oyster Pond) 13204; (Parrsborough, landing) 13205; (Pembroke, breakwater) 13205 (vi); (Petit du Grat, dredging) 1146 (i); (Pickett's, pier) 13205 (vi); (Pictou, light beach) 13205 (vi); (Poirierville, wharf) 1146 (i), 13205; (Porter's channel) 13206 (vi); (Port George, breakwater) 1146 (i), 13210; (Port Greville, breakwater) 13210 (vi); (Port Hastings, wharf) 1146; (Port Hawkesbury) 1146 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206; (Port Howe, wharf) 13210; (Port Latour, breakwater) 13210; (Port Maitland) 13211; (Port au Pique, wharf) 13211; (Prospect, wharf) 13205; (Pugwash, landing) 13205; (St. Ann, wharf) 13203; (Sable Island, East End) 13180 (vi); (Sandy Cove, breakwater) 1149 (i); (Scott's Bay) 13211 (vi); (Short Beach) 1149 (i); (Skinner's Cove) 13213 (vi); (South Ingonish, wharf) 1149 (i); (Spry Bay) 13213; (Summerville, wharf) 13213; (Swim's Point, wharf) 13211; (Sydney, quarantine wharf) 13213; (Tenecape, breakwater) 13213 (vi); (Tiverton, breakwater) 1150 (i); (Victoria, beach wharf) 13213; (Wallace, harbour) 13216 (vi); (Washabuck Centre, wharf) 1150 (i); (Wedge Point) 13217; (Wentworth, wharf) 13216 (vi); (West Baccaro, channel) 1150 (i); (West Bay, wharf) 13217; (White's Cove, breakwater) 13217; (Windsor Harbour, sheer dam) 14248; (Wolfville, wharf) 13217; (Yarmouth, bar) 13218 (vi).

N. W. T. (repairs, &c.) 1450 (i).

Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185 (i) 13235 (vi); (Barrie wharf) 1187 (i); (Barry's Bay) 13236 (vi); (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1192 (i); (Blind River, wharf) 13235 (vi); (Bowmanville pier) 1352 (i); (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bronte, harbour) 1354 (i); (Bronte improvements) 13236 (vi); (Bruce Mines) 5911 (iii); (Burk's Falls) 1358; (Burlington channel) 1359 (i), 13237 (vi); (Cobourg, repairs) 5909 (iii); (Collingwood improve-

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Ont.—*Con.*

ments) 13239; (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland wharf) 13238; (vi); (Depot harbour) 1359 (i), 13239 (vi); (general repairs) 1369; (Goderich harbour) 1365 (i), 13240; (Gore's wharf) 13244; (Grand Bend, pier), 13239 (vi); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Kingsville) 13244 (vi); (Lake Temiscamingue wharf) 1376 (i); (Leamington, wharf) 13246; (Little Bear Creek) 13245; (Little Current) 13245 (vi); (Midland, dredging) 5909 (iii); (Midland, harbour) 1376 (i), 13246 (Oakville pier) 1376; (Orillia wharf) 1377 (i); (Ottawa River) 13251 (vi); (Owen Sound, harbour) 1377 (i); (Parry Sound wharf) 13248; (Petewawa narrows) 1425, 1442 (i), 13251 (vi); (Pickering harbour) 1377; (Point au Baril route) 1365 (i); (Point Edward) 13249 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3341 (ii), 13012; (Port Burwell) 13249 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3368 (ii); (Point Edward, dredging) 1377; (Port Elgin, dredging) 1424; (Port Hope pier) 1425 (i); (Port Perry) 13249; (Port Stanley) 13249 (vi); (Prescott, dredging) 5915 (iii); (Rivière aux Puces) 1425; (Rondeau harbour) 1427 (i); (Rosedale, wharf) 13250 (vi); (St. Joseph, wharf) 3382 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 13253 (vi); (Southampton harbour), 1428; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431 (i); (Sydenham river) 13250; (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254 (vi); (Thornbury harbour) 1432; (Toronto harbour) 1433 (i); (Toronto, Magann & Phinn claim) 13255, (Toronto, pier) 13255 (vi); (Trenton, dredging) 1434 (i); (Victoria harbour) 13255 (vi); (Wendover wharf) 1434 (i); (Wiarton wharf) 13256 (vi); (Wolfe Island dredging) 1443 (i), 13252 (vi).

P.E.I. (Aitken's wharf) 1159 (i); (Beach point) 13218 (vi); (Belfast, pier) 1153 (i); (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Cape Traverse, survey) 13219 (vi); (Cascumpec, harbour) 1153 (i); (Cove Head, channel) 13222 (vi); (Cove Head, harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber) 1155 (i); (dredging) 13310; (dredging plant) 13313 (vi); (Gaspereaux, harbour) 1155; (Higgin's shore pier) 1159 (i), 13222; (Lewis point, pier) 13223; (North Cardigan) 13223 (vi); (New London) 1160 (i); (New London, channel) 13223 (vi); (piers, repairs, &c.) 1161 (i); (Point Prim, wharf) 13223; (Richmond Bay) 13223; (Skinner's Pond) 13309 (vi); (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i); (Summerside, breakwater) 13224 (vi); (Summerside, harbour) 3367 (ii); (Tignish breakwater) 1162 (i).

Que. (Anse aux Gascons wharf) 13445; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 13445; (Anse St. Jean wharf) 13445; (Barachois de Malbaie breakwater) 13445 (vi); (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Bois Brulé pier) 13448; (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446 (vi); (Cacouna wharf) 5896 (iii), 13442; (Caplan, breakwater) 13448; (Chambord, wharf) 13454 (vi); (Chateauguay river) 2280 (i), 3208 (ii); (Chateau Richer) 13455 (vi); (Crane Island, wharf) 1513; (Cross Point pier) 1512 (i); (Desjardins, Allumette wharf) 13457 (vi); (Doucet's Landing) 5907 (iii); (Douglastown, isolated block) 13457 (vi); (Esquimaux Point) 2278; (Father Point, pier) 1513 (i); (Gatineau River, C. P. R. bridge) 13457; (Grande Rivière, wharf) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallee, pier) 1514-72 (i); (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Isle aux Coudres wharf) 2242 (i); (Isle Grosbois) 5902 (iii); (Kamouraska, pier) 13457; (Lake St. John, dredging) 13459 (vi); (Lake St. John, wharf) 2243; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie ice piers) 2248 (i), 13460 (vi); (Le Tableau, wharf) 2249; (L'Ile d'Alma) 2257 (i); (Lotbinière, wharf) 13460 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 2264 (i); (Maguasha, pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Mistook, wharf) 13461; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (Montreal harbour) 3365 (ii); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Newport breakwater) 2277 (i), 13462; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463 (vi); (Nicolet river) 2278 (i); (Nominingue Lake, wharfs) 13460; (Notre Dame du Portage) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (Perce pier) 13467; (Pierreville, wharf) 13468; (Pointe Fortune, wharf) 13468 (vi); (Pointe St. Pierre) 2278 (i); (Pointe aux Trembles, wharf) 13468; (Port Daniel, wharf) 13468 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 3336 (ii); (repairs, improvements) 2241 (i); (Repentigny, wharf) 13468; (Rimouski, pier, &c.) 13468 (vi); (river and bridge works) 5907 (iii); (Rivière Jesus, dredging) 13470; (Rivière du Loup, harbour) 13476 (vi); (Rivière du Loup, wharf) 2281 (i); (Rivière du Nord) 5907 (iii); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 (i); (Rivière Verte) 13470 (vi); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289 (i); (St. Alphonse, Ha-Ha Bay) 13489 (vi); (St. André de Kamouraska, pier) 2290 (i); (Ste. Anne de la Pérade, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatière) 13489; (Ste. Anne de Saguenay, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Anne de Sorel) 13489; (Ste. Famille, pier) 13488; (St. Fidèle, wharf) 13493 (vi); (St. Francis, ice pier) 2282; St. François, Orleans) 2290 (i); (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gédéon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13489 (vi); (St. Irénée, wharf) 2291 (i); (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 (vi); (St. Jerome, wharf) 2291 (i), 5909 (iii); (St. Laurent, wharf) 5906 (iii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2257 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3304 (ii); (St. Louis river) 13473 (vi); (St. Maurice, Grandes Piles) 2286 (i); (St. Maurice River) 5904 (iii); (St. Maurice River, dam) 13491; (St. Michel de Bellechasse) 13494 (vi); (St. Nicholas, pier) 5905 (iii); (St. Simeon, wharf) 13493; (Sabrevois, wharf) 13485; (Sacré-Cœur, wharf) 13478; (Saguenay, dredging) 13472; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13479; (Shegawake, harbour) 13479 (vi); (Sorel, wharf) 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12848, 12869 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs)

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Que.—*Con.*

2296; (Touladie River) 2286 (i); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2298 (i), 5905 (iii); (Ville Marie, wharf) 14248; (Yamaska lock, dredging) 13498 (vi).

Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13306 (vi).

Miscellaneous: (architect's office) 2747 (ii); (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi); (art gallery) 2725; (clerical assistance) 2753 (ii); (Ottawa river, surveys) 13340 (vi); (salaries, engineers, &c.) 2726 (ii), 13340 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2715, 2720 (ii); (transportation commission) 13362 (vi).

Roads and Bridges: Generally (Bryson, approaches) 13321 (vi); (Dom. traffic, bridges) 2701 (ii); (Edmonton, flooring) 13323; (Moisie Post road) 13322; (Peace River, pack trail) 13323 (vi).

N.W.T. (Pelly river bridge) 13367 (vi).

Ottawa, 2700 (ii); (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321; (Union bridges, Ottawa) 13321; Quebec (Bryson) 13321 (vi); (Portage du Fort) 2690 (ii).

Yukon (Trading and Exploring Co.) 5826 (iii).

Slides and Booms (Gagner, Mr., salary) 2976; (Gatineau) 2977; (generally) 2690 (repairs, &c.) 2978; (St. Maurice slides) 2676; (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—B.C., 2992 (ii); (Alberni-Clayoquot) 5918 (iii); (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2992 (ii); (Kamloops, Nicola line) 13337 (vi); (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5826 (iii); (Vancouver Island to Salt Springs) 13337; (working expenses) 13368 (vi).

Mar. Provs. (Chatham to Tracadie) 13325; (Deer Island to Eastport) 13325 (vi); (land and cable, Mar. Provs.) 2701 (ii).

N.W.T., 2991 (ii); (Alexander, Indian agency) 5918 (iii); (Edmonton and Athabasca) 13335; (Edmonton, Indian agency) 13334; (Victoria to Andrews) 13335; (Wood Mountain Post) 13335 (vi).

P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13326 (vi); (P.E.I. and mainland) 2988 (ii), 5918 (iii).

Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii) 13325 (vi); (Belle Isle) 2712, 2989 (ii); (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332; (Chicoutimi, St. Charles) 13333 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 2714 (ii); (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13326; (Murray Bay, &c.) 13326; (Orleans Island) 13330; (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334 (vi); (Quebec, repairs, &c.) 2711 (ii); (Ste. Anne du Saguenay) 13331 (vi).

Yukon (working expenses) 14041 (vi).

Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 13367 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14381, 14511 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14737 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) M. to ref. back to Com., 7813 iv).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Toronto Island, Damage by Storms, &c. (Ans.) 5589 (iii).

Toronto to Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Toronto Post Office, Contract of Mr. Coleman (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13099 (vi).

Toronto Public Works Employees, Delay of Payment, &c. (Ans.) 5588 (iii).

Translators, Debates, Rent of Office, &c. (Ans.) 2311 (i), 3799 (ii).

Transportation Com., in Com. of Sup., 12854, 13362 (vi).

——— Instructions, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

——— Meetings, Business transacted, &c. (Ans.) 13027 (vi).

——— N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours, Que., Sorel,'

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11074 (v).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 13134, 13258 (vi).

Valleyfield P.O., Site, Erection, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 11187 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 4362 (ii) 13011 (vi).

Wharfs, Govt. Policy *re* Construction, 13156 (vi).

Winnipeg City Water B.: *See* 'Assiniboine.'

Woods, J. W., Rental of Buildings, &c. (Ans.) 5764 (iii).

Woodstock, N. B., P. O., Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 672 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4563 (ii).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Management, &c., Complaints *re*, 7004 (iii).

See: 'Supply—Public Works — Telegraph Lines, Yukon.'

Sutherland, Mr. R. F., *N. Essex.*

Box Freight Cars, Ladders, &c.: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Budget, The, 1860 (i).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) M. to refer back to Com., 5959 (iii).

Drainage on Rys.: *See* Ry. B. 21.'

G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9447 (iv).

Osler, Mr. and 'Grafters.': *See* 'Privileges.'

Privileges and Elections, Sel. Com., 1st Rep. *re* Mr. Schell (presented) 5511 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry., Subsidy, 10520 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (box-cars, safety appliances, amt.) 6325; (cattle guards, amt.) 6220 (iii); in Com. (drainage) 4754 (ii).

Schell, J. T., M.P., 1st Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com. *re* (presented) 5511 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (exhibitions) 4623 (ii).

Customs (salaries, &c.) 3909 (ii).

Windsor, Ont., Customs Officers, Overtime, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7370 (iii).
Campaign Literature and Mail Bags, Govt. Ownership (Ques.) 14286 (vi).
Campaign Literature, Employment of Sessional Messengers (Ques.) 14286 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12340, 12521 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5150 (iii), 7909 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9472 (iv); in Com. on B., 11951 (v); on M. for 3°, 12736 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, Authenticity of, (M.) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).
——— Pets., Irregularities, &c., Par. in Montreal *Star*, (M.) to adjn., Affidavits, &c., 14845 (vi).
——— Pets. *re* (remarks) 12944 (vi).
——— *See* 'Petitions,' &c.
G. T. Ry. Co., Loans by Govt. (Ques.) 2920 (ii).
——— Terminal Facilities: *See* 'Transportation.'
Hagar, Miss, Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 5316 (iii).
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 144) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Isle of Orleans, Submarine Cable, &c. (M. for ret.*) 11301 (v).
——— *See* 'Submarine.'
McCraney, W., Letter *re* Legislation (ques. of order) 5362 (iii).
Mail Bags: *See* 'Campaign.'
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 814 (i).
Petitions *re* G. T. P. Ry. Co., Responsibility of Members, &c. (remarks) 12715 (vi).
——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12786; on M. for 3°, 13939 (vi).
——— Statement of Mr. L. E. Morin (read) 12786 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in *Citizen*, 3127 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s (B. 145) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14454 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14454, 14495 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies for Man., &c. (remarks) 14495 (vi).
Saunders, Mr. C. E,, Appnmt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 1676 (i).
Submarine Cable to Island of Orleans, &c. (Ques.) 11186 (v).
——— *See* 'Isle of Orleans.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (exhibitions) 4623 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Levis) 431 (i); (Montmagny, P. O.) 13067 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers: Generally (dredges, repairs, &c.) 2627 (ii); Que. (Grande Vallee pier) 1547 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I. C. R. (Amqui, accommodation) 12601 (v).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*), (M.) to adjn. deb., 4868 (ii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11082 (v).
Woolf Valve Gear Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 161) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel, *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14818 (vi).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iii).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7104 (iii), 8025 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7303, 7322, 7353 (iii).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, Par. in Toronto *News* (remarks) 6751 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ministerial.'
Budget, The, 1619 (i).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Cable News with G. B. and Can. B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8235 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5602 (iii).
Can. Northern Ry., Cor. between Govt. and Mackenzie & Mann (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
C. P. R. and Car Shortage in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 392 (i).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4419 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 842 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7519 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3098 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3006 (ii).
Eureka, Str., Personal Explanation, 14687 (vi).
Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'Ottawa.'
Grain Blockade in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9644 (iv); in Com. on B., 10420, 10467 (v).
G. T. R. Transcontinental Ry. (M. for cor.) 447 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B, 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7937 (iv).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. on Sup., 4322 (ii).
Le Canada and Mr. Latour: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2504, 2521 (ii).

——— Settlement, &c., Tel. (read) 2677 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., and Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, on M. to conc., 8025 (iv).

——— *See* 'Beauharnois.'

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7998 (iv).

Ministerial Changes (explanation) 136 (i).

——— Par. in Toronto *News* (remarks) 6751 (iii).

Montreal Dry Dock, Site, &c. (M. for O. Cs. cor., &c.*) 706 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Docks.'

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4452 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co., O. Cs. Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 705 (i).

Newspaper Agents and Quebec Postmasters (M.) to adjn. Hse., 14669 (vi.)

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1309 (i).

Petersen-Tate Deposit: *See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14669 (vi).

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4211 (ii).

Public Works Dept. and Mr. Préfontaine: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Harbours and Rivers, Quebec.'

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14721 (vi).

Quebec Harbour Improvements, Reps. to Council, &c. (M. for copies*) 706 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2299 (i), 3337 (ii).

Racine Bros., Claims against Contractors of Nelson, P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 254 (i); in Com., 6103 (iii).

Ry. Commissioners' Salaries B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).

Ry. Labour Dispute B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2579 (ii).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., and Freight Blockade, Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2445 (i).

Reciprocity Negatiations, Emissaries from Can. (remarks) on Alaskan Boundary Award, 14819 (vi).

Resignation as Minister: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Que.'

Sorel Wharf: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours and Rivers, Que.'

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c. (M. for cor.) 451 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

South Shore Ry., Working, &c. (M. for cor.) 448 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7051 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7560; (transportation facilities) 7562; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7552; (Corry & Laverdure, contract, &c.) 7559 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Interior (salaries) 269 (i); Labour Dept. (Racine Bros. claims) 7168 (iii).

Customs (Montreal port) 3901 (ii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6679 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7576, 7584 (iv).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes royal commission) 6985; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6981 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 4046; (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4067; (hydrographic surveys) 4118; (meteorological service) 4118; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4116; (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 4116 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; (quarantine station, St. John) 487; (St. John quarantine water service) 414 (i).

Ont. (architects) 524 (i).

Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 342; (geological museum) 352; (Royal Mint) 344; (ventilation, &c.) 488; (Victoria Museum) 365 (i).

Que. (Thetford Mines) 441; (Valleyfield P.O.) 444 (i).

Docks (Montreal) 2981; (rep. of commission) 2981 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers: B.C. (Columbia River) 1457 (i).

Generally (dredge vessels, repairs,) 2612; (hydraulic dredge) 2612 (ii).

Man. (dredging) 2665; (St. Andrews Rapids) 3355 (ii).

N. B. (Campbellton wharf) 1168; (Caraquet wharf) 1176; (St. John River wharfs) 1178 (i).

N. S. (Bridgewater, dredging) 1075; (Cow Bay) 1081; (Glace Bay) 1090; (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1097; (Lunenburg Harbour) 1109 (i).

Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185 (i); (dredging plant) 2671 (ii); (Petawawa narrows) 1444 (i); (Port Arthur) 3341; (Port Colborne) 3369; (St. Joseph, wharf) 3382 (ii); (St. Lawrence, dredging) 1444 (i).

Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1537; (Lake St. John, wharf) 2243; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie ice piers) 2248; (Le Tableau wharf) 2249; (Magdalen islands) 2264; (Maria, pier) 2266 (i); (Montreal, harbour) 3365; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Que. harbour) 3336 (ii); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. André de Kamouraska) 2290; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 3305 (ii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 2292 (i), 3377 (ii); (Three Rivers wharfs) 2297; (Touladie river) 2286 (i); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633, 2945; (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2299 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633, 2 45 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2992; (Belleisle station) 2989; (Marconi stations) 2989; (Yukon) 2992 (ii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875 (ii); (Neg. Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4263 (ii).

Tariff Revision, Inquiry for Cor., &c., 3003 (ii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co. (M. for cor.) 672 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., G. T. Pac. Ry. (M. for cor.) 447 (i).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Transportation Commission, O.C., Cor., &c. *re* Appnmts. (M. for copies) 1324 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2633, 2926, 3305, 3369, 3451 (ii), 7562 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works,' &c.

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4522 (ii).

Valleyfield, P. O. Site: *See* 'Beauharnois.'

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Buildings.'

Yukon Supplies, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4071 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 3283 (ii).

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Allegations *re* Inspection of Fruit (remarks) 13508 (vi).

Auditor General and Finance Dept. (remarks) 11423 (v).

Aud. Gen. and Payment of Members (remarks) 11552 (v).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circular (read) 11552 (v).

Bayfield, Str., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7302, 7323; in Com. on B., 7384 (iii).

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14049 (vi).

Bonding Privileges with U.S.: *See* 'Coasting,' &c.

Boyd, Sir John, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 5990 (iii).

Brockville and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 6655, 7137, 7430 (iii).

——— on Order for resuming adjnd. Deb., 6847 (iii).

——— (M.) that com. rise, 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 7339 (iii).

——— on M. for 3° (amt.) 7469 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co., (M.) to reprint Bill, 7467 (iii).

Brockville and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67) 1° *, 813 (i).

Budget, The, 1974 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5055, 5066 (ii); in Com. on B., 5422, 5461 (iii).

Campaign Literature, *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian (3rd) Mounted Rifles, Medals, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).

——— (M. for ret.) 289 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 479, 544 (i).

——— (remarks) 204 (i).

Chickens, Killing of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 836 (i).

Cigarettes Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 1°, 2014 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12493, 12571 (v).

Clergue Contract for Steel Rails, Quality, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Coasting Privileges *re* U.S. (remarks) 12714, 12756 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6638; in Com., 7491 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3048; in Com. on B., 4011 (ii).

See 'Masters,' &c.

Customs Employees, Transfers, &c. (M.) for Ret., 5318 (iii).

Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Ferry Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'

France and Can. SS. Service B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 11422 (v).

Grain in Bond: *See* 'Coasting.'

Grain Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. of Res., 13807 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10485, 10555, 10562, 11290, 11982, 12252 (v); on M. for 3°, 12697, 12770; (amt.) 12750 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13270, 13301 (vi).

Haycock, Jos., Inspector of Binder Twine, &c. (Ques.) 4960 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection,' &c.

Howe Island Ferry: *See* 'Navigable,' &c., 'Wolfe,' &c.

Hurley: *See* 'Supply—Fisheries,' 'Lighthouse Service,' &c.

I. C. R. Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12301 (v).

Le Canada: *See* 'Pelletier.'

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Cor. *re* Mr. Mullen, &c.) 5757 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Mails carried *via* New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7729 (iv).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14549 (vi).

——— Campaign Literature, Statement *re* Special Trains, 14681 (vi).

——— Refund of Express Charges (remarks) 14684 (vi).

Masters of Vessels, Instructions *re* Postage, &c., in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5664 (iii).

Militia Estimates (remarks) 13369 (vi)

Militia Tents, Rush Ordér, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

See 'N. W. M. P.'

Milk Cans Bill : *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4484 (ii) ; in Com. on B., 5418 (iii).

Napanee Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12780 ; in Com. on B., 12984 (vi).

N. W. Mounted Police Tents, Wood & Co.'s Tender, &c. (Ques.) 3804 (ii).

——— Remarks, 6850 (iii).

Officers Mess, Fisheries Protection Service, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 9819 (iv).

Parliament Buildings, Ottawa: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Buildings,' 'Ventilation.'

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and *Le Canada*, Canvass (remarks) 13982 (vi).

——— Salary, &c. (remarks) 13992 (vi).

——— *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10829 (v).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12791 (vi).

Postal Newspaper Boxes for Streets, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 14283 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14671 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5064 (iii).

Poultry, Fattening, &c.: *See* Supply—'Agriculture.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) M. to adjn. Hse., 10535 (v).

Public Works Dept. and Mr. Préfontaine: *See* 'Pilotage Bill.'

Quadra, Str., Officers Mess, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 9819 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3750, 3896 (ii) ; 6299 (iii).

——— Suggestions *re* Sel. Com. (remarks) 5313.

Ry. Act (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com , 12950 (vi).

Ry. Commission : *See* 'Supply—Rys.'

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7129 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14464 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11014, 11483 ; on M. for 3°, 12478 (v).

Rideau Canal Employees, Payment of, Delay, &c. (remarks) 13302 (vi).

St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7215, 7242 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 13503 (vi) ; (census enumerators, Gananoque) 4823 ; (patent branch, salaries) 4351 (ii) ; (*Poultry Farming*) 7640 ; ('wringing chickens' necks') 7640 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (electric lighting) 14139 (vi) ; (Galops, deepening, &c.) 8400 ; (enlargement) 7804 (iv).

Gene ally (toll collectors) 12932 (vi).

Grenville (Tucker, Henry, investigation *re* Supt.) 14157 (vi).

Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv).

Murray (Supt.'s duties and expenses) 14146; (wire fencing) 14150 (vi).

Rideau (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv) ; (swing bridge, Concession St., Ottawa) 14150 (vi).

Soulanges (bank repairs) 14153 (vi) ; (construction) 7550 (iii) ; (Goodwin's claim) 14143 ; (J. & M. O'Leary's claims) 14651 (vi).

Welland (Dunnville dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 237 ; Justice (salaries) 212 (i) ; (marine contingencies) 5033 (ii) ; Militia (salaries) 2 2 (i) ; Post Office (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13996 (vi).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3897 ; (contingent expenses, Montreal) 3784 ; (Gananoque port) 3897 (ii) ; (Kilroy, Mr., payment to) 13994 (vi) ; (locks, instruments, &c.) 3962 ; (preferential ta iff) 3932 ; (preventive service) 3949 ; (printing, &c.) 3962 (ii) ; (salaries, extra) 13980 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Teulon, North, road) 6927 ; (tree culture) 6773 (iii) ; (tree planting) 13775 (vi).

Excise (inspectors salaries) 13978 (vi) ; (tobacco stamps) 5373 ; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (Bance, Mr., promotion) 5277 ; (*Bayfield*, str.) 5280, 5292 (iii) ; (Canadian fishery exhibit) 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii) ; (fish-breeding stations) 4174 ; (fishery officers) 5050 ; (fishways) 4174 ; (Hurley, J. M , inspector, &c.) 5123, (ii) ; 5280, 5305 ; (intelligence bureau) 5277 ; (Ottawa exhibit) 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii) : (protection service, B.C.) 4174 (ii) ; (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Immigration (Ques. of order) 6855 ; (tents, &c.) 6850 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7773 ; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7763 (iv).

Justice, Administration of — Penitentiaries (binder twine circular) 3512 (ii).

Supreme Court (contingencies) 3404 ; (reporter) 3402 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3414; (Eilbeck, allowances, &c.) 3509; (police magistrates) 3415; (Taylor, Geo. L.) 3415 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (messengers, &c.) 5265; (printing, &c.) 5267; (senate contingencies) 5264 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4173 (ii); (Hurley, J. M.) 5740 (iii); (lighthouse supplies) 4168; (lightkeepers' salaries) 4132; (wharfs, repairs) 4174 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7729; (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5033 (ii).

Militia (military college) 3778 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 13543 (vi); (Dominion steamers, repairs) 5034; (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4084 (ii); masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi); (meteorological service) 4118; (steamer supplies, Drolet, F.X.) 5036 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings, Generally (armouries) 970; (Gananoque armoury) 970 (i).

Man. (military buildings) 13128 (vi).

N. B. (St. John quarantine station) 486.

N. W. T. (Moose Jaw, P.O.) 13130 (vi).; (Prince Albert, court house) 13129 (ii).

Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 503 (i); (Kingston military college, stables) 13117, 13128; (Wingham, P.O.) 13123 (vi).

Ottawa (coal sheds) 13116; (elevator, west Block) 13115 (vi).

Docks (commissioner's rep.) 2983 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Anderson's Hollow) 1163; (Campbellton, wharf) 1166; (Caraquet, wharf) 1175 (i).

N. S. (Amagandus wharf) 1068; (Bailey's Brook, wharf) 1072; (Big Pond, wharf) 1071; (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (cement, piers, &c.) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1098; (Kingsport Pier) 1103 (i).

Ont. (Bronte, harbour) 1354; (Gananoque, harbour) 1371 (i)

P.E.I. (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i).

Que. (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13494 (vi); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13344 (vi).

Slides and Booms (Ottawa river staff) 2980 (ii).

Tèlegraph Lines—B.C. (Kamloops, Nicola line) 13337; N.W.T. (Wood Mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle) 5504; (Dr. Couture) 5504; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5496 (iii); (public health, small-pox) 5008 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Clergue's rails) 14097; Miscellaneous (Ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration Act) 7759; (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7797 (iv).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7282; (roads and bridges) 7284; (supplies purchased, &c.) 6930 (iii).

Swing Bridges Bill: *See* 'Navigable,' &c.

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Ques. of Order (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Mr. Tarte, 4843 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Thousand Islands, Improvement: *See* 'St. Lawrence.'

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14464 (vi).

Tyerman, P. D., Payments to, by Govt. (Ques.) 286 (i).

U. S. Coasting Privileges: *See* 'Coasting.'

Valleyfield Post office, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11187 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, Fans, &c. (remarks) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2344 (i); on M. to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, Collector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12935 (vi).

Wolfe Island and Howe Island wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13498 (iii).

Woods, J. W., Amount paid for Tents, &c. (Ques.) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

——— Rental of Buildings to Govt. (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A. T., *Haldimand and Monck.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (moved) 7 (i).

Budget, The, 1994 (i).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 872 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13583 (vi).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, Deb. adjourned, 1065 (i).

G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2415 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12206 (v).

Hides Bill: *See* 'General Inspection B.'

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 1204.

Loan Companies Extension (B. 24) 1°m., 284; 2°m., 2349; in Com., 2350 (i).

Mexican Light and Power Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 1853 (i).

Militia Force, Condition, Pay, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 5702 (iii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 1811 (i).

Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1059 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11635, 11659 (v).

SUPPLY:

Militia (annual drill) 3606 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13430 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 499; (Cayuga) 499 (i).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s (B. 163) 1°*, 2582; in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

Thomson, Mr. T. I., *N. Grey.*

Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract (Ques.) 13263 (vi).

Bayfield, Str., Sale, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5586 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

See 'Supply—Fisheries,' 'Lighthouse Service.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7359, 7372; in Com. on B., 7383, 7391 (iii).

See 'Supply—Inspection.'

Cement in Buildings: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ottawa.'

Census: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Commercial Agencies, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4360 (ii).

Dredges at Midland, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3011 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9573 (iv).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections) 13277 (vi).

Grey County, Public Buildings wanted, &c., List read, in Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii).

Indians: *See* 'Supply—Indians.'

I. C. R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Ry. Act.'

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8226 (iv).

Meaford Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

Owen Sound, Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks B.'

——— Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13063 (vi).

——— Water Lot, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (iii).

See 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ont.'

Public Works, Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (iv).

——— Govt. Policy *re* Public Buildings, 5831 (iii).

Ry Act (stores of I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12967 (vi).

Representation in H of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10999, 11528 (v).

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Dredge, Sinking in Lake Ont. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

Small-pox: *See* 'Supply—Quarantine.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, Grey counties) 4826 (ii).
Excise (Standard Chemical Co.) 5380 (iii); (wood alcohol) 5380 (iii).
Fisheries (str. *Bayfield*) 5278 (iii).
Indians—B.C. (salaries) 7257; (schools, &c.) 7257; (travelling expenses) 7262; Yukon (expenses, generally) 7272 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7775; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7775 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str. reps. *re*) 5743; (*Bayfield*, str., sale, &c.) 5763 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4096 (ii).

Thomson, Mr. T. I.—*Con.*

SUPPLY.—*Con.*

Post Office (Chatsworth, vacancy) 6057; (postmasters' salaries, arrears) 5924; (postmasters, &c.) 6057 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5831; (Guysborough) 5840 (iii).
Ont. (Bridgeburg, P. O.) 13113; (Guelph, armoury) 13083; (Oshawa, P. O.) 13111 (vi); (Owen Sound) 439, 533 (i), 13063; (Picton, P.O.) 13114; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P. O.) 13107 (vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 652 (i); (Wingham, P. O.) 13120; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13108 (vi).
Ottawa (coal sheds) 13115 (vi).
Que. (Longueuil, P. O.) 13070 (vi)
Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (dredging, plant, &c.) 13311; (Fraser river, improvement) 13305 (vi).
Mar. Provs. (dredging) 13309; (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi); (dredging, repairs) 2639 (ii).
Ont. (general repairs) 1370 (i); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Owen Sound, harbour) 1377 (i); (Port Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi).
P.E.I. (dredging plant) 13313 (vi).
Que. (Grande Vallee, pier) 1515 (i).
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307 (vi).
Quarantine (small-pox) 5011 (ii).
Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276 (iii).

Wood Alcohol: *See* 'Supply—Excise.'

Tisdale, Hon. David, *S. Norfolk.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5968 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5989 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378, 4962 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3229 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Ry. Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4422 (ii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1327 (i), 3243 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 576 (i).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 613 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5168 (iii).

Indian Agents, Brant Reserve, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 1322 (i).

Indian Agents, Guardians, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) in Com., 1117 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4870 (ii).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5982 (iii).

Tisdale, Hon. David—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com., 2586; in Com., 2593, 3721, 3835, 3882 (ii), 6075 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10960, 10911; (Brant) 11087; (Norfolk) 11117, 11427; on M. for 3°, 12372 (v).

SUPPLY:

Militia (annual drill) 3603; (association grants) 3767: (defence scheme) 3763; (G.O.C.) 3779; (Martineau investigation) 3584, 3752; (military college) 3778; (pay and allowance, 3584 (ii); (pay and allowance, general statement) 13405 (vi); (stores branch) 3608; (Valleyfield strike) 3591, 3756 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—N. B. (St. John, drill hall) 13043 (vi).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Manitoba Newspapers *re* Judges (remarks) 11082 (v).

Wilson, Stephen Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9150 (iv).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 1575 (i).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4090 (ii).

Tolmie, Mr. J., *W. Bruce.*

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10944 (v).

Tucker, Mr. J. J., *St. John City, (N.B).*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5186 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies, &c.) 5043 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert, K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Award, &c. (remarks) 14280 (vi).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 316 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 303, 628 (i).

Hay and Oats bought by Can., for S. A. War, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 682 (i).

Inverness and Richmond Ry. Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 872 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 10) in Com., 314 (i).

Judges of High Court, B.C., Salaries, &c. (remarks) 14305 (vi).

Minister of Mines, Appnmt. of, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Pensions to S. A. Veterans by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14599 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations of Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14275 (vi).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c., 14368 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt. Interior (salaries) 269 (i).

Miscellaneous—Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce) 14274 (vi).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14305 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 314 (i).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).

SUPPLY;

Public Works: Buildings—N. B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (dredges, repairs) 2631 (ii); N. B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176; (Shippegan harbour) 1184 (i).

Vrooman, Mr. A. E., *S. Victoria (O.)*

Budget, The, 1832 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10102 (v).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11500, 11658 (v).

Pigeon Lake Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 6412 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Indians (survey, reserves) 6412 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Seven Islands, wharf) 13484 (vi).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5501 (iii); (small-pox) 5025 (ii); (trachoma epidemic) 5496 (iii).

Wade, Mr. F. B., *Annapolis.*

Beauharnois Electoral District: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7336, 7371 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7492 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8245, 8361 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6909 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3819, 3829 (ii).

G. T Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5174, 5199 (iii), 7859 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9820 (iv).

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8100, 8371 (iv).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt., &c., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com. (presented) 7916 (iv).

——— (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8008 (iv).

McDermid, Ellen, Relief (B. 229) 1°*, 7922 (iv).

Wade, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii), 5359 (iii).
Mills, Mr., Claims against (Ques.) 6167 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4469 (ii).
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4868 (ii).
Postage Rates for Books, &c. (remarks) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5869 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5869 (iii).
Privileges and Elections Com., Rep. of Com. *re* Geo. M. Loy, M.P. (M.) to conc., 8008; on Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8034 (iv).
——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 7916 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4581, 4702 (ii), 6115, 6192, 6209, 6291 (iii).
Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Furness-Withy Co.) 7734; (St. John and London) 7734 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5835 (iii).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief (B. 228) 1°*, 7922 (iv).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *E. Durham.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10010 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Cricket Playing (remarks) 2423 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (annual drill) 3603; (military property) 3621 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13425 (vi); (properties) 3612; (Valleyfield strike) 3599 (ii).
Trent Canal, Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 129 (i).
——— Surveys at Rice Lake, (M for reps.) 2313, 2333 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.* (*N.B.*)

Bathurst Harbour Buoys, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Bourgeois, M. E., Sub-Collector of Customs at Tracadie, N.B., Dismissal (Ques.) 543 (i).
Census, Sunbury, N.B., Religious Classification, &c, (Ques.) 4005 (ii).
Daly, Michael, Harbour Master, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4687 (ii).
Gagetown, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1676 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7902; on M. for 3° (amt.) 8067 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9980 (iv).
Harrison, Mr., Inspector of Fisheries, N.B., Resignation (Ques.) 288 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D.—*Con.*

Hatchey, Nazaire, Appnmt. as Harbour Master, (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
McMonagle, Miles, Dismissal from Beacon Light, N.B. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
Mehan, Dr., Meterological Service, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Oromocto Shoals, N.B., Dismissal of Miles McMonagle, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).
Rivers, Robert, Dismissal from Miscou Light-house (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, N.B., religions) 4821 (ii).
Indians: N.B. (St. John river, pet., &c.) 6352 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Bay du Vin) 1164; (Lord's Cove, wharf) 1177; (Great Salmon River) 1177; (Negro Point, breakwater) 1182; (Oromocto, wharf) 1181; (St. John, harbour) 1183; (St. John river, tributaries) 1177 (i).
Tracadie Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 543 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Contract with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2759 (ii).
Venoit, P. I., Customs Collector at Bathurst, Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3629 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6969 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11169 (v).
Binder Twine Inspector, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4959 (ii).
——— Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5588 (iii).
——— Penalties *re* Inspection (remarks) 14048 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection.'
Bridges over Canals, Maintenance by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5617 (iii).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).
——— Loans to by Govt. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).
——— Pilgrimage, Expenses, Losses, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).
Ernestown Station Postmaster, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).
False Creek, B.C., Lease to Burnett & Kelly (Ques.) 2758, 2919 (ii).
Grain carried by C. P. R. to St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9367 (iv); in Com. on B., 10697 (v).
G. T. Pacific Bill, Distribution to Members (remarks) 8918 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Haycock, Jos., Appnmt. as Inspector of Binder Twine (Ques.) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection of Staples.'

Immigrants at Quebec, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Immigration Expenditure, 1902 to 1903 (Ques.) 6269 (iii).

Immigration, Inspection, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6546 (iii).

——— Notice of M., 6522 (iii).

——— Nationality, &c., (Ques.) 2310 (i).

Immigration into Man., Houses and Fuel, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).

Immigration refused Admission, &c. (Ques.) 2310 (i), 2502 (ii).

Iron and Steel, Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7925, 7929, 7986 (iv).

Iron and Steel, Bounty Payments (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8088 (iv), 10763 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8206, 8228 (iv).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10828 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on Sen. Amts., 13846 (vi).

Ry. Carriage of Mails, &c. (Ques.) 6268 (iii).

Railway Subsidies, Amounts paid from 1900 to 1903 (Ques.) 13370 (vi).

——— Interest payable, &c. (Ques.) 3970 (ii).

——— voted for 1900, 1901, 1902 (Ques.) 12842, 13027, 13259, 13934 (vi).

——— voted and paid by Govt. 1901-3 (Ques.) 2306 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Service *re* (Ques.) 13259 (vi).

Supply:

Agriculture (experimental farms) 4549 (ii).
Canals: Beauharnois (dykes) 14152; Generally (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157 (vi).
Civil Govt.: Finance (contingencies) 227 (i); Finance (insurance) 12587 (v); Sec. of State (printing, &c.) 223; (salaries) 223 (i).
Customs (Napanee collector, salary) 3919 (ii).
Dom. Lands (Banff Hot springs, baths) 6789; (Stewart, inspector of forests) 6774; (tree culture) 6774 (iii).
Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5283 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6660; (Devlin, Mr., successor) 6731; (expenditures) 6615; (White, Mr., expenses) 6732 (iii).
Indians: B.C. (industrial schools) 7254 (iii).
Inland Revenue (excise inspections) 5364 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7766; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7766 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii); (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Paris agency) 12589 (v); (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6969 (iii); (Printing Bureau, plant) 12587 (v).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Supply—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4104 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 636; (Ft. William) 637 (i).
Ottawa (additional rooms) 13012 (vi); (Rideau Hall, grounds, &c.) 5006 (ii); (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 993 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Glace Bay) 1094 (i).
Ont. (Port Arthur, dredging) 13019 (vi).
Miscellaneous (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi).
Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 2701; (Portage du Fort) 2099 (ii).
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice slides) 2678 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (St. Lawrence) 5007 (ii).
Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5494; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5499 (iii); (small-pox) 5029 (ii); (trachoma disease) 5494 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (G. T. R. rental) 12888 (vi); (Rivière du Loup engine houses, &c.) 12593 (v); Miscellaneous (Ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *S. Renfrew.*

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14052 (vi).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10735 (v).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5076 (ii); in Com. on B., 5424 (iii).

Can. Central and O. & B. Ry., Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5622 (iii).

C. P. R. Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 9455 (iv).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10754 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3054 (ii).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6416 (iii).

Electric Lighting in Renfrew, 14137 (vi).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 300 (i).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10817 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10483 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com, of Sup., 772 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8095 (iv).

K. and P. Ry. (remarks) 5622 (iii).

Milk Can B.: *See* 'Weights,' &c

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1307 (i).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telegraph poles) 5350 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6480, 7225, 7228 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7629 ; (creameries) 7633 (iv).

Canals : Cornwall (electric lighting) 14137 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7593 (iv).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 13108 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12858 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii)

Weights and Measure Act (milk cans) Amt. B. (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2346 (i).

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

ABRAM'S RIVER, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

ACADEMY OF ARTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

——— *See* 'Agriculture, Arts.'

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

'ACADIAN,' SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

——— *See* 'Marine.'

ACETYLENE, GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

——— IN LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

ACTON VALE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 18 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 23; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 40; (Mr. *Monk*) 55; (Mr. *Charlton*) 67; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 75 (i).

ADDRESS, THE, REPLY FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1204 (i).

AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS:

ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3127 (ii).

DOMINION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5589 (iii).

EASTER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

LABOUR DAY, DELAYING SESSION, &C. (remarks) 10742 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10489 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 10712 (v).

PROCEDURE *re* ADJOURNMENT: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Sproule*) 6630 (iii).

THANKSGIVING DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13790 (vi).

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 4; *pro forma.*

ADMIRALTY COURT, ACCOMMODATION FOR SITTINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

ADVERTISING (GOVT.) IN NEWSPAPERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5267–5274 (iii).

'ADVOCATE,' PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTION PROCLAMATION: in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

——— *See* 'Prince Albert.'

AFFIDAVITS *re* P. O. SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR N. W. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REBATE FOR 1901–2: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3803 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION SEL. COM.: M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5679 (iii).

——— REP. *re* BINDER TWINE: *See* 'Binder Twine,' &c.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:

ACADEMY OF ARTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL LECTURERS IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).

AGRICULTURE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4429, 4548, 4800 (ii), 7053 (iii),

——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).

——— SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4349 (ii).

AIDS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).

ANDERSON, MR. J. G., APPNMT. AS FRUIT INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13372 (vi).

——— Remarks *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).

ANTHRAX IN CATTLE, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10102 (v).

APPLES, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S STATEMENT *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).

ARCHIVES, CANADIAN, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5417 (iii).

——— RE-ORGANIZATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13503 (vi).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

ART GALLERY, ENCOURAGEMENT TO CANADIAN ARTISTS: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE ON PAINTINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12717 (vi).

——— NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 2725 (ii), 12589 (v).

BURRARD, B.C., CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

BUTTER ADULTERATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Blain*) *re* Irish Butter in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING, REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 5414 (iii).
BUTTER, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712, 10745 (v).
BUTTER MADE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593, 1857 (i).
CANADIAN APPLES: *See* 'Apples.'
CANADIAN ARTISTS AND ART GALLERY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION, GOVT. AID *re* TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
CANADIAN BUTTER, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712, 10745 (v).
CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU, SUIT AGAINST W. T. R. PRESTON: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
CANADIAN EXHIBITS AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
——— *See* 'Imperial.'
CANADIAN TRADE WITH JAPAN: *See* 'Japan Exhibition.'
CARLETON, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).
CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 267 (i).
——— LORD ONSLOW'S DECLARATION: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 14054 (vi).
——— Papers laid on Table, 591 (i).
CATTLE INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
——— ON STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
CATTLE PURCHASED BY BRITISH GOVT.: Par. in Montreal *Gazette* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 5415.
CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; (Neg. Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).
CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
CENSUS: in Com. of Sup., 4594 (ii).
——— CARLETON, &C., N.B., RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).
——— CIRCULAR OF MR. COTE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
——— COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 69) 13759 (vi).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Monk*) 13368 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13672 (vi).
——— GRAND MANAN, N.B., RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).
——— LAND VALUES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 286 (i).
——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).
——— SCHEDULES, HALTON, PEEL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii), 11425 (v).
——— SCHEDULES, 1891, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7054 (iii).
——— SCHEDULES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4635.
——— STAFF EMPLOYED *re* ALTERATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13935 (vi).
——— TOTAL COST: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iii).
——— TOTAL COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
——— TOTAL COST, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 289, 479, 544 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 203 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 204 (i).
CIRCULARS TO CURÉS, P.Q., *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
CLASSIFYING RECORD: in Com. of Sup., 12592.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii), 7086 (iii), 7610 (iv).
COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7632.
CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
DAIRYING BRANCH, AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
——— COLD STORAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii).
DEPUTY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Amount paid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 7055 (iii).
EXHIBITION FURNITURE, &C., AT PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).
EXHIBITIONS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).
——— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1937 (i).
FOOD ANALYSIS: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
FRUIT INSPECTORS BUYING APPLES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
——— *See* 'Anderson.'
FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE TO EUROPE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Smith*, *Wentworth*) 3805 (ii).
——— VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith*, *Wentworth*) 3232 (ii).
FUMIGATION STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).
GAUDET, COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
GENERAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
GOLD NUGGETS, EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
GREY COUNTIES, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE, SUPPLIES *re* QUARANTINE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
HAGAR, MISS, APPNMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5316 (iii).
HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
See 'Census.'
HEALTH ACT, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4440 (ii). *See* 'Public Health.'
HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).
IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CANADIAN EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, INFLUX OF: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 3713 (ii).
JAPAN EXHIBITION, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii),
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv.)
LEPROSY IN CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes. Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
See 'St. Louis.'
MINING EXHIBIT.: *See* 'Can. Exhibit,' &c.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
See 'Arts,' &c.
O'HALLORAN, GEO. F., DEP. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
ONSLOW, LORD, *re* CATTLE EMBARGO; *See* 'Cattle Embargo.'
ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
OSAKA EXHIBITION: *See* 'Japan.'
PATENT BRANCH, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
PATENTS, CLASSIFICATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4433 (ii).
PEEL, CARDWELL AND HALTON, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436 (iii).
See 'Halton,' &c.
PETHICK, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
'POULTRY FARMING,' PAMPHLET OF DEPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 7640 (iv).
PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
See 'Health.'
PUBLIC HEALTH, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii).
QUARANTINE, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i) 13030 (vi).
QUARANTINE, ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (i).
ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
RUTHERFORD, DR., DUTIES IN ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3001 (ii).
——— LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 4037 (ii).
See 'Live Stock.'
SAN JOSE SCALE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii).
SAUNDERS, DR. C. E., APPNMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 1676 (i).
SHUTT, PROF., REPORT *re* SOFT PORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
SIMCOE COUNTY, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SMALL-POX, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5491 (iii).
SUNBURY, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).
TORONTO INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 534 (i), 13501 (vi).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii).
TUBERCULOSIS, AID TO CAN. ASSOCIATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
VETERINARY CHIEF INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1591 (i).
VETERINARY DIVISION, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

AIDS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

——— CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).

AITKEN'S WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).

ALASKAN BOUNDARY AWARD, &C., TEL. FROM LONDON *re* LORD ALVERSTONE'S REFERENCE TO CANADIAN CRITICISM: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).
——— ALLEGED INTERVIEW WITH MR. AYLESWORTH: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi).
——— ALLEGED INTERVIEW WITH MR. AYLESWORTH, VERIFICATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13667 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 14287 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 14289 (vi).
See 'Interview.'
——— Official Information, Inquiry for Cor., &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14521 (vi).
——— BOND-HAY TREATY, &C.: Inquiry for Papers *re* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 878 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Monk*) 853 (i).
——— COMMISSION, CABLEGRAM FROM LORD ALVERSTONE: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13806 (vi).
——— Cor. *re*, Laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14688 (vi).
——— CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, ABROGATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 109 (i).
——— Inquiry for ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7297 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on Alaska Award, 14521 (vi).
——— COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 2299 (ii).
——— EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii), 13957 (vi).
——— GOVT. RESPONSIBILITY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14791 (vi).
——— HISTORY OF CASE, &C.: Recapitulation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14773 (vi).
——— JUDGMENT, &C.: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Bell*) 13671 (vi).
——— Notice *re* proposed Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14765 (vi).
——— REFUSAL OF CAN. COMMISSIONERS TO SIGN AWARD: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14402 (vi).
——— SUMMARY PUBLISHED: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10536 (v).
——— TEL. FROM MR. SIFTON: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14529 (vi).
——— TREATY, CONVENTION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 480 (i).

'ALASKA,' STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629 (iii).

ALBANY STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
——— *See* 'B.C.'

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 75.)

Alberta Railway and Coal Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 3582; in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 76.)

ALBERT COUNTY, HARBOUR-MASTER, DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

ALBERTON, P.E.I., RY. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
ALCOHOL: *See* 'Wood.'
ALERT,' STR., *re* CANAL SURVEYS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup.. 12900 (vi).
ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE TO: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALEXANDRIA WOOD EXPORT CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).
Algoma Ry.: *See* 'Bruce.'
Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2172 (ii); in Com., 5361; 3°*, 5361 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 77.)
ALIEN LABOUR ACT, PROSECUTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3971 (ii).
Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. No. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i), 3282 (ii).
Aliens: *See* 'Naturalization.'
ALLANS' CONTRACT *re* ATLANTIC SERVICES, DISCRIMINATING RATES *re* CAN. FREIGHT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13674 (vi).
——— *See* 'Atlantic Fast SS.'
ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937 (vi).
——— *See* 'Atlantic,' 'C.P.R. Steamers,' &c.
Allan, William, Relief B. No. 196 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 4179; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 78.)
Alliance Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) M. to receive Pet., 4958 (ii); 1°*, 5512; 2°m., 5585; in Com., 7470; 3°*, 7478 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 79.)
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
ALUMINUM, OXIDE OF, IMPORTS INTO CAN., PORTS OF ENTRY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1035 (i).
ALVERSTONE, LORD: *See* 'Alaskan Boundary.'
AMAGANDUS WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
Amalgamated Engineers: *See* 'Dom. Institute,' &c.
AMHERSTBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
AMHERST, N.S., POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell* 1591 (i).
AMQUI STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
ANCHOR LINE SALVAGE COMPENSATION FOR 'SCOTIA': in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY LAKE: in Com. of Sup. 1451 (i).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup , 1163 (i).
ANDERSON, MR. J. G., APPNMT. AS FRUIT INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13372 (vi).
——— Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. No. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1°*, 4003; 2°m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690; 3°*, 4691 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 11.)
ANNANDALE PIER, P.E.I., AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
——— RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii)
ANNUAL DRILL, CAMPS: in Com of Sup., 5005 (ii).
ANNUAL DRILL OF MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3603 (ii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTHRAX IN CATTLE, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10102 (v).
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
——— TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
ANTIGONISH POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
APPLES, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S STATEMENT *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
ARBITRATION AND AWARDS, *re* PUBLIC WORKS, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vi).
ARCHITECT'S (CHIEF) OFFICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
ARCHITECTS *re* PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).
ARCHITECTS STAFF, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
ARCHIVES, CANADIAN, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5417 (iii).
——— DEPT., RE-ORGANIZATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13503 (vi).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
ARICHAT, N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
ARMOURIES, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

ARSENALS, DOM., CONSTRUCTION IN CAN.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

ARSENAULT, CAPT., COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGES TO SCHR.: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

ART GALLERY, ENCOURAGEMENT TO CANADIAN ARTISTS: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE ON PAINTINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12717 (vi).

——— NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 2725 (ii).

——— *See* 'Portrait.'

ASCENSION ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3127 (ii).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

Ashley, Harford, Relief B. No. 236 (Mr. *Porter*) 1°*, 8115; 2°*, 9431 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 12146 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 80).

ASSAY OFFICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii); 13779, 13965 (vi).

ASSENT, ROYAL: *See* 'Bills.'

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. No. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) 1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 5558, 5584, 5887, 5960, 6845; 3°*, 6845 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 203).

ASTRONOMICAL, DEMARCATION WORK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i); 6791 (iii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) 1°*, 446; on order for 2°, 631, 664, 852; 2° m., 1505 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6617 (iii).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).

ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4007 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 14158; Neg. (Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).
Debate: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14171; (Mr. *Sproule*) 14178; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 14185; (Mr. *Bell*) 14193; (Mr. *Logan*) 14203; (Mr. *Gourley*) 14204; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 14215; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14216 (vi).

——— TENDERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3882, 4120 (ii).

——— INQUIRY (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Stmnt., 4445 (ii).

——— TENDERS RECEIVED: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4727 (ii).

——— ALLAN'S CONTRACT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv); 13672 (vi).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Halifax* 7091 (iii).

——— ALLAN STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN, REDUCTION IN NUMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, ALLAN STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN, REDUCTION IN NUMBER: Remarks *re* Amt. to Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13948 (vi).

——— PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806; M. for 3°, 1810, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 81).

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. No 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 11159 (v); Order dschgd., 13444 (vi).
Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13990 (vi).

——— GOVTL., INTENTION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11692 (v), 13258 (vi).

AUDITING DEPTL. FINANCES: Remarks *re* Martineau Investigation, 6933 (iii).

AUD. GENERAL AUDITING BOOKS OF RY. COS., *re* SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Res., 14516 (vi).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

——— OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD, PAYMENTS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 10956 (v).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 11427 (v).

——— CIRCULAR FROM AUD. GEN.: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 11552 (iv).

——— *See* 'Audit Act,' &c.

AURORA FOUNDRY, MANUFACTURE OF POST BOXES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).

AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

AUSTRALIA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS IN N. W. T., REP. OF INSPECTORS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*) 847, 880 (i).

AUTOMOBILES FOR P.O. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).

AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T., Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).
Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 13856; (Mr. *Oliver*) 13883 (Mr. *Hackett*) 13894; (Mr. *Sproule*) 13894; (Mr. *Davis*) 13896; (Mr. *McCreary*) 13897; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 13905; (Mr. *Scott*) 13914 (vi).

——— *See* 'Provincial'.

AYLESWORTH, MR.: *See* 'Alaskan Boundary.'

AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com of Sup., 1072 (i).

BAIN, MR., ASS'T COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT., &c.: Remarks in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B., 4010 (ii).

Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 13263 (vi).

Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).

Balsam Lake Locks: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).

—— *See* 'Trent.'

Bananas imported, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1198 (i).

Bance, Mr., Promotion, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

Banff, Bath House, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii), 13955 (vi).

—— Coal Reserve, Leases by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).

—— Museum Building, Addition, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

—— Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. No. 234 (Mr. *Henderson*) 1°, 7565 (iv).

Bankers' Association, Inspection Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 819 (i).

Bankers, Private, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 285 (i).

Bank Failures since Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 6435 (iii).

Bank of Montreal B. No. 72 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 82).

Bank of Winnipeg Incorp. B. No. 79 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 83).

Banks, Unclaimed Balances: Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (ii).

—— *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

—— *See* 'Alliance,' 'Citizens, &c.', 'City and County,' 'Crown,' 'Home,' 'Mount Royal,' 'Northern,' 'Sterling.'

Baptists, N.B., Census Enumeration, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 4801 (ii).

Barachois de Malbaie, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

Barnes, Amos, Claims for Land, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6922 (iii).

Barr Colony, Mr. Haultain's Speech, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 6354 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Sifton*) 6355, 6375; (Mr. *Lennox*) 6358; (Mr. *Bell*) 6360; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx*) 6365; (Mr. *Gourley*) 6369; (Mr. *Scott*) 6371; (Sir *William Mulock*) 6383; (Mr. *Fowler*) 6384; (Mr. *Davis*) 6391; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6394, 6400; (Mr. *Henderson*) 6404 (iii).

Barr Colony and Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

—— Number, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).

Barrie, Wharf, Construction: in Com. of Sup, 1186 (i), 13452 (vi).

—— P. O., Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).

Barry's Bay, Ont., Madawaska River: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).

Barton, Sir Edmund, Expenditure *re* Can. Visit in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

Bass River, Permanent Light: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

Bathurst Customs Collector, Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

—— Fishery Inspector: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

—— Harbour Buoys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

—— Harbour Master, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

Batiscan River Channel, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).

Bauxite, Tons imported in 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1678 (i).

Baxter's Harbour, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

Bay du Vin Wharf, Reconstruction: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).

Bayfield Harbour Works, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

Bayfield, Ont., Extension Piers: in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).

'Bayfield,' Str., Repairs and Sale, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5278, 5282, 5762 (iii).

—— Sale, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5586 (iii).

—— in Com. of Sup., Mr. Evans Reps., &c.: Read (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 5742, 5763 (iii).

Bay of Fundy Fish Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14435 (vi).

Beach Point, P.E.I., Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

Beauharnois Canal, Flooding Lands, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

Beauharnois Electoral District Representation and Independence of Parlt. Act: (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

—— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

Beaver River Fish Hatchery, Establishment: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Beersville Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi.).

Behring Sea Arbitration, Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

Belfast Pier, P.E.I., Dredging: in Com. of Sup 1153 (i).

Bell, Dr., Appnmt. as Director of Geological Survey: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

Belle Isle Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup. 2712, 2989 (ii).

Belle Riviere, Sheet Piling, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).

Bell Telephone and C. P. R. Agreement, &c: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

—— *See* 'Ry. B. 21,' 'Telephones,' &c.

BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup.. 969 (i), 13082 (vi).

—— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5588 (iii).

BELMONT ACCIDENT, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14154

BENNETT, MR., INCREASE IN SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13967 (vi).

BENOIT'S COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Clare*) 1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 84).

BERNIER, CAPT., GOVT. AID TO, *re* POLAR EXPEDITION: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 12805 (vi).

BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).

BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

BIG POND WHARF, N.S., SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).

BILLS, PRIVATE, DELAY IN TRANSLATION AND PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 482 (i).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 5427, 6388 (iii), 8655 (iv), 14858 (vi).

—— COMS. FROM GOV. GEN'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5315, 6353 (iii), 8642 (iv), 14844 (vi).

BILLS WITHDRAWN: M. (Mr. *Hyman*) 7203 (iii).

—— *See* 'Business,' &c.

BILLS:

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1°*, 4; *pro formâ*.

BILL (No. 2) To amend Chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1900, authorizing the granting of Railway Subsidies.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1° m., 92; 2° m., 545; in Com., 550; ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., 700; in Com., 1059; 3° m., 1199 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 56).

BILL (No. 3) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1°*, 92; 2° m., 885; in Com., 902, 1200 (i). M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; in Com., 13560, 14405; wthdn., 14769 (vi).

BILL (No. 4) Respecting Telephone Companies.—(Mr. *Maclean*).
1°*, 92; 2° m., 700 (i).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Maclean*).
1° m., 92; 2° m., 701 (i).

BILL (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Lancaster*).
1° m., 93; 2° m., 552; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., agreed to (Y., 99; N., 53) 565 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 7) To amend Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes with respect to retiring allowances of Judges.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 93; wthdn., 634 (i).

BILL (No. 8) To amend the Expropriation Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 93; 2°*, 291; in Com., 291, 612, 632; 3°*, 945 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 22).

BILL (No. 9) To amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2° m., 313; in Com., 313; 3°*, 314 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 73).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 10) To amend the Act relating to the Custody of Juvenile Offenders in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2°*, 314; in Com., 314; 3°*, 316 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 30).

BILL (No. 11) To amend the Act respecting the Publication of the Statutes.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2°*, 634; in Com., 634; 3°*, 635 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 65).

BILL (No. 12) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 95; 2°*, 316; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 13).

BILL (No. 13) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 95; 2° and in Com., 635; on Order for Com., 945, 1115, 2239; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 12).

BILL (No. 14) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Law*).
1°*, 113; 2° m., 1061; in Com., 1062 (i).

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Clancy*).
1°*, 114; 2° m., 704 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 19).

BILL (No. 16) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 114; 2°, 871 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 17) To aid in the Settlement of Railway Labour Disputes.—(Sir *William Mulock*).
1°*, 114; 2° m., 2535 (ii); in Com., 2923; 3°*, 3298 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5653 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 55).

BILL (No. 18) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1° m., 125; on Order for 2°, 566, 705; 2° m., 916; negatived, 939 (i).

BILL (No. 19) Respecting Drainage on and across the property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1° m., 202; 2°*, 916 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 20) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1° m., 203; 2° m., 2338 (i), 3245 (ii).

BILL (No. 21) To amend and consolidate the Law respecting Railways.—(Mr. *Blair*).
1° m., 244 (i); 2°*, 2585; M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591 (i), 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5513, 5560, 5679, 5765, 6071, 6170, 6172, 6202, 6271, 7299 (iii), 7609, 8125; 3° m., 8334 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13834, 14519, 14663, 14690, 14734, 14740, 14760, 14762, 14844 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 58).
—— Salaries of Ry. Commissioners, &c., Res. prop., 8085; in Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).

BILL (No. 22) To amend the Supreme Court and Exchequer Court Acts.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).

BILL (No. 23) To indemnify those who suffered damages in consequence of Fires caused by Railways.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1° m., 283 (i); 2° m., 2780 (ii); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 24) To extend the power of Loan Companies.—(Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*).
1° m., 284; 2°*, 1025; in Com., 2349 (i); 3°*, 2756 (ii); Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).

BILL (No. 25) Respecting the Eastern Townships Bank.—(Mr. *McIntosh*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1853 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 115).

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. *Costigan*).
1°*, 367; 2° m., 630, 664 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 27) Respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1025 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 92).

BILL (No. 28) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; M. for Com., 1804 ; in Com., 1806 ; M. for 3°, 1810, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 81).

BILL (No. 29) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Geoffrion*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 121).

BILL (No. 30) To incorporate the Federal Oil Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 120).

BILL (No. 31) Repecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—(Mr. *Calvert*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., 1854 ; 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 206).

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 (i).

BILL (No. 33) To incorporate the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 141).

BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 446 ; 2°*, 632 (i).

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson*).
1°*, 446 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 108).

BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ball*).
1°*, 446 ; on Order for 2°, 631, 664, 852 ; 2° m., 1505 (i) ; M. *re* Ry. Com., 6617 (iii).

BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Champagne*).
1°*, 540 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 173).

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 124).

BILL (No. 39) To make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to Animals, and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Brock*).
1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 1324 ; in Com., 1324 (i) ; 2779, 3237 (ii)

BILL (No. 40) To confer on the Commisssioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the International Railway Appliance Company.—(Mr. *Brock*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 133).

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 142).

BILL (No. 42) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 75).

BILL (No. 43) To incorporate the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 852 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 182).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i).

BILL (No. 45) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 89).

BILL (No. 46) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Harty*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 976 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 139).

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Nipissing and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 166).

BILL (No. 48) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1° m., 592 ; 2° m., 1065 (i) ; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

BILL (No. 49) To amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 204 ; in Com. on Res., 593 ; 1°* of B., 597 ; 2°, 1116 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1116 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 10).

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway (Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 853 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 87).

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Northern Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 853 (i) ; in Com., 2753 ; 3°*, 2755 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 168).

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bazinet*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 135).

BILL (No. 53) Respecting Insolvency.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1° m., 654 ; 2° m., 2373 (i) ; on Order for 2°, 2787 ; 2° m., 3248 ; neg. (Y., 41 ; N., 74), 3256 (ii).

BILL (No. 54) Respecting the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, and to change its name to the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., 2303 ; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 94).

BILL (No. 55) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 (i).

BILL (No. 56) To incorporate the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. *Girard*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 179).

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr *German*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., 1811 ; 3°*, 1812 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 161).

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Edmonton Street Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 (i).

BILL (No. 59) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1°*, 707 ; on Order for 2°, 977 ; 2° m., 1327, 1511 (i) ; M. *re* Ry. Com., 6523 ; Neg. (Y., 51 ; N., 87), 6537 (iii).

BILL (No. 60) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ross, Ontario*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 1327 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 130).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the Winnipeg Western Land Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 204).

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., 2716; 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 169).

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *McGugan*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 145).

BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); M. for Com., 4132; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 4441, 4586; M. for Com., 4871 (ii); in Com., 5139 (iii) 7814; 3° m., 8055, 8321 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 122).

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada (Mr. *Bruce*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2304; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 159).

BILL (No. 66) To Readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1° m., 708; 2° m., 1207; ref. to Sel. Com., 1294 (i); Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 7293 (iii); M. for Com., 10832, 10903; in Com., 10911, 10958, 11087, 11427, 11567, 11692, 12293; 3° m., 12372, 12492 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 60).

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Brockville and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor*).
1°*, 813 (i).

BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1°*, 813; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 146).

BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the North-west Coal and Coke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 813; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 167).

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 147).

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Imperial Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 2956, 3170 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 132).

BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 82).

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Power Co.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 4868; 3° m., 4869; 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 170).

BILL (No. 74) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Guthrie*).
1° m., 814 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3247 (ii).

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*).
1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 98).

BILL (No. 76) To enable the City of Vancouver to acquire certain lands and interests adjoining Vancouver Harbour.—(Mr. *Macpherson*).
1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 77) To promote the Safety of Railway Employees.—(Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*).
1°* m., 872; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2387 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 78) To amend the Militia Pension Act, 1901.—(Sir *Frederick W. Borden*).
1°* m., 872; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2240; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 35).

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 83).

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Canada North-west Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 93).

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5585 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 85.)

BILL (No. 82) Respecting and restricting Chinese Immigration.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
Res. prop., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°-4 of B., 945; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2398; 3°*, 2399 (i); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 8).

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the New Canadian Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Lemieux*.)
1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 1328; 2° m., 1512, 2241; in Com., 2241 (i), 2720; ref. back to Com., 2753; in Com., 3221; 3°*, 3222 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 160.)

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1338; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 176.)

BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Clare*.)
1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 84.)

BILL (No. 86) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*.)
1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°*, 2387 (i); 2° m., 2788, 3257, 3807 (ii).

BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson*.)
1°*, 1111; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., 4587; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 199.)

BILL (No. 88) Respecting the Mutual Fire Insurance Company, of the City of Montreal, and to change its name to the 'Montreal Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. *LaRivière*.)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 158.)

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Brockville and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)
1° m., 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i).

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company, Limited; and to change its name to the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—(Mr. *Guthrie*.)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 163.)

BILL (No. 91) To incorporate the Dominion Gas Improvement Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 114.)

BILL (No. 92) Respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited; and to change its name to the 'Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. *Bickerdike*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 92)—*Con.*
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 113.)
BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Shipping Federation of Canada.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 1193; 2° m., 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 190.)
BILL (No. 94) Respecting Incorporated Companies.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 1193 (i); 2° m., 3257 (ii).
BILL (No. 95) To amend the Conciliation Act 1900.—(Mr. *Puttee.*)
1° m., 1193 (i); 2° m., 2790; 2° m., and in Com., 3259, 3260 (ii).
BILL (No. 96) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 138.)
BILL (No. 97) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 148.)
BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i).
BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 1294; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 91.)
BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Sterling Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i) (3 *Edward VII*, c. 194.)
BILL (No. 101) To Incorporate the London Loan Company of Canada.—(Mr. *McGugan.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1815 (i).
BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°m., 1812; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 5892; 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 181.)
BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Royal Trust Company.—(Mr. *Casgrain.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i) (3 *Edward VII*, c. 185.)
BILL (No. 104) To incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., 6655; on Order for Com., 6846, 7137, 7339; in Com., 7339, 7400; 3°m., 7468 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 88).
BILL (No. 105) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Standard Car Truck Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 192.)
BILL (No. 106) To amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i), 3282 (ii).
BILL (No. 107) To incorporate the Empire Accident and Surety Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 2755; 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c 118).
BILL (No. 108) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 171.)
BILL (No. 109) To correct a clerical error in the Act to incorporate the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 1378 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 2581 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 18.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 110) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 97.)
BILL (No. 111) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 116.)
BILL (No. 112) To incorporate the Canada Industrials Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 95.)
BILL (No. 113) To incorporate the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 3225; 3°*, 3225 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 188.)
BILL (No. 114) Respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 165.)
BILL (No. 115) To incorporate the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Tobin.*)
1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1816; in Com., 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 83).
BILL (No. 116) Respecting the Restigouche Boom Company, and to change its name to 'The Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Company.—(Mr. *Logan.*)
1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1816 (i).
BILL (No. 117) To incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 128).
BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 90).
BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 3582; in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 76.)
BILL (No. 120) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 143.)
BILL (No. 121) To incorporate the Consolidated Trust Corporation.—(Mr. *McColl*).
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 110).
BILL (No. 122) Respecting the Rathbun Company.—(Mr. *Harty*).
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 180).
BILL (No. 123) To incorporate the Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4588 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 131).
BILL (No. 124) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Stewart*).
1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii (3 *Edward VII*, c. 129).
BILL (No. 125 To incorporate the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. *Guthrie*).
1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, c. 125).
BILL (No. 126) Respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. *Thompson*).
1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, c. 153).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 127) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George M. Depew.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 112).

BILL (No. 128, from the Senate) For the relief of William Francis Schooley.—(Mr. *Boyd*).
1°*, 2100; 2° m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 189).

BILL (No. 129) Respecting the Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Guthrie*).
1°*, 1936; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2756 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, c. 111).

BILL (No. 130) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Henderson*).
1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285, 3823 (ii).

BILL (No. 131) To incorporate the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *McIsaac*).
1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 5093, 5359; 3°*, 5360 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 149).

BILL (No. 132) To incorporate the Père Marquette International Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, c. 175).

BILL (No. 133) To prohibit the importation, manufacture, or sale of Cigarettes.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1° m., 2014 (i); 2° m., 3286 (ii).

BILL (No. 134) To incorporate the Erie, Ontario Power Company.—(Mr. *German*).
1°*, 2100; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751, 3982; 3°*, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 119).

BILL (No. 135) To incorporate the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway Company.—(Mr. *Logan*).
1°*, 2100 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978, 6399; 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 178).

BILL (No. 136) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 2100 (i); 2° m., 3288 (ii).

BILL (No. 137) To regulate the sale and provide for the inspection of Textile Fabrics.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°, 2101 (i); 2° m., 3294 (ii).

BILL (No. 138) To amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1°*, 2100 (i); wthdn., 11302 (v).

BILL (No. 139) Respecting the St. Mary's River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4591 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 187).

BILL (No. 140) To incorporate the Cardiff Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4591; 3°*, 4592 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 103).

BILL (No. 141) Respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c, 152).

BILL (No. 142) Respecting the Elgin and Havelock Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fowler*).
1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, c. 117).

BILL (No. 143) Respecting the Canadian Northwest Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2300 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 3226, 3582, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 96).

BILL (No. 144) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 2395 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 134).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 145) Respecting the Quebec Bridge Company; and to change its name to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(*Mr. Power*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4586; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 177).

BILL (No. 146) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *Vrooman*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 144).

BILL (No. 147) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4672; order for Com., 4868 (ii); 5555 (remarks), 5882, 6198 (iii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7812; in Com., 9419; 3°*, 9431 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 196).

BILL (No. 148) respecting certain Trust Funds of the Diocese of Moosonee.—(Mr. *Osler*.)
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in. Com. and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 157).

BILL (No. 149) To incorporate the Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Company. (Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4587; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 126).

BILL (No. 150) To incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Galliher*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., 5559; in Com., and 3°*, 5585; Sen. Amts., 6847, 6894 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 109).

BILL (No. 151) To incorporate the St. Joseph Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Calvert*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii).

BILL (No. 152) To incorporate the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Riley*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 191).

BILL (No. 153) To incorporate the Mount Royal Savings Bank.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2720 (ii); wthdn., 10831 (v).

BILL (No. 154) To incorporate the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.—(Mr. *German*).
1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4592; 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 162).

BILL (No. 155) Respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1°*, 2501 (ii); 2° m., 8243; in Com., 8244, 8360; 3°*, 8369 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14769 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 21).

BILL (No. 156) To incorporate the Longueuil Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5558; 3°*, 5558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 156).

BILL (No. 157) To incorporate the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 5238; in Com., 5985; 3°*, 5989 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 86).

BILL (No. 158) To incorporate the St. Chrysostôme Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7399 (iii); in Com., 7771; 3°*, 7772 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 186).

BILL (No. 159) To incorporate the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 102).

BILL (No. 160) To incorporate the Stewart River Development Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 160)—*Con.*

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 195).

BILL (No. 161) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Woolf Valve Gear Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 205).

BILL (No. 162) Respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, and to change its name to the "Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company."—(Mr. *German*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 136).

BILL (No. 163) Respecting the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Thompson*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3796, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 198).

BILL (No. 164) To incorporate the Pacific Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Galliher*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 3796 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 174).

BILL (No. 165) To incorporate the Algonquin Lumber and Power Company.—(Mr. *Gould*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., 5361; 3°*, 5361 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 77).

BILL (No. 166) To incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gauvreau*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5891.

BILL (No. 167) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to "The Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company."—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

BILL (No. 168) To incorporate the Chicoutimi and North Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Girard*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii).

BILL (No. 169) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James Sinclair McDougall.—(Mr. *Gallery*.)

M. to rec. Pet., 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 151).

BILL (No. 170) To incorporate the Nepigon Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)

M. to rec. Pet., 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

BILL (No. 171) To incorporate the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company—(Mr. *Stephens*).

1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 105).

BILL (No. 172) To incorporate the City and County Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Rosamond*.)

1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3797 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 107).

BILL (No. 173) To change the name of Hudson's Bay.—(Mr. *Maclean*.)

1°m., 2794 (ii).

BILL (No. 174) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Paterson*.)

Res. prop., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; 1°* of B., 3126; 2°*, 4010; in Com., 4010; 3°m., 4187; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 14).

BILL (No. 175) Respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)

1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5583, 5960, 6199; 3°*, 6202 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 104).

BILL (No. 176) To incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. *German*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 176)—*Con.*

1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883; 3°*, 5887 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 101).

BILL (No. 177) Respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. *McIsaac*.)

M. to receive Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219; 2°*, 3583; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 140).

BILL (No. 178) Respecting the encouragement of the construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)

Res. prop., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; 2°, and in Com., 4678 (ii); 5871; 3°*, 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 17).

BILL (No. 179) To amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)

1°m., 3298 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6918; 3°*, 6921 (iii). (3 *Edward VII c.* 63).

BILL (No. 180) To incorporate the Prince Edward Island Ferry Company.—(Mr. *Emmerson*.)

1°*, 3391; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914; 3°, 7914 (iv).

BILL (No. 181) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *German*.)

1°m., 3391 (ii).

BILL (No. 182) To amend Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

1°m., 3392; 2°*, 4203; in Com., 4203; 3°*, 4213 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 50).

BILL (No. 183) Respecting the Desjardins Canal.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

1°m., 3393; 2°*, 4213; in Com., and 3°*, 4213 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 16).

BILL (No. 184) To amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)

1°m., 3622; 2°*, 4213; in Com., 4213, 4674 (ii); 3°*, 5243 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 46).

BILL (No. 185) Respecting the Canadian Steel Company.—(Mr. *German*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 3797; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 99).

BILL (No. 186) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4007; in Com., 4007; 3°*, 4009 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 26).

BILL (No. 187) To amend the Electric Light Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°m., 4007; in Com., and 3°*, 4007 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 20).

BILL (No. 188) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4009; in Com., 4009, 4187; 3°*, 4203 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 72).

BILL (No. 189) To incorporate the Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Birkett*.)

1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3°m., 7485; agreed to (Y., 57; N., 9); 7486 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 100).

BILL (No. 190) Respecting Queen's College, Kingston.—(Mr. *Harty*.)

1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4404 (ii).

BILL (No. 191, from the Senate) To incorporate the Home Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell*.)

1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 127).

BILL (No. 192) To enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr *Puttee*.)

1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 5558, 5584, 5887, 5960, 6845; 3°*, 6845 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 203).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 193) To amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford.*)
1° m., 3970; 2°*, 4221; in Com., 4221; 3°*, 4224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 194) Respecting infectious or contagious Diseases affecting Animals.—(Mr. *Fisher*).
1°*, 4003; 2° m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690; 3°*, 4691 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 195, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Reid Steele.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 4178; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 193.)

BILL (No. 196, from the Senate) For the Relief of William Allen.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 4179; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 78.)

BILL (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Rocky Mountains Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 4262; 2°*, 4404 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 184.)

BILL (No. 198) Respecting Penny Banks.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m., 4175 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793; 3°*, 10798 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 199) Respecting the Good Shepherd Reformatory in the City of St. John, N.B.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 4178; 2°, and in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4842 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 200) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1° m., 4442; in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); 2°*, and in Com., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn., 12493 (v.)

BILL (No. 291) To provide for further Advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop. 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445; 1°* of B., 4486 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5417; 3°, m., 5657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 202, from the Senate) To incorporate the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. *Russell.*)
1 *, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6846 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 155.)

BILL (No. 203) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 4261; 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 197.)

BILL (No. 204, from the Senate) To amend the Act relating to Naturalization and Aliens.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 5137; 2°, and in Com., 5872; 3° m., 5991 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 205, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 5238, 2°*, 5362; in Com., and 3°*, 6657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 200.)

BILL (No. 206) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5243 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 207) To prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of adulterated, process or renovated Butter, Oleomargarine, Butterine or other substitute for Butter; and to prevent the improper marking of Butter.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 207)—*Con.*
Res. prop., 4960; in Com. on Res., 5052 (ii); 1° of B., 5240; 2°, and in Com., 5419, 5430, 5845; 3°*, 5853 (iii). (3 *Edward VII,* c. 6.)

BILL (No. 208) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Sir *William Mulock.*)
1° m., 5240; 2° m., 5657; in Com., 5659, 5853; 3°*, 5871 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 209) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Res. prop., 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5100 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; 2°, and in Com., 5589, 5786; 3°*, 5824 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 210) Respecting the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool.*)
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 211) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 2°*, 5585; in Com., 6428 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 164.)

BILL (No. 212) To incorporate the Alliance Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 4958 (ii); 1°*, 5512; 2° m., 5585; in Com., 7470; 3°*, 7478 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 213) To incorporate the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5990; in Com., 7478; 3°*, 7479 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 214) For the Relief of Florence D. Graves.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 5581; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 123.)

BILL (No. 215) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 5581; 2°*, 6638; M. for Com., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746 (v); wthdn., 14768 (vi).

BILL (No. 216) Respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher*).
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 154.)

BILL (No. 217) Respecting Penitentiaries.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 5763 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v); Order dschgd, 13444 (vi).

BILL (No. 218) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1903, and the 30th June, 1904.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Remarks, 6170; 1°*, 2°*, 6170; in Com., 6171; 3°*, 6172 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 219, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting the punishment of Fradulent Debtors.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 220) Respecting Government and Post Office Savings Banks.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
1°, 6353; 2°*, and in Com., 6814; 3°*, 6815 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 221) Further to amend the Act respecting Public and Reformatory Prisons.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 6427 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8087; 3°*, 8087 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 51).

BILL (No. 222) Respecting Dominion Notes.—(Mr. *Fielding*)
Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; 2°, and in Com., 6913; 3°*, 6915 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 43).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 223) To amend the Act of 1899, respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6448; 1°*, of B., 6456; 2°*, and in Com., 6806; 3°*, 6814 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 45).

BILL (No. 224) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1° m., 6538; 2°, and in Com., 6896; 3°*, 6913 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 23.)

BILL (No. 225) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; 1°* of B., 6543; 2°, and in Com., 6915; 3°*, 6917 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 226) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
Res. prop., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6543; 1°* of B., 6545; 2°, and in Com., 6917; 3°*, 6918 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 34.)

BILL (No. 227, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act, 1902.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 228, from the Senate) For the relief of Stephen Wilson.—(Mr. *Wade*).
1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9149; in Com. and 3°*, 9152 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 202.)

BILL (No. 229, from the Senate) For the relief of Ellen McDermid.—(Mr. *Birkett*).
1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9148; in Com., and 3°*, 9149 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 150.)

BILL (No. 230, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting Offences connected with Trade and Breaches of Contract.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 231) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Keller Heater Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *McIsaac*).
M. to rec. Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294; 2°*, 7487 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 137.)

BILL (No. 232) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Sifton*).
1° m., 7294 (iii); 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991, 9350 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 33.)

BILL (No. 233) Respecting the Manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300, 7353; 1°*, 2°*. 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii), 7728 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 5.)

BILL (No. 234) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. *Henderson*).
1°, 7565 (iv).

BILL (No. 235) To provide for the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1° m., 7658; Res. prop., 7915; M. for Com. on Res., 8406, 8483, 8559, 8617, 8656, 8718, 8808, 8918, 9082, 9152, 9218, 9351, 9431, 9459, 9582, 9683, 9820, 9980 (iv), 10102, 10243; agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10408; in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°, and in Com. on B., 10412, 10538, 11190, 11302, 11833, 11959, 12074, 12146, 12221 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12720 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 236, from the Senate) For the relief of Harford Ashley.—(Mr. *Porter*).
1°*, 8115; 2°*, 9431 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 12146 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 80.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 237, from the Senate) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1° m., 12494 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12777; 3°*, 12779 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 238) To amend chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1899, respecting the Bounties on Steel and Iron, and to provide for the payment of Bounties on certain articles manufactured from Steel.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6629 (iii); in Com. on prop. Res., 7923; 1°* of B., 7988 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10799; 3°*, 10802 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 68.)

BILL (No. 239) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores mined in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
Res. prop., 6169 (iii), in Com. on Res., 8195; 1°* of B., 8230 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10798; 3°*, 10799 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 31.)

BILL (No. 240) To assist in establishing and maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain, for publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
Res. prop., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of B., 8243 (iv); 2°m., 10715; in Com., 10718; 3°*, 10741 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 241) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8404 (iv).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 3.)

BILL (No. 242) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)
1° m., 8321 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10741; 3°*, 10742 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 37.)

BILL (No. 243) To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)
Res. prop. 203 (i); withdn., 2582; Res. prop., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii), 8087; in Com. on Res., 8369; 1°*; 2°* of B.; in Com. and 3°*, 8372 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 29).

BILL (No. 244) Respecting the Western Assurance Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1°*, 8406; 2°*, 8559 (iv); in Com. and 3°*, 10903 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 201).

BILL (No. 245) To further amend the Civil Service Act.—(Sir *Wm. Mulock*.)
1° m., 9079 (iv); Res. prop., 10410; wthdn., 11301 (v).

BILL (No. 246, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting Freedom of Labour.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 247, from the Senate) To amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 248, from the Senate) Respecting the incorporation of Mining Companies.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 249) To incorporate the Westminster Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
M. to rec. Pet., 10489; 1°, 10744; 2°*, 10903 (v).

BILL (No. 250) Respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 250)—*Con.*

Prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 10759; 1°*; 2°*; and in Com., 10792, 11406; 3°*, 11422 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 251) To amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

1° m., 11159 (v); Order dischd., 13444 (vi).

BILL (No. 252) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)

Res. prop., 10410; in Com. on Res., 10802; 1°* of B., 11422; 2°*, and in Com., 12295; 3°*, 12500 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 253) To increase the Representation of the North-west Territories in the Senate.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 11691; 2°*, and in Com., 12302; 3°*, 12304 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 254) Further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 11692; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 12301 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 255) To provide for the Appointment of an Additional Judge of the Superior Court of Quebec.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Res. prop., 11426; in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° of Res., 11833; 1°* of B. 11833; 2°*, and in Com., 12301; 3°*, 12302 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 28.)

BILL (No. 256) To provide for Advances to the Government of the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Res. prop., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°* of B., 12330 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12843; 3°*, 12845 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 257) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Sir *William Mulock.*)

Res. prop., 10410, 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330; M. for Com., 12493; in Com. on Res., 12500; 1°* of B., 12574 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 13808, 13833; 3° m., 13942; Sen, Amts., 14845 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 258) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Res. prop., 8332 (iv); Res. wthdn., 10715; Res. prop., 11189; in Com. on Res., 12574; 1°* of B., 12584 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12944; 3°*, 12983 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 259) To amend the North-west Territories Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 12610; 2°, and in Com., 13853; 14287; 3°*, 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 260) To amend the Act respecting certain Works constructed in or over Navigable Waters.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

In Com. on Res., 12779; 1°* of B., 12781; 2°, and in Com., 12984; wthdn., 14768 (vi).

BILL (No. 261) Respecting the Pilotage District of Montreal, and the Port and Pilotage District of Quebec.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

Res. wthdn., 12493 (v); in Com. on Res., 12781; 1°* of B. 12800; 2° m., 12984; 2°, and in Com. 13627; 3° m., 13937 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 262) To amend the Act respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

In Com. on Res., 12304; wthdn., 12492 (v); in Com. on Res., 12800; 1°* of B., 12801; 2°, and in Com., 12993; 3°*, 12994 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 263) To amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 263)—*Con.*

In Com. on Res., 12801; 1°* of B., 12805; 2°, and in Com., 12994; 3°, 13560 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 64.)

BILL (No. 264) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ethier.*)

1°*; 2°*; and ref. to Ry. Com., 12993; in Com., and 3°*, 13330 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 172.)

BILL (No. 265) Respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1°, 13667; 2°*, and in Com., 14297; 3°*, 14299 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 266) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)

Prop. Res., 13264; in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808; 2°, and in Com., 14311; 3°*, 14313 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 267) Respecting the Librarians of Parliament.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14299; 3°*, 14300 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 268) Respecting the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14300, 14403; 3°*, 14405 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 69.)

BILL (No. 269) Respecting the Management and Control of Public and other Works.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 14281; 2°, and in Com., 14741: 3°*, 14755 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 270) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the Construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Prop. Res., 13549; in Com. on Res., 14313, 14428; 1°*, 14519; 2°, and in Com., 14735, 14740; 3°*, 14741 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 271) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1904.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 14765; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14768 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 272) To authorize aid to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company towards the completion of its undertaking, and to confirm an Agreement between His Majesty and the said Company, with respect to such aid.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Prop. Res., 14523; on Order for Com. on Res., 14690; 1°* of B., 14734; 2° m., 14734; in Com., and 3°*, 14735 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 273) To amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1897.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

In Com. on Ways and Means, 14755; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14758 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 15.)

BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE OF MANILLA, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7566 (v).

BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE OF SISAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8085 (iv).

Binder Twine Bounties B. No. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300, 7353; 1°*; 2°*, 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii), 7728 (iv). (3 *Edward VII,* c. 5.)

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7305, 7353 (iii).

BINDER TWINE, CIRCULAR ISSUED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).

—— CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4180 (ii).

—— COST IN 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 447 (i).

—— INSPECTION, ADMINISTRATION OF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).

—— INSPECTOR, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii).

—— INSPECTION, METHOD OF COLLECTING PENALTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 14684 (vi).

—— INSPECTOR HAYCOCK, DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).

—— INSPECTOR'S REP.: M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc. in Rep. on Agriculture, &c., 13788, 14043 (vi).

—— NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 3798 (ii).

—— PRICES FOR CURRENT YEAR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 203 (i).

—— PRICES FIXED FOR PENITENTIARY SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 159c (i).

—— QUANTITY, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 2311 (i).

—— QUANTITY IMPORTED FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7565 (iv).

—— REP. OF AG. COM., DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES: M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc., 13788, 14043 (vi).

—— RESIDENCES OF PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4182 (ii).

BIRKETT, MR. T., M.P., LEASE OF LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 12217 (v).

BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOUR MASTER FROM ALBERT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

BLACK, A. W., ENGLISH M.P., STATEMENTS *re* COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMAN CONSUL, 12218 (v).

BLACK BROOK, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).

BLAIR, HON. A. G., RESIGNATION: Announcement (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6540 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6522 (iii).

—— Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

BLANKETS, CLOTHING, INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).

BLANKETS, WEBCLOTH, PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 10102, 10410, 10714, 10954 (v).

BLIND RIVER, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).

—— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 1298 (i).

BLOOMFIELD POSTMASTER, N.B., CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BLUESHANK, P.E.I., STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).

Boards of Trade Incorp. B. (No. 247, from the Senate). [This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BOIS BRULÉ, TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

BONAVENTURE EAST, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

BOND-HAY TREATY: *See* 'Finance-German.'

BONDING PRIVILEGES WITH U. S.: *See* 'Coasting, &c.'

BONDED WAREHOUSES, P.E.I., RENTAL, CLOSING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

BOOK-KEEPING *re* I.C.R. EXPENDITURE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8269 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 12877

BOOTS FOR MAIL CARRIERS: *See* 'Post Office, &c.'

BOPP, GERMAN CONSUL, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

—— *See* 'German Tariff.'

BORDEN, MR., RY. POLICY: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790.

Bounties, &c.: *See* 'Lead, &c.', 'Steel and Iron'

BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N.B., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).

—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).

BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).

BOYD, SIR JOHN, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5990 (iii).

—— RELATIVES IN GOVT. EMPLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 4185 (ii).

BRACEBRIDGE, CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960

—— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).

—— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).

BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 157 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. to ref. back to sel. com., 5238; in Com., 5985; 3°*, 5989 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 86).

Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 940; 2°* 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5585 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 85).

BRANTFORD DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).

BRANTFORD ELECTORAL DISTRICT: in Com. on Representation B. 66, 10919 (v).

——*See* 'Representation B. 66.

BRANT INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., P.E.I., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

BRETON COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).

BRIDGES OVER CANALS, GOVERNMENT MAINTENANCE OF, &C.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BRIDGES OF I.C.R., STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).

BRIDGEWATER, N.S., DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).

BRIGADE CAMP, SUSSEX, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

British Cable News Service, G. B. and Can. B. No. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. prop., 8118 ; in Com. on Res., 8231 ; 1°* of B., 8243 (iv) ; 2°m., 10715 ; in Com., 10718 ; 3°*, 10741 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 70).

——Remarks *re* (Mr. *Gourley*) 1396 (vi).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 853 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 87).

BRITISH COLUMBIA :

ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup. 13304 (vi).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

ASSAY OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii), 13965 13779 (vi).

ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

BURRARD, CENSUS COMMISSIONERS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

CANNING INDUSTRY : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

——*See* 'Fraser,' 'Salmon,' &c.

CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO., *re* LIARD RIVER MINERS : in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOL : in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).

——*See* 'Indians.'

COLUMBIA RIVER, ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— OPENING CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).

CROW'S NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

DREDGING PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

——GRAVING DOCK : in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

FALSE CREEK, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. (Mr. *Earle*) for Copies*, 2337 (i).

——LEASE TO KELLY & BURNETT : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2758, 2919 (ii).

——Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Earle*) 3129 (ii), 5513, 6354 (iii).

FISHERIES PROTECTIVE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

FISHERIES STEAMERS, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 5278 (iii).

FLAGSHIP, BRITISH, REMOVAL FROM ESQUIMALT : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

FRASER RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRASER RIVER SALMON INDUSTRY, COMPLAINTS FROM CANNER'S ASSOCIATION TEL.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

——*See* 'Salmon,' &c.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).

HARDY BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).

HAZLETON HOSPITAL GRANT : in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

'HOT AIR LINE' RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

INDIANS : in Com of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——AGENTS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iii).

——FISHING RIGHTS *re* INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7264 (iii).

——MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS : in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii), 13786 (vi).

——STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT : in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, ROYAL COMMISSION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).

JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

KELLY & BURNETT, LEASE OF FALSE CREEK : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——*See* 'False Creek.'

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

——CORRECTION, &C : in Com., 14519 (vi).

LABOUR COMMISSION, REP. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 8116 (iv).

—— REP. *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 7198 (iii).

—— COMMISSIONERS, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1595 (i).

LABOUR TROUBLES, ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, B.C.*) 945 (i).

—— *See* 'Industrial.'

LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).

LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

LUMBER TRADE, TEL. FROM MANUFACTURERS : Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14766 (vi).

MCCRANEY, MR. W., EX-M.P., LETTER *re* LEGISLATION : Read (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5362 (iii).

MARINE SIGNAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

MILITARY RESERVE AT PORT MOODY : Ques (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

NELSON POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

—— RACINE BROS., CLAIMS AGAINST CONTRACTORS : in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

—— *See* 'Racine.'

NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.'s SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

NICOLA-KAMLOOPS, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).

OFFICERS' MESS., STR. 'QUADRA,' REGULATIONS *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

PORT MOODY, MILITARY RESERVE : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B.C. SALMON : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS'

BRITISH COLUMBIA--*Con.*

'QUADRA' STR.—*Con.*

MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).
QUATSINO CITY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
QUESNEL DAM, OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 11557 (v).
RACINE BROS., CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
——— AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*) 7162 (iii).
——— Letters read from Dep. Minister of Labour, &c., 7164 (iii).
ROSSLAND, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
SALMON COMMISSIONERS: M. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii).
SALMON INDUSTRY, FRASER RIVER, TELS. FROM CANNERS' ASSOCIATION, &C.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).
——— INCREASED CAPACITY OF HATCHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).
SALMON SHIPPED TO FRANCE FROM B.C., TARIFF *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O.C's., &c.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2016 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print, 2675 (ii).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).
UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
VANCOUVER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
VICTORIA AND VANCOUVER ISLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WILLIAMS HEAD, QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

BRITISH JOURNALISTS' AND MEMBERS' VISIT TO CAN., RECEPTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 7488 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 2105 (i).

B.N.A. BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE KING, EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14279 (vi).

BRITTON, JUDGE, CHARGES *re* INVESTIGATION OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION, PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11065 (v).

——— *See* 'Treadgold.'

BROAD COVE, N.S., HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).

Brockville and North-Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1° m., 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., 6655; on Order for Com., 6846, 7137, 7339; in Com., 7339, 7400; 3° m., 7468 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 88.)

——— M. (Mr. *Galliher*) for Com., 7339 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).
——— Appeal to Speaker from Dep. Speaker's Ruling (Mr. *Taylor*) 7342 (iii).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7401 (iii); M. (Mr. *Speaker*) for 3°, Agreed to (Y. 64; N. 35) 7468 (iii); 3° m. (Mr. *Galliher*) 7468; Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7469 (iii).
——— on M. to resume adjnd. Deb., 6847 (iii).

Brockville and Western Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 67 (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°*, 813 (i).

BRONTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
BRONTE LIGHTHOUSE: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5755, 5757 (iii).
BROOKFIELD STATION, ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
BROWN, MRS., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
BRUCE COUNTY, REPRESENTATION IN PARLT.: in Com. on Representation B. 66, 10940 (v).
——— *See* 'Representation B. 66.'

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s B. No. 98 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i).

BRUCE MINES AND ALGOMA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com of Sup., 5911 (iii).
BRUNET, ARTHUR, AND DOM. ELECTION ACT: M. for Pets., O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 101 (i).
——— *See* 'St. James,' &c.

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1378, 1743 (i).
——— Reply (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1462, 2192 (i).
Debate: (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1596; (Mr. *Tarte*) 1619; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1643; (Mr. *Gourley*) 1657; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1681; (Mr. *Davis*) 1715; (Mr. *Speaker*, irrelevancy of debate, Ruling) 1735, 1742; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1740; (Mr. *Fielding*) on Ques. of Order, 1743; (Mr. *Heyd*) 1764; (Mr. *Blain*) 1785; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1799, 1816; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1825; (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1832; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 1860; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1876; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 1891; (Mr. *Bell*) 1907; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 1937; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1946; (Mr. *Holmes*) 1953; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974; (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1994; (Mr. *Hackett*) 2017; (Mr. *Schell*) 2025; (Mr. *Morin*) 2034; (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 2036; (Mr. *Kemp*) 2050; (Mr. *Galliher*) 2063; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2076; (Mr. *Grant*) 2109; (Mr. *Broder*) 2119; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2131; (Mr. *Puttee*) 2149; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2167; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2176; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Remarks, *re* Winnipeg Speech, 2192; (Mr. *Clarke*) 2206; (Mr. *Ball*) 2234 (i).

BUDGET, AMT. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Negatived (Y. 54 ; N. 107) 2235 (i).

BUDGET, THE: (Remarks) 1114 (i).

—— REP. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 410 (i).

BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).

—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 412, 421, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).

—— N.W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i), 13129 (vi).

—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).

—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).

—— OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i), 5841 (iii), 13053, 14245 (vi).

—— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

—— *See* 'Dom. Buildings.'

Burglary Guarantee: *See* 'Dom. Guarantee.

BURK'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).

BURLINGTON CHANNEL, PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup , 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).

BURRARD, B.C., CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

BUSINESS OF THE HSE., COMPLAINTS, &C.: (Mr. *Monk*) 1343 (i).

—— DELAY IN PRINTING BILLS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 482 (i).

—— INACCURACY OF STATEMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4347 (ii).

—— LATE SITTINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3207 (ii).

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Victoria Day Adjournment, 3127 (ii).

—— ON M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) TO TAKE IN MONDAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3708 (ii).

—— PRIVATE BILLS PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRiviére*) 5138 (iii).

—— PUBLIC BILLS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 2300 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2386 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1110 (i), 3794, 5051 (ii), 5581, 5959, 7090 (iii), 7728, 7812 (iv).

—— *re* SUPPL. ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 4957 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 2394 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 871 (i).

—— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. No. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) Res. prop., 4960 ; in Com. on Res., 5052 (ii) ; 1° of B., 5240 ; 2°, and in Com , 5419, 5430, 5845 ; 3°*, 5853 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 6.)

BUTTER ADULTERATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Blain*) *re* Irish Butter in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).

BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING, REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 5414 (iii).

BUTTER, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10745 (v).

—— *See* 'Canadian.'

BUTTER MADE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593, 1857 (i).

CABINET CHANGES: *See* 'Ministerial Changes.'

CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

Cable News Service between G. B. and Can: *See* 'British Cable.'

CACOUNA WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).

CADET TRAINING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 89).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY., REGULATIONS *re* MORTGAGE DEEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).

'CAMPANA,' INVESTIGATION *re* WRECK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE AND MAIL BAGS, AUTHORITY TO USE: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14286 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*) 14219 (vi).

—— *See* 'Mail Bags.'

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, EMPLYMT. OF SESSIONAL MESSENGERS: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14286 (vi).

—— *See* 'Franking.'

CAMPBELL, D. J., POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).

CAMPBELLFORD, PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

—— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).

CAMPBELLTON, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).

—— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).

CAMPOBELLO, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

Canada Atlantic Railway Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1642 ; 2°*, 1816 (i) ; in Com., and 3*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 90).

C. A. RY., STRIKE OF SECTION MEN: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 2303 (i).

CAN. AND AUSTRALIA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

Canada Bank: *See* 'Sterling Bank of Canada.'

Canada Central Railway Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 1294; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 91).

CAN. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (iii), 7728 (iv).

Canada Industrial Corporation, Limited, Incorp. Co.'s B. No. 112 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 95).

CANADA IRON FOUNDRY, TORONTO, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).

—— REPRESENTATIONS TO MIN. OF LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 7205 (iii).

Canada National Railway and Transport Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1025 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 92).

Canada North-west Land Company, Limited, Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 93).

Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation Co.'s B. No. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2303; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 94).

CAN. AND SOUTH AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).

CANADA STEEL CO., RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14479 (vi).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Law*) 1°*, 113; 2° m., 1061; in Com., 1062.

CANADIAN APPLES: *See* 'Apples.'

CANADIAN ARTISTS AND ART GALLERY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

—— *See* 'Art,' &c.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION, GOVT. AID *re* TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

CANADIAN BEEF SUPPLIED TO BRITISH TROOPS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 483 (i)

—— *See* 'Cattle.'

CANADIAN BUTTER, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).

—— *See* 'Butter.'

CANADIAN CATTLE EMBARGO IN G. B.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

—— *See* 'Cattle.'

CAN. CENTRAL AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

CANADIAN COAST LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 4164 (ii).

CANADIAN COMPANY (NEW) INCORP. B. No. 83 (MR. LEMIEUX): M. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2753 (ii).

—— *See* 'New.'

CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU, SUIT AGAINST W. T. R. PRESTON: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).

CANADIAN EXHIBITS AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).

CANADIAN FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

—— *See* 'Fisheries.'

CANADIAN FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION, APPROVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3537 (ii).

—— O. C. *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).

CANADIAN-GERMAN FISCAL POLICY, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (vi).

—— *See* 'German Tariff.'

CANADIAN MAIL VIA NEW YORK, NUMBER OF TONS, &C.: (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).

CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).

CANADIAN MINT, ERECTION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 10955 (v).

—— *See* 'Ottawa.'

CANADIAN MOUNTED RIFLES, MEDALS, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

—— *See* 'Militia.'

Canadian, New Co.: *See* 'New Canadian.'

Canadian Northern Railway Co.'s B. No. 110 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 97).

—— **Aid B. No. 209** (Mr. *Blair*) Res. prop., 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5100 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; 2°, and in Com., 5589, 5786; 3°*., 5824 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 7).

CAN. NORTHERN RY., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MACKENZIE & MANN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 916 (i).

—— Ret. *re* Estimate of Cost laid on Table, 5052.

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. No. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2300 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 3226, 3582, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 96).

Canadian Order of Woodmen: *See* 'Woodmen.'

Canadian Pacific Railway Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 98).

C. P. R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH JAMES BAY RY. CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

—— CAR SHORTAGE AND FREIGHT CONGESTION IN N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation from N.W.T.'

—— ELKHORN BRANCH SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

—— EXPENDITURE FOR ROLLING STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 2311 (i).

—— EXTENSION TO WINNIPEG BEACH SUBSIDY: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

—— AND GREAT NORTHWEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

—— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXES IN MAN. AND N. W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 916 (i).

—— LANDS AND SCHOOL TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).

—— LANDS IN MAN., TAX EXEMPTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 667 (i).

C.P.R., Private Car No. 001, Improvements, &c., Payment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, St. John*) 14282 (vi).
—— Steamers leaving St. John : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup. 14076 (vi).
—— *See* 'Allan Line.'
—— Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply : Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).
Can. Press Despatches: *See* 'British Cable, &c.'
Canadian Steel Co.'s B. No. 185 (Mr. *German*) 1°, 3708; 2°, 3797; in Com., and 3°, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 99).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 3864; 2°, 4132 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3° m., 7485; agreed to (Y. 57; N. 9) 7486 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 100).
—— in Com.: Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7479 (iii). Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).
Canadian Trade with Japan : *See* 'Japan Exhibition.'
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 176 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883; 3°*, 5887 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 101).
Canadian Yukon Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 159 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 102).

CANALS :

'Alert,' Str., Canal Surveys : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi.)
Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).
—— Locks : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
Beauharnois Canal, Flooding Lands, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
Canals : in Com. of Sup., 7803, 8268 (iv); 12895, 14134 (vi).
—— Conc., 8374 (iv).
Canal Collectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12933 (vi).
—— Employees, Increases of Wages : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 2303 (i).
—— in Ont. and Quebec, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
—— Miscellaneous Vote : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
—— Operating Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 12920 (vi).
—— Tolls, Collectors Duties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12929 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
—— Tonnage Dues, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 874 (i).
Casselman, Lockmaster, Williamsburg Canal, Superannuation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
Chambly, Collector of Tolls, Salary : Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
—— Dismissal of Jules Quesnel : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
—— *See* 'Moreau.'
—— Electric Station By-Wash : in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

CANALS—*Con.*

Chambly, Land Damages : in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— Landing Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— Macadamizing Tow Path : in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).
Cornwall, Electrical Equipment for Lock Gates : in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
—— Lighting, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii), 12895 (vi).
—— Supt.'s Duties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).
Corry Award, 7557 (iii).
Engineers Salaries *re* Canals : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Equipment : in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
—— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
—— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii), 14150 (vi).
Galops, Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).
—— surveys, lifting boulders : in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
—— Dam : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12608 (vi).
—— Rapids Channel, Deepening, &c.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) Agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
—— deepening, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).
—— *See* 'Farrans,' 'North Channel,' 'Williamsburg,' &c.
Grenville, Guide Piers at Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
—— Payment to Henry Tucker *re* Investigation : in Com. of Sup., 14166 (vi).
Gibault, Mr. Edward, Gratuity to Widow : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Howie, F. W., Legal Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).
Iroquois Canals, Electric Lighting : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901.
Lachine, Electrical Appliances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).
—— Enlargement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
—— Gratuities : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
—— Lighting : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).
—— Lock Gate Protection : in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
—— Masonry Wall, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
Lockmen, &c., on Canals : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Mill Street, Paving, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Moreau, Mr. H., Collector on Chambly Canal : Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
—— *See* 'Chambly—Dismissal,' &c.
Morrison, Mrs., Claims *re* Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).
Murray, Purchase of Mr. Johnson's House : in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
—— Goodrich, Mr., Removal : Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).
—— Wire Fencing : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
North Channel and Dam, Galops Rapids : in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vi).
—— Completion : in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
—— *See* 'Farrans,' 'Galops,' &c.

CANALS—*Con.*

NORTH CHANNEL CONSTRUCTION OF DAM: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv).
O'LEARY, J. & M., CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPORTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
PETERBOROUGH CANAL, LIFT LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE PIER, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
PRIVILEGE, Ques. of (Mr. *Schell*) *re* appmnt. of Mr. Stewart on Canals, 14599 (vi).
QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
RAMY'S POINT, WELLAND CANAL, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— *See* 'Welland'.
RAPIDE PLAT ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— BIRKETT, Mr. T., M.P., LEASE OF LAND, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 12217 (v).
——— CONCESSION ST. BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 13302 (vi).
——— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE, EQUIPMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).
ST. OURS, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
——— STOP LOGS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE, COALING ACCOMMODATION *re* SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iii).
——— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii)., 12904 (vi).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &c.: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2762 (ii).
SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEORGE GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— PAYMENT OF O'LEARYS' CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
STEWART, Mr., APPNMT AS SUPT. OF CANALS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*) 14599 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
'TOWNSEND' VALVE *re* LOCK GATES, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
TRENT, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii)., 14645 (vi).
——— DODDS, THOS., PAYMENT TO: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).
——— EMPLOYMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr *Hughes, Victoria*) 8117 (iv).
——— HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 129 (i).
——— MESSRS. CORRY & LAVERDURE, INTEREST *re* ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— *See* 'Corry'.
——— PETERBOROUCH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— *See* 'Peterborough'.

CANALS—*Con.*

TRENT, REP. OF ENGINEER MCLEOD, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 12716 (vi).
——— ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, REPORTS, &c.: M. (Mr. *Ward*) for copies, 2313 (i).
See 'Simcoe.'
TUCKER, HENRY, PAYMENT *re* INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
WELLAND, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— DUNNVILLE DAM & BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12900, 14148 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv)., 14149 (vi).
——— RAMY'S POINT: *See* 'Ramy's Point.'
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— TOWNSEND VALVE, 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, O.Cs., *re*., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE, ST. CATHARINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
WILLIAMSBURG, APPNMT. OF SUPT., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— LOCKMASTER CASSLEMAN, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— OVERSEER'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
WIRE FENCING, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— *See* 'Murray.'
YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

CANE BROS., GRANTS FOR TIMBER LICENSE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).

CANNING INDUSTRY IN B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE, N.B., PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr *Campbell*) in Com. on Res., 14470 (vi).

CAPE TRAVERSE, P.E.I., SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).

CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

Cardiff Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4591; 3°*, 4592 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 103).

CARETAKERS, DOM. BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).

CARETAKERS, GOVT. POLICY *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13061 (vi).

CARGILL, HENRY, LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12937 (vi).

CARIBOO ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CARLETON, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— *See* 'Census.'

CARLETON HEAD, P.E.I., SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).

CARLIN, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).

CAR SHOPS, NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).

See 'I.C.R.'

CARTOONS IN 'MILITARY GAZETTE,' &c.: (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2103 (i).

CARVER *vs.* KING, COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO. AND LIARD RIVER MINERS: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I., BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).

CASEY, GEO. E., EX-M.P., AND ARCHIVES: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 13504 (vi).

CASSELMAN, LOCKMASTER, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

——— *See* 'Canals.'

CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bell*) 368 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Fielding*) 375; (Mr. *Sproule*) 376; (Mr. *Maclean*) 381; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 384; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 385; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 388; (Mr. *Tarte*) 392; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 393; (Mr. *Cargill*) 395; (Mr. *Ross*) 396; (Mr. *McGowan*) 396; (Mr. *Boyd*) 397; (Mr. *Clancy*) 398; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 400; (Mr. *Ingram*) 401; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 402; (Mr. *Hackett*) 405; (Mr. *Haggart*) 408 (i).

CATTLE EMBARGO in G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 267 (i).

——— LORD ONSLOW'S DECLARATION: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 14054 (vi).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

——— papers laid on Table, 591 (i).

CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF MR. GEO. ROBERTSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 668 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF MR. HOLT AND RETIREMENT OF MR. ROBERTSON, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1059 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Lennox*) 3396 (ii).

——— NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

——— REP., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 669 (i).

——— REP.: Inquiry (Mr. *Pringle*) 14686 (vi).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1199 (i).

——— REP. LAID ON TABLE, PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 14758 (vi).

——— WITHDRAWAL OF MR. ROBERTSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1034 (i).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Railway Act.'

CATTLE INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

———ON STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

CATTLE PURCHASED BY BRITISH GOVT.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5415 (iii).

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; Neg. (Y., 48; N., 78) 5489 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Fisher*) 5467; (Mr. *Henderson*) 5468; (Mr. *Gourley*) 5469; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5473; (Mr. *Logan*) 5475; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 5477; (Mr. *Broder*) 5478; (Sir *William Mulock*) 5480; (Mr *Lennox*) 5484; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 5487; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5488 (iii).

CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).

CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).

CEMENT USED FOR BUILDINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

CENSUS, BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

——— CARLETON, &c., N.B., RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— CIRCULAR OF MR. COTE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).

——— COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).

——— COST, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4800 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 204 (i).

——— ENUMERATORS, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4800 (ii).

——— EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y., 35; N., 69) 13759 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Fisher*) 13707; (Mr. *Clarke*) 13708; (Mr. *Sproule*) 13721; (Mr. *Heyd*) 13724; (Mr. *Henderson*) 13730; (Mr. *Holmes*) 13733; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 13737; (Mr. *Bell*) 13740; (Mr. *McEwen*) 13753; (Mr. *Clancy*) 13755 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13672 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE: Notice of Motion (Mr. *Monk*) 12368 (vi).

——— GRAND MANAN, N.B., RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).

——— LAND VALUES: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).

——— N.B., RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— PAYMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 286 (i).

——— SCHEDULES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4635 (ii), 7054 (iii).

——— SCHEDULES, HALTON, PEEL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6894 (iii).

——— SCHEDULES, 1891, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7054 (iii).

——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).

CENSUS SCHEDULES, *re* HALTON AND CARDWELL: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 11425 (v).

——— STAFF EMPLOYED *re* ALTERATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13935 (vi).

——— TOTAL COST, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 289; Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) 289 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 479, 544 (i).

CENSUS BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 203 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
—— TOTAL COST: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iii).
—— VOTE: in Com. of Sup , 4594 (ii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5583, 5960, 6199; 3°*, 6202 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 104).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i).

CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2015 (i).

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET AND GOV. GEN'S SPEECH: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS, COR., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).

CHAMBERLAIN, HON. MR., SUGGESTIONS *re* MILITIA ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).
—— SPEECH *re* PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, 13375 (vi).

CHAMBLY CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
—— DISMISSAL OF JULES QUESNEL, Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
—— ELECTRIC STATION BY-WASH: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
—— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— MACADAMIZING TOW PATH: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).

CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).

CHAPMAN DOUBLE BALLBEARING CO., LETTER *re*: Read (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
—— REP. *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iii).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
—— *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

CHARLOTTETOWN ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
—— DOM. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
—— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14131 (vi).
—— REBUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).

CHARTERED BANKS, LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1575 (i).

CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).

CHATHAM DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).

CHATHAM, N.B., LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CHATHAM TO TRACADIE, N.B., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 171 (Mr. *Stephens*) 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 105).

CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).

CHAUDIERE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).

CHEGOGGIN, N.S., PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CHÉTICAMP, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CHEVERIE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CHEVRIER FAMILY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12498 (v), 12716 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13971 (vi).

CHEZZETCOOK, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

Chicoutimi and North Eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 168 (Mr. *Girard*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii).

CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).

Chinese Restriction Immigration B. No. 82 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Res. prop., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°* of B., 945; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2398; 3°*, 2399 (i); Sen Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 8).

Church Missionary Society of Canada Incorp. B. No. 202 (Mr. *Russell*) 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6846. (3 *Edward VII*, c. 155).

CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CIGARETTES, LEGISLATION *re*, in Com. on Criminal Code, 10748 (v).

CIGARETTES, PROHIBITION OF: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Holmes*) 824; (Mr. *Barker*) 830; (Mr. *Lennox*) 831; (Mr. *Roddick*) 832; (Mr. *Logan*) 833; (Mr. *Taylor*) 836; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 837; (Mr. *Bureau*) 838; (Mr. *Heyd*) 838; (Mr. *Broder*) 839; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 839; (Mr. *Stephens*) 841; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 841; (Mr. *Tarte*) 842; (Mr. *Sproule*) 843; (Mr. *Macdonald*) 843; (Mr. *Brock*) 844; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 845 (i).

Cigarettes Prohibition Sale B. No. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°m., 2014 (i); 2°m, 3286; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3286 (ii).

CIRCULARS TO CURÉS, P.Q. *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).

Citizens' Bank of Canada B. No. 213 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5990; in Com., 7478; 3°* 7479 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 106).

City and County Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 172 (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3797 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 107).

CITY POST OFFICES, APPNMT. OF CLERKS ON PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 14001, 14009 (vi).

CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 207, 267, 319 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND GUARANTEE COMPANIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3233 (ii).

CIVIL SERVANTS IN MAN., AND INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3141; Neg. (N. 71; Y. 22) 3206 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *McCreary*) 3152; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3158; (Mr. *Scott*) 3164; (Mr. *Ingram*) 3167, 3183; Ques. of Order, 3167; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ruling, 3167; (Mr. *Blain*) 3169; (Mr. *Boyd*) 3172; (Sir *William Mulock*) 3176, 3185; (Mr. *Davis*) 3179; (Mr. *Puttee*) 3181; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3189 (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3191; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 3197; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3198 (ii)

——— Notice of Amt., 3126 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 245 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1°m., 9079 (iv); Res. prop. 10410; wthdn., 11301 (v).

——— **B. No. 257** (Sir *William Mulock*) Res. prop. 10410, 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330; M. for Com., 12493; in Com. on Res., 12500; 1°* of B., 12574 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 13808, 13833; 3°m., 13942; Sen. Amts., 14845 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 9).

See 'Post Office Bill'.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12330; Amts. (Mr. *Birkett*) 12349, 12370, 12510 (v).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND TECHNICAL OFFICERS, &C.; Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13771 (vi).

CIVIL SERVICE, DECORATIONS: *See* 'Imperial Service'

——— EMPLOYEES CLASSIFICATION, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 9681 (iv).

——— EXAMINATIONS *re* CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. on Customs Bill, 4016 (ii).

——— EXAMINERS LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 479 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

Civil Service Superannuation Act Amt. B. No. 49 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B., 597; 2°m., 1116; in Com., and 3°*, 1116 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 10).

CLARKE, DUNCAN, EX. COURT: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

CLASSIFYING RECORDS: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, ABROGATION, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 109 (i).

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Alaskan Boundary Award, 14521 (vi).

CLAYTON, &C., Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7297 (iii).

See 'Alaskan.'

CLEMENT, JULES, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13664 (vi).

CLERGUE'S CONTRACT WITH I. C. R. FOR STEEL RAILS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

See 'Steel Rails.'

CLERGUE SYNDICATE, LABOUR DISTURBANCES: Remarks, 12610, 12717, (vi).

——— *See* 'Sault Ste. Marie.

CLERGUE RY. SYNDICATE, SUBSIDIES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14397 (vi).

CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT FOR GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 13668 (vi).

CLERKS OF PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).

See 'Public Works.'

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notification of Appnmt. (Mr. *Speaker* 1 (i).

'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER, PATENT *re* I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).

CLINTON, ONT., CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).

CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).

CLOTHING FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).

COAL CONTRACTS FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. on Sup., 1065 (i).

COAL FIELDS, SURVEY, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE, 1901, TO MARCH, 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 669 (i).

COALING ACCOMMODATION *re* SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

COAL LANDS IN CROW'S NEST PASS APPLICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).

COAL RATES, I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 6167 (iii).

COAL SHEDS, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

COASTING LAWS AND BONDING PRIVILEGES OF U. S., REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).

——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

Coast Yukon Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Macpherson*) 1°*, 446; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 108).

COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 13084 (vi).

——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).

——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS; in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).

COCAGNE, WHARF, N.B., COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

COCHRANE, HON. SEN., TEL. *re* HEALTH (Mr. *Fielding*) 3000 (ii).

COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii), 7086 (iii), 7610 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'
COLDSTREAM GUARDS BAND, ARRANGEMENTS *re* VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) 9683 (iv).
COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
COLLINS, MR., PAYMENT *re* FISHERY INSPECTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5129 (ii).
COLONIAL CONFERENCE, BOND-HAY TREATY AND ALASKA: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 853 (i).
—— MEMORANDUM OF CAN. MINISTERS: in Budget Speech, 1404 (i).
—— REP. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3632 (ii).
COLONIAL OFFICE AND CAN. PRIME MINISTER, COR. *re* GERMAN FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 12218 (v).
—— *See* 'German.'
COLUMBIA RIVER, B. C., ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
—— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
—— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
Columbia River Improvement Company Limited, Incorp. B. No. 150 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., 5559; in Com., and 3°*, 5585; Sen. Amts., 6847, 6894 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 109).
COMMANDERS OF GOVT. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 446 (i).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson*, Grey) 4360 (ii).
COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, PRIVILEGES, FARES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Clarke*) 5680 (iii).
COMMISSIONER, ASS'T., CUSTOMS: *See* 'Customs Act Surtax.'
COMMITTEES:
COMMITTEES, SEL. STANDING: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).
—— STANDING: Lists presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 197 (i).
—— M. to meet during Sittings of Hse. (Mr. *Hyman*) 8405 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 8333 (iv).
AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5679 (iii).
—— REP. *re* BINDER TWINE: M. to conc., 13788, 14043 (vi).
DEBATES: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).
ELECTION LAWS: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to add Name, 6734 (iii).
INTERNAL ECONOMY: M. for Com., 91 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
COMMITTEES:—*Con.*
PRINTING, JOINT: List presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
—— M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. (Mr. *Parmelee*) 5314 (iii).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, 1ST REP. OF SEL. COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*, *Essex*) 5511 (iii).
—— M. to employ stenographer (Mr. *Fraser*) 7202 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, MEETING CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 8334 (iv).
—— Motion to add Name (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3431 (ii).
—— M. *re* Pub. Accts. (Mr. *Fraser*): 67 (i).
—— PRODUCING CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).
COMMUTATION OF CARVER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 13303 (vi).
Companies Act (1902) Amt. B. No. 227, (from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Elections B. 3.'
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) 1°m., 1193 (i); 2°m., 2790, 3259; in Com., 3260 (ii),
CONCILIATION BOARD, REGISTRATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3628 (ii).
CONCILIATORS, SETTLEMENT OF LABOUR DISPUTES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4003 (ii).
CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENT FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
CONSERVATIVE LITERATURE: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.
Consolidated Revenue, &c.; *See* 'Audit Act.'
Consolidated Trust Corporation Incorp. B. No. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 110).
CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'
Contagious Diseases: *See* 'Animals.'
Contracts, Public Works: *See* 'Public Works Act.'
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
Controverted Elections Bill: *See* 'Dominion Election Bills.'
COOKE VS. COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).
CORN DUTIES, ABOLITION OF BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1681 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL, ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
—— ENLARGEMENT, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vi).
—— LIGHTING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
—— SUPT'S. DUTIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).

CORNWALL ROAD P. O., MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14038 (vi).

CORONATION CONTINGENT, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORRY & LAVERDURE, AWARD *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).

—— COMPENSATION *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).

COTTEE, HERBERT, SALARY AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3610 (ii).

COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATIONS OF WATER: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).

COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, APPOINTMENTS FROM LOCAL BARS: Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 5582 (iii).

—— APPOINTMENTS., RETIREMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 4960 (ii).

COUNTRY POSTMASTERS: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).

—— SALARIES: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5662, 5676, 5863 (iii).

—— SALARY INCREASES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).

Court of Appeal, Yukon: *See* 'Yukon B. 254.'

COURTS, YUKON, PURCHASE OF LAW BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'

COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).

COVE HEAD HARBOUR, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com of Sup., 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).

COW BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vi).

COW BAY (POINT MORIEN) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CRANDALL, BRAKESMAN, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

—— *See* 'Belmont.'

CRANE ISLAND WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).

CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

CRICKET PLAYING ON PARLIAMENT GROUNDS: Objection (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 95; 2°*, 316; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 13.)

Criminal Code, 1892 (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) 1°*, 541; 2°*, 1324; in Com., 1324 (i), 2779, 3237 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. No. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 5581; 2°*, 6638; M. for Com., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746 (v); wthdn., 14768 (vi).

Criminal Code (fraudulent debtors) B. (No. 219, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Criminal Code (1902) Act (trades and contracts) Amt. B. (No. 230, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (freedom of labour) B. (No. 246, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

CRISIS IN ONT: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'

CROSS POINT PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

Crown Bank of Canada B. No. 129 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1936; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2756 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 111.)

CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P.O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).

CROWS NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

Cruelty to Animals: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

CULLING TIMBER, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).

CUMBERLAND RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14506 (vi).

CUMBERLAND WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

CUMMINGS, JAMES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 9458 (iv).

Currency Amt.: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).

Customs Act Amt. B. No. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) Res. prop., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; 1°* of B., 3126; 2°*, 4010; in Com., 4010; 3° m., 4187; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 14.)

—— **(German Surtax) Amt. B. No. 273** (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 14758 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 15.)

CUSTOMS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REBATE FOR 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3803 (ii).

ALUMINUM, OXIDE OF, IMPORTATION INTO CANADA, PORTS OF ENTRY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1035 (i).

BAIN, MR., ASST. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B., 4010 (ii).

BANANAS IMPORTED, VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1198 (i).

BATHURST CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

BAUXITE, TONS IMPORTED IN 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1678 (i).

BONDED WAREHOUSES, P.E.I., RENTAL, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

BONDING PRIVILEGES WITH U.S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

BRACEBRIDGE CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

CAMPBELLFORD PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS *re* CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. on Customs Bill, 4016 (ii).

COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE 1901 TO MARCH 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 669 (i).

COASTING LAWS AND BONDING PRIVILEGES OF U. S.: Regulations (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

COMMISSIONER, ASST.: *See* 'Customs Act, B. 174.

CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR, TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

CORN DUTIES, ABOLITION OF BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1681 (i).

CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, PER CAPITA REVENUE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13935 (vi).
——— *See* 'Per Capita.'

CUSTOMS CLAUSE G. T. P. BILL, LEGAL OPINIONS: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).

CUSTOMS DEPT., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 331 (i), 3782, 3897 (ii).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 319 (i).
——— PORTS OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3697 (ii).
——— OVERTIME OF OFFICERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13980 (vi).
——— TRANSFERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5318 (iii).
——— PRINTING, STATIONERY, &C., in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).
——— TEMPORARY CLERKS. APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Customs Bill, 4012 (ii).

DAUPHIN, PORT OF ENTRY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

DIME NOVELS: *See* 'Jesse James.'

DRESDEN CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

FREE LIST, CHANGES IN TARIFF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

GANANOQUE PORT OF ENTRY, COLLECTIONS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3791, 3897 (ii).

GERMAN GOODS ('TEAPOTS, &C.') IMPORTED UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on Customs Act, 3056 (ii).

GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

GERMAN SURTAX, PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO IMPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3394 (ii).

GERMAN TEAPOT AND MR. BLAIN: *See* 'German Goods.'

GOODS IMPORTED DIRECT INTO CAN., VALUE OF DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 12716 (vi).

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).

GRANT, J. G., BARRIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFAULT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).

IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 13935 (vi).

INSPECTION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL TARIFF, CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

JAPANESE TARIFF *re* U. S. PRODUCTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

JAPAN TRADE WITH CAN., CUSTOMS DUTIES *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8617 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

'JESSE JAMES' SERIES OF PUBLICATIONS, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT, PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).

LINSEED OIL, DEPUTATION *re* IMPORTATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii).

LOCKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup. 3962 (ii).

'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup. 5992 (iii).

MIDLAND PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

MONTREAL PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
——— CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
——— SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv)

NAPANEE, COLLECTOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).

OXIDE OF ALUMINUM IMPORTS INTO CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N. B.*) 1035 (i).

PER CAPITA TAX, EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).

PER CAPITA TAX, REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13935 (vi).
——— *See* 'Customs.'

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3583 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B. C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
——— *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5322 (iii).
——— *See* 'German Goods.'
——— PREVENTION OF FRAUD, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE, OFFER OF CAN. GOVT. TO G. B.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3219 (ii).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

PULP WOOD, DUTY BY U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 4362 (ii).

REVENUE COLLECTED FOR 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12715 (vi).

S. A. COLONIES, AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL AMOUNT 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 14285 (vi).

SUGAR IMPORTED INTO CANADA 1902: M. (Mr. *Madore*) for Stmnt.,* 3236 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES, FREE LIST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

TARIFF PROTECTION, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6707 (iii).
See 'Tariff.'

TOBACCO (CANADIAN) SALE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, AMOUNTS PAID TO MR. BLAISE DUGAS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).

TOBACCO DUTIES COLLECTED IN 1902, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2103 (i), 12217 (v).
——— DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 446 (i).

TORONTO, CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Supply., 3906 (ii).

TRACADIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
U.S. Coasting Laws, Bonding Privileges, &c.: Regulations *re* (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
See 'Coasting.'
Vegetables imported from U.S., Duty collected at Toronto and Montreal: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1058 (i).
Veniot, P.I., Customs Collector at Bathurst: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
Walpole Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
Warehouse at Winnipeg, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
Weekly Publications, 'Jesse James' Series, Customs Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).
Wheat, Export Freight Rate per Hundred Pounds: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
Windsor, Customs Port of Entry, Salaries, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
See 'Kilroy.'

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Contract, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

Cutler, Gore Bay Mail Service; Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

Cutler, Spanish Mills Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

Dairying Branch, Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
——— Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii).

Dalhousie Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

Daly, M.T., Harbour Master at Bathurst, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

Dauphin, Lake, Lowering: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
——— Port of Entry, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3898 (ii).

Dawson Board of Trade, Memorial *re* Treadgold Concessions: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1024 (i).
See 'Treadgold.'

Dawson City to Stewart River, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Dawson Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

Debates, Amanuenses, Increase of Salary: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Com., 5 (i).
——— 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 654 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 814 (i).
——— 2nd Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 939 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1111 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1461 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1764 (i).
——— 4th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1674 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1936 (i).
——— 5th Rep.: M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii).

Debates, 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 7658 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 7922, 9349 (iv).
——— 7th and 8th Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 14053 (vi).
——— 8th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 12216 (v).

Debates Translators, Rental of Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 3799 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2311 (i).

Debert Coal Mines Ry. Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 14328 (vi).

Debt of Can.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

Deer Island to Eastport, Me., Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

Defalcations, &c.: *See* 'Post Office.'

Defaulting Postmasters *re* Saving Banks Deposits: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

Defence Scheme *re* Militia: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).
See 'Militia.'

Delegates from Chambers of Commerce, Treatment by U.S. Immigration Officers: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).

Demurrage Regulations, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).

Departments, Reorganisation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief B. No. 127 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 112).

Depot Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).

Deputy Minister of Agriculture: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).

Deseronto Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

Deschambault, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

Desjardins, Allumette Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).

Desjardins Canal B. No. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3393; 2°, 4213; in Com., and 3°, 4213 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 16.)

DesRoches, Fishery Guardian, Alleged Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Detroit River, &c., International Waters, U.S. Govt. Work: M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Cor.,* 2778 (ii).

Devlin, Mr., Successor of, as Immigration Agent, Ireland: in Com. of Sup., 6731 (iii).

Digby, Pier, Renewal, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— Wharf Extension, Improvement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).

Diocese of Moosonee: *See* 'Trust Funds.'

DIPPER HARBOUR, N. B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

DISCRIMINATING RATES, G. T. RY. CO. BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

DISCRIMINATING FREIGHTS ON OCEAN VESSELS: *See* 'Freight Rates.'

DISTILLERIES, &C., INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13974 (vi).

DIVISIONS:

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 14158; Neg. (Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

BROCKVILLE AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) neg. (Y. 26; N. 44) 7467; M. for 3°, agreed to (Y. 64; N. 35) 7468 (iii).

BUDGET, THE: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Neg. (Y. 54; N. 107) 2235 (i).

CANADIAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7479; Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).

CENSUS EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &C:. Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 69) 13759 (vi).

CIGARETTES, PROHIBITION OF: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND POLITICAL INTERFERENCE, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3151; Neg. (Y. 22; N. 71) 3206 (ii).

FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 68) 14642 (vi).

G.T. PACIFIC RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) M. for Com., 4871: Amt. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4871; Neg. (Y. 55; N. 102) 4874 (ii).

G.T.P. B. No. 235: Amt. (Mr. *Borden*) Alternative Route, to M. for 3°, 12642 (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690 (vi).

———Amt. (Mr. *Osler*) Customs Duties, &c., 12693; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12702 (vi).

———Amt. (Mr. *Alcorn*) Capital Stock, 12704; Neg. (Y. 25; N. 75) 12705 (vi).

———Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) Rates, &c., Neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709 (vi).

———Amt. (Mr. *Puttee*) to M. for Com. on Res., 9148; Neg. (Y, 50; N. 135) 10404 (v).

———Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) 10076 (iv); Neg. (Y. 68; N. 119) 10404 (v).

———Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 10405; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 117) 10407 (v).

———3° of Bill; Agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10407 (v).

———Reporting Debates, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) Speaker's Ruling sustained (Y. 52; N. 50) 0634 (v).

HAY AND OATS BOUGHT BY IMP. GOVT., AMOUNT PAID BY CAN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 6) 690 (i).

INSOLVENCY ACT AMT. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) 2°m., 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION: Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 4790 (ii).

OTTAWA VALLEY RY. CO.'S B. No. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87) 6537 (iii).

DIVISIONS—*Con.*

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM. *re* MR. LOY, M.P.: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7917; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7918; M. to conc. in Rep., 7922, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008, 8069; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 105) 8080, (iv).

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

RY. ACT (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2°m., 552; M. (Mr. *Blair*) to ref. to Com. on Rys..; Agreed to (Y. 99; N. 53) 565 (i).

RY. ACT (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) 3°m., 8334; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* two cent rate, 8334; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 45) 8359 (iv).

REPRESENTATION IN H. OF C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2°m., 1207, 1265; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) to M. for 2°, Neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 1284, 1292 (i).

———Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to recommit to Com. of Whole Hse., Neg. (Y. 28; N. 65) 12430 (v).

TARIFF POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95) 2914 (ii).

———INSTRUCTION TO COMMISSIONS, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4486; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, N.B., SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

Divorce: *See* 'Allan, William.'

———*See* 'Ashley.'

———*See* 'Graves, Florence.'

———*See* 'McDermid, Ellen.'

———*See* 'Schooley.'

———*See* 'Steele, James Reid.'

———*See* 'Wilson, Stephen.'

DIXON, F. A. PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726–2753 (ii).

———COR., &C. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1058 (i).

———Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).

DIXON, MR. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DIXON, CAPT., DUTIES IN S. AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7914 (iv).

DOCKS, HARBOURS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii). *See* 'Public Works.'

DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

DODDS, MR. THOS., PAYMENT TO *re* TRENT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).

DOG FISH NUISANCE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi)

DOKIS INDIAN RESERVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST TRESPASSERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 7914 (iv.)

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12590 (v).

DOMINION ARSENAL: in Com. of Sup., 7089 (iii).

DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO. (WOLFVILLE) SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

———N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 421 (i).

DOMINION BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
——RENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
—— *See* 'Buildings.'
DOM. COAL, IRON AND STEEL CO.'S ACCOMMODATION AT GLACE BAY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
—— *See* 'Glace Bay.'
Dominion Controverted Elections Act (trials) Amt. B. No. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 95; 2°, and in Com., 635; on Order for Com., 945, 1115, 2239; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII., c.* 12).
DOM. CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. No. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., Objection (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 945 (i).
DOM. DAY ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5589 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 92; 2° m., 885, in Com., 902, 1200 (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; in Com., (compulsory voting) 13560; wthdn.. 14769 (vi).
DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Sel. Com., 3001 (ii); 6734 (iii).
DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. No. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*): Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12720 (vi).
Dominion Elections Act (intimidation) Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) 1°*, 114; 2° m., 704 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (3 *Edward VII., c.* 19).
DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 534 (i).
—— *See* 'Agriculture.'
Dominion Gas Improvement Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 91 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1193; 2°* 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII., c.* 114).
Dominion (burglary) Guarantee Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII., c.* 113).
Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineers Incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632 (i).
DOM. LANDS ACT AMT. B. (Mr. *Sifton*). Motion dropped, 13444 (vi).
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
—— COMMISSIONER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iii).
—— INSPECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
—— MAN. AND N.W.T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816 (i).
—— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
—— SALE, LOCATION, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 670 (i).
—— SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 6939 (iii).
DOM. LANDS, SURVEYORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).
DOM. LANDS *re* YUKON REGULATIONS: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).
Dominion Notes B. No. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; 2°, and in Com., 6913; 3°*, 6915 (iii). (3 *Edward VII., c.* 43).
DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii) 14252 (vi).
DOM. NOTES SECURITY: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6270 (iii).
DOMINION POLICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
DOM. STATUTES CONSOLIDATION: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'
DOM. STEAMERS, REPAIRS, SUPPLIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (ii).
DOM. SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, INCREASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
DOM. TRAFFIC BRIDGES THROUGH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, TERREBONNE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 10102 (v).
DOUBLE TRACKING PARTS OF I.C.R. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).
—— *See* 'I.C.R.'
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN, ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DOUKHOBORS, HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
—— LOANS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
—— PILGRIMAGE, AND GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
—— PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
DOYLE, MR., RY. MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).
Drainage across Railway Property B. No. 19 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1° m., 202; 2°*, 916 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
DRAINAGE CLAUSE IN B. 21, RAILWAY ACT AMT.: 5774 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 4729, 4735 (ii).
DRAKE, MR., N.W.M.P., INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13761 (vi).
DRAW-BARS, EXCHANGE ON FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520, (iii), 8288 (iv).
DREDGES AT MIDLAND, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

DREDGES, NEW, COST, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1856 (i).

DREDGING, MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).

DREDGING PLANT, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2674 (ii).

DREDGING PLANT FOR B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).

—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).

—— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).

DREDGING VESSELS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).

See 'Public Works.'

DRESDEN CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

DRILL HALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13643 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).

—— ST. JOHN'S, QUE., CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).

—— WOODSTOCK, N.B., PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Hale*) 3236 (ii).

DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR, AMOUNT PAID TO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iii).

DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

DRUMMONDVILLE RY. SIDING, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. No. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; 2°, and in Com., 4678 (ii), 5871; 3°*, 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 17.)

DUCHESNEAU, RESIGNATION AS WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).

DUFFERIN AND SAPPERS BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

DUGAS, JUDGE, YUKON TER., REFUND TO DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNT PAID TO, FOR TRIP IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES *re* SALE OF CANADIAN TOBACCO: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).

DUNCAN, ARCHIBALD, FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

DUNCAN'S COVE, N.S., APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

DUNDONALD, LORD, AND FRAUDULENT TELEPHONE MESSAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 10536, 10744 (v). *See* 'G. O. C.'

DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).

See 'Grand River.'

DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).

EARNINGS, &c, I.C.R., DATE OF INTERIM REPS.: Ques., (Mr. *Barker*) 4444 (ii).

See 'I. C. R.'

EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

EAST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EAST BERLIN, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EASTERN EXTENSION CO., CONCESSIONS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2675 (ii).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.B., BALANCE OF INTEREST *re* AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iii).

—— FEES OF STENOGRAPHER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).

Eastern Townships Bank B. No. 25 (Mr. *McIntosh*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1853 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 115).

ECONOMY, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 446; 2°*, 632 (i).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co. (correction) B. No. 109 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 1378 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2581 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 18.)

EDMONTON BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).

EDMONTON INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).

EDMONTON N.W.T., JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 707, 2°*, 977 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 111 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 116.)

EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

EDMUNDSTON, N.B., INDIAN RESERVE, FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).

EDVILLE POSTMASTER, OPENING OF OFFICE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

EEL RIVER, I. C. R. STATION AGENT'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12600 (v).

EILBECK, SHERIFF, YUKON, FEES, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3414, 3507 (ii).

ELDORADO GUSHER, EXPENDITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6949, 7275 (iii).

Election Bills: *See* 'Dom. Elections, &c.'

ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED, CERTIFICATES, &c.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ELECTION LAWS COMMITTEE: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to add Name, 6734 (iii).

ELECTION LAW, LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 12218 (v).

ELECTION PAMPHLETS : *See* 'Mail Bags.'
ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGMENTS OF SUPREME COURT : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 91 (i).
ELECTION PROCLAMATIONS, PRINTING : *See* 'Saskatchewan Elections.'
ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENT TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 288 (i).
——— N.S., PRINTING, &C., CHANGES MADE: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 8331 (iv).
Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 187 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2° m., 4007; in Com., and 3°*, 4007 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 20).
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5407 (iii).
ELECTRIC LIGHTING, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, CONTRACT PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 3235 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 816 (i).
——— TRANSFORMERS : in Com. of Sup., 5843 (iii).
——— CORNWALL CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
——— WELLAND CANAL : in Com of Sup., 14148 (vi).
See 'Canals.'
ELECTRIC POWER FOR DOM. BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
ELEVATOR ACCIDENT : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5417 (iii).
ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
See 'Ottawa Buildings.'
ELEVATOR RATES, ADVANCE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 11062 (v).
See 'Grain.'
ELGIN COUNTY CENTENARY CELEBRATION : Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 3129 (ii).
ELGIN COUNTY REDISTRIBUTION, PAR. IN 'TORONTO GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 6540 (iii).
Elgin and Havelock Railway Co.'s B. No. 142 (Mr. *Fowler*) 1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com. and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 117.)
ELKHORN AND MOOSOMIN RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 14497 (vi).
ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, N. W. TER., AVERAGE ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
See 'Indians.'
ELLIS, DR., INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE, P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
EMERSON MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
Empire Accident and Surety Co.'s B. No. 107 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 2755; 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 118.)
EMPLOYEES, PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726-2753 (ii).
Employees on Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Employees.'
Engineers, Marine : *See* 'Steamboat Inspection.'
ENGINEERS' OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'
ENGINEERS SALARIES *re* CANALS : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
Engineers : *See* 'Dom. Institute.'
ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum read, 14008 (vi).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 134 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2100; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751, 3982; 3°*, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 119).
ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).
ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).
——— GRAVING DOCK : in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).
——— NAVAL STATION, REMOVAL OF FLAGSHIP : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).
ESQUIMAUX POINTE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
ESTIMATES 1902-3 : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 (i).
——— SUPPL., 1903 : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 707 (i); 4956 (ii).
——— (1904) : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).
ESTIMATES *re* ONE-FIFTH VOTE : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).
See 'Supply.'
"EUREKA," STR., LOAN BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14285 (vi).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 14687 (vi).
"EUXINE," SCHR., SCUTTLING OF : M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*) 699 (i).
EWART, MR., ARCHITECT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY ARREARS : in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).
EWART, JOHN A., ADDRESS PRESENTED TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
Exchequer Court (railway debts) B. No. 155 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m., 2501 (ii); 2° m., 8243; in Com., 8244, 8360; 3°*, 8369 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14769 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 21).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to place on Govt. Orders, 8115 (iv).
EXCHEQUER COURT, JUDGES TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE : in Com of Sup., 3407 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).
EXCISE INSPECTORS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
——— OFFICERS, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
——— TAXATION, PER CAPITA FOR 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
See 'Customs,' &c.
EXECUTIONS, EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

EXHIBITION, FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).

EXHIBITIONS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).

—— REPAIRS TO BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

—— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1937 (i).

EXPORT FREIGHT RATES ON WHEAT TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 93; 2°*, 291; in Com., 291, 612, 632; 3°*, 945 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 22).

FABER, DR., ILLEGAL PRACTICE, CHARGES *re*: Par. in *Star*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iii).

—— MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 6850 (iii).

FAIR WAGES SCHEDULE ON GOVT. CONTRACTS AND LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
See 'Labour.'

FALSE CREEK, B.C., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. (Mr. *Earle*) for Copies*, 2337 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Earle*) 3129 (ii), 5513, 6354 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2758, 2919 (ii).

FARQUHARSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).

FARRAN'S POINT CANAL, ACETYLENE GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

—— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).

—— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii); 14150 (vi).

FAST ATLANTIC SS. LINE: *See* 'Atlantic.'

FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

Federal Oil Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 120).

FERGUSON, J. M., LEGAL EXPENSES *re* ADULTERATION ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5412 (iii).

FERRIES, CONTROL OF: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13696 (vi).

Ferries Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'

FIELDING, HON. MR., PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME: Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13936 (vi).

"FIELDING, W. S.", DREDGE, PREPARATION OF PLANS, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14283 (vi).

FINANCE:

ASSAY OFFICE, B.C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779, 13965 (vi).

AUDIT ACT AMT. BILL, GOVTL. INTENTION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11692 (v), 13258.

AUDITING DEPTL. FINANCES: Remarks *re* Martineau Investigation, 6933 (iii).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD, PAYMENTS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 10956 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11427 (v).

—— CIRCULAR FROM AUD. GEN.: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 11552 (v).

AUD. GENERAL AUDITING BOOKS OF RY. COS., *Re* SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Res., 14516 (vi).

—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

—— OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).
See 'Audit.' &c.

BANKERS ASSOCIATION, INSPECTION DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 819 (i)

BANKERS, PRIVATE, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 285 (i).

BANK FAILURES SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 6435 (iii).

BANKING BUSINESS: M. (Mr. *Russell*) to receive Pet., 4958 (ii).

BANKS, UNCLAIMED BALANCES: Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (ii).

BARTON, SIR EDMUND, EXPENDITURE *re* CAN. VISIT: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

BLACK, A. W., ENGLISH M.P., STATEMENTS *re* COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMAN CONSUL: 12218 (v).

BOPP, GERMAN CONSUL, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

B.N.A. BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE KING, EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14279 (vi).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1378 (i).

—— REP. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 410 (i).
See 'Financial Review.'

CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

CANADIAN-GERMAN FISCAL POLICY, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

CANADIAN MINT, ERECTION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 10955 (v).
See 'Mint.'

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
See 'Dom. Notes.'

CHARTERED BANKS, REP. *re*: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1575 (i).

COLONIAL OFFICE AND CAN. PRIME MINISTER, COR. *re* GERMAN FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

DEBT OF CAN.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRTION, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 12590 (v).

DOM. NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii), 14252 (vi).
See 'Charges,' &c.

DOM. SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, INCEEASE, &c.; M. for Cor., (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).

ESTIMATES, 1902-3: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90.

ESTIMATES *re* ONE-FIFTH VOTE: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

—— SUPPL., 1903; Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 707 (i), 4956 (ii).

—— SUPPL., 1904: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

—— *See* 'Supply,' &c.

FIELDING, HON. MR., PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME: Par in Montreol *Star*, 13936 (vi).

FINANCE DEPT., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i).

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N.S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601 (vi).
See 'Budget, &c.'
GERMAN CONSUL BOPP, COR. WITH CAN. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
GERMAN TARIFF, COR. &C.: Papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).
——— DISCRIMINATION AND BOND-HAY TREATY: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 1324 (i).
——— LORD STRATHCONA'S LETTER: in Budget Speech, 1413 (i).
——— MR. FIELDING'S MEMORANDUM *re* MR. BOPP: in Budget Speech, 1414 (i).
GOV. GEN.'S SPEECH AT CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).
IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, COR., &C., CAN. GOVT'S REFUSAL TO PUBLISH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 9457 (iv).
——— PAPERS *re*: laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
INSOLVENCY ACT, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 818 (i).
INSURANCE COS. OF CANADA, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1025 (i).
INSURANCE, REPORT OF SUPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9350 (iv).
——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12586 (v).
IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— LEGAL EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7795 (iv).
——— PAID FOR 1890-1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 11556 (v)
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6435 (iii).
IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).
——— AMT.: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) *re* Notice of Motion, 3864, 4040 (ii).
LADY LAFONTAINE, PENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14252 (vi).
LOANS, GOVT., &C.: *See* 'Public Debt.'
MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re* TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 265 (i).
MINT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi)
See 'Can. Mint.'
NORTH-WEST TER., ADVANCE ACCOUNT, &C.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 10102 (v).
——— INCREASED SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
See general heading.
N. S. AND DOM. OF CAN. FINANCIAL TERMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
PREFERENTIAL TARIFF AND S. A. COLONIES, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
PREFERENTIAL TRADE, MEMORANDUM OF MR. BALFOUR, PRES. OF BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE: in Financial Statement, 1402 (i).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Mr. Fielding's pledges *re* Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, 13936 (vi).
PRIVATE BANKERS: *See* 'Bankers.'
PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, INCREASES, &C.: M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux* 5764 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
PUBLIC DEBT, DECREASE OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14665 (vi).
PUBLIC DEBT CONVERSION, PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14253 (vi).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE, TORONTO, ADDITIONAL VAULT: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903, AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 13370 (vi).
STEEL SHIPBUILDING, BOUNTY TO AID: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).
SUPPLY: Remarks *re* one-fifth vote (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).
SUPPLY BILL, VOTE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 5995 (iii).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6003 (iii).
See general heading.
TARIFF AND TAXATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. on Immigration, 6861 (iii),
——— NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4957 (ii).
——— POLICY OF GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 4263, 4843, 4875 (ii).
——— CORRESPONDENCE, *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*) 3003 (ii).
——— PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. on Binder Twine, B. 233, Remarks (Mr. *Maclean* &c.) 7304, 7392 (iii).
——— REVISION, CORRESPONDENCE *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*) 3003 (ii).
TREASURY BOARD: *See* 'Auditor General.'
WAYS AND MEANS—GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on B. 273, 14755 (vi).
——— Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 89, 1378 (i).
——— Financial Statement, 1378 (i).
——— FOR DEBATE: *See* 'Budget.'
FINLAY POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N.S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y., 30; N., 68) 14642 (vi).
FIRE AT MORTIMER & CO., GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4836 (ii).
Fire Damages: *See* 'Railway Act.'
Fire Guards: *See* 'Railway Act.'
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FIRE REGULATIONS, N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
FIRE, SECURITY FROM, IN PARLT. BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
FISHER, CHAS. A. L., INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1592 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt., B. No. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1° m., 6538; 2°, and in Com., 6896; 3°*., 6913 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 23).
FISHERIES:
BANCE, MR., PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).
BATHURST FISHERY INSPECTOR: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'
BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
CANADIAN FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).
CANNING INDUSTRY IN B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).
COLLINS, MR., PAYMENT *re* FISHERY INSPECTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5129 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

DesRoches, Fishery Guard, Alleged Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Dog Fish Nuisance, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi).

Duncan, Archibald, Fishery Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

False Creek B.C., Lease to Burnett & Kelly: *See* 'B.C.'

Fish Breeding Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Fish Breeding and Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, Compiling Reps.: in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

Fisheries Protective Service, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* Officers Mess: Que. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

Fisheries, Salaries: Conc., 6069 (iii).

——— Steamers in B.C., Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (iii).

Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization': Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13316 (vi).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 13373 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13374 (vi).

Fishery Exhibit, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).

Fishery Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii), 5278 (iii).

Fishery Officers, Inspections, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).

Fishery Officers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).

Fishery Overseer, Bathurst, N.B., Complaints, *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14686 (vi).

Fishery Rights of Dom. and Provs.: M. to bring down Papers (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 7923 (iv).

Fishermen's Indemnity from U. S. Govt.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3236 (ii).

Fishing Bounties, Guardian DesRoches, Alleged Fraud: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Fishing Industry, Mar. Provs., Wharf, Building, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Fishing Licenses to U.S. Vessels, Collectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5309 (iii).

Fishing Rights *re* Indians, B.C., Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7264 (iii).

Fishing within Three Mile Limit, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 4179 (ii).

Fish Inspection, Investigations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

Fish Shippers, Loss, &c., by Govt. Strs.: Memorandum read (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4051-54 (ii).
See 'Frozen.'

Fishways, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

Fraser River Salmon Industry, Complaints from Canners Ass'n.: Tel. read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Frozen Fish, &c., P.E.I.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

——— Shippers, Losses, &c., Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (iii), 13373 (vi).
See 'Fish Shippers.'

Harrison, Mr., Inspector of Fisheries, N.B., Resignation: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).

Hurley, J. M., Appnmt., Duties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (ii), 5280 (iii).

——— Rep., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
See 'Mullen.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*

James and Hudson Bay Fishing Rights: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6893 (iii).

James and Hudson Bays, Fishing Rights, Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Complaint *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).

Lobster Factory Inspection, Halifax: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).

Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

——— Industry, Inspection *re:* in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151, 13660 (vi).

Lunenburg Fish Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Mullen, Cornelius: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5280 (iii).

——— Letter *re* Hurley, J. M., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Taylor*) 5757, 5761 (iii).

Oyster Fishing, P.E.I., Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).

Oyster, Herring, &c., Fish Inspection, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Roche, Hfx.*), *re* Fishermen of N.S., 13373 (vi).
See 'Fishermen of N.S.'

Rivière du Nord Fish Ladders, &c.: M. for Copies of Reps.* (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Salmon Commissioners, B.C.: M. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii).

Salmon Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, B.C., Tels. from Canners Association, &c.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

Salmon shipped to France from B.C., Tariff *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).

Shepherd, B., Fishery Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

Sills, E. H., Payment *re* Storage of Fish Nets: in Com. of Sup., 5128 (ii).

Trap Nets in Gulf St. Lawrence, Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

U. S. Indemnity to Fishermen, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor.* 3236 (ii).

Five Islands, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

Flagship, Removal from Esquimalt: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

Flesherton Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

Flint, T. B., Clerk of Hse., Appnmt.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

Food Analysis: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
See 'Inland Revenue,' 'Customs,' &c.

Forrest, E., Reimbursement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).

Fort Dufferin, Extension Wharf, River St. John: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

FORT LAWRENCE LANDING PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).

FT. WILLIAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i). *See* 'Public Works,' &c.

FRANCE AND CANADA SS. SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4957 (ii).

FRANCE AND CAN. STEAMSHIP SERVICE SUBSIDY: Prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 10410 (v). *See* 'Ocean SS. Subsidies Bill.'

FRANK DISASTER, INVESTIGATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi). *See* 'Turtle.'

—— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 2100 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 2106; Tels. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2106 (i).

—— TEL. TO DEP. MIN. OF INT.: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2238 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE *re* CAMPAIGN LITERATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 14286 (vi). *See* 'Campaign.'

FRASER RIVER, B.C., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRASER RIVER SALMON INDUSTRY, COMPLAINTS FROM CANNERS' ASSOCIATION, TEL.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

—— SALMON INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v). *See* 'Fisheries.'

Fraudulent Debtors: *See* 'Criminal.'

FRAUDULENT MARKING ACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

FRAWLEY, MR., REMOVAL FROM ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).

FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

FREE LIST, CHANGES IN TARIFF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

FREE PASSES, I.C.R.: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337.

FREEPORT, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

FREIGHT CARS OF I.C.R. ON CONNECTING LINES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).

FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION (CANADIAN), O.Cs,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).

FREIGHT RATES BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B.: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).

FREIGHT RATES, I.C.R., CLASSES 1-10: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.*, 2338 (i).

FREIGHT RATES ON COMMODITIES TO G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).

—— DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CAN. AND U.S. FREIGHT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 13674 (vi).

—— PROVISION IN CONTRACT *re* DISCRIMINATION: (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).

FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674 (iii).

FRENCH CANADIAN REPATRIATION: in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iii).

FRIARS HEAD, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

FROZEN FISH, &C., P.E.I.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

FROZEN FISH SHIPPERS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).

—— LOSSES, &C., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (ii).

FRUDES POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

FRUIT INSPECTORS, BUYING APPLES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi). *See* 'Anderson.'

FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE TO EUROPE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3805 (ii).

—— VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3232 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. No. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 2387 (i); 2° m., 2788, 3257, 3807 (ii).

—— **B. No. 130** (Mr. *Henderson*) 1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285, 3823 (ii).

FUEL CONTRACT, INTEREST *re* UNPAID ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5318 (iii).

FUMIGATING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).

FURNESS-WITHY CO., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

FYFE, MR., INSPECTION REP. *re* GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).

GABAROUSE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).

GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS *re* N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).

GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).

—— SURVEYS, LIFTING BOULDERS: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

—— DAM: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12608 (v).

—— RAPIDS CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &C.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y., 36; N., 14) 8403 (iv).

—— COMPLETION OF CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).

GANANOQUE ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970(i).

—— CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4823 (ii).

—— CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3791, 3897 (ii).

—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).

GARDEN PRODUCTS, READJUSTMENT OF DUTY, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y., 51; N., 100) 4799 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Speaker*) Members' remarks checked, 4768, 4779; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4768; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4770; (Mr. *Holmes*) 4771; (Mr. *Monk*) 4772; (Mr. *Ethier*) 4777; (Mr. *Speaker* members' remarks checked, 4779; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4782; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 4784; (Mr.

GARDEN PRODUCTS—*Con.*
Debate—*Con.*
Fielding) 4785; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4789; (Mr. *Campbell*) 4792; (Mr. *Broder*) 4796; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 4798 (ii).

GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
See 'Marine.'

Gas, Dom., Improvement Bill: *See* 'Dom. Gas.'

GASPE AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).

Gaspe and Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5891 (iii).

GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

GATE LIFTER, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).

GATES OVER RY. CROSSINGS: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5775 (iii).

GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C. P. R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup. 13457 (vi).

GAUDET, MR., COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

GAYNOR & GREENE EXTRADITION: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

GENELLE *vs.* THE KING, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. No. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1° m., 592; 2° m., 1065 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

——— **(Weigh Masters) Amt. B. No. 266** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Res. prop., 13264; in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808; 2°, and in Com., 14311; 3°*, 14313 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 24).

GENERAL STATEMENT, I. C. R.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Blair*) 3633 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

GENERAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

G. O. C., APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3779 (ii).

——— LORD DUNDONALD'S SPEECH AT HAMILTON: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).

——— REP. *re* DEFENCE SCHEME: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

——— REP., &C., PUBLISHMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
See 'Militia Act Amt.'

GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS, VISIT TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).

GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11188 (v).

GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 352 (i), 6824 (iii).

——— VICTORIA MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

——— EXPLORATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, PLOTS, PLANS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iii).

——— REP.: Presented (Sir. *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v), 13769 (vi

GEO. M. DEPEW: *See* 'Depew.'

GEORGEVILLE, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com of Sup., 13198 (vi).

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 13340 (vi).
See 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'

GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup. 6410 (iii).

GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).

GERMAN CONSUL BOPP, COR. WITH CAN. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

GERMAN GOODS (TEAPOT) IMPORTED UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on Customs Act, 3056 (ii).

GERMANS RECRUITED IN CANADA FOR NAVAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).

German Surtax Bill: *See* 'Customs.'

GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

GERMAN SURTAX, PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO IMPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3394 (ii).

GERMAN TARIFF, COR., &C.: Papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).

——— DISCRIMINATION AND BOND-HAY TREATY: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 1324 (i).

——— Lord Strathcona's Letter in Budget Speech, 1413 (i).

——— Mr. Fielding's Memorandum *re* Mr. Bopp in Budget Speech, 1414 (i).

'Gerrymander' Bill: *See* 'Representation.'

GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).

GLASS FACTORY, PICTOU: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii).

GLENGARRY SCOTTISH DEMONSTRATION: *See* 'Dundonald, Lord.'

GLOCKLING, MR. ROBERT, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iii).

GODERICH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).

——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).

GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).
See 'Yukon.'

GOLD NUGGETS, EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).

GOODERICH, MR., REMOVAL FROM MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).

Good Shepherd Reformatory St. John, N.B., B. No. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 4178; 2°, and in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4842 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 25).

GOODS IMPORTED DIRECT INTO CAN., VALUE OF DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 12716 (vi).

GOODWIN, GEO., COMPENSATION *re* SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

GORDON HIGHLANDERS' TROPHY: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7253 (iii).

GORE'S LANDING WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

GOVT. APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REP. *re* MARTINEAU INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

GOVT. BUSINESS FURTHER LEGISLATION: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13559 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 13547 (vi).

——— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3708 (ii).

——— PRECEDENCE ON WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1114 (i).

——— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

——— PRIVATE MEMBERS' DAY: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1343 (i).

——— REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 204 (i).
See 'Business of the Hse.'

GOVT. CONTRACTS TENDERS *re*: Par. in Ottawa *Free Press* (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

GOVT. LANDS: *See* 'Lands.'

GOVT. POLICY *re* DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works Transfer.'

GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED BY FIRE: *See* 'Mortimer & Co.'

GOVT. RY. POLICY, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7298 (iii).
See 'G. T. P. R.'

Govt. Rys., Supplies to: *See* 'Railway Act.'

Govt. Savings Bank: *See* 'Post office.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMANDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 446 (i).

——— REPAIRS TO 'STANLEY' AND 'LANSDOWNE': in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

——— SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4047, 5033 (ii).
See 'Marine.'

GOVT. STEAMER TO REPLACE 'ACADIA,' &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13659 (vi).

GOV. GEN'S OFFICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SPEECH AT CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

GRAHAM *vs.* KING, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* PUBLIC WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13471 (vi).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain Act,' 'General Inspection B. 266.'

GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).

GRAIN INSPECTION, COST PER CAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4837 (ii).

GRAIN INSPECTION *re* STANDARD SAMPLES, RES. OF TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).

——— OFFICIAL GRAIN WEIGHERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12535 (v).

Grain Scales: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 188.'

GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).

GRAIN STANDARD WEIGHING MACHINES: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).

GRAIN TRAFFIC FROM N.W.T.: *See* Ry. Transportation from N.W.T.

GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
See 'Automatic.'

GRAND BEND, ONT., BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

GRAND ETANG BRIDGE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).

GRANDE RIVIÈRE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

GRANDE VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514-1574 (i); Conc., 6070 (iii).

GRAND MANAN, BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).

GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTIONS in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).

GRAND NARROWS, BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).

——— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).

——— WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND PILES, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND RIVER WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); M. for Com., 4132; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 4441, 4586; M. for Com., 4871 (ii); in Com, 5139 (iii); 7814; 3° m., 8055, 8321 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 122).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3° m., 8055, 8321; amt. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8055, 8321; Amt. (Mr. *Kemp*) 8066; Amt. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8065; (Mr. *Wilmot*) 8067; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8324; Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) 8326 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. No. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 7658; Res. prop., 7915; M. for Com. on Res., 8406, 8488, 8559, 8617, 8656, 8718, 8808, 8918, 9082, 9152, 9218, 9351, 9431, 9459, 9582, 9683, 9820, 9980 (iv); 10102, 10243; agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10408; in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°, and in Com. on B. 10412, 10538, 11190, 11302, 11833, 11959, 12074, 12146, 12221 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12720 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 71).

—— AGREEMENT B. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*): Remarks, 8086 (iv).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.'S SUBSIDY B. NO. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 7658; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7697; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7726; Ruling reserved (Mr. *Speaker*) 7727 (iv).

Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 7915; (M.) for Com. on Res., 8406 (iv).

Debate: (Mr. *Blair*) 8406; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8467, 8489; (Mr. *Monk*) 8526; (Mr. *Fielding*) 8546; (Mr. *Barker*) 8593; (Mr. *Sifton*) 8617; (Mr. *Haggart*) 8680; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 8706, 8718; (Mr. *Sproule*) 8746; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8776; (Mr. *Oliver*) 8805; (Mr. *Lennox*) 8808; (Mr. *Morrison*) 8859; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8874; (Mr. *Russell*) 8907. 8919; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 8961; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 9006; (Mr. *Northrup*) 9039; (Mr. *Costigan*) 9064; (Mr. *Guthrie*) 9082; (Mr. *Puttee*) 9120; (Mr. *Kemp*) 9152; (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 9183; (Mr. *Bennett*) 9198; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 9218; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 9228; (Mr. *Logan*) 9238; (Mr. *Osler*) 9281; (Mr. *Heyd*) 9305; (Mr. *Ganong*) 9327; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 9351; (Mr. *Wilson*) 9367; (Mr. *Broder*) 9394; (Mr. *Mackie*) 9414; (Mr. *Lavell*) 9431; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 9447; (Mr. *Hackett*) 9459; (Mr. *Talbot*) 9472; (Mr. *Blain*) 9495; (Mr. *Fisher*) 9512; (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 9529; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 9553; (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 9573; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 9583; (Mr. *Porter*) 9597; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 9622; (Mr. *Tarte*) 9640; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 9666; (Mr. *Clancy*) 9683; (Mr. *German*) 9708; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9727; (Sir *William Mulock*) 9751; (Mr. *Bell*) 9784; (Mr. *Wade*) 9820; (Mr. *Brock*) 9871; (Mr. *Malouin*) 9882; (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) 9898; (Mr. *Bureau*) 9906; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 9909; (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 9927; (Mr. *Henderson*) 9942; (Mr. *Stephens*) 9963; (Mr. *Wilmot*) 9980; (Mr. *Girard*) 9992; (Mr. *Ward*) 10010; (Mr. *Davis*) 10019; (Mr. *Richardson*) 10040; (Mr. *Holmes*) 10049; (Mr. *Clare*) 10060; (Mr. *Archambault*) 10071; (Mr. *Boyd*) 10076; (Mr. *Johnston, Lambton*) 10096 (iv); (Mr. *Vrooman*) 10102; (Mr. *Murray*) 10111; (Mr. *Pringle*) 10118; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 10139; (Mr. *Henry Cargill*) 10146; (Mr. *Parmelee*) 10157; (Mr. *Ball*) 10165; (Mr. *Scott*) 10173; (Mr. *Birkett*) 10216; (Mr. *Beland*) 10224; (Mr. *Stewart*) 10235; (Mr. *Fowler*) 10243; (Mr. *Paterson*) 10275; (Mr. *Clarke*) 10308, 10317; (Mr. *Angers*) 10349; (Mr. *Gourley*) 10353 (v).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC, &C.—*Con.*

Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax.*) by (Mr. *Monk*) 10315; Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) neg. (Y. 68; N. 119) 10403; Amt. (Mr. *Puttee*) neg. (Y. 50; N. 135) 10404; Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) neg. (Y. 70; N. 117) 10406; M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10407 (v).

3° m., 12612, 12644 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12612; (amt.) 12642; neg. (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12644; (Mr. *Sproule*) 12657; (Mr. *Haggart*) 12676; (Mr. *Osler*) Amt., 12691; (Mr. *Fielding*) 12694; (Mr. *Broder*) 12695; (Mr. *Taylor*) 12697; (Mr. *Paterson*) 12698; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12699; (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 12700; (Mr. *Richardson*) 12701; neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12702; (Mr. *Alcorn*) Amt., 12703; neg. (Y. 35; N. 75) 12705; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) Amt., 12706; neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709; (Mr. *Fowler*) Amt., 12709; (Mr. *Northrup*) Amt., 12711; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12720, Amt., 12721; (Mr. *Blain*) Amt., 12724; (Mr. *Kemp*) 12729; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 12731; (Mr. *Hale*) 12733; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12734; (Mr. *Talbot*) 12736; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12736; (Mr. *Hackett*) 12740; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12743; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12743; (Mr. *Fowler*) 12744; (Mr. *Taylor*) Amt., 12750; (Mr. *Paterson*) 12755; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12755; (Mr. *Haggart*) 12757; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12758; (Mr. *Bennett*) 12761; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12761; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12762; (Mr. *Bennett*) Amt., 12767; (Mr. *Barker*) Amt., 12768; (Mr. *Charlton*) 12770; (Mr. *Henderson*) Amt., 12770; (Mr. *Bell*) Amt., 12772; (Mr. *Morin*) Amt., 12774 (vi).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Sproule*) Irregularity of Introduction of Bill, 7726 (iv), 12774; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12744 (vi).

G. T. P. RY., ALTERNATIVE POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).

—— COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT SYSTEMS: Remarks (Mr. *Cargill*) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

—— CONTRACTS *re* EASTERN PORTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 13027 (vi).

—— DISTRIBUTION OF BILL TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 8918 (iv).

—— FRENCH TRANSLATION OF BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Léonard*) 8118 (iv).

—— GOVT. POLICY, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7487 (iii).

—— M. (Mr. *Lennox*) to adjn. Debate, 8806 (iv).

—— M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 447 (i).

—— MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).

—— PARISHES CROSSED, LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).

—— PETS. *re* IRREGULARITIES, AFFIDAVITS, &C.: Par. in Montreal *Star* (Mr. *Talbot*) 14845; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14846 (vi).

—— PETS. *re*: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 13266; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 13266 (vi).

—— PETS. *re*, MEETINGS OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13559, 13671 (vi).

—— Remarks *re* (Mr. *Marcil, Bagot*) 12941 (vi).

G. T. P. Ry. Ques. of Order (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) Member reading Speech, 10249; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 10250 (v).
—— Subsidies : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 671, 1031 (i).
—— Subsidy : Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Kemp*) 5733 (iii).
—— Par. in Toronto *Globe re* Details (Mr. *Haggart*) 5892 (iii).
—— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— Mr. Hays Statement *re*, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 14648 (vi).
—— Surveys, 'Business System,' &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14355 (vi).
—— Surveys, Plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 8230 (iv).
—— Surveys, Reps. of Surveyors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14765 (vi).
—— Surveys, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. *Fielding*) 14765 (vi).
—— Two-Cent Rate, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 10462 (iv).
—— Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 12221 (v).
See 'G.T.R.'
—— Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 5892 (iii).
—— and Trans Canada, Sale, &c.: Par. in Toronto *News* : Read (Mr. *Monk*) 7566 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII* ; *c.* 121).

G. T. Ry. and C.P.R. Fiscal Policy : Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).
G.T.R. and I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 2759 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co., Discriminating Rates between Canadians and Americans : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).
—— Loans by Fed. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 2920 (ii).
—— Rentals from I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
—— Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
—— Terminals at St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
—— Two-Cent Rate, Repeal of Clause in Charter : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 11556, 11828 (v).
—— Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on B. 235, 12221 (v).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Granite Village, N.S., Mooring Pier : in Com. of Sup., (vi).
Grant, J. G., Barrie Customs Collector, Default, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).

Graves, Florence D. Relief B. No. 214 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 5581 ; 2°*, 5989 ; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 123).

Grazing Lands, N.W.T., Lease to Geo. McDonnell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
G.B. and Can. Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 13672 (vi).
See 'Can. and G. B.'
Great North-West Central Ry. and C. P. Ry. Co.'s Agreement : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

Great North West Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 124).

Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
'Grecian,' Str., Reimbursement to Capt. Harrison *re* Suspension of Certificate, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
Green Cove Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
Grenville Canal, Guide Pier at Entrance : in Com. ot Sup., 12909 (vi).
—— Payment to Henry Tucker *re* Investigations : in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
Grey Counties, Census Enumerators : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
Grey County, List of Public Buildings wanted : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
—— Supplies *re* Quarantine Service : in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
Guay, Mr. A., Compensation for Loss of Horse : in Com. of Sup., 5406 (iii).

Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1764 ; 2°*, 2050 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 125).

Guelph, Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
—— Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
Guilbault, Mr. Edward, Gratuity to Widow : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Gull Habbour, St. George's Bay, Man., Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
Guns ordered by British Army : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Guysborough, N.S., Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
Haanel, Dr., Supt. of Mines, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13764, 13774 (vi).
Hagar, Miss, Appnmt. at Experimental Farm : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5316 (iii).
Haldimand, Census Enumerator : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).
Half-Breed Claims, Commissions, Applications for Scrip, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
—— Schools, Salaries paid, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).

HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
See 'Can. and G. B.,' 'Mail Subsidies,' &c.
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
—— AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
—— COTTON CO., LOAN OF RAILS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
—— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
—— DEEP-WATER TERMINUS, I.C.R., DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).
—— HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
—— HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
—— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 12874, 14080 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
—— MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*) 14279 (vi).
—— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com of Sup., 13032 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
—— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
—— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
—— TIME BALL: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
—— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HALTON, PEEL AND CARDWELL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
Hamilton, &c., Power Co.: *See* 'Jordan Light, &c.'
Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4587; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 126.)
HAMILTON, DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
—— ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER CO., RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3803 (ii).
—— GRIMSBY ELECTRIC RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6084 (iii).
HAMILTON INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, MONTREAL, LOAN B. NO. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5417 (iii).
See 'Montreal.'
HARBOUR AND RIVERS AND BRIDGES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
—— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii), 13308 (vi).
—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
—— MAR. PROVS., GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424 (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1512, 2241 (i), 3304 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
—— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
HARDY BAY, B.C., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
HARRISON, CAPT., STR. *Grecian*, COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
HARRISON, MR., INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, N.B., RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY., SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).
HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
HATFIELDS POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
HAULAGE OF GOVT., &C., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
HAWK POINT INLET, N.S., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HAWKESBURY, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup, 13119 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, ONT., TO SOUTH INDIAN, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAY AND OATS BOUGHT BY CAN. GOVT. FOR IMPERIAL GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr *Monk*) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 66) 690 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) for Ret., 1057 (i).
HAYCOCK, MR. J., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4960 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).

HAZELTON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

HEALTH ACT, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4440 (ii).

HEATH, GEO., COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).

'HERALD' PRINTING CO., MONTREAL, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 8329 (vi); Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

HERCHMER, MR. L. W., PENSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5321 (iii).

HERRING COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

HÊTU, RUDOLPH, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 7915 (iv).

Hides Inspection Bill: *See* 'General Inspection.'

HIDES INSPECTION, TEL. FROM W. F. MACLEAN, M.P.: Read (Mr. *Sproule*) 3969 (ii).

HIDES INSPECTION AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).

HIDES, TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7748 (iv), 13678 (vi).

HIGGINS SHORE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup, 12585 (v).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).

——— CONTRACTORS AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).

——— CONTRACTORS NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).

——— PREPARATION OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD, PAINTING OF PORTRAIT BY CANADIAN ARTIST: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13026 (vi).

HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

HNAUSA WHARF EXTENSION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).

HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).

——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).

HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
See 'Cattle Guard Comn.'

Home Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 191 (Mr. *Russell*) 1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 127.)

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 720 (i).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND—*Con.*

Debate: (Mr. *Hackett*) 731; (Mr. *Charleton*) 734; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 740; (Mr. *Sproule*) 742; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 751; (Mr. *Broder*) 754; (Mr. *Belcourt*) 758; (Mr. *Richardson*) 761; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 763; (Mr. *Kemp*) 766; (Mr. *Murray*) 767; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 769; (Mr. *Wright*) 772; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 772; (Mr. *Porter*) 775; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 778; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 782; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 787; (Mr. *Reid*) 787; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 788; (Mr. *Clarke* 794; (Mr. *Ingram*) 809 (i).

——— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 871 (i).

——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to present Address to His Maj., 1193 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13894 (vi).

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FREE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

——— *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iii).

——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).

——— LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'

HOPEWELL CAPE, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

HOSPITALS FOR TREATMENT OF TRACHOMA, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
See 'Trachoma.'

HOSPITALS OF ISOLATION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).

'HOT AIR LINE' RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14490 (vi).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS: *See* 'Rooms,' &c.

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, PRIVATE BILLS PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).

——— *See* general heading.

CARGILL, HENRY, LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12937 (vi).

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notification of Appnmt. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

CONSERVATIVE LITERATURE: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

DOOR-KEEPER'S SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

ELECTION LAW, LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

ELECTION PAMPHLETS, FRANKING, &C.: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGMENT OF SUPREME COURT: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 91 (i).

ELECTIONS OF 1878, CONGRATULATIONS TO PRIME MINISTER (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

ELEVATOR ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5417 (iii).

FARQUHARSON, MR., late M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).

FLINT, T. B., CLERK OF HSE., APPNMT.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE *re* CAMPAIGN LITERATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 14286 (vi).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

FRANKING PRIVILEGES : *See* 'Mail Bags.'
GOVT. APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 3632 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS, BETTER ACCOMMODATION *re* ROOMS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13007 (vi).
——— INCREASES TO CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii), 14112 (vi).
——— LOCKED P.O. BOXES : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Vic.*) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT : *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'
——— *See* 'Schell, J. T.'
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS : in Com. of Sup., 14112 (vi).
LIBRARY OF PARLT. : in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
See general heading.
LOY, GEO. M., INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT, &C. : on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8008 ; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
——— *See* 'Beauharnois Electoral District.'
——— REP. OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS : Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 7203 (iii).
MAIL BAGS AND CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, BLOCKING CORRIDORS : Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*, *Bonaventure*) 14219 (vi).
See general heading.
MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).
MEMBERS APPOINTED TO GOVT. POSITION : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 3805 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 3632 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 9582 (iv).
MEMBERS INTRODUCED : 3, 7, 283, 1642 (i).
——— CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3, 367 (i).
MEMBERS' RIGHTS TO SPEAK *re* MR. SPEAKER'S RULING : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 10535 (v).
MESSENGERS OF THE H. OF C. : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— *See* 'House.'
MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90, 707 (i). 4956 (ii), 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 90, 707 (i), 4956 (ii), 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— Read (*Dep. Speaker*) 12869 (vi).
ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 367 (i).
ORDER, QUES. OF, *re* BRUNET AND DOM. ELECTIONS : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 108 (i).
OTTAWA PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, ADDITIONAL ROOMS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).
PARLIAMENT, DATE OF CONVENING, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).
PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DUST NUISANCE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 2104 (i).
——— PLAYING CRICKET : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
PERKINS, WM., PAYMENT TO, *re* LISGAR ELECTION : in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
PETITIONS, PRESENTATION OF, RULES, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
PETITIONS REJECTED AS CONTRARY TO RULE 86 : (Mr. *Speaker*) 654 (i).
PRESS REPRESENTATIVES IN GALLERY OF H. OF C., SESSIONAL SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14242 (vi).
PRIME MINISTER, CONGRATULATIONS *re* TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS A MEMBER : (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PRINTING : *See* general heading.
PRIVATE BILLS : M. (Mr. *Morrison*) to extend Time, 10489 (v).
——— M. to suspend Rule (Mr. *Russell*) 4958 (ii).
——— NOTICES, REVISING RULES *re* : M. (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) *re* Rep. of Joint. Com., 13547 (vi).
——— *See* 'Rules.'
——— ORDER FOR PROCEDURE : Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* VISITORS IN CORRIDORS, 11557 (v).
——— *See* 'Visitors.'
——— (Mr. *Robinson*, *Elgin*) *re* ATTENDANCE IN HOUSE, 2015 (i).
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION TO BOARDS OF TRADE : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1378 (i).
——— *See* 'Parliamentary Documents.'
QUEENS, WEST, P.E.I. REPRESENTATION *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).
ROOMS FOR MEMBERS, FURNITURE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).
——— *See* 'House,' &c.
RULES OF HSE., REVISION, &C. *re* PETS. FOR PRIVATE BILLS : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Demers*) 4441 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) to amend, 12216 (v).
——— *See* 'Private Bills.'
RUSSELL ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 1022 (i).
ST. JAMES (MONTREAL) ELECTORAL DIVISION, JUDGMENT OF SUP. COURT : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WARRANT : M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13303 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i), 6995 (iii), 13376 (vi).
——— NOTIFICATION OF VACANCY : (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).
——— *See* 'Brunet.'
SCHELL, J. T., M.P., 1ST REP. OF PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS COM. *re* : Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*, *Essex*) 5511 (iii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14242 (vi).
——— INCREASES TO, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 14113 (vi).
——— MESSENGERS : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See 'Messengers.'
SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE, DATE OF MEETING : M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).
SITTINGS OF HOUSE : *See* 'Govt. Business.'
TRADESMEN'S ACCOUNTS FOR H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).
VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 1023 (i).
VENTILATION IN H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 13007 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).
VISITORS IN H. OF C. CORRIDORS : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 11427 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lennox*) 11557 (v).
VOTERS' LISTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 5274 (iii).
WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE, MEMBER FOR ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUSSELL : Introduced, 1642 (i).

HOWIE, F. W., LEGAL EXPENSES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

Hudson's Bay, Change of Name B. No. 173 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 2794 (ii).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Co.'s B. No. 124 (Mr. *Stewart*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 129.)

Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Haggart*) 1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 128.)
See 'James Bay.'

HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

HULL WHARF, COMPLETION: in Com. of Sup., 5900 (iii).

HUNGARIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iii).

HUNTER, J. B., PROMOTION: in Com. of Sup., 13499 (vi).

HURLEY, J. M., APPNMT., DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (iii), 5280 (iii).
——— REP., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 13744 (vi).

HURON COUNTY JUDGESHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 123 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4588 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 131.)

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 1327; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 130.)

HUTTON, MAJ.-GEN., INQUIRY FOR RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 206 (i).

HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii), 13312 (vi).

HYDRAULIC LEASES, YUKON TER.: M. for Cor.*, (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).
——— O.C.'S &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*) 1323 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720, 4118 (ii).

IMMIGRATION, &C., INADEQUATE INSPECTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6546; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 6557; (Mr. *Oliver*) 6562: (Mr. *Puttee*) 6567; (Mr. *Richardson*) 6573; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 6576; (Mr. *Bell*) 6577; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6590; (Mr. *Davis*) 6596; (Mr. *Sifton*) 6603 (iii).

IMMIGRATION:
ACCOMMODATION FOR SETTLERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Sup., 1119 (i).
AGENCIES IN OLD COUNTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iii).
AGENCIES, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6615, 6658 (iii).
BARR COLONY, IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
——— NUMBER, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
BARR COLONY, BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
See 'general heading.'
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE DELEGATES, TREATMENT BY U.S. IMMIGRATION OFFICERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).
DEVLIN, MR., SUCCESSOR OF, AS IMMIGRATION AGENT, IRELAND: in Com of Sup., 6731 (iii).
DISEASED IMMIGRANTS, INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
DOUKHOBORS, HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
——— LOANS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
——— PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
——— AND GOVTL., ACTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
ELLIS, DR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6702.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
EXPENDITURE, 1902–3: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6269 (iii).
FABER, DR., ILLEGAL PRACTICE, CHARGES *re* PAR. IN 'STAR': Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iii).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6850 (iii).
FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674, 6700 (iii).
GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS, *re* N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).
GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 2299 (i), 6827 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6269 (iii).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
HAZLETON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FFEE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704.
——— IMMIGRATION AGENTS, PRE-EMPTION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Sproule*) 289 (i).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
——— LANDS, AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
HOSPITALS OF ISOLATION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).
HUNGARIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iii).
IMMIGRANTS, LANDING AT QUEBEC, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5318 (iii).
——— Notice of M. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6522 (iii).
——— *See* general heading.
——— PROVISION FOR NEW SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 866 (i).
——— REFUSED ADMISSION INTO CANADA, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2310 (i), 2501 (ii).
IMMIGRATION INTO MAN., HOUSES AND FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1593 (i).
——— QUES. OF ORDER *re* DISCUSSION: in Com. of Sup, 6854 (iii).
——— *re* observance of Rules, 6862 (iii).
——— *re* quoting of Speeches, 6870–74 (iii).
——— STATISTICS, TOTAL NUMBER, ORIGIN, EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 1035 (i).
IRELAND, IMMIGRATION OFFICE, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1031 (i).
See 'Devlin.'
LAKE ST. JOHN COL. CO., EXPENDITURE *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iii).
LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN B.C., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).
See 'Homestead' &c.

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

MAR. PROVS., IMMIGRANTS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1855 (i).
MEDICAL EXAMINER, QUEBEC, &C.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTION, GOVT. APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2756 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 6695, 6851 (iii).
MURRAY, IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
NATIONALITIES, &C., IMMIGRATION, 1902-3: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2310 (i).
N.S. EXODUS TO U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
ONT. AND QUEBEC, IMMIGRATION FOR, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1593 (i).
PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
PRESTON, MR., INTERVIEW *re* CAN. BUTTER: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).
——— STATEMENT *re* CAN. APPLES: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
——— SUIT BY CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
P.E.I. AGENTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6884 (iii).
QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
REPATRIATION AGENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6674, 6700 (iii).
RITCHIE, MR., U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).
SETTLERS EFFECTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).
TRACHOMA EPIDEMIC *re* IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 5493 (iii).
——— HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6662, 6696, 6843 (iii).
U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).
U.S. IMMIGRATION EXODUS TO: in Com. of Sup., 6727, 6874 (iii).
WHITE, MR., EXPENSES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6732, 6853 (iii).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 11188 (v).
See 'Interior', 'Indians,' &c.

Immoral Intertainments: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

Imperial Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 2956, 3170 (ii). (3 *Edward VII., c.* 132).

'IMPERIAL' BUILDING, OTTAWA, GOVT. OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3803 (ii).

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, COR., &C., CAN. GOVT'S., REFUSAL TO PUBLISH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 9457 (iv).
——— Papers *re* laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
——— *See* 'Colonial.'

IMPERIAL DEFENCE AND PROP. RES. OF LORD ROSEBERY: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 410 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Reserve,' &c.

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CANADIAN EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).

IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION, NAMES OF OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 12715, 13936 (vi).

IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION SYSTEM *re* SELECTION OF CIVIL SERVANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13669 (vi).

IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 13935 (vi).
See 'Preferential,' 'Tariff,' &c., 'Customs,'&c.

Incorporated Companies B. No. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1193 (i); 2° m., 3257 (ii).

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.', 'Schell, J. T.'

INDIANS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR N.W. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY TELEPHONE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*), 6895 (iii).
BLANKETS, CLOTHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
BRANT, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOL, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).
CLOTHING FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).
DOKIS RESERVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST TRESPASSERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 7914 (iv).
DONCASTER RESERVE, SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*), 288 (i).
EDMONTON AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
EDMUNDSTON RESERVE, N.B., FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
ELKHORN SCHOOL, N.W.T.. AVERAGE ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSION *re* APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*), 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
HALF-BREED SCHOOLS, SALARIES PAID, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 13760 (vi).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 272 (i).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
INDIAN AGENTS, B.C., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iii)
——— GUARDIANS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*), 819 (i).
——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7262 (iii).
INDIANS, BRANT RESERVE, LEASE, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tisdale*), 1322 (i).
INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
INDIANS, CHIEFS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
——— GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
——— LAND MANAGEMENT FUND: in Com, of Sup., 6415 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KINGS, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2501 (ii).
——— N.B., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— N.S., PURCHASE OF RESERVE LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
——— N.W.T., AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
—— N.W.T., LIVE STOCK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iii).
—— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
—— ONT. AND QUEBEC, ROAD REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
—— QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
—— RESERVES, RE-ALLOTMENT, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7262 (iii).
—— SCHOOLS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 6409, 6414 (iii).
—— SCHOOLS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
—— SUPPLIES, N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).
—— SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS. B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iii),
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
—— B.C.: in Com of Sup., 13785 (vi).
—— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
ROBINSON TREATY, PAYMENTS *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 5319 (iii).
ST. JOHN'S RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).
SAND, INDIAN BOY ADOPTED BY MR. JOHNSTON: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii).
SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii), 13786 (vi).
—— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
SEED GRAIN, RELIEF: in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
—— N. W. T. Reserves, &c., 6350 (iii).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 7258 (iii).
STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
TERREBONNE INDIAN RESERVE: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
—— *See* 'Doncaster.'
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WADSWORTH, MR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
YUKON INDIANS, GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iii).
—— RELIEF, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7270 (iii)
See 'Immigration' 'Interior,' &c.

INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
INDIAN RIVER RY. AND LAKE MEGANTIC SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, B. C., ROYAL COMMISSION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
—— *See* 'Labour,' &c.
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS FOR INDIANS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
INGERSOLL TO STRATFORD, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14345 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 186 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4007; in Com., 4007; 3°*, 4009 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 26).

INLAND REVENUE:

ALCOHOL: *See* 'Wood.'
ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS in N.W.T., REP. OF INSPECTOR, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*) 847, 880 (i).
BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).
CHEVRIER FAMILY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12498 (v), 12716 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13971 (vi).
CLEMENT, JULES, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13664 (vi).
CULLING TIMBER, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
DISTILLERIES, &c., INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com., of Sup., 13974 (vi).
DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNTS PAID TO *re* TRIP TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5407 (iii).
EXCISE OFFICERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
—— SALARIES *re* C. S. ACT AMT.: in Com. of Sup., 13967 (vi).
—— TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (vi).
EXCISE TAXATION PER CAPITA FOR 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
FERGUSON, J. M., LEGAL EXPENSES *re* ADULTERATION ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5412 (iii).
FORREST, E., REIMBURSEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
FYFE, MR., REP. *re* GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
—— Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).
GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
GRAIN INSPECTION, COST PER CAR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4837 (i).
—— *re* STANDARD SAMPLES, RES. OF TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINE: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*, &c.) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 89 (i).
—— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
—— INSPECTORS, &c.: Salaries in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
INSPECTION OF STAPLES: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*

KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).
KELLY, ASST. INSPECTOR, REFUND, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 5405 (iii).
LIQUOR INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
LONGFORD: *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191,-4203 (ii).
MAN. GRAIN ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— INSPECTION *re*, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
——— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLIED TO MANUFACTURERS: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
——— *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
MONTREAL INLAND REV. OFFICE, MONEY STOLEN: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
PRESCOTT, INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
STANDARD CHEMICAL COMPANY, PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
——— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
TOBACCO COMBINE, CHAIRMAN'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).
TOBACCO EXCISE DUTIES: PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5701 (iii).
TOBACCO STAMPS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).
WOOD ALCOHOL, MANUFACTURED AT LONGFORD, OUTPUT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 98 (i).
——— *See* 'Standard.'
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

Insolvency B. No. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 654; 2° m., 2373 (i); on Order for 2°, 2787; 2° m., 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

INSOLVENT ACT, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 818 (i).

Inspection Act: *See* 'General.'
——— *See* 'Textile Fabrics.'

INSPECTION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).
INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS. *See* 'Immigration.'
INSPECTION OF STAPLES: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
INSURANCE COS. OF CANADA, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1025 (i).
INSURANCE FUND, P. O., REP., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
INSURANCE RATES *re* MARINE SHIPPING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13697 (vi).
INSURANCE, ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
——— REPORT OF SUPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9350 (iv).
——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12586 (v).
INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8230 (iv).
——— *See* 'Imperial Preference.'
——— CONFIDENTIAL REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7923 (iv).

I. C. R., Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. Act, B. 258.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

ADDITIONAL SIDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 14055(vi).
——— *See* 'Sidings.'
AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).
BOOK-KEEPING *re* EXPENDITURE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8270 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 12877 (vi).
BRIDGES, STRENGTHENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).
BROWN, MRS., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
CAR SHOPS, NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
——— *See* 'Machinery,' 'Moncton,' &c.
'CHAPMAN' BALL-BEARING APPARATUS, REP. *re*: Remarks in Com of Sup., 8283 (iv).
——— LETTER *re*: Read (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
——— *See* 'Muhlfeld.'
CHAUDIERE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).
CLERGUE'S CONTRACT FOR STEEL RAILS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER PATENT: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).
COAL RATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 6167 (iii).
DEMURRAGE ON CARS, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).
DOUBLE TRACKING: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).
DRAW BARS ON FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 8288 (iv).
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
DRUMMONDVILLE SIDING, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).
EARNINGS, &c., DATE OF INTERIM REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4444 (ii).
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FREIGHT CARS ON CONNECTING LINES, &c.: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
——— FREIGHT RATES, CLASSES 1-10: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.* 2338 (i).
——— *See* 'Traffic.'
——— RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1857 (i).
——— *See* 'Traffic Arrangements,' &c.
GENERAL STATEMENT: on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Blair*) 3633 (ii).
——— INQUIRY FOR PAPERS *re* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3537 (ii).
GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
HAULAGE OF GOVT., &c., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12593 (v), 12823 (vi).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONSTRUCTION FOR I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

LEVIS, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
——— LAND PURCHASE, PAYMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &C., PURCHASED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
LORNE SIDING, TRAFFIC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR LOCOMOTIVE AND CAR SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 8290 (iv), 14106 (vi).
MONCTON, INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS, I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
MONTREAL LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'Chapman.'
OFFICIAL GUIDE, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3535 (ii).
OPERATING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7811 (iv).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3698 (ii).
PASSES: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9582 (iv).
PENSION SYSTEM, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 9216 (iv).
PINTSH GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
PRIVATE CARS, PURCHASE BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2309 (i).
See 'Haulage.'
RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: in Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).
RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1857 (i).
REP. OF MR. POTTINGER *re* TIES, &C.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Haggart*) 3806 (ii).
RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, FIRE PROTECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
RHODES, CURRY & CO., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100 (vi).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup. 8314 (iv).
——— SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gouvreau*) 12497 (v).
RIVER OUELLE BRANCH, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).
——— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).
ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8292 (iv), 14100 (vi).
'SCOTIA' STR., SALVAGE SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
——— Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 7150 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7206 (iii).
SIDINGS AND INCREASED FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14081, 14107 (vi).
See 'Additional.'
STEEL RAILS, FASTENINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).
——— CONTRACT WITH CLERGUE SYNDICATE: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
——— CONTRACT, PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 285 (i).
SUPPLIES ENTERED DUTY FREE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fowler*) 916 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

SUSSEX, N.B., ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672 (ii).
SYDNEY JUNCTION TO NORTH SYDNEY EXTENSION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 447 (i).
TARIFF RATES, INQUIRY FOR PAPERS: (Mr. *Bell*) 3712 (ii).
See 'Freight.'
TERMINAL FACILITIES AT BONAVENTURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
TIES IMPORTED FOR GOVT. RYS., COST, QUANTITY, &C., Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1679 (i).
——— PURCHASED, USED, &C.; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
TRACKMEN ON I. C. R., INCREASE OF WAGES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12874, 14083 (vi).—
——— Remarks in Com. on B. 257 (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 12558 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 1297 (i).
TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH G. T. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 2759 (ii).
VESTIBULE EQUIPMENT FOR CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT, EVIDENCE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3301, 3398 (ii).
WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
See 'Railways.'

INTERIOR:

ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii).
ASTRONOMICAL DEMARCATION, WORKS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i) 6791 (iii).
BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
BANFF SPRINGS, BATHS: in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii) 13955 (vi).
——— MUSEUM BUILDING, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
——— ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
BELL, DR., APPNMT. AS DIRECTOR OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
C. P. R. LANDS, AND SCHOOL TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).
CANE BROS., GRANTS FOR TIMBER LICENSE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).
CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).
COTTEE, HERBERT, SALARY AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3610 (ii).
CROWS'S NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— COMMISSIONER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iii).
——— INSPECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N. W. T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816 (i).
——— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— SALE, LOCATION, PURCHASERS &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 670 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

DOM. LANDS SURVEYORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).
——— SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 6939 (iii).
——— YUKON REGULATIONS *re*: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).
GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS, VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).
GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, VICTORIA MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 352 (i), 14243 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11188 (v).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— EXPLORATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
——— PLOTS, PLANS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iii).
——— REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v), 13769 (vi).
GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).
GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T., LEASE TO GEO. MCDONNELL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
GUAY, MR. A., COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF HORSE: in Com. of Sup., 5406 (iii).
HAANEL, DR., SUPT. OF MINES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13764, 13774 (vi).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSIONS, APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
INTERIOR, DEPTL. EMPLOYEES, DATE OF APPNMT., SALARIES, &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Ret.,* 23.8 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
——— COMPLAINTS *re* ILLUSTRATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3972 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6922 (iii).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 267 (i), 13761 (vi).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, GEOLOGISTS REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iii).
——— CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY, VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).
IRRIGATION, N.W.T., SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).
JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1198 (i).
LAND GUIDES, *re* SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6768 (iii).
LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1858 (i).
LAND SLIDES: *See* 'Turtle Mountain.'
——— *See* 'Frank Disaster.'
LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).
LOW, A. P., TECHNICAL OFFICER, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13770 (vi).
MCDONALD, GEO., LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL LANDS, PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 6169 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

MAN. AND N.W.T., SCHOOL LANDS, SALES, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 6893 (iii).
MAPS, LITHOGRAPHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6800 (iii), 13778 (vi).
——— PRINTING, &C., INFORMATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
MEHAN, DR., METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
METALLURGISTS AND PETROGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13778 (vi).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MINES BRANCH, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13762 (vi).
MINING INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 12591 (v), 13965 (vi).
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO., CONTRACT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13372 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13667, 13933 (vi).
N. W. TERS., MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
P. E. I. COAL FIELDS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO., SECTIONS ACQUIRED, &C.: M. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) for Cor.*, 2338.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (*W. J. Roche*) 4363 (ii).
——— SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (ii).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STEWART, E., FOREST INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6416, 6774 (iii).
SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS, PURCHASE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6320 (iii)
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
TELESCOPE FOR OTTAWA OBSERVATORY; in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
TREE CULTURE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii).
——— PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13775 14272 (vi).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
TYERMAN, P. D., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 286 (i).
VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See 'Geological.'
WASHINGTON, MR. HECTOR, REP. *re* LAND VALUES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
WINNIPEG LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
YOHO PARK, ROADS CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
See 'Immigration', 'Indians', &c.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Com., 91 (i).

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, GEOLOGIST'S REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iii).

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY, VISIT TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).

'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE, LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr *Fowler*) 12218 (v).

International Railway Appliance Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 40 (Mr. *Brock*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 133.)

INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. OF N. B., RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

INTERNATIONAL TARIFF CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 125; on Order for 2°, 566, 705; 2° m., 916; neg., 939 (i).

Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 144 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2395 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 134.)

INTERPROVINCIAL AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
See 'James Bay.'

INTERVIEW WITH N. Y. REPORTERS *re* ALASKAN BOUNDARY: Denial (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13962 (vi).

INVERNESS MINES, N. S., BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).

INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).

INVERNESS RY. AND COAL CO.'S RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).

IONA, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. B.: *See* 'Steel,' &c.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com, of Sup., 7762 (iv).

—— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7795 (iv).

—— PAYMENTS FOR 1890–1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 11556 (v).

—— PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6435 (iii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Fielding*) 4278; (Mr. *Bell*) 4279; (Mr. *Kendall*) 4288; (Mr. *Osler*) 4293; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4297; (Mr. *Clancy*) 4300; (Mr. *Pringle*) 4309; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4322; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4329 (Mr. *Oliver*) 4336; (Mr. *Heyd*) 4338; (Mr. *Pope*) 4341 (ii).

—— TARIFF PROTECTION: Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3864 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) *re* Notice of Motion, 4040 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).

IROQUOIS CANAL, ELECTRIC LIGHTING: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

IRRIGATION, N. W. T., SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).

ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).

ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).

ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).

—— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).

JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

JAMES AND HUDSON'S BAYS, FISHING RIGHTS, APPLICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6893 (iii).

JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).

James Bay Ry.: *See* 'Interprovincial.'

JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

JAPAN EXHIBITION, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, INFLUX OF: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 3713 (ii).

JAPANESE TARIFF *re* U.S. PRODUCTS: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

JAPAN TRADE WITH CAN., CUSTOMS DUTIES *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8617 (iv).

JEDDORE EAST, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

JEROME, MARTIN, M.P.P., AND MAN. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 5321 (iii).

'JESSE JAMES' SERIES OF PUBLICATIONS, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).

—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

JOGGINS RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).

JOHNSON, MR., PURCHASE OF HOUSE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).

JOINT HIGH COMMISSION AND RECIPROCITY WITH U.S.: Par. in Toronto *World* (Mr. *Sproule*) 14053 (vi).
See 'Alaskan,' 'Colonial,' &c.

—— COR. WITH SENATOR FAIRBANKS: in Budget Speech, 1407 (i).

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Co.'s Incorp, B. No. 52 (Mr. *Bazinet*) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com. and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 135.)

JOLIETTE AND LAKE MANUAN RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).

JONQUIERES TO HA HA BAY RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

Jordan Light, Heat and Power Co.'s B. No. 162 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2582: 2°*, 2756; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 136.)

JUBILEE STAMPS, SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6060 (iii).

Judges of the N. W. Ters. Act Amt. B. No. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 12609 (v) ; 2°, in Com., 13853, 14287 ; 3°*, 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 40.)

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. No. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 10102 ; in Com on Res., 10759 ; 1°* ; 2°*, and in Com., 10792, 11406 ; 3°*, 11422 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 27.)

Judges Retiring Allowance B. No. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 1° m., 93 ; wthdn., 634 (i).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. No. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 203 (i) ; wthdn., 2582 ; Res. prop., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii), 8087 ; in Com. on Res., 8369 ; 1°*, 2°* of B. and in Com., and 3°*, 8372 (iv) ; Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 29.)

Judges of Superior Court (Quebec) Act Amt. B. No. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), Res. prop., 11426 ; in Com. on Res., 11821 ; 2° m., 11833 ; 1°* of B, 11833 ; 2°*, and in Com., 12301 ; 3°*, 12302 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 28.)

JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, RETIRING ALLOWANCES B.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 3431 (ii).

JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), 11072 (v).

JUDGES APPOINTED FROM LOCAL BAR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

JUDGES, B.C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

——— MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

——— N.S., INCREASE OF SALARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

JUDGES SALARIES, COUNTY COURTS, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3628 (ii).

——— LEGISLATION *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 95 (i).

JUDGESHIP, OFFER TO CONSERVATIVE POLITICIAN : Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13805 (vi).

JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND OUTSIDE LEGAL BUSINESS : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*), 14665 (vi).

JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).

JUSTICE :

AD HOC JUDGES : in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

ADMIRALTY COURT, ACCOMMODATION FOR SITTINGS : in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

BINDER TWINE, COST IN 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 447 (i)

——— NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 3798 (ii).

——— PRICES FOR CURRENT YEAR, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 203 (i).

——— PRICES FIXED FOR PENITENTIARY SUPPLY : Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 1595 (i).

——— *See* 'Sisal.'

B.C. STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O.Cs., &c* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), 706 (i).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

B. C. STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2016 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to print, 2675 (ii).

BRUNET, ARTHUR, AND DOM. ELECTION ACT : M. for Pets., O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 101 (i).

CLARKE, DUNCAN, EX. COURT : in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

COMMUTATION OF CARVER : Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), 13303 (vi.)

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES : *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

COOKE *vs.* COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

COUNTY COURTS, APPOINTMENTS FROM LOCAL BARS : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*), 5582 (iii).

——— APPNMTS., RETIREMENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*), 4960 (ii).
See 'Judges.'

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, N.B., SALARY OF JUDGE : in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

DOM. STATUTES CONSOLIDATION : *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*), 10102 (v).

EXCHEQUER COURT, JUDGE'S TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR, EDITING REPS. : in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

EXECUTIONS, EXPENDITURES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

GAYNOR & GREENE, EXTRADITION : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 109 (i).

GENELLE *vs.* THE KING, LEGAL EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

GRAHAM *vs.* KING, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* PUBLIC WORKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13471 (vi).

HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).

HETU, RUDOLPHE, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*), 7915 (iv).

HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

HOWIE, F. W., LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), 11072 (v).

JUDGES APPOINTED FROM LOCAL BAR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
See 'County.'

——— QUES. OF ORDER *re* : Ruling (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*), 209 (i).

JUDGES, B.C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

JUDGESHIP, HURON COUNTY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

——— MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

JUDGESHIP, MANITOBA, DELAY IN APPNMT. ; Remarks in Com of Sup., 212 (i).

JUDGE, N.W.TERS. SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).

JUDGES, N.S., INCREASE OF SALARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

JUDGES, QUEBEC, COMPLAINTS *re* OUTSIDE BUSINESS : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).

——— JUDGESHIP, OFFER TO CONSERVATIVE POLITICIAN : Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13805 (vi).

——— SALARIES, COUNTY COURTS, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3628 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

JUDGES, QUE., SALARIES, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 95 (i).
——— YUKON, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com of Sup., 3409 (ii).
JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).
——— DEP. REPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 90 (i).
——— INCREASE OF SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*), 10100 (v).
See 'Binder Twine.'
LAW LIBRARY IN ENGLAND, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 98 (i).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* GOVT. CASES: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
LEGAL OPINIONS *re* G.T.P. CLAUSE, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).
LITIGATION EXPENSES *re* INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 6794 (iii).
MANITOBA PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGE'S REP., &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).
MYERS, JUDGE OF MAN., REP. IN HANSARD: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).
N.W. TER. MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
PARDONS, PREROGATIVE OF HIS EX., O. CS., &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 567 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
PENITENTIARY, CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
——— GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
PRENDERGAST AND MAN. JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT, CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii).
REVISION OF DOM. STATUTES, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14643 (vi).
——— REVISION COMMISSION, NAMES, PROGRESS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1029 (i).
ROBERT *vs.* KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. REGIS LOCKUP: in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
——— HOSPITAL: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
——— WARDEN'S RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 286 (i).
——— ACTING WARDEN, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 10831 (v).
SISAL USED IN BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8085 (iv).
——— *See* 'Binder.'
STEWART *vs.* KING, LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

SUPREME COURT, CONTINGENCIES, DISBURSEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
——— LIBRARY, PURCHASE OF BOOKS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3402, 3405 (ii).
——— REPORTER, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).
——— REPORTS, BINDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3405 (ii).
——— SALARY OF MR. TASCHEREAU: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
——— TICKET OF LEAVE ACT, RELEASE, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 566 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
TOBACCO COMMISSION EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 8267 (iv).
WABY, INDIAN PRISONER, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iii).
YUKON TER. GOVT., ADMINISTRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

Juvenile Offenders (N.B.) Act Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 94; 2°*, 314; in Com., 314; 3°*, 316 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 30.)

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
KAMOURASKA, EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).

Keller Heater Co. of Can. Patent Relief B. No. 231 (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to receive Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294; 2°*, 7487 (iii); in Com. and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 137.)

KELLY, ASST. INSPECTOR, REFUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
KELLY & BURNETT, LEASE OF FALSE CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).
——— *See* 'False Creek.'
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938, 6064 (iii).
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
KENSINGTON, STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KETCH, N.S., HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).

Kettle River Valley Railway Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 138.)

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).
KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
KINGS, N.B., INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2502 (ii).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 976 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 139.)

KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i), 13202 (vi).

King's Printer B.: *See* 'Public Printing.'

KING'S S.A. MEDALS PET., *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).

KINGSTON BARRACKS, R. C. FIELD ARTILLERY: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).

KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).

—— GROCERY CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).

KINGSTON ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).

—— STABLE: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 13117 (vi).

KINGSVILLE, ONT., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 6268 (iii).

—— *See* 'Customs.'

KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).

Klondike Mines Railway Co.'s B. No. 177 (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to receive Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219; 2°*, 3583; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 140).

KLONDIKE MINES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 33 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 141).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 142).

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

—— CORRECTION, &c.: in Com., 14519 (vi).

LABOUR COMMISSION 1886, NAMES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 8083 (iv).

LABOUR COMMISSION, B.C., APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1595 (i).

—— REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 8116 (iv).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Ingram*) 7198 (iii).

LABOUR DAY ADJOURNMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10489 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 10712 (v).

—— DELAYING SESSION, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10742 (v).

LABOUR DEPARTMENT, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).

LABOUR DISPUTES, SETTLEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4003 (ii).

Labour Disputes Settlement: *See* 'Railway Labour.'

'LABOUR GAZETTE,' CORS., REMUNERATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7154 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7203 (iii).

LABOUR TROUBLES IN B.C.: on M. for Com. of Sup. Remarks (Mr. *Smith, B.C.*) 945 (i).

—— *See* 'Nelson P. O.', 'Racine Bros.' &c., 'Longshoremen, &c.

LAC BOUCHETTE AND QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).

—— ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).

—— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).

—— LIGHTING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).

—— LOCK GATE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

—— MASONRY WALL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

LADY LAFONTAINE, PENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14252 (vi).

Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Co.'s B. No. 120 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 143).

LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).

LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6679, 6888 (iii).

LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13459 (vi).

LAKE ST. JOHN RY. AND LA TUQUE RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

—— PIERS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i).

LAKE SUPERIOR, LONG LAKE AND ALBANY RY. CO. TO PENINSULAR HARBOUR SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE, IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).

—— *See* 'Temiscamingue.'

LAMBTON POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278, 14661 (vi).

LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN B.C., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).

Land Company Bills: *See* 'Canada Northwest,' 'Ontario and Qu'Appelle.'

LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i), 3797 (ii).

—— VOTED BY PARLT., AREA &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).

—— *See* 'Manitoba,' 'N.W.T.', &c.

LAND GUIDES, *re* SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6768 (iii).

LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).

LAND SCRIP, MAN. AND N. W. T. VOLUNTEERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
LAND SLIDE: *See* 'Turtle Mountain,' 'Frank Disaster.'
LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N.W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
——— UNEARNED, &c., Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3797 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARKIN, CAPT. W. S., COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION, POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 (ii).
——— P O., RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &c.: M. for Copies*, 3236 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
LATOUR, L. J., CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* 'LE CANADA': Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 1032 (i).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980, 14002 (vi).
——— *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
LAW LIBRARY IN ENGLAND, ESTABLISHMENT, &c.: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 98 (i).
Lead Bounties Payment B. No. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6169 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8195; 1°* of B., 8230 (iv); 2° and in Com., 10798; 3°*, 10799 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 31).
LEAMINGTON WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
'LE CANADA,' CIRCULAR ISSUED BY L. J. LATOUR, &c.. Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 1032 (i).
——— *See* 'Newspaper Agents,' &c., 'Latour,' &c.
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* GOVT. CASES: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
——— *re* INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iii).
——— *re* RYS. AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
——— *See* 'Justice.'
LEGAL OPINIONS *re* G. T. P. RY., CLAUSE 17, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).
LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 14112 (vi).
——— PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).
LEPROSY IN CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— *See* 'Tracadie.'
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249 (i).
LETTER BOX COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER BOXES IN POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— LOCKED BOXES IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 6026 (iii).
LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— BOOTS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER CARRIERS, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
——— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. on Post Office B., 5660, 5672 (iii).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— SUPERANNUATION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iii).
——— TORONTO, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— WINNIPEG, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
LEVIS, ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
——— GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
——— LAND PURCHASED FOR I. C. R.: M. for O. Cs. &c.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING; in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
——— *See* 'Yukon.'
LEWIS POINT, P. E. I., PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).
Librarians of Parliament B. No. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14299; 3°*, 14300 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 32.)
LIBRARY OF PARLT.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
LT. GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO AND APPNMT. OF ADMINISTRATOR: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— Remarks, on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i). *See* 'Mowat.'
LIFE-SAVING AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii), 5735, 5751 (iii), 13632 (vi).
——— AGENCIES, RENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (iii).
——— FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES, APPLICATIONS, &c. FROM CAPTAINS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE, KEEPERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii).
—— KEEPERS, INCREASE OF SALARY, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).
—— SUPPLIES, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).
LIGHTING DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa Buildings.'
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
LIME RIDGE AND MEGANTIC RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
LIME ROCK, N.S., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. No. 146 (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 144.)
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
LINSEED OIL, DEPUTATION *re* IMPORTATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii).
LIQUOR INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
See 'Inland Revenue.'
LISGAR ELECTION TRIAL: *See* 'Perkins.'
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITHGOW, MR., CONTROLLER, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).
LITIGATION EXPENSES *re* INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 6794 (iii).
See 'Justice,' &c., 'Legal,' &c.
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE METIS: *See* 'Metis.'
LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38 (ii).
See 'Marine,' 'St. Lawrence Route, &c.'
Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. No. 24 (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1°m., 284; 2°*, 1025; in Com., 2349 (i); 3°*, 2756 (ii); Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).
LOANS, GOVT., &C.: *See* 'Public Debt.'
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LOBSTER INDUSTRY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
—— INDUSTRY, N. S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
—— INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
LOBSTER INSPECTION, HALIFAX: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
LOCKMEN, &C., ON CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
LOCKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &C., I. C. R., PURCHASE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
See 'I. C. R.'
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *McGugan*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 145).
LONDON DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
London Loan Co. of Canada Incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. *McGugan*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1815 (i).
LONDON MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
LONGFORD: *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, MONTREAL, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: Remarks, (Mr. *Monk*) 2504 (ii).
—— PAY OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
—— SETTLEMENT, &C.: Tel. Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 2676-7 (ii).
LONGUEUIL BRIDGE: *See* 'Montreal and Longueuil B.'
LONGUEUIL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com, of Sup., 13069 (vi).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N.B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
LORD'S COVE (DEER ISLAND) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
LORNE SIDING, I. C. R., TRAFFIC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
'LORD STRATHCONA' WRECKING PLANT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).
LOTBINIÈRE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOW, A. P., TECHNICAL OFFICER, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13770 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
LOY, GEO. M., M. P. FOR BEAUHARNOIS, VIOLATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT, REPORT OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS: Presented (Mr. *Wade*) 7916 (iv).
—— M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7917; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7918, 7922 (iv)
—— on M. to Conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
—— REP. *re* STENOGRAPHER: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 7203 (iii).
—— *See* 'Beauharnois Electoral District.'
LUMBER COMBINE IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 1579-1590 (i).
—— N. W. T., COMMISSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 6168 (iii).
Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Co's. Incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 813; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 146).

LUMBER TRADE IN B. C., TEL. FROM MANUFACTURERS: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14766 (vi).
LUNENBURG FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com of Sup., 13315 (vi).
LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
MACGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).
MACNEE FISHING LICENSES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii).
Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co's. Incorp. B. No. 70. (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 147).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
MACLEOD, N. W. T., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
MACPHERSON, D. F., CENSUS ENUMERATOR, CLINTON: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MCCRANEY, MR. W., ex-M. P., LETTER *re* LEGISLATION: Read (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5362 (iii).
McDermid, Ellen, Relief B. No. 229 (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9148; in Com., and 3°*, 9149 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 150).
MCDONNELL, GEO., LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
McDougall, James Sinclair, Patent Relief B. No. 169 (Mr. *Gallery*) M. to receive Pet., 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 151).
MCKAY'S POINT, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PETS. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
See 'Lambton.'
MCNUTT'S ISLAND, N. S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MABOU AND GULF RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: in Com. on RES., 14326 (vi).
MACHINERY FOR CAR SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS *re* TORONTO HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— LAND TEL. LINES, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191-4203 (ii).
——— *See* 'Fyfe.'
MAGOG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
MAGUASHA, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MAHONE BAY POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup, 14038 (vi).
MAIL BAGS AND CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, BLOCKING CORRIDORS: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*) 14219 (vi).
——— *See* 'Campaign.'
——— REFUNDING EXPRESS CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14684 (vi).
——— REFUSAL TO ACCEPT IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14550 (vi).
——— SPECIAL TRAINS, ACCOMMODATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 14680, 14688 (vi).
——— STATEMENT *re* CONFERENCE (Sir *William Mulock*) 14681 (vi).
——— STATEMENT (Sir *William Mulock*) read *re* Threats to Express Cos., 14851 (vi).
——— USE OF ROOMS IN H. OF C., &C.: Remarks (Mr, *Borden, Halifax*) M. to adjn. Hse., 14530 (vi).
——— STATEMENT *re*: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14565 (vi).
MAIL BAGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
MAILS CARRIED BY RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
MAILS CARRIED VIA NEW YORK, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
MAIL CARS, N.W.T., INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
MAIL CLERKS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13997 (vi).
——— *See* 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
MAIL-MARKING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I.: IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 5878, 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672, 14249 (vi).
——— *See* 'Trade and Commerce.'
MAIN A DIEU, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
MALAGAWATCH, N.S., BOAT CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MALIGNANT COVE, N.S., HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MALLON, A.D., RETIREMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).
MANAGERS *re* RY. CONFERENCE: *See* 'Railw

MANCHESTER AND MONTREAL SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 7294 (iii); 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991, 9350 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 33).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co's. B. No. 44 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i).

MANITOBA:

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Larivière*) 1859 (i).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS, &C., 847, 880 (i).
——— *See* 'Grain.'
BARNES, AMOS, CLAIM FOR LAND, &C.: in Com, of Sup., 6922 (iii).
BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 442 (i), 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
CORY, W. W. SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).
DAUPHIN, LAKE LOWERING: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
——— PORT OF ENTRY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
DOM. LANDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816.
——— *See* 'Lands,' &c.
DOUKHOBORS HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
——— LOANS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
———PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).
ELEVATOR RATES, ADVANCE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 11062 (vi).
EMERSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
EWART, JOHN A., ADDRESS PRESENTED TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
FYFE, MR., INSPECTION REP. *re* GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).
——— *See* 'Grain.'
GRAIN ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— INSPECTION *re*, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
——— WEIGHING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*, &c.) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).
GULL HARBOUR, ST. GEORGE'S BAY, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSIONS, APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
HNAUSA WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iii).
HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
HOMESTEAD LANDS, AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
IMMIGRATION BUILDING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

IMMIGRANTS, ACCOMMODATION FOR SETTLERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 866 (i).
——— HOUSES AND FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
JEROME, MARTIN, M.P.P., AND MAN. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 5321 (iii).
JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).
JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
JUDGES' TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAKE MANITOBA, OUTLET *via* FAIRFORD RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N. W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
——— AREAS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2102 (i).
——— AREA UNPATENTED: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).
——— *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191-4203 (ii).
——— *See* 'Grain,' &c.
MAN. POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Postmasters.'
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
MYERS, JUDGE, REP. IN HANSARD: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).
NATURALIZATION ACT, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2015 (i).
NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON, AND EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).
PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Copies*, 2338 (i).
PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
PERKINS, WM., PAYMENT TO *re* LISGAR ELECTION; in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
POSTMASTERS' ASSOCIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T., MEMORIAL *re* SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 125 (i), 13259 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).
PRENDERGAST AND MAN. JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply,' 'Public Works.'
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RY. MAIL CLERKS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).
RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6889 (iii).
REPRESENTATION OF MAN. AND N.W.T. IN THE SENATE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1297 (i).

MANITOBA—*Con.*
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5319 (iii).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
—— REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 14284 (vi).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 10490 (v).
ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
—— POSTAL FACILITIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
SCHOOL LANDS, MAN. AND N. W. T., SALE, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 706 (i).
—— *See* 'Lands,' &c., 'Dom.', &c.
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6893 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 6169 (iii).
SELKIRK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
SENATE REPRESENTATION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1297 (i).
—— *See* 'N. W. T., B. 254.'
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
TEULON NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N. W. T., LAND SCRIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
WATSON, JOHN, PRES'DT. OF LIB. ASSOCIATION: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).
WHEAT FREIGHT RATES, RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
WHITE MUD RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
WINNIPEG, CUSTOMS WAREHOUSE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
—— IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS AND POSTAL STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
—— LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
—— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
—— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
—— MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).
—— Dixon, Mr. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).
—— P.O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
—— REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 666 (i).
WINNIPEGOSIS CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
See 'N.W.T.,' 'Immigration,' 'Interior,' &c.

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. *Dyment*), 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 148.)

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).
MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re* TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*), 265 (i).
MAPS, LITHOGRAPHING AND PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 6800 (iii), 13778 (vi).
—— PRINTING, INFORMATION *re*, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
MARA, RAMA, &C., FLOODING OF LANDS: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Copies of Rep., &c., 2762 (ii).

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada, Limited, Incorp. B. No. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*), 1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 5093, 5359; 3°*, 5360 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 149.)

MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. APPARATUS AT CHATEAU BAY: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
—— SUCCESS OF SYSTEM: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
—— TELEGRAPH STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii), 13639 (vi).
MARGAREE, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MARGARETVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MARIA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).

Marine Engineers Bill: *See* 'Steamboat Bill.'

MARINE:
"ACADIA", SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 13658 (vi).
—— STEAMER TO REPLACE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13659 (vi).
ACETYLENE GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
ACETYLENE GAS, &C., IN LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).
AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
—— CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
—— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
ALBERT CO., N.B., DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
ANCHOR LINE SALVAGE COMPENSATION FOR "SCOTIA": in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
ANNANDALE RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 2921 (ii).
ANTICOSTI LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
ARSENEAULT, CAPT., COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGES TO SCHR.: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
BASS RIVER PERMANENT LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
BATHURST HARBOUR BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).
—— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2919 (ii).
"BAYFIELD", REPAIRS AND SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5278, 5282, 5762 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*), 5586; in Com. of Sup., Mr. Evans' Reps., &c.: read (Mr. *Préfontaine*), 5742, 5763 (iii).
BIOLOGICAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOUR MASTER FROM ALBERT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
BRONTE LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Henderson*), 5757 (iii).
"CAMPANA", INVESTIGATION *re* WRECK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
CANADIAN COAST LIGHTING: Quotation (Mr. *Préfontaine*), from English paper, in Com. of Sup., 4164 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*), 2015 (i).

COMMANDERS OF GOVT. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 446 (i).

DALY, M. T., HARBOUR MASTER AT BATHURST, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2919 (ii).

DALY, MICHAEL, HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).

"EUXINE", SCUTTLING OF SCHR.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*), 699 (i).

GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi). *See* 'Acetylene.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMANDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 446 (i).

——— REPAIRS, SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4047, 5033 (ii).

"GRECIAN", STR., REIMBURSEMENT TO CAPT. HARRISON *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*), 10239 (v).

HALIFAX HARBOUR, BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

——— LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).

——— MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*), 14279 (iii).

HARRISON, CAPT., STR. "GRECIAN", COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*), 10239 (v).

HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).

HATFIELD S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720, 4118 (ii).

INSURANCE RATES ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv), 13697 (vi).

LIFE-SAVING AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi.).

LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii), 5735, 5751 (iii), 13632 (vi).

——— AGENCIES, RENTS, &C.; in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (iii).

——— FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES, APPLICATIONS, &C., FROM CAPTAINS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).

——— KEEPERS SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii).

——— SUPPLIES, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38 (ii).

——— *See* 'St. Lawrence.'

LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

MCGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).

MARCONI STATIONS: *See* general heading.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, DEPT. CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (ii).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 244 (i).

——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 341 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

MARINE, DEPTL. SALARIES, INCREASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13663 (vi).

——— AND TRANSFER OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works.'

MARINE SIGNAL SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13524 (vi).

MASTERS OF VESSELS, INSTRUCTIONS *re* POSTAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).

MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

——— REMOVAL FROM TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).

'MINTO' AND 'STANLEY' STRS., INFORMATION *re* TELEGRAM: Read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6 (i).

'MINTO' GOVT. STR., PASSENGERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3631 (ii).

MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

MONTREAL PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

MONTREAL SHIPPING INTERESTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).

'MONTEREY' STR. WRECK, PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR': Memo read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6803 (iii).

NAVAL RESERVE: *See* 'Schools.'

NEWFOUNDLAND COAST WRECKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, P. E. I., WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 5033 (ii).

OFFICERS MESS, STR. 'QUADRA,' REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).

PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Copies*, 2338 (i).

PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).

'PETREL,' REPLACEMENT BY NEW STEAMER: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

PICTOU LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

P. E. I. WINTER COMMUNICATION: M. for Copies of Pets., &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE GULF FISHING, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——— AND LLOYDS, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).

——— *See* 'Can. Coasts.'

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, NAVIGATION OBSTRUCTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE, REP. *re*, in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4133 (ii).

——— PILOTAGE, *re*, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4132, 4168 (ii).

——— RETIREMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).

——— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5758 (iii).

ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 13545 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. of Sup., 13535 (vi).

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS AND HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

'SCOTIA,' STR., SALVAGE CLAIMS, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 7150 (iii).

——— SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7206 (iii).

'STANLEY,' STR., MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).

——— REPAIRS TO 'STANLEY' AND 'LANSDOWNE': in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

——— AND P. E. I., WINTER COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Govt. Steamers,' 'Winter,' &c.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

——— TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 13648 (vi).

SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).

WINTER NAVIGATION, P.E.I., CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).

——— COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I., COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1036 (i).

——— M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

WIRELESS STATIONS ON MARINE COASTS: in Com. of Sup., 13639 (vi).
See 'Marconi.'

WRECKING PLANT 'LORD STRATHCONA,' MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii), 6803 (iii), 13524, 13544 (vi).

MAR. PROVS., BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup,, 422 (i).

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION: Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 4799 (ii).
See 'Vegetables,' &c.

'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5992 (iii).

MARTINEAU, ARTHUR, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3802 (ii).

MARTINEAU DEFALCATIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 6934 (iii).

——— EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iii).

——— AND REPORT *re* FIRE SECURITY: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

——— REP. *re* AUD. GENERAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii), 6933 (iii).

MARTINEAU DEFALCATIONS, INQUIRY FOR REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).

MARYSVILLE N. B., POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. No. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Res. prop., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6543; 1°* of B., 6545; 2°, and in Com., 6917; 3°*, 6918 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 34.)

MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13524 (vi).

MASTERS OF VESSELS FROM FOREIGN PORTS AND CUSTOMS DEPT., INSTRUCTIONS *re* POSTAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

MATANE AND GASPE RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).

MATHURIN, JCS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGE'S REP. &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).

MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).

MEAFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

MECHANICS FROM ENG., AND TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).

MEDALS FOR THIRD CAN. MOUNTED RIFLES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).
See 'Militia.'

MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

——— INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——— INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).

——— INDIANS, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).

——— INDIANS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).

——— INDIANS, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 6695, 6851 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'

Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 152.)

MEDICINE HAT RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).

MEHAN, DR., METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

MELBOURNE, N.S., WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

MEMBERS APPOINTED TO GOVT. POSITIONS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3805 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9582 (iv).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 3, 7, 283, 1642 (i).

——— NEW, CERTITICATES OF ELECTION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

MEMBERS RIGHTS TO SPEAK, MR. SPEAKER'S RULINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 10535 (v).
See 'H. of C.'

MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3526 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 707 (i), 4956 (ii), 14662 (vi).

——— Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1204 (i).

——— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 90, 707, 1204 (i), 4956 (ii), 14662 (vi).

——— Read (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 12869 (vi).

MESSENGERS OF THE H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
See 'H. of C.'

METALLURGIST AND PETROGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13778 (vi).

METAPEDIA, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).

METEGHAN COVE BREAKWATER, RESTORATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).

——— REMOVAL FROM TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLIED TO MANUFACTURERS: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

METIS STATION, DIVERTING ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).

Mexican Light and Power Co., Limited, Co.'s B. No. 126 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 153.)

MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

MIDDLE RIVER, N.S., SHEAR DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).

MIDDLETON ARMOURY, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).

MIDDLETON AND VICTORIA BEACH RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).

MIDDLETON, T. W., GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

MIDLAND DREDGES, &C., CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

MIDLAND HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii).

——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).

MIDLAND MERCANTILE CO., RENT OF BUILDINGS ON DOCK, MIDLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii), 13247 (vi).

——— PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).

MIDLAND RY. CO., TRURO BRANCH, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

MIDLAND WATER FRONT, LEASE TO PRATT & CO. : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii), 13247 (vi).

Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 216 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6658 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 154).

MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFAULTING POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

MILITARY ASYLUM, PENSIONS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

——— BUILDINGS, QUE., IRON FOUNDRY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
See 'Militia.'

——— COLLEGE, KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
See 'Royal Military,' 'Kingston,' &c.

MILITIA ACT AMT. AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SUGGESTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).

MILITIA FORCE, CONDITIONS, PAY, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5702 (iii).

DEB. : (Mr. *Sproule*) 5715; (Mr. *Gourley*) 5717; (Mr. *Fielding*) 5719; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5720; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5722; (Mr. *Ingram*) 5725; (Mr. *Morin*) 5726; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5727; (Mr. *Clarke*) 5729; (Mr. *Johnson, Cardwell*) 5732; (Mr. *Kemp*) 5733 (iii).

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. No. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 1°m., 872; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2240; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 35.)

MILITIA :

ANNUAL DRILL, CAMPS : in Com. of Sup., 3603, 5005 (ii).

ARMOURIES, GENERALLY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).

ARSENAL, DOM. : in Com. of Sup., 7089 (iii).

——— CONSTRUCTION IN CAN.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

——— DOM. ARSENAL STORE : in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

BLANKETS, WEB, CLOTH, PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 10102, 10410, 10714, 10954 (v).

CADET TRAINING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).

CAMPS FOR MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 3603, 5005 (ii).

CANADIAN BEEF SUPPLIED TO BRITISH TROOPS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 483 (i).

——— MOUNTED RIFLES, MEDALS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

CARTOONS IN 'MILITARY GAZETTE,' &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2103 (i).

CHAMBERLAIN, HON. MR., SUGGESTIONS *re* MILITIA ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).

COLDSTREAM GUARDS BAND, ARRANGEMENT *re* VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9683 (iv).

COOKE *vs.* COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORONATION CONTINGENT, EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

DEFENCE SCHEME *re* MILITIA : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

DIXON, CAPT., DUTIES IN S. AFRICA : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7914 (iv).

DUNDONALD, LORD : *See* 'G. O. C.'

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

FLAGSHIP, REMOVAL FROM ESQUIMALT : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

G. O. C., APPNMT., &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3779 (ii).

——— LORD DUNDONALD'S SPEECH IN HAMILTON : Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup. 2399 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

G. O. C., Rep. *re* Defence Scheme: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).
——— Rep., &c., Publishing of: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
German Recruiting in Canada for Naval Service: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (vi).
Gordon Highlanders Trophy: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7253 (iii).
Guns ordered by British Army: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt.: on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Ret., Remarks, 1057 (i).
See general heading.
Hutton, Maj. Gen.: Inquiry for Ret., Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 206 (i).
Imperial Defence and prop. Res. of Lord Rosebery: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 410 (i).
See 'Naval Reserve'
King's S. A. Medals, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
See 'S. A. War.'
Kingston Barracks, R. C. Field Artillery: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 13128 (vi).
——— Military College: in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii), 5842 (iii).
——— drill hall: in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Pay of Militia: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— Strike, Montreal, Govtl. Action, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 2504 (ii).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3802 (ii).
——— Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 6934 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep. of Investigation; in Com. of Sup., 3752, 3898 (ii).
——— Investigation, Rep. *re* Aud. General: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).
Medals for Third Can. Mounted Rifles: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).
——— *See* 'S.A.', &c.
Middleton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i).
Military Asylum, Pensions, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
Military College: *See* 'Kingston.'
Military Properties, Care and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 3611 (ii).
Military Reserve at Port Moody: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8616 (iv).
Military Stores Branch, Reorganization: in Com. of Sup., 3608 (ii).
Militia: in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii), 7089 (iii).
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
Militia, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 283 (i).
——— Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
——— Estimates: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13368 (vi).
——— Expenditures: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Payment of Militia: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— *See* 'Longshoremen.'
Mulloy, Trooper, Pension to by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Naval Defence: Par. in Toronto 'Globe.' (Mr. *Clarke*) 944 (i).
Naval Militia and School of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 13545 (vi).
Naval Recruiting in Can. for German Navy: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).
Naval Reserve, &c., in Can., Cor. between G.B. and Can.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7298 (iii).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
Niagara Militia Camp, Annual Drill: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
Ninety-Fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9080 (iv).
Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 13379 (vi).
——— General Statement (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 13379 (vi).
Permanent Force, Increase, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
——— Increase of Pay: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 13371 (vi).
——— Qualifications of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).
See 'Royal,' &c.
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3234 (ii).
Port Moody, Military Reserve: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
Quebec Military Buildings, Iron Foundry: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Sup., 3130, 3134 (ii).
Rebellion of 1885, Claims of Settlers: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
Rifle Associations, Grants to: in Com. of Sup., 3767 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Examination by Experts: Ques. (Mr *Morin*) 2758 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).
——— Imperfect Return: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture of: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Royal Canadian Regiment, Numerical Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3801 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Trouble: Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Militia (Mr. *Borden, Kings*) 12939 (vi).
Settlers Claims *re* Rebellion, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
S. A. Constabulary, Information *re* Grievances, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1027 (i).
——— Purchase of Discharge, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 14287 (vi).
S. A. Contingents, Employees reinstated, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2337 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1026 (i).
——— Pensions to by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
——— Pensions from Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
S.A., Medals presented by King, Pet. *re* from Non-Com. Officers: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
——— Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv).
——— Remarks (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 8319 (iv).
——— Memorial Association Grant: in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

S. A., Saddles and Bridles Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).
——— Supplies purchased for Imp. Govt.: M. *Borden, Halifax*) for Copies of O. Cs., &c., 2760 (ii).
Stuart, Capt. D. C., Halifax, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4353 (ii).
Sussex, N. B., Armoury Construction, &c., Overseer's Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8331 (iv).
——— Brigade Camp: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).
Target Practice, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).
Tents, Rush Order, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
See 'Woods.'
Transport and Freight for Military Purposes: in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii).
Valleyfield Strike, Pay of Militia: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).
Veterans, Canadian, Pet. *re* Military Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 11188 (v).
Volunteers of Man. and N. W. T., Land Scrip, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
West Point, U.S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13095 (vi).
Winnipeg Barracks, Street Paving: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
——— Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
Woods, J. W., Amount paid for Tents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures, B. 20.'

Mills, Mr., Annapolis, Claims against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wade*) 6167 (iii).

Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2794 (ii).

Mill Street Paving, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).

Mines Branch, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 13762 (vi).

Mining Companies Incorp. B. (No. 248 from the Senate). This bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Mining Companies Incorporation Bill: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14850 (vi).

Mining Institute: in Com. of Sup., 12591 (v), 13508 (vi).

Ministerial Changes, Explanation: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 110 (i).
——— Explanation *re* Mr. Tarte, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 130, 159 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 90 (i).
——— Explanation *re* Mr. Blair, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

Ministers, Reduction in Numbers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

Mint, Establishment, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi).
——— *See* 'Royal.'

'Minto' and 'Stanley' Strs., Information *re* Telegram: Read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6 (i).
'Minto' Govt. Str., Passengers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3631 (ii).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.

Miramichi Bridge, Superstructure: in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'

Miscou Harbour, N.B., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
——— Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

Missionary Society of Can.: *See* 'Church Missionary.'

Mississaga Indians, Alnwick Band, Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).

Mistook (Delisle) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

Moira River, Flooding: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

Moisie Point Road, Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).

Moncton, Car Shop Extension: in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— Increased Shed Accommodation for I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).

Money Subsidies to Rys., I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
See 'Subsidies,' &c., 'Rys., &c.

Montague Bridge Survey, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

'Monterey' Str., Wreck, Par. in Montreal *Star*: Memo. read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6803 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

Mont Louis, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

Montmagny Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).

Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Montreal Bank: *See* 'Bank.'

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
——— *See* 'Militia.'

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 167 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

Montreal, Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of of Sup., 436 (i).
——— Customs Dept., Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
——— Customs Port of Entry, Changes, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
——— contingent expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— Dry Dock: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
——— rep. of commission *re* site: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).

MONTREAL DRY DOCK, SITE, &C.: M. FOR O. CS., COR., &C.: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— *See* 'Harbour.'
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i), 13058 (vi).

Montreal Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name Bill No. 88 (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 158).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan Bill No. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445; 1°* of B. 4486 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5417; 3°m., 5657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 36).

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (iv).
——— HARBOUR, DOCK IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
——— PERMANENT SHEDS, PLANS PREPARED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
MONTREAL 'HERALD' CO., &C.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).
MONTREAL, INLAND REVENUE OFFICE, MONEY ABSTRACTED: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
——— 'LABOUR GAZETTE,' COR.: in Com. of Sup., 7155 (iii).
——— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——— LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Longshoremen's.'

Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Co's. Incorp. B. No. 156. (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5558; 3°*, 5558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 156).

MONTREAL, NEW POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
See 'Pilotage.' 'Shipping Casualties Bills.'
——— POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).
——— SUBWAY CO., O. CS., COR., &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 705 (i).
MONTREAL TURNPIKE: *See* 'Turnpike Trust.'
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
MOOSEJAW POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).

Moosonee Diocese: *See* 'Trust Funds.'
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
MOREAU, DR. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331 (iv).
——— AT CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).
MOREAU, MR. H., COLLECTOR ON CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8333 (iv).
MORRISBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup. 492 (i).
MORRISON, MRS., CLAIMS *re* LANDS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).
MORRISON'S POINT, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup. 13203 (vi).

Mortgage, &c.: *See* 'Canada Permanent..
MORTIMER & CO'S. FIRE, GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4836 (ii).

Mounted Police: *See* 'N. W. Mounted.'

Mount Royal Savings Bank Incorp. B. No. 153. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2720 (ii); wthdn., 10831 (v).
MOUNT ROYAL SAVINGS BANK INCORP. B. NO. 153 (Mr. *Campbell*): M. to withdraw Bill and refund fees, 10831 (v).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup. 7530 (iii).
MOWAT, SIR OLIVER, LT.-GOV. OF ONTARIO. DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1575 (i).
See 'Lt.-Governor.'
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'
MULGRAVE AND PETIT DE GRAT S.S. SERVICE: *See* 'Petit de Grat.'
MULLENS, CORNELIUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5280 (iii).
MULLENS' LETTER *re* HURLEY, J. M., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5757, 5761 (iii).
MULLOY, TROOPER, PENSION TO BY THE DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
MUNICIPALITIES, COMPENSATION FOR AMALGAMATION OF CANADA CENTRAL AND BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RYS., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* TRAMWAY CO'S., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Railway Bill, 6081 (iii).
MURRAY BAY TO ST. CATHARINES TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
MURRAY BAY, WHARF EXTENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
MURRAY CANAL, PURCHASE OF MR. JOHNSTON'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— WIRE FENCING: in Com. of Sup. 14150 (vi).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530, (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 4108, 14115 (vi).
MURRAY, IMMIGRATION AGENT, SCOTLAND: in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
MUSEUM AT HALIFAX, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

MUSQUODOBOIT, N. S., WHARF APPROACHES: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

Mutual Fire Ins.: *See* 'Montreal Fire.'

Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada B. No. 65. (Mr. *Bruce*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2304; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 159.)

MYERS, JUDGE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).

NAPANEE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr, *Taylor*) 1594 (i).

NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY., CHARTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).

NAPPAN EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
See 'Art, &C.

National Ry. and Transport Co.: *See* 'Canada.'

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

NATURALIZATION ACT, EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

——— REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2015 (i).

Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. No. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5137; 2°; and in Com., 5872; 3°R., 5991 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 38).
See 'Aliens.'

NAVAL DEFENCE, PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 944 (i).

——— GREAT LAKES, NUCLEUS OF: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5295 (iii).

NAVAL MILITIA RESERVE AND SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 13535, 13545 (vi).

NAVAL RECRUITING IN CANADA FOR GERMAN VESSELS: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).

NAVAL RESERVE, &C., IN CAN., COR. BETWEEN G.B. AND CAN.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

——— Inquiry for papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7298 (iii).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. No. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779; 1°* of B., 12781; 2°, and in Com., 12984; wthdn., 14768 (vi).

NECUM TEUCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).

NEIL'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).

NELSON POST OFFICE, B. C., RACINE BROS., CLAIMS AGAINST CONTRACTORS: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

NEPEAN POINT, IMPROVEMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).

NEPIGON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON, AND EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK:

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

ALBERT CO., N. B., DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS, WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).

ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).

BATHURST, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

——— FISHERY INSPECTOR: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

——— HARBOUR BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOURMASTER FROM ALBERT CO., N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

BLACK BROOK, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).

BLOOMFIELD, POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

BRIGADE CAMP, SUSSEX: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 412, 421, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).

CAMPBELLTON, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).

——— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).

CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

C.P.R. STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
See 'Allan.'

CAPE TORMENTINE, PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com. on Res., 14470 (vi).

CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

CHATHAM, LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CHATHAM TO TRACADIE, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

CENSUS, BAPTISTS ENUMERATION, &C., RELIGIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— CARLETON, &C., CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— GRAND MANAN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).

——— RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).

COCAGNE WHARF, COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENT FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).

DALY, M. T., HARBOUR MASTER AT BATHURST, DISMISSAL, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

DEER ISLAND TO EASTPORT, ME., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

DIPPER HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup. 13233 (vi).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 10102 (v).
EDMUNDSTON INDIAN RESERVE, FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
FISHERY OVERSEER, BATHURST, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14686 (vi).
FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).
GAUDET, MR., COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GRAND MANAN, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
See 'Census,' &c.
GREAT SALMON RIVER, GROYNE AND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
HARRISON, MR., INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).
HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
HATFIELD'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KING'S: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2502 (ii).
INDIANS, N.B., SALARY TO AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12218 (v).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N.B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOAL LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
MARYSVILLE, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
MISCOU HARBOUR, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).
MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).
NEWCASTLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques, (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
PETIT ROCHER, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
POINTE DU CHÊNE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

RICHIBUCTO, HARBOUR, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).
RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).
ST. ANDREWS WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
ST. JOHN, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
——— LONG WHARF: *See* 'Long Wharf.'
——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE, WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).
——— WINTER SERVICE: *See* 'Allan.'
ST. JOHN RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).
SHEGAWAKE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHIVES, MR.; PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SMALL-POX PATIENTS, EXPENSES INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14688 (vi).
SUNBURY, CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8331 (iv).
——— STATION GROUNDS, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
TRACADIE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii), 13038 (vi).
VENIOT, P. I., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT BATHURST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
WOODSTOCK ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
——— DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4563, 4593 (ii), 5735 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
See 'N. S.,' 'P. E. I.'

NEW CAMPBELLTON, BALLAST WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).

New Canadian Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 1328; 2° m., 1512, 2241; in Com., 2241 (i), 2720; ref. back to Com., 2753; in Com., 3221; 3°*, 3222 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 160.)

NEWCASTLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
NEWFOUNDLAND, AIDS TO NAVIGATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13647 (vi).
NEWFOUNDLAND COAST WRECKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, PROTECTION SLOPES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).

NEW LONDON, P.E.I., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NEWPORT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
NEW RICHMOND, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
NEWSPAPER AGENTS AND POSTMASTERS IN QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 14669 (vi).
——— *See* 'Latour.'
NEWSPAPER, CABLE NEWS: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.
NEWSPAPER POSTAGE: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5856 (iii).
NEWSPAPERS IN UNITED KINGDOM, U. S., &C.: AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.,* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 57 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 1811; 3°*, 1812 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 161.)
NIAGARA MILITIA CAMP, ANNUAL DRILL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 154 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4582; 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 162.)
Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 163.)
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Co.'s B. No. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) M. to receive Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 2°*, 5585; in Com., 6428 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 164.)
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14337 (vi).
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
NICOLET RIVER, BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
NINETY-FOURTH REGIMENT, SENIOR AND JUNIOR MAJORS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 9080 (iv).
Nipigon Iron Range Ry Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 170 (Mr. *Dyment*), M. to receive Pet., 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956 (ii).
Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 114 (Mr. *McCool*), 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 165.)
Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 210 (Mr. *McCool*): 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Nipissing and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 47 (Mr. *McCool*): 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 166.)
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY: in Com. o Sup., 14258 (vi).
NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
NOEL WHARF, N.S., REPAIRS: in Com of Sup., 13204 (vi).
NOMININGUE LAKE, WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO., CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13372 (vi).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRANSPORTATION CO.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13667, 13933 (vi).
Northern Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*), 1°*, 654; 2°*, 853 (i); in Com., 2753; 3°*, 2755 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 168.)
NORTH CARDIGAN, P.E.I., PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
NORTH CHANNEL AND DAM, GALOPS RAPIDS: in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION OF DAM: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 14142 (vi).
NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3536 (ii).
NORTH POLE EXPEDITION, GOVT. AID TO CAPT. BERNIER: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), 12805 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
See 'I.C.R.', &c., 'Sydney', &c.
North Sydney Harbour Commission: *See* 'Sydney', &c.
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, P.E.I., WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6895 (iii).
See 'Winter Navigation.'
North-West Central: *See* 'Great N.W. Central.'
North-west Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 69 (Mr. *Scott*), 1°*, 813; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 167.)
N.W. Mounted Police (1894) Act Amt. B. No. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1°, 8321 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10741; 3°*, 10742 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 37.)
N.W. MOUNTED POLICE, APPNMTS AND PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 2921 (ii).
——— COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 92 (i).
——— PAY OF FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 5262 (iii).
——— PENSIONS ACT AMT.: M. to introduce B. (Mr. *Scott*), 14280; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 14281 (vi).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i); 13760 (vi).
——— TENTS, WOOD & CO.'S TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 3804 (ii).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup.. 5003 (ii).

N.W. Provincial Autonomy, Imperfect Ret. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 6891 (iii).
See 'Provincial Autonomy,' &c.

N.W. Ters. Govt., Additional Subsidies B. No. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 10102 ; in Com. on Res., 12306 ; 1°* of B., 12330 (v) ; 2°, and in Com. 12843 ; 3°*, 12845 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 41.)

N.W.T., Senate Representation B. No. 254 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 1°m., 11691 ; 2°*, and in Com., 12302 ; 3°*, 12304 (v), (3 *Edward VII, c.* 42.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES :
"Advocate, Prince Albert," Payments for Printing *re* Election Proclamation : in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Aid to Agricultural Societies, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).
Alexander Indian Agency, Telephone : in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*), 847, 880 (i).
See 'Automatic.'
Autonomy for N.W.T., Amt. : (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), on M. for Sup., 13856 ; Neg. (Y. 29 ; N. 63), 13932 (vi).
Banff Springs, Baths : in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii), 13955 (vi).
——— Museum Building, Addition, &c.: in Com. of Sup , 6927 (iii).
——— Roads and Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
Barr Colony, Mr. Haultain's Speech, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on M. for Sup., 6354 (iii).
——— and Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
——— Number, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).
Bennett, Mr., Increase in Salary : Remarks (Mr. *Pope*), 13967 (vi).
Bow River Bridge, Canmore, Protection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
Buffalo Herd in Banff Park : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958, 959 (i), 13129 (vi).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry., Regulations *re* Mortgage Deeds : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 13024 (vi).
C.P. Ry., Elkhorn Branch Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
——— lands exempt from taxes in Man. and N.W.T. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 916 (i).
——— Land and School Taxation : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Lands.'
Coal Mining in Banff Reserve, Lease by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).
Court Houses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
Creameries : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Doukhobors Pilgrimage and Govtl. Action : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i), 5587 (iii).
Drake, Mr., N.W.M.P., Increase of Salary : in Com. of Sup., 13761 (vi).
Edmonton and Athabasca Landing, Tel. Service : in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
——— Bridge, Saskatchewan River, Flooring : in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— Indian Agency, Telephone Service : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
——— Jail : in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con-*
Elections in Saskatchewan, Payments to Prince Albert 'Advocate': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Elkhorn Indian School, Average Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
Elkhorn and Moosomin Ry. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 14497 (vi).
Fire Regulations . Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 2100 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 2106 ; Tels. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2106, 2238 (i).
——— Investigation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
Gallician Immigrants *re* N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).
Grain Blockade : *See* 'Ry. Traffic.'
Grazing Lands leased to Geo. McDonnell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
Great North-west Central Ry. and C. P. Ry. Co.'s Agreement : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).
Half-Breed Schools, Salaries paid, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).
Herchmer, Mr. L. W., Pension, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5321 (iii).
Homestead Entries, Free : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
Immigration Agents, Homestead Pre-emption : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Sproule*) 289 (i).
Immigration and Settlers' Effects, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
Indians : in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— Agricultural Implements : in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii), 13782 (vi).
——— Blankets, Clothing : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— Clothing : in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).
——— Land Management Fund : in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii)
——— Live Stock, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iii).
——— Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— Schools : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— Seed Grain, Relief : in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii)
——— Supplies &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).
Irrigation, Surveys, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).
Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i).
See general heading.
Land Slides : *See* 'Turtle Mountain.'
——— *See* 'Frank Disaster.'
Lumber Combines, Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 1579-1590 (i).
Macleod Court House : in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
——— Dismissal of Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
Macrae, Mr., Indian Inspector : in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
Mail Cars, Overcrowding, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
See 'Postal,' 'Ry. Mail,' &c.
Maintenance of Prisoners : in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
Medicine Hat Ry. Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).
Military Asylum, Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
MOUNTED POLICE, APPNMTS. AND PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2921 (ii).
—— COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).
—— M. to introduce Pension Bill (Mr. *Scott*) 14280; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 14281 (vi).
—— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
—— TENTS, WOODS & CO.'S TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
N. W. T., GOVTL. EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iii).
—— ADDITIONAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii), 13787 (vi).
—— MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
—— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
—— NATURALIZATION RETURNS: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3804 (ii).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
—— BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
POSTAL SERVICE IN N. W. TERS.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).
See 'Mail.'
PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
—— CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
—— COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29 N. 63) 13932 (vi).
—— LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1296 (i).
—— O. Cs., &c.: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for copies,* 2778 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5088 (ii).
—— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
—— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print Papers, 5582 (iii).
—— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6891 (iii).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup. 6946 (iii).
—— FURTHER COR., &c.; Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 7295 (iii).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RYS.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY.: Bonds, Attack on Mr. E. B. Osler, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*) 14583 (vi). Memorandum from Mr. Kingsmill: Read, 14588 (vi).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. CO.'S LAND GRANT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2338 (i).
—— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. MORTGAGE, DEEDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
RY. LANDS VOTED, &c., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
See 'Mail, &c.'

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

RY. TRAFFIC IN N.W.T., BLOCKADE, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2424 (i).
REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii).
REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY, SURVEYS OF RESERVED LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
REPRESENTATION *re* SENATE: *See* 'N.W.T. Senate Representation B. 254.'
See 'Senate.'
ROADS AND BRIDGES CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).
SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION, PROCLAMATION IN PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO.'S SALES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO., SECTIONS ACQUIRED, &c.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor.* 2338 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 4363 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2306 (i).
SENATE REPRESENTATION: *See* 'N. W. T. Senate Representation B. 254.'
SETTLERS CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
SNOW STORMS, REPORTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 11822 (v).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOMINION LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STEWART, MR., FOREST INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6774 (iii).
STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii).
TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).
TIMBER AND TREE PLANTING, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
TREE CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii), 13775 (vi).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
See 'Frank.'
VICTORIA TO ANDREWS, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WADSWORTH, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi)
YOHO PARK, ROADS CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
YORKTON COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
See 'B.C.', 'Man.', &c.
NOTES, DOM.: *See* 'Dom. Notes, &c.'
NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA:

ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ABRAM'S RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
AMAGANDUS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
AMHERST POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).
AMQUI STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY'S LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
ANTIGONISH, POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
ARICHAT PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
BAILEY'S BROOK, BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1072 (i).
BASS RIVER, PERMANENT LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
BAXTER'S HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BAYFIELD EXTENSION PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).
——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
BEERSVILLE COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
BELMONT DISASTER, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14155 (vi).
BENOIT'S COVE, BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG POND WHARF, SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).
BRETON COVE, BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
BRIDGEWATER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).
BROAD COVE, HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).
CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
CANADA STEEL CO., RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14479 (vi).
CARIBOO ISLAND, HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CARLIN, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
CHEGOGGIN, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHETICAMP, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHEZZETCOOK, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
COVE HEAD HARBOUR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vi).
COW BAY (POINT MORIEN) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
DALHOUSIE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DIGBY, PIER RENEWAL, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

DIGBY, POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).
DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).
DOG FISH NUISANCE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DREDGING, MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).
DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
DUNCAN'S COVE, APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
EAST BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup.. 13180 (vi).
EAST BERLIN, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
ECONOMY, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
EMIGRATION TO U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
'EUXINE', SCUTTLING OF SCHR.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*) 699 (i).
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N. S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
FINLAY POINT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FISHERMEN OF N. S., 'OUTSKIRTS OF CIVILIZATION': Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13316 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Roche*, *Halifax*) 13373 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13374 (vi).
FISHING INDUSTRY, MAR. PROVS., WHARF, BUILDING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— *See* 'Lobsters,' &c.
FISHING WITHIN THREE MILE LIMIT: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 4179 (ii).
FIVE ISLANDS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FORT LAWRENCE, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
FREEPORT, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
FRIARS HEAD, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup. 1087 (i).
FRUDE'S POINT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
GABAROUSE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GEORGEVILLE, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
GLACE BAY, DOM. COAL, IRON AND STEEL COS., ACCOMMODATION AT GLACE BAY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
——— SHIELDS, MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF: Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
GRAND ETANG BRIDGE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
GRAND NARROWS, BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
GRAND RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

GRANITE VILLAGE, MOORING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
'GRECIAN', STR., REIMBURSEMENT TO CAPT. HARRISON, *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
GREEN COVE BOAT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX COTTON CO., LOAN OF RAILS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
HALIFAX, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
——— ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825, 12874 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
——— LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
——— *See* 'Peggy's Cove,' &c.
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
HALIFAX, LOBSTER FACTORIES, INSPECTION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).
——— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
——— POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— AND SOUTH-WESTERN, CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
——— TIME BALL: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
——— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
HARRISON, CAPT., STR. 'GRECIAN,' COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).
HAWK POINT INLET, BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).
HERRING COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
INDIAN SCHOOLS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 6409, 6414 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

INVERNESS MINES, BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
——— POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).
IONA, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
JEDDORE, EAST, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
JUDGES, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).
See 'Henry.'
JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
KETCH HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
LAWLOR'S ISLAND, QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— *See* 'Halifax,' &c.
LIME ROCK, POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— PACKING INDUSTRY, N.S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— *See* 'Fishing,' 'Halifax,' &c.
LORD'S COVE (DEER ISLAND) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
LUNENBURG, FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 13315 (vi).
LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
MAGGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
MCKAY'S POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MCNUTT'S ISLAND, BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MAHONE BAY POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIN A DIEU, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MALAGAWATCH, BOAT CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MALIGNANT COVE, HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MARGAREE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MARGARETVILLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., HALIFAX, REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*) 14279 (vi).
'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5992 (iii).
MELBOURNE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

METEGHAN COVE BREAKWATER, RESTORATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MIDDLE RIVER, SHEAR DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MIDDLETON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).
MILLS, MR., ANNAPOLIS, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wade*) 6167 (iii).
MOISIE POINT ROAD, IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).
MORRISON'S POINT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MUSQUODOBOIT, WHARF APPROACHES: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
NAPPAN, EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
NECUM TEUCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
NEGRO POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
NEIL'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
NEW CAMPBELLTON, BALLAST WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, PROTECTION SLOPES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
NOEL WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Sydney,' &c.
N.S. AND DOM. OF CAN., FINANCIAL TERMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
NOVA SCOTIA EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
N.S. EMIGRATION TO U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
NOVA SCOTIA STEEL AND COAL CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
OGDEN'S POND CHANNEL, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
OYSTER POND, BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
PARRSBOROUGH, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
PEMBROKE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &c.: in Com. of Sup.. 1146 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTOU GLASS FACTORY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii)
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C R.: in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
——— LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
PLEASANT BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
——— DREDGING, CLAIMS OF M. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
POIRIERVILLE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
PORTER'S CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

PORT GREVILLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOWE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PROSPECT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PUGWASH, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR PARRSBORO DISTRICT, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14491 (vi).
ST. ANN'S NORTH GUT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——— NORTH RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
SANDY COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SCOTCH HILL STATION, I.C.R., PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 872 (i).
SCOTT'S BAY, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHORT BEACH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SKINNER'S COVE, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SOUTH INGONISH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SPRINGHILL, ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— BOILER EXPLOSION IN DOM. BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 8296 (iv).
STUART, CAPT. D. C., HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).
SUMMERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SWIM'S POINT, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
SYDNEY, ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
——— *See* 'North.'
——— POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SYDNEY MINES, POST OFFICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).
——— *See* 'North.'
TENECAPE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR, BEACH WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TIVERTON, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).
VICTORIA BEACH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
WALLACE HARBOUR, FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEDGE POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WENTWORTH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITNEY PIER POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 130, 668 (i).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, SHEER DAM, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WINDSOR, NEW STATION, I. C. R., RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
WINDSOR JUNCTION RY. ACCIDENT, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Clarke*), 3496, 3713 (ii).
WOLFVILLE, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com of Sup.. 13217 (vi).
YARMOUTH BAR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
See 'N.B.,' 'P.E.I.,' &c.

OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).

Oaths of Office: *See* 'Administration."

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 5033 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies Act (France and Canada) Amt. B. No. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*); Res. prop., 10410; in Com. on Res., 10802; 1°* of B., 11422; 2°*, and in Com., 12295; 3°*, 12500 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 44.)

OFFICERS' MESS, STR. "QUADRA", REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 9819 (iv).

OFFICIAL GUIDE, I.C.R., COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 3535 (ii).

OGDEN'S POND CHANNEL, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).

O'HALLORAN, GEO. F., DEP. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).

OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).

O'LEARY, J. & M.. CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY. BRANCH LINE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6168 (iii).

O'LEARY'S STATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

Oleomargarine Bill: *See* 'Butter B. 207.'

ONSLOW, LORD, SPEECH *re* CATTLE EMBARGO: *See* 'Cattle Embargo.'

ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS NUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).

ONTARIO, NORTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*), 367 (i).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*), 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., 2716; 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 169.)

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*), 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 4868; 3°m., 4869; 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 170.)

ONTARIO:

"ALERT", STR., *re* CANAL SURVEYS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALEXANDRIA WOOD EXPORT CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi). *See* 'Privilege', &c.
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*), 6895 (iii).
AMHERSTBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup, 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
AURORA FOUNDRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*), 1195 (i).
BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thompson, Grey*), 13263 (vi).
BALSAM LAKE AND LAKE SIMCOE: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).
BARRIE P.O., BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).
——— WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (i).
——— DOM. AID, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13452 (vi).
BARRY'S BAY, MADAWASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BELLE RIVIÈRE, SHEET PILING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 13082 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5588 (iii).
BLIND RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*), 1298 (i).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOYD, SIR JOHN, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 5990 (iii).
——— RELATIVES IN GOVT. EMPLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*), 4185 (ii).
BRACEBRIDGE CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
BRANTFORD, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
——— INDIAN RESERVE, LEASES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1322 (i).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) in Com. of Sup., 5757 (iii).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).
BURKS FALLS, MAGNETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
CAMPBELLFORD, PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
CAN. CENTRAL RY. AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
CANADA FOUNDRY, TORONTO, STRIKE, &C., REPRESENTATIONS TO MINISTER OF LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 7205 (iii).
See 'Scotch Iron,' &c.
CANALS IN ONT. AND QUE., AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).
CHATHAM DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).
CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT *re* RAILS FOR GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Ont.*) 13668 (vi).
See 'Sault.'
CLINTON, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
See 'Macpherson.'
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).
COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE 1901 TO MARCH 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 669 (i).
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i).
——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii), 13084 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD, DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
CORNWALL CANAL, LIGHTING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vi).
——— SUPT'S. DUTIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).
COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATION OF WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P. O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).
CUMBERLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 13239 (vi).
CUTLER, GORE BAY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 2308 (i).
——— AND GORE BAY MAIL CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

CUTLER, SPANISH MILLS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
DEPOT HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
See 'Parry Sound,' 'Grain,' &c.
DESERONTO, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
DETROIT RIVER, &C., INTERNATIONAL WATERS, U. S. GOVT. WORK: M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Cor.* 2778 (ii).
DREDGING PLANT FOR ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).
DRESDEN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).
DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
EDVILLE POSTMASTER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).
ELGIN COUNTY, CENTENARY CELEBRATION: Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 3129 (ii).
——— REDISTRIBUTION, PAR. IN 'TORONTO GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 6540 (iii),
ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum (Sir *William Mulock*) read, 14008 (vi).
ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT, ACETYLENE GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii), 14150 (vi).
FLESHERTON ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
FT. WILLIAM, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
See 'Grain,' 'Kaministiqua.'
GALOPS CANAL ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).
——— SURVEYS, LIFTING BOULDERS: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— DAM: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12608 (vi).
——— RAPIDS, DEEPENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) Agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
See 'North Channel.'
GANANOQUE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970 (i).
——— CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4823 (ii).
——— CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3791, 3897 (ii).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
——— *See* 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'
GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
GODERICH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).
——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
GOODERICH, MR., REMOVAL, MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).
GORE'S LANDING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13244.
GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi),

ONTARIO—*Con.*

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).
——— SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i). *See* 'Wheat,' &c.
GRAND BEND, BREAKWATER PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
GRANT, J. G., BARRIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFAULT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).
GREY COUNTIES, CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
GREY COUNTY, LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS WANTED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
GUELPH, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
HALDIMAND, CENSUS ENUMERATOR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).
HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii), 11425. (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
HAMILTON, DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND : in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— ELEVATOR WORKS : Remarks (Mr. *Bruce*) in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— INLAND REVENUE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424 (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT. AID *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAYCOCK, J., MR., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772(iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE : in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Nr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).
HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
HUDSON'S BAY : *See* 'James.'
HURLEY, J. M., APPNMT., DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (ii), 5280 (iii).
——— REP., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
HURON COUNTY JUDGESHIP : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
INDIANS ONT., AND QUEBEC, ROAD REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
INDIAN SCHOOLS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii). *See* general heading.
IROQUOIS CANALS, ELECTRIC LIGHTING : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).
JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
JAMES AND HUDSON BAY FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii), 6893 (iii).
——— Ques: (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).
JOHNSON, MR., PURCHASE OF HOUSE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
——— *See* 'Port Arthur.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
KELLY, ASST. CUSTOMS INSPECTOR, REFUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
KINGSTON, BARRACKS, R. C. FIELD ARTILLERY : in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
——— GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & CO.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).
——— MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii), 5842 (iii).
——— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
——— MILITARY STABLES : in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 13117 (vi).
——— PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
KINGSVILLE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
LAMBTON, POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278, 14661 (vi).
LEAMINGTON WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup , 5929 (iii).
LT.-GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
——— APPNMT. OF ADMINISTRATOR : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Decease, 1575 (i).
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LONDON, DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
MACNEE FISHING LICENSES : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii).
——— *See* 'James.'
MACPHERSON, D. F., CENSUS ENUMERATOR, CLINTON : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PETS. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi). *See* 'Lambton.'
MARA, RAMA, &C., FLOODING OF LANDS : M. (Mr. *Grant*) for copies of Rep., &c., 2762 (ii).
MEAFORD POST OFFICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13069, 13124 (vi).
MECHANICS FROM ENG. AND TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL FROM TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).
MIDLAND HARBOUR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
——— DREDGES, &C., CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— PORT OF ENTRY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
MIDLAND MERCANTILE CO.'S RENTAL OF BUILDINGS ON DOCK, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 13427 (vi).
MIDLAND, POSTOFFICE BUILDING : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— WATER FRONT, LEASE TO PRATT & CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

MILITARY COLLEGE : *See* 'Kingston.'
MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
MOIRA RIVER FLOODING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
MORRISBURG PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 492 (i).
MOWAT, SIR OLIVER : *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
MURRAY CANAL, PURCHASE OF MR. JOHNSON'S HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— STEWART, MR., INSPECTOR : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
——— WIRE FENCING: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
NAPANEE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).
NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
NEPEAN POINT, IMPROVEMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).
NEWMARKET, OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NIAGARA MILITIA CAMP, ANNUAL DRILL : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
NINETY-FOURTH REGIMENT, SENIOR AND JUNIOR MAJORS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9080 (iv).
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).
NORTH CHANNEL, CONSTRUCTION OF DAM : in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14142 (vi).
See 'Galops.'
OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).
ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 367 (i).
ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
ORILLIA, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 968 (i), 13086 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF CARETAKER : in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA, BRIDGE OVER CONCESSION STREET : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— BRIDGES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii), 13321 (vi).
——— BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
——— VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See general heading.
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
See 'Georgian,' 'Point au Baril,' &c.
OTTAWA RIVER, PETEWAWA NARROWS : in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
——— SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13110, 13122 (vi).

PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

PARRY SOUND, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PERTH PUBLIC BUILDING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETERBOROUGH ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— CANAL, LIFT LOCK : in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
PETEWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE : in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICTON, MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13134 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, LEVELLING GROUNDS : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
POINT AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
See 'Georgian,' &c.
POINT EDWARD DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
See 'Kaministiquia.'
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT : in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— *See* 'Welland.'
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT PERRY, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5749 (iii).
See 'Midland.'
PRESCOTT, HARBOUR DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
——— INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968 (vi).
PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRITCHETT, AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN ONT. : Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 898, 908 (i).
QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &c. FOR SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5587 (iii).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RATHBUN CO.'S RY. CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE, TORONTO, ADDITIONAL VAULT : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES, &c. : *See* 'Can. Central.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 13302 (vi).
——— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
RIVIÈRE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).
ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— *See* 'Trent.'
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: *See* 'Kingston.'
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
ST. MARY'S PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
SARNIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
——— COALING ACCOMMODATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii).
——— CLERGUE SYNDICATE, LABOUR DISTURBANCES: Remarks, 12610, 12717 (vi).
——— PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR' *re* MILITIA: Remarks (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 12939 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
SCOTCH IRON MOULDERS AND TORONTO CAN. FOUNDRY CO.'S. STRIKE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
——— *See* 'Can. Foundry.'
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
SIMCOE COUNTY CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &C.: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2762 (ii).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5587 (iii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— N. W. T. RESERVES, &C., 6350 (iii).
SMITH, WM., LATE, M.P., AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 894 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., LONGFORD: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
——— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 13648 (vi).
STRATFORD ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
STURGEON FALLS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).
SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO, JUDGES' SALARIES: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 10102 (v).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

SYDNENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).
TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).
——— REPAIRS TO WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
THESSALON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THOMPSON, MR. P., 'LABOUR GAZETTE' COR., TORONTO, REMUNERATION: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
TORONTO, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— (LETTER READ): in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
——— CANADA IRON FOUNDRY, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
——— *See* 'Scotch,' &c.
——— CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957 (i).
——— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, &C., TOTAL AMT. PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Grant*) 1203 (i).
——— INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 13501 (vi).
——— ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
——— LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS, STORE HOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup.,' 13112 (vi).
——— BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
——— COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i), 13096 (vi).
——— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).
——— BALSAM LAKE LOCKS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— CORRY & LAVERDURE, COMPENSATION *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii), 14651 (vi).
——— EMPLYMT. OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8117 (iv).
——— HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 129 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

TRENT CANAL, PAYMENTS TO THOS. DODDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).
——— PETERBOROUGH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— REP. OF W. MCLEOD: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 12716 (vi).
——— ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, REPS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Copies, 2313 (i).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
TRENTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Conc., 14764 (vi).
WALLACEBURG, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).
WALPOLE, CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
——— RAMY'S POINT, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— 'TOWNSEND' VALVE *re* LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE OF ST. CATHARINES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
——— O. CS., *re*, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— *See* 'Pt. Colborne,' &c.
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, COMMISSIONERS' REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6168 (iii).
——— JURY'S VERDICT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3231 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
WHEAT EXPORT FREIGHT RATE TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
WHEAT SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 284 (i).
See 'Grain,' &c.
WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).
WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— LOCKMASTER CASSELMAN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— MORRISON, MRS., CLAIMS *re* LANDS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, OVERSEER'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— STEWART, MR., APPNMT. AS SUPT. OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*) 14599 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
WINDSOR, CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
See 'Kilroy,' &c.
——— POST OFFICE LETTER BOXES: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOODSTOCK ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041, 13108 (vi).
OPERATING EXPENSES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7811 (iv).
ORDER, QUES. OF, IN COM. ON CRIMINAL CODE B.: Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 318 (i).
ORDER IN THE HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12723 (vi).
ORDER, QUESTIONS OF: Mr. Speaker's Rulings (Mr. *Ingram*) 10537 (v).
ORDER, QUES OF, *re* BRUNET AND DOM. ELECTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 108 (i).
——— *See* 'H. of C.'
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3698 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
ORILLIA, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 968 (i).
——— remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF CARETAKER: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
ORLEANS ISLAND, MAIL SERVICE &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
See 'Island of Orleans.'
OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
OSAKA EXHIBITION: *See* 'Japan.'
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i), 5842 (iii), 14243 (vi).
——— ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ROOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).

OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS, CARETAKERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).
——— COAL CONTRACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).
——— COAL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— ELEVATORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
——— FIRE SECURITY AND MARTINEAU REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
——— FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 973, 1006 (i).
——— GOVT. OFFICES, RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 588 (i).
——— GROUNDS, MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— CRICKET PLAYING: Objection (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— LIGHTING &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974, 988 (i).
——— NEW ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
——— STEEL SHELVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— TELEPHONES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
——— WESTERN BLOCK, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES, APPROACHES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
OTTAWA, CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

Ottawa City Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. No. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6448; 1°* of B., 6456; 2°*, and in Com., 6806; 3°*, 6814 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 45).

Ottawa Electric Railway Co.'s B. No. 108 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 171).

OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
See 'Georgian.'

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 37 (Mr. *Champagne*) 1°*, 540; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 173).

OTTAWA, NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14319 (vi).
——— *See* 'Waltham.'
OTTAWA POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
——— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
OTTAWA RIVER, PETAWAWA NARROWS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).
OTTAWA VALLEY FIRE SUFFERERS AND GOVTL. ASSISTANCE: Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3133 (ii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) 1°*, 707; on Order for 2°, 977; 2° m., 1327, 1511 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87), 6537 (iii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 264 (Mr. *Ethier*) 1°*; 2°*, and ref. to Ry. Com., 12993; in Com., and 3°*, 13330 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 172).

OUELLE RIVER BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).
——— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).
OUELLE RIVER, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, BUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13122 (vi).
——— HARBOUR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
——— HARBOUR SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13110 (vi).
OXIDE OF ALUMINUM, IMPORTS INTO CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1035 (i).
OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).
OYSTERS, HERRING, &C., FISH INSPECTION, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
OYSTER POND, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).

Pacific Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 164 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 3796 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 174.)

PACIFIC CABLE, CONCESSIONS TO EASTERN EXTENSION CO., LIABILITY OF CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2675 (ii).
PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) for copies*, 2338 (i).
PARDON PREROGATIVE OF, BY HIS EX.. NUMBER RELEASED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 567 (i).
PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE: *See* 'Chamber of Commerce.'
PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).
PARLIAMENT, DATE OF CONVENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 14853 (vi).
See 'Sessions.'
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, LOWERING TONE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 14583 (vi).
See 'Debates.'
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS, OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, POSTAGE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).
——— TRANSLATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 545 (i).

PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DUST NUISANCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 2104 (i).
—— LAWN MUTILATION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i), Prorogation, 14858 (vi).
PARRSBORO AND SPRINGHILL RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
PARRSBORO AND TRURO: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies for N.S.', &c.
PARRSBORO, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PARRY SOUND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PASPEBIAC AND GASPE BASIN SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
PASPEBIAC TO GASPE, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).
PASPEBIAC, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PASSES, I. C. RAILWAY: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.. 2337 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9582 (iv.)
Patent Act Amt. B. No. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 3622; 2°*, 4213; in Com.. 4213, 4674 (ii); 3°* 5293 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 46.)
PATENT ACT AMT., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 97 (i).
PATENT BRANCH, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
—— CLASSIFICATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4433 (ii).
Patent Relief: *See* 'Depew, Geo. M.'
—— *See* 'International Ry. Appliances.'
—— *See* 'Keller.'
—— *See* 'McDougall, James S.'
—— *See* 'Standard Car.'
—— *See* 'Woolf Valve,' &c.
PAVING SIDEWALKS, OTTAWA, CONCRETE: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS, PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
PEEL, CARDWELL AND HALTON CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436 (iii).
See 'Halton.'
PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' PAYMENTS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Latour,' &c.
PELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
PEMBROKE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. No. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 5763 (iii): 2° m., and in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v); Order dischg., 13444 (vi).
PENITENTIARIES, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
PENITENTIARIES, GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
—— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
See 'Justice.'
Penny Banks B. No. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 4175 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793; 3°*, 10798 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 47.)
Pensions, Militia: *See* 'Militia.'
PENSION SYSTEM, &C., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 9216 (iv).
PENSIONS TO S.A. SOLDIERS, PETS. *re*; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
PER CAPITA TAX, EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
PER CAPITA TAX, REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 13935 (vi).
PERCE, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
Père Marquette International Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 132 (Mr. *Cowan*), 1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 175.)
PERKINS, W.. PAYMENT TO *re* LISGAR ELECTION; in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726, 2753 (ii).
PERMANENT CORPS, QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*), 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).
—— INCREASE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
—— INCREASE OF PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 13371 (vi).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Bourassa*), *re* STOCK GAMBLING, 7204 (iii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* REPORT OF SPEECH: (Mr, *Hughes. Victoria*) 14850 (vi).
See 'Privilege.'
PERTH PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETAWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE: in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
—— IMPROVEMENT TO CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PETERBOROUGH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
—— CANAL, LIFT LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
—— ENTRANCE PIER, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S, DEPOSIT CHEQUE: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
See 'Atlantic.'
PETHIC, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).

PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).
PETITIONS, PRESENTATION OF, RULES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*), 6 (i).
PETITIONS *re* G.T.Ry., SIGNATURES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*), 12715; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 12715 (vi).
PETITION REJECTED AS CONTRARY TO RULE 86 (Mr. *Speaker*), 654 (i).
See 'H. of C.'
PETIT ROCHER, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
"PETREL", REPLACEMENT BY NEW STEAMER: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).
See 'Marine.'
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS, &C: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTON MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Alcorn*), 13134 (vi).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LEVELLING GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
—— LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
—— LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PIERREVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi)
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec) Amt. B. No. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), Res. wthdn., 12493 (v); in Com. on Res., 12781; 1°* of B., 12800; 2°m., 12984; 2°, and in Com., 13628; 3°m., 13937 (vi). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 48.)
Pilotage Act. Amt. B. No. 138 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), 1°*, 2100 (i); wthdn., 11302 (v).
PILOTAGE ACT AMT. B: Prop. Res. wthdn., 12493 (v).
PILOTS, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2915 (ii).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4132-4168 (ii).
See 'Shipping Casualties Bill.'
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. CARS: in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
PLAINS OF ABRAHAM AND MILITARY PARADES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3234 (ii).
PLEASANT BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
POINTE AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
POINTE AUX TREMBLES, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINTE DU CHENE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
POINT EDWARD, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i). 13249 (vi).
POINTE FORTUNE, WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT PRIM, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
POINT TUPPER, DREDGING, CLAIMS OF MR. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
—— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
POIRIERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
POLAR EXPEDITION, GOVT. AID TO CAPT. BERNIER: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), 12805 (vi.)
POLICE MAGISTRATES, YUKON. LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'
POLITICAL CORRUPTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Dom. Elections B., 891 (i).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
PORTAGE, P.E.I., POST OFFICE OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
PORT ARTHUR, ADDITIONAL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii)., 13012 (vi).
See 'Ontario,' &c.
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
—— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
—— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
—— ROCK CUT: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
—— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
PORT DANIEL, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORTER'S CHANNEL, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
PORT GREVILLE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, N. S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT HOWE, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT MOODY, MILITARY RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
PORT PERRY, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).

PORTRAIT PAINTING OF HIS MAJESTY THE KING AND CANADIAN ARTISTS; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13026 (vi).
See 'Art,' &c.

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i), 13249 (vi).

Postal Scales: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1°m., 5240; 2°m., 5657; in Com., 5659, 5853: 3°*, 5871 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 49).

Post Office and Govt. Savings Bank B. No. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°m., 6353; 2°*., and in Com., 6814; 3°*, 6815 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 62).

POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MONTREAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

POST OFFICE, GOVT'S. POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487-533 (i).

POST OFFICE:

AFFIDAVITS *re* P. O. SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iii).

AGRICULTURE DEPT., POSTAGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4355 (ii).

AMHERST, N. S., POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

AURORA FOUNDRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).

AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com of Sup., 6139 (iii).

AUTOMOBILES FOR P. O. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).

AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 13263 (vi).

BARRIE P. O., BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).

BLOOMFIELD POSTMASTER, N. B., CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BOXES ON STREET CORNERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
See 'Postal Boxes,' &C.

BOX RENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

BRACEBRIDGE POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., P. E. I., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

CAMPBELL, D. J., POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 8082 (iv).

CAMPBELLFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).

CANADA AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (iii).

CANADIAN MAIL VIA NEW YORK, NUMBER OF TONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).

CARLIN, PETER, J., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY PIER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).

CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).

CITY POST OFFICES, APPNMT. OF CLERKS ON PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 14001, 14009 (vi).

CLERKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5853 (iii).

CONVENTION, POSTAL, LONDON, ENG., RES. ADOPTED: Read (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14018 (vi).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

CORNWALL ROAD P. O., MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14038 (vi).

COUNTRY POSTMASTERS, SALARY INCREASES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5662, 5676, 5863 (iii).
See 'Postmasters, Rural.'

COUNTRY POST OFFICES, HOURS OF CLOSING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com. of Sup., 5931 (iii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii), 14011 (vi).

CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P. O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).

CUTLER AND GORE BAY MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

——— SPANISH MILLS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS *re* SAVING BANKS DEPOSITS: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *William Mulock*) 89 (i).

DISTRIBUTION, &C.: REMARKS (Mr. *Bell*) 879 (i).

DEPTL. SALARIES, ADDITIONAL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DIXON, MR. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DOYLE, MR., RY. MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

EDVILLE POSTMASTER, OPENING OF OFFICE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

EMERSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).

EMPLOYEES, HOLIDAYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4005 (ii).

ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER; Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum (Sir *William Mulock*) read, 14008 (vi).

ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).

FACILITIES TO PARISHES NEAR MONTREAL, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 12498 (v).

FITTINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13090 (vi).

GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).

GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., (Sir *William Mulock*) 14012 (vi).

GUELPH POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).

HALIFAX POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).

——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).

H. OF C., LOCKED P. O. BOXES: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 6026 (iii).

INSPECTORS, SUPT. OF RY. MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).

INSURANCE FUND, REP., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).

JUBILEE STAMPS, SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6060 (iii).

KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938 (iii).

LAMBTON POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278 14661 (vi).

LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

LETTER BOX COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER BOXES IN POST OFFICES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— BOOTS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on Post Office B., 5660, 5672 (iii).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iii).
——— TORONTO, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— WINNIPEG, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
LIME ROCK, N.S., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PET. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
See 'Lambton.'
MACLEOD, N.W.T., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
MAHONE BAY, POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIL BAGS, REFUNDING EXPRESS CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14684 (vi).
See general heading.
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
MAIL, CANADIAN, SENT VIA NEW YORK: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
MAILS CARRIED BY RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
MAIL CARS, N.W.T., INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
MAIL CLERKS, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13997 (vi).
See 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
MAIL MARKING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6053, 6065 (iii).
——— P.E.I., IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MALLON, MR., DISMISSAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).
MAN. POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Postmasters.'
MEAFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFAULTING POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
MONTREAL POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
NAPANEE POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).
NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON AND EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1195 (i).
NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NEWSPAPER BOXES, NAMES OF MANUFACTURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 14283 (vi).
See 'Boxes.'

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

N. W. TER., POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).
ORLEANS ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
OTTAWA, POST OFFICE, ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
——— SUPPLY CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).
OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5924, 6004 (iii).
PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, POSTAGE, *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).
PICTON MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13134 (vi).
PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
PORTAGE, P.E.I., POST OFFICE, OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
POSTAL, BOXES ON STREET CORNERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
——— CONVENTION: *See* 'CONVENTION.'
——— MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iii).
POSTMASTERS, ASSOCIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T., MEMORIAL *re* SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 13259 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRiviére*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
——— STMNT. (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).
——— DEFAULTING *re* SAVINGS BANKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
——— DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1020 (i).
——— IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PETS. *re* SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 125 (i).
POSTMASTERS, RURAL, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5920, 6037 (iii).
——— *See* 'Country.'
POSTMASTERS' SALARIES, ARREARS: in Com. of Sup., 5921 (iii).
POST OFFICES IN CITIES, STMNT. OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Sir *William Mulock*) *re* NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., 13256 (vi).
QUEBEC POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
RY. CARRIAGE OF MAILS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
RY. MAIL CLERKS: in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5926, 6136 (iii).
——— INCREASED SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
See 'Mail Clerks.'
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
RY. MAIL TRANSFER AGENTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iii).
RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6889 (iii).
ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
RONAN, MR., AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, FREE ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 285 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 13259 (vi).
——— P.E.I., Par. in Charlottetown *Patriot*: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13806 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 6137 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 511 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
—— POSTAL FACILITIES: Ques (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iii).
SAVINGS BANKS, DEFALCATIONS OF POSTMASTER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
SMITH, F. H., P.O. DEPT., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
STAMPING LETTERS BY MINISTERS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
SUPPLIES AND CURRENT WAGES, DECLARATION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iii).
THETFORD MINES POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).
TORONTO, ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
TORONTO POST OFFICE, BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
—— AUTOMOBILES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).
TRANSFER OF TEMPORARY CLERKS TO PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
U. S. INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS *re* CUSTOMS MANIFEST, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).
VALLEYFIELD POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 98 (i).
—— TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
VANCOUVER P. O., INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Conc., 14764 (vi).
WHITNEY PIER, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
WINNIPEG P. O., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
—— REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).

POTTINGER, MR., I.C.R., REP. OF *re* TIES, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Haggart*) 3806 (ii).

'POULTRY FARMING,' PAMPHLET OF DEPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 7640 (iv).

POUPORE, G. C., AWARD: *See* 'Ottawa River.'

PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
—— *See* 'Midland.'

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, AND RT. HON. JOS. CHAMBERLAIN'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13375 (vi).
—— AND S.A. COLONIES, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
—— CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3583 (ii).
—— WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B. C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
—— PAR. IN 'MONTREAL STAR' *re* MR. FIELDING'S PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME, 13936 (vi).
—— PREVENTION OF FRAUD, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).
—— *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5322 (iii).
—— MEMORANDUM OF MR. BALFOUR, PRES'DT. OF BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE, IN FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1402 (i).
—— OFFER OF CAN. GOVT. TO G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3219 (ii).

PRÉFONTAINE, HON. R., AND PUBLIC WORKS PORTFOLIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2266-2273, 2657, 2925, 2956 (ii).

PRENDERGAST, JUDGE, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).

PRESCOTT, HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
—— INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968 (vi).

PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
—— DOCK REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).

Press Associated Despatches: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

PRESS REPRESENTATIVES IN GALLERY OF H. OF C., SESSIONAL SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14242 (vi).

PRESTON, MR., INTERVIEW *re* CAN. BUTTER: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).
—— STATEMENT *re* CAN. APPLES: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
—— SUIT BY CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
See 'Barr Colony,' &c.

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).
——*See* 'Customs.'

PRIME MINISTER, CONGRATULATIONS *re* TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS A MEMBER (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

'PRINCE ALBERT ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
—— *See* 'Advocate.'

PRINCE ALBERT, CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
—— COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

Prince Edward Island Ferry Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1°*, 3391; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914; 3°, 7914 (iv).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
AGENTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6884 (iii).
AITKEN'S WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
ALBANY STATION AND LAND PURCHASE, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
ALBERTON RY. STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
—— STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
ANNANDALE, PIER, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
—— RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
BEACH POINT, BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
BELFAST PIER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
BLUESHANK, STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
BONDED WAREHOUSES, RENTAL, CLOSING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
BROOKFIELD STATION, ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
CANOE COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).
CAPE TRAVERSE, SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CARLETON HEAD, SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
CHARLOTTETOWN, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— DOM. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14131 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).
COAL FIELDS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
COVE HEAD, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13222 (vi).
CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).
DESROCHES, FISHERY GUARD, ALLEGED FRAUDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).
DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
FARQUHARSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
FISHING BOUNTIES, GUARDIAN DESROCHES, ALLEGED FRAUD: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).
FISH SHIPPERS, LOSS, &C., BY GOVT. STRS.: Memorandum read (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4051-54 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).
——— PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
GRAND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
HIGGIN'S SHORE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).
——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938, 6064 (iii).
KENSINGTON STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
LARKIN, CAPT. W. S., COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
LEWIS POINT, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

LOBSTER INDUSTRY, INSPECTION, *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDY, P.E.I. AND G.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii).
MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
See 'Hillsborough.'
NEW LONDON HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH CARDIGAN, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).
O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY., BRANCH LINE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY, DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).
OYSTERS, HERRING, &C., FISH INSPECTION, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
PERCÉ, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
PETHICK, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
POINT PRIM, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
PORTAGE, POST OFFICE OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
P.E.I. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv).
——— AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
——— AND NEWFOUNDLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13676 (vi).
——— PROTEST *re* REPRESENTATION IN H. OF C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
——— *See* 'Redistribution.'
P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12608 (v), 12828 (vi).
——— GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——— MISREPRESENTATION *re* TOTAL COST: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P. E. I.*) 1679 (i).
——— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH AND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14115 (vi).
——— RY. SALE OF TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— SUBSIDIES BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
——— WATER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
QUEENS, WEST, REPRESENTATION *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).
REDISTRIBUTION *re* P. E. I. AND N. B., COR. RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 876 (i).
REPRESENTATION IN P.E.I. AND N B. FOR H. OF C., LAW OFFICERS' OPINION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
RICHMOND AND NORTHAM, P.E.I. RY. STATION : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
RICHMOND BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, Par. in Charlottetown *Patriot* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13806 (vi).
SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, P.E.I. RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4443 (ii).
SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).
SKINNER'S POND : in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com, of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SOURIS, KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR, RY. TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
ST. LOUIS, ELMSDALE, COLEMAN AND CONWAY STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
"STANLEY," STR., AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 4006 (ii),
——— MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).
STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 4361 (ii)
STEEL RAILS, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COMPLETION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 3234 (ii).
——— COAL SHEDS : in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
TELEGRAPH LINES AND MAINLAND : in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).
——— RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
TELEGRAPH SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 2765 (ii).
——— COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*), 1036 (i).
——— STR. "STANLEY": Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 4006 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6895 (iii).

Printing and Stationery Bill: *See* 'Public,' &c.

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1102 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU AND UNION EMPLOYEES : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4182, 4444 (ii).

——— AND UNION LABELS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*), 4179 (ii).

PRINTING BUREAU, COMPOSITORS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4444 (ii).
PRINTING BUREAU, INDEBTEDNESS OF MEMBERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 4180 (ii).
——— PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 12587 (v).
——— SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
PRINTING COM. : M. (Mr. *Parmelee*) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 5314 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Parmelee*) to concur in 4th Rep. of Com., 5581 (iii).
PRINTING OF PARLT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
PRINTING, STATIONERY, CUSTOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).

Prisons Act : *See* 'Reformatory.'

PRITCHARD AND ANDREWS, P.O. SUPPLIES : in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iii).
PRITCHETT, AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN ONT.: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*), 898, 908 (i).
PRIVATE BANKERS : *See* 'Bankers.'
PRIVATE BILLS : M. (Mr. *Morrison*), to extend Time, 10489 (v).
——— M. (Mr. *Russell*) to suspend Rule, 4958 (ii).
——— NOTICES, REVISING RULES *re* : M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) in Com. on Rep. of Joint Com., 13547 (vi).
——— ORDER FOR PROCEDURE : Remarks (Mr. *La-Rivière*), 5138 (iii).
PRIVATE CARS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR HAULAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 9682 (iv).
——— PURCHASED BY GOVT,, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2309 (i).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., 1ST REP. OF SEL. COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*), 5511 (iii).
——— M. *re* Stenographer (Mr. *Fraser*), 7202 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. *re* MR. LOY, M.P.: Presented (Mr. *Wade*), 7916 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7917 (iv).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 7918 (iv).
——— M. to conc. in Rep., 7922, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*), 8008, Neg. (Y. 40 ; N. 105), 8069, 8080 (iv).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF : (Mr. *Fisher*) Par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Montreal *Herald* Co., 5314 (iii).
——— (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Par. in *La Patrie*, 6803 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11557 (v).
——— (Sir *William Mulock*) *re* Newmarket Office Specialty Co., 13256 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys. and 'Grafters,' 10497, 10529 (v).
——— (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) *re* Attendance at House, 2015 (i).
——— (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) *re* Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization,' 13373 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Schell*) *re* Purchase of Cheese Hoops, 5416 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Schell*) *re* Appnmt. of Mr. Stewart on Canals, 14599 (vi).

PRIVILEGE (Mr. *Scott*) *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates', in Campaign Literature, 14583 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 3127 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets. of G.T.P. Ry. Co., 13265 (vi).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.,' &c.
——— (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* 'Eureka', 14687 (vi).
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
PROCEDURE *re* ADJOURNMENT: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Sproule*), 6630 (iii).
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Secretary (Mr. *Speaker*), 14844 (vi).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 14858 (vi).
PROSPECT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup.' 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63), 13932 (vi).
See 'Autonomy.'
——— FURTHER COR., &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*), 7295 (iii).
——— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 6891 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print Papers, 5582 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 5512 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*), 1296 (i).
——— RET., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii).
See 'N.W.T. Subsidies B. 256.'

Provincial Court Judges, &c.: *See* 'Judges Retiring,' &c.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, INCREASES, &C.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 5764 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: M. (Mr. *Fraser*) 367 (i).
——— M. to add Name (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3431 (ii).
——— MEETINGS CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 8334 (iv).
——— PRODUCING CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Publication of Statutes: *See* 'Statutes.'

PUBLIC DEBT, CONVERSION, PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS *re*, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14253 (vi).
PUBLIC DEBT, INTEREST DECREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14665 (vi).
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION TO BOARDS OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1378 (i).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE WHARFS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).
PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
PUBLIC HEALTH, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture.'

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. No. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3392; 2°*, 4203; in Com., 4203; 3°*, 4213 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 50).

Public Works Act (contracts) Amt. B. No. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1° m., 3970; 2°*, 4221; in Com., 4221; 3°*, 4224 (ii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 52).

Public Works Management and Control B. No. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 14281; 2°, and in Com., 14741; 3°*, 14755 (vi). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 53).

PUBLIC WORKS:
ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ABRAM'S RIVERS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ACTON VALE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
AITKEN'S WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
'ALASKA,' STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629 (iii).
ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
AMAGANDUS WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
AMHERSTBURG, ONT., HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1285 (i), 13235 (vi).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW, WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY'S LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
ANNANDALE PIER, P.E.I., AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTICOSTI TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
ANTIGONISH POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
ARBITRATION AND AWARDS *re* PUBLIC WORKS, PAYMENTS &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vi).
ARCHITECT'S (CHIEF) OFFICE, OTTAWA, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
ARCHITECTS *re* PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).
ARCHITECT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY ARREARS: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).
——— STAFF, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
ARICHAT, N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).
ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1859 (i).
See "St. Andrews Rapids" (vi).
ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1072 (i).
BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
BARRIE, ONT., WHARF CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (i), 13452 (vi).
BARRY'S BAY, ONT., MADAWASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BATISCAN RIVER, CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
See 'St. Maurice.'
BAXTER'S HARBOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BAYFIELD EXTENSION PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i), 13141 (vi).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
BEACH POINT, P.E.I., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
BELFAST PIER, P.E.I., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
BELLE ISLE, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2989 (ii).
BELLE RIVIÈRE, SHEET PILING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969, (i), 13082 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5588 (iii).
BENOIT'S COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG POND WHARF, N.S., SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).
BLACK BROOK, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).
BLIND RIVER, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 1298 (i).
BOIS BRULÉ, TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
BONAVENTURE, EAST, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
BRACEBRIDGE, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
BRANTFORD DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRETON COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
BRIDGES OVER CANALS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
BRIDGEWATER, N.S., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).
B.C. TELEGRAPH LINES, WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).
BROAD COVE, N.S., HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5755 (iii).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 956, 1065 (i).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 442 (i), 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
——— MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 412, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i), 13129 (vi).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 487, 956 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).
——— OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13053 14245 (vi).
——— QUEBEC, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
See 'Dominion Buildings.'
BURK'S FALLS, MAGNETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
CACOUNA WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
CAMPBELLFORD, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
CAMPBELLTON, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).
——— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).
CAMPOBELLO, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in of Com. Sup., 13218 (vi).
CAPE TORMENTINE, N.B., PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
CAPE TRAVERSE, P.E.I., SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).
CARETAKERS OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, GOVT. POLICY *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i), 13061 (vi).
CARIBOO ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CARLETON HEAD, P.E.I., SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I., BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).
CEMENT USED FOR BUILDINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).
CHARLOTTETOWN, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).
CHATEAUGUAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
CHATHAM, N.B., LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
——— TO TRACADIE, N.B., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
CHATHAM, ONT., DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
CHEGOGGIN, N.S., PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

CHETICAMP, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHEVERIE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
CHEZZETCOOK, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
CLERKS OF PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).
COAL CONTRACTS FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 13084 (vi).
——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
COCAGNE WHARF, N.B., COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
COLUMBIA RIVER, B.C., ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
CORRY & LAVERDURE, AWARD *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATION OF WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
COVE HEAD HARBOUR, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).
COW BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i), 13178 (vi).
CRANE ISLAND WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
CROSS POINT PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
CUMBERLAND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
DALHOUSIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DAUPHIN, LAKE LOWERING: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
DAWSON TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).
DEER ISLAND TO EASTPORT, ME., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
See 'Parry Sound.'
DESCHAMBAULT WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESERONTO, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

DESJARDINS, ALLUMETTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, CAMILLE, APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques., (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).
DIGBY PIER, RENEWALS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
DIPPER HARBOUR, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DOCKS, HARBOURS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (i).
——— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 421 (i).
——— RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
——— RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN, ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DREDGES, AT MIDLAND, CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— NEW, COST, CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1856 (i).
——— PLANT FOR B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2674 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).
——— MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).
See "Hydraulic" &c.
——— ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).
——— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
——— VESSELS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
DRILL HALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13043 (vi).
See 'Militia.'
——— ST. JOHNS, QUE., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
DUFFERIN AND SAPPERS BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
DUNCAN'S COVE, N.S., APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DUNNVILLE: *See* 'Grand River.'
DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
EAST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST BERLIN, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
ECONOMY, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
EDMONTON, BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
ELECTRIC POWER FOR DOM. BUILDINGS GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
ENGINEERS OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

ESQUIMAUX POINTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

'EUREKA,' STR., LOAN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14285 (vi).

——— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Tarte*): 14687 (vi).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, REPAIRS TO BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

FAIR WAGE SCHEDULE ON GOVT. CONTRACTS AND LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).

FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

'FIELDING, W. S.,' DREDGE PREPARATION OF PLANS, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14283 (vi).

FINLAY POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).

FISHER, CHAS. A. L., INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1592 (i).

FIVE ISLANDS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

FLESHERTON ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

FT. DUFFERIN EXTENSION WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

FT. LAWRENCE, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).

FT. WILLIAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
See 'Port Arthur,' 'Kaministiquia,' &c.

FRASER RIVER, B.C., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRAWLEY, MR., REMOVAL FROM ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).

FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

FREEPORT, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

FRIARS HEAD HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

FRUDE'S POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

FUEL CONTRACTS, INTEREST *re* UNPAID ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5318 (iii).

GABAROUSE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

GANANOQUE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970 (i).

——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).

GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C.P.R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

GEORGEVILLE, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
See 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'

GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).

GODERICH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).

——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).

GORE'S LANDING, WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REP. *re* MARTINEAU INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
See 'Ottawa.'

GOVT. CONTRACTS, TENDERS *re*: Par in Ottawa *Free Press* (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

GOVT. POLICY *re* DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works, Transfer.'

GRAND BEND, ONT., BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

GRAND ETANG BRIDGE, ENTRANCE. in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).

GRAND MANAN, N. B., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).

GRAND NARROWS, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i), 13198 (vi).

GRAND PILES DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND RIVER WHARF, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

GRANDE RIVIERE WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

GRANDE VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514-1574 (i); on conc., 6070 (iii).

GRANITE VILLAGE, N.S., MOORING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

GREAT SALMON RIVER, GROYNE AND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

GREEN COVE BOAT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).

GREY COUNTY, LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS WANTED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).

GUELPH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).

GULL HARBOUR, ST. GEORGE'S BAY, MAN., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).

GUYSBOROUGH, N. S., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).

HALIFAX, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).

———MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

——— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).

——— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

HALL'S HARBOUR, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).

HAMILTON DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).

——— INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 145 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).

——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).

——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii), 13308 (vi).

——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).

——— MAR. PROVS. GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).

——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).

——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).

——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424, (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).

——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).

——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1512, 2241 (i), 3304 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).

——— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS AND BRIDGES, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

HARDY BAY, B.C., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT. AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAWK POINT INLET, N. S., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HERRING COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HIGGIN'S SHORE, P.E.I., PIER: in Com. of Sup.. 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).
HNAUSA WHARF, EXTENSION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HOPEWELL CAPE, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
HULL, WHARF, COMPLETION: in Com. of Sup., 5900 (iii).
HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (i), 13312 (vi).
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE, LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12218 (v).
INVERNESS MINES, N.S., BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
IONA, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND TEL. LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).
—— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).
See "Orleans," &c.
ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).
ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).
JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
JEDDORE, EAST, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
—— Remarks: (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
See 'Port Arthur.'
KAMOURASKA EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
KETCH, N. S., HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
—— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).
—— MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., (i), 13094 (vi).
—— MILITARY STABLES: in Com. of Sup., 638 13117 (vi).
KINGSVILLE, ONT., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
LAKE ST. JOHN, WHARF, PIERS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (*i*), 13459 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).
See 'Temiscamingue.'
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, N. S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 (ii).
—— RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for copies*, 3236 (ii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
LATOUR, L. J., LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
—— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Le Canada.'
LEAMINGTON WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
'LE CANADA' CIRCULAR ISSUED BY J. L. LATOUR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 1032 (i).
See 'Pelletier and Latour.'
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249 (i).
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii).
—— LAND PURCHASED FOR I. C. R.: M. for O. Cs., &C.*: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
LEWIS POINT, P. E. I., PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
LIGHTING DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of SUP., 2257 (i).
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com of Sup., 1105 (i).
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LONDON, DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
—— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
LONGUEUIL, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N. B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
LORD'S COVE (DEER'S ISLAND) WHARF: in Com., of Sup., 1177 (i).
LOTBINIERE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 13315 (vi).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

McKay's Point, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
McNutt's Island, N. S., Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Magann & Phin, Claims *re* Toronto Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— Land Tel. Lines, Repairs, Rewiring, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
Magog Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
Maguasha Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Main a Dieu, N. S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Malagawatch, N. S., Boat Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Malignant Cove, N. S., Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Marconi Telegraph Stations, Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii), 13639 (vi).
——— Tel. Apparatus at Chateau Bay: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— Success of System: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
Margaree, N. S., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
Margaretsville, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
Maria Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
Marysville, N. B.: Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).
Meaford Post Office: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).
Melbourne, N.S., Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater, Restoration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
Middle River, N.S., Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
Middleton Armoury, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).
Midland Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
——— Dredges, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
Midland, Mercantile Co.'s Rental of Buildings on Dock, Midland: in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— Water Front, Lease to Pratt & Co.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
Miscou Harbour, N.B., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
Mistook (Delisle) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Moira River, Flooding: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
Moisie Point, Road Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).
Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
Mont Louis, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Montmagny Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
Montreal, Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13058 (vi).
——— Harbour Dry Dock, Site, &c.: M. for O. Cs., Cor., &c.*: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

Montreal, Harbour, Permanent Sheds, Plans prepared, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
——— Harbour Dock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
——— New Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— Post Office, Enlargement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
Moose Jaw Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
Morrisburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 492 (i).
Morrison's Point, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Murray Bay to St. Catharines, Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
Murray Bay, Wharf Extension, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
Musquodoboit, N.S., Wharf Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Nappan, Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
Necum Teuch Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
Negro Point, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
Neil's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
Nelson Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— Racine Bros'. Claims against Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).
Nepean Point, Improvement by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).
Newcastle Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
New Harbour Breakwater, Protection Slopes, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
New London, P.E.I., Harbour Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— Repairs to Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
Newport, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
New Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
Nicola, Kamloops, Telephone Service: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
Nicolet River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
Noel Wharf, N.S., Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
Nominingue Lake Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
North Cardigan, P.E.I., Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
North Sydney Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— *See* 'Sydney.'
N. W. T., Court Houses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
Oakville Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
Orillia, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 968 (i), 13086 (vi).
——— Public Buildings, Removal of Caretaker: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
ORLEANS, ISLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 5906 (iii).
——— *See* 'Submarine,' 'Island,' &c.
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i), 5842 (iii), 14243 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
——— APPROACHES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
——— CONCESSION STREET: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY, BUILDINGS, &C., ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
——— CARETAKERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).
——— CENSUS BUILDING, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
——— COAL CONTRACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).
——— COAL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— ELEVATORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
——— ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— FIRE SECURITY AND MARTINEAU REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
——— FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
——— GROUNDS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— GROUNDS, PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— HEATING, &C., WESTERN BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— "IMPERIAL" BUILDING, OTTAWA, GOVT. OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3803 (ii).
——— LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974, 988 (i).
——— LIGHTING OF CHAMBER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 816 (i).
——— LIGHTING, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, CONTRACT PRICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 3235 (ii).
——— TRANSFORMERS: in Com. of Sup., 5843 (iii).
——— MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— OFFICE FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13117 (vi).
——— FITTINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13090 (vi).
——— RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 588 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5077 (ii).
——— RIDEAU HALL, LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i).
——— RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 344 (i).
——— STEEL SHELVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— TELEPHONES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
——— VENTILATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
——— VICTORIA MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i).
OTTAWA RIVER, PETAWAWA NARROWS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

OUELLE, RIVIÈRE, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13110 (vi).
——— SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13122 (vi).
OYSTER POND, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
PARRSBOROUGH, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PARRY SOUND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PASPEBIAC LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PAVING SIDEWALKS, CONCRETE: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' PAYMENTS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
PELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
PEMBROKE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PERCÉ, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
PERTH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETAWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE: in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENT TO CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PETERBOROUGH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PETIT ROCHER, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDING, LEVELLING GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PICTOU, N.S., LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup. 13205 (vi).
PIERREVILLE, WHARF: in Com. in Sup., 13468 (vi).
PLEASANT BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
POINTE AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE, CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
POINTE DU CHENE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
POINT EDWARD, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of SUP., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
POINTE FORTUNE, WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT PRIM, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
POINTE AUX TREMBLES, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT TUPPER DREDGING, CLAIMS OF M. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
POIRIERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
See 'Fort William,' 'Kaministiquia.'

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

PORT BURWELL HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
See 'Welland.'
PORT DANIEL, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORTER'S CHANNEL, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
PORT GREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT HOWE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT PERRY, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, DREDGING, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i), 13249 (vi).
POST OFFICES, GOVT.'S POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487–533 (i).
POUPORE, G. C., AWARD: *See* 'Ottawa River,' &c.
PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— *See* 'Midland.'
PRESCOTT, HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
P.E.I., PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS, &C.- in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
——— TEL. SERVICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
PROSPECT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE WHARFS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— MAN.; in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13037 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 13133, 13306 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 411, 636 (i), 2612 (ii), 3304, 5006 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i), 13498 (vi).
——— CIVIL GOVT., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iii).
——— CONTRACTS AWARDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*), 9080 (iv).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*), 6 (i).
——— EMPLOYEES, DISMISSALS, PROMOTIONS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*), 1058 (i).
——— AND MARINE DEPT., DIVISION OF WORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2266-2273 (i), 2657 (ii).
——— TRANSFER OF EXPENDITURES; Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), in Com. of Sup., 2925, 2956 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 2925 (ii).
——— PORTFOLIO AND QUEBEC PROVINCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2925. 2956 (ii).
——— PRESERVATION OF HEALTH, REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1857 (i).
——— TOTAL AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE IN CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*), 1197 (i).
PUGWASH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
QUATSINO CITY, WHARF, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
QUEBEC, CITADEL DRILL SHED; in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).
——— DRILL SHED, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*), 706 (i).
——— HARBOUR PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3972 (ii).
——— HARBOUR WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soleil* (Mr. *Casgrain*), 2237 (i).
——— MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
QUESNEL DAM, B.C., OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*), 11557 (v).
QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5587 (iii).
RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3231 (ii).
RACINE BROS., CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O., B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
——— AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7162 (iii).
——— Letters read from Deputy Minister of Labour, &c., 7164 (iii).
RED DEER, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
REPENTIGNY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &C., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).
RICHIBUCTO, NORTH PIER EXTENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).
RICHMOND BAY, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
RICHMOND, QUE., RIVER ST. FRANCIS ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, DRAINAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 647 (i).
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5006 (ii). *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
RIMOUSKI EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RIVIERE DU LOUP, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).
RIVIERE DU NORD, CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
RIVIERE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
RIVIERE AUX RENARDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).
RIVIERE VERTE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).
——— RECONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
ROBIN, COLLAS, CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC: Remarks in Com. of Supply, 13464 (vi).
RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).
ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
ROSSLAND, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
ST. AGNES, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST. ALEXIS, BAIE DES HA HA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE, HA HA BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÉ DE KAMOURASKA, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup.. 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &c.: Que. (Mr. *Puttee*) 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 10490 (v).
——— RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— MAN., REPORT re CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 14284 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. ANN'S, N.S., NORTH GUT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——— NORTH RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE, PIER RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE: in C m. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY FERRY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
STE. FAMILLE, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. FIDÈLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCOIS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

ST. GÉDEON ISLANDS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODFROI DE NOUVELLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. JEROME, LAKE ST. JOHN, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
ST. JOHN, N.B., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).
ST. JOHN RIVER TRIBUTARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 5895 (iii).
ST. JOHN RIVER WHARFS, TIDAL WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
ST. JOHNS, QUE., CUSTOMS BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).
ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLE OF ORLEANS: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii). *See* 'Island of Orleans,' &c.
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER (LOWER) REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE, CABLE AND TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2989, 5007 (ii), 13332 (vi).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).
——— SHIP CHANNEL, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).
——— WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
ST. LOUIS DE MILE END PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. MARY'S CURRENT WHARF, CONTRACT WITH POUPORE & MALONE: M. for copy of Contract* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
ST. MARY'S PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
ST. MAURICE RIVER, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).
——— DREDGING EASTERN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
——— *See* 'Batiscan.'
——— SLIDES, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
ST. MICHEL DE BELLECHASSE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. NICHOLAS PIER, REBUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
ST. PIERRE POINTE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
ST. SIMEON, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
SABREVOIS WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

SACRÉ-COEUR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
SANDY COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SARNIA, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
SAUGENAY RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SELKIRK WHARF, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
SEVEN ISLANDS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHEGAWAKE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHERBROOKE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
SHIELDS MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF : Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SHORT BEACH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5587 (iii).
SKINNER'S COVE, N.S., PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
——— POND, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SLIDES AND BOOMS, GENERAL REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re* : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
See 'St. Anne de Sorel.'
SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
SOUTH INGONISH WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SPRINGHILL, N.S., ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— BOILER EXPLOSION : Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
STAFFORD & CO.'S RENTAL OF DOCK BUILDINGS, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
See 'Midland.'
STRATFORD, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS : in Com of Sup., 13130 (vi).
STURGEON FALLS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

SUBMARINE CABLE, ISLE OF ORLEANS : M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 11186 (v).
See 'Island of Orleans,' &c.
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3234 (ii).
SUMMERVILLE, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720 (ii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
SWIM'S POINT, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SYDENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).
SYDNEY, N.S., POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13028, 13035 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
See 'North Sydney,' &c.
TELEGRAPH LINES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
——— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii), 5918 (iii).
——— P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).
——— P.E.I., RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
——— QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— ST. LAWRENCE : in Com. of Sup., 5067 (ii).
TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).
TELEPHONE COS. IN MAR. PROVS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2585 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
TELEPHONE, LONG DISTANCE IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 5088 (ii).
TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, REPAIRS TO WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
See 'Lake Temiscamingue.'
TENDERS *re* GOVT. CONTRACTS, INJUSTICE TO ENGLISH FIRMS : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).
TENECAPE, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
TERREBONNE, POST OFFICE BUILDING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
TEULON, NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
THESSALON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR, BEACH WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
——— RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
TIVERTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TORONTO, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— LETTERS READ : in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

TORONTO, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957, (i).
——— HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
——— TOTAL AMT. PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Grant*) 1203 (i).
——— ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
——— LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS, STORE HOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i), 13096 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
——— PUB. WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
TRANSPORTATION, COMMISSION *re* SOREL WHARF: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
——— FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
See general heading.
TRENTON HARDOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.S., BEACH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.W.T., TO ANDREWS TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WALLACEBURG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).
WALLACE HARBOUR, N.S., FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WATER SUPPLY FOR DOM. BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
WEDGE POINT, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WENTWORTH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO, BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup,, 13217 (vi).
WHARFS, &C., POLICY OF GOVT. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
——— PRIVATE, GOVT. EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352-1377 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE MUD RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WILLIAMS HEAD, B.C., QUARANTINE STATION WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, N.S., SHEER DAM., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE, LETTER BOXES: in Com. of of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDING AND POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).
WOLFE ISLAND, DREDGING SHOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WOODS, J. W., RENTAL OF BUILDING, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
WOODSTOCK, N.B, ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
——— PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5735 (iii).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
WOODSTOCK, ONT., ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
——— PUB. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
WOODVILLE, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
YARMOUTH, N.S., BAR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
YORKTON COURT-HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
YUKON TER., PUB. WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).

PULP WOOD, DUTY BY U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 4362 (ii).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

Qu'Appelle Land Co. Bill: *See* 'Ontario and Qu'Appelle,' &c.

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. BONDS: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*) *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates,' 14583 (vi).
——— MEMORANDUM FROM MR. KINGSMILL: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 14588 (vi).
——— Co.'s LAND GRANT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2338 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
——— MORTGAGE DEEDS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).

QUARANTINE, ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of of Sup., 5007 (ii).

——— PUBLIC HEALTH, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).

——— LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).

QUATSINO CITY WHARF, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. No. 145 (Mr. *Power*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com. 4586; and 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 177.)

Quebec Bridge Subsidy Agreement B. No. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 14523; on Order for Com. on Res., 14690; 1°* of B., 14734; 2° m., 14734, in Com., and 3°*, 14735 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 54.)

——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14280 (vi).

QUEBEC BRIDGE, AMOUNTS PAID IN SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 10496 (v).

——— Papers laid on Table, 14521 (vi).

——— FURTHER AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).

QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14449 (vi).

QUEBEC, CITADEL DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).

——— DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).

——— REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).

——— PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3972 (ii).

——— WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soliel* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2237 (i).

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi),

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 84: (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 176).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No, 135 (Mr. *Logan*) 1°*, 2100 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978, 6399; 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 178.)

QUEBEC, MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).

QUEBEC PILOTS: *See* 'Pilotage,' 'Shipping Causalties Bills.'

QUEBEC POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'

Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 56 (Mr. *Girard*) 1°*, 707: 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 179).

Quebec Sup. Court: *See* 'Judges, &c.'

QUEBEC:

ACTON VALE POSTOFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

ADMIRALTY COURT, QUEBEC, REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

AGRICULTURAL LECTURERS IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

ANSE AUX GASCONS WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

——— LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).

——— TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &C.: Remarks (Mr *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).

BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

BATISCAN RIVER CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
See 'St. Maurice.'

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, FLOODING LANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).
——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BELLE ISLE TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2989 (ii).

BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).

BOIS BRULÉ TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

BONAVENTURE EAST BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
See 'G.T.Ry.'

BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).

BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, AMOUNTS PAID IN SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 10496 (v).
——— FURTHER AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).

BRUNET, ARTHUR AND DOM. ELECTION ACT.: M. for Pets., O.C.'s &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 101 (i).
See 'St. James,' &c.

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

BUILDINGS, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 13053, 14245 (vi).
——— RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).

CACOUNA WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).

CANALS IN ONT. AND QUEBEC, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).

CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, SALARY Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
———MOREAU, MR., APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331, 8488 (iv).
——— DISMISSAL OF JULES QUESNEL: (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
——— ELECTRIC STATION BY-WASH: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

CHAMBLY CANAL, LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

CHAMBLY CANAL, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— MACADAMIZING TOW PATH: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).
CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).
CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHT-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2015 (i).
CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).
CHATEAUGUAY RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
CIRCULARS TO CURES, P.Q., *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
CITADEL DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
CRANE ISLAND, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1513.
CROSS POINT, PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
CUMMINGS, JAMES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 9458 (iv).
CUSTOMS SALARIES AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS *re* SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
DESCHAMBAULT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, ALLUMETTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, CAMILLE, APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).
DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, TERREBONNE: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DRILL HALL, QUEBEC, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).
——— SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).
——— ST. JOHNS, QUE., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (vi).
DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR, AMOUNT PAID TO: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iii).
DUCHESNEAU, RESIGNATION AS WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Vincent.'
DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNTS PAID TO *re* TRIP TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).
ELLIS, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
——— INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iii).
ESQUIMAUX POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup,, 2278 (i).
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674 (iii).
——— *See* 'Immigration,' &c.
GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C.P.R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GOODWIN, GEO., COMPENSATION *re* SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

GRAND PILES DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
G. T. PACIFIC, MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——— PARISHES CROSSED, LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
G. T. RY., STE. ROSALIE TO MONTREAL, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
See 'Bonaventure,' &c.
——— TERMINALS AT ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
GRANDE RIVIÈRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GRANDE VALLÉE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514, 1574 (i); on Conc., 6070 (iii).
GRENVILLE CANAL, GUIDE PIER AT ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
——— PAYMENT TO HENRY TUCKER *re* INVESTIGATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
——— SUPPLIES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
GUILBAULT, MR. EDWARD, GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, QUEBEC: in Com. in Sup., 1512 (i), 3304, 3336 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2241 (i).
HARBOUR OF QUEBEC, IMPROVEMENTS, REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3972 (ii).
——— WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soleil* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2237 (i).
HÉTU, RUDOLPHE, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 7915 (iv).
HIDES INSPECTOR AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
HOSPITAL FOR TREATMENT OF TRACHOMA, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
IMMIGRANTS LANDING AT QUEBEC, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5318 (iii).
IMMIGRATION, MEDICAL EXAMINER, QUEBEC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
INDIANS, QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).
ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).
ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).
——— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.* 11301 (v).
JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND OUTSIDE LEGAL BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).
KAMOURASKA, EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES FOR GATES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— LIGHTING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

LACHINE CANAL, LOCK GATE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— MASONRY WALL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
——— *See* 'Mill St.,' &c.
LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6679, 6888 (iii).
LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13459 (vi).
——— WHARF, PIERS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i).
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ASSOMPTION, POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3230 (ii).
———RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for copies, * (Mr. *Monk*), 3236 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i)
LATOUR, L. J., CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* "LE CANADA": Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*), 1033 (i).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR "LE CANADA", &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980 14002 (vi).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*), 1 (i)
"LE CANADA," CANVASSING, &C.:
See Pelletier, and Latour.
——— CIRCULAR ISSUED BY L. J. LATOUR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*), 1032 (i)
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES. &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 8615 (iv)
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249, (i)
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup.. 2978 (ii).
LEVIS, LAND PURCHASED FOR I.C.R.: M. for O. Cs., &c.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
See general heading.
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS SALARIES, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).
———Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
LITTLE METIS:
See "Metis."
LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38 (ii)
See "St. Lawrence".
LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, MONTREAL, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 2504 (ii).
——— PAY OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 4006 (ii)
———SETTLEMENT, &C.: Tel. Read (Mr. *Tarte*), 2676-7 (ii)
LONGUEUIL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi)
LOTBINIÈRE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOY, GEO. M., VIOLATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elect's., 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to employ stenographer, 7203 (iii).
——— *See* "Beauharnois Electoral District".
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— LAND TELEGRAPH LINES, REWIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
MAGOG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
MAGUASHA LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. APPARATUS AT CHATEAU BAY: in Com. of Sup. 13325 (vi).
See 'Belle Isle'.
MARIA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
MARTINEAU, Mr., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).
MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGES REP., &C: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).
MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, *re* QUEBEC INDIANS: in Com. of Sup. 6408 (iii).
MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).
METAPEDIA STATION, I.C.R.; IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).
METIS, LITTLE, STATION CHANGES: in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).
MILITARY BUILDINGS, QUEBEC, IRON FOUNDRY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
MILITARY RIDING SCHOOL, ST. JOHN D'IBERVILLE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8616 (iv).
MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFALCATION OF POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup. 14274, 14655 (vi).
MILL STREET PAVING, LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
MISTOOK (DELISLE) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MONT LOUIS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MONTMAGNY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
MONTREAL, BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
———BONAVENTURE STATION:
See 'Bonaventure,' 'Victoria Bridge.'
———BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
———CUSTOMS DEPT., SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
———CUSTOMS PORTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
———DRY DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
——— DRY DOCK, SITE, &C.: M. for O. Cs., Cor. &c.: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— DRY DOCK, REP. OF COMMISSION *re* SITE: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13058 (vi).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
———HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (iv).
———HARBOUR DOCK IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
———HARBOUR, PERMANENT SHEDS, PLANTS PREPARED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
———INLAND REV. OFFICE, MONEY ABSTRACTED: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
———LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Longshoremen's.'
———NEW POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
———PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
———POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
———POST OFFICE, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 666 (i).
———POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

MONTREAL, ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION: *See* 'St. James.'

——SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii). *See* 'St Lawrence.'

—— SUBWAY CO., O. Cs. COR. &c.: M. for Ret. *(Mr. *Tarte*) 705 (i).

—— TURNPIKE: *See* 'Turnpike Trust.'

MOREAU, DR. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331, 8488 (iv).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).

MURRAY BAY TO ST. CATHARINES, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

MURRAY BAY, WHARF EXTENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).

NEWPORT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).

NEW RICHMOND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi)

NICOLET RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

NOMININGUE LAKE WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).

NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).

OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi)

O'LEARY, J. & M., CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

ORLEANS ISLAND, MAIL SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).

—— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i). *See* Island of Orleans.

OUELLE RIVER, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

PASPEBIAC LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

PELLETIER, H.L., CANVASSING FOR "LE CANADA," PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi). *See* 'Latour.'

PIERREVILLE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

PILOTS, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii). *See* general heading.

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM AND MILITARY PARADES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3234 (ii).

POINTE AUX TREMBLES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

POINTE FORTUNE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

PORT DANIEL WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

POSTAL FACILITIES TO PARISHES NEAR MONTREAL, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 12498 (v).

POSTMASTERS, DEFAULTING *re* SAVINGS BANKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MONTREAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i). *See* 'Montreal.'

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, DEFALCATIONS OF POSTMASTER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS PORTFOLIO AND QUEBEC PROVINCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2925, 2956 (ii).

QUEBEC BRIDGE: *See* general heading.

QUEBEC CITY: *See* 'Citadel,' 'Drill Hall,' 'Ellis, Dr.,' 'Harbour,' &c.

QUEBEC JUDGES, COMPLAINTS *re* OUTSIDE BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).

QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).

RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3231 (ii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

REPENTIGNY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &C., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).

RICHMOND, RIVER ST. FRANCIS, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

RIMOUSKI EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12593 (v).

—— FREIGHT YARD: in Com. of Sup, 8309 (iv).

—— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).

——WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD FISH LADDERS, &C.: M. for Copies of Reps. *(Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

ROBERT VS. KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

ROBIN, COLLAS CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY, ESTABLISHMENT AT QUEBEC: M. for Ret. *(Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

——IMPERFECT RETURN: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i)

ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).

ST. AGNES TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).

ST ALEXIS BAIE DES HA HA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).

ST. ALPHONSE HA HA BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

ST. ANDRÉ DE KAMOURASKA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE PIER, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).

——WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi). *See* 'Sorel.'

STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).

ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY FERRY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v),

STE. FAMILLE PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

ST. FIDÈLE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).

ST. FLAVIE STATION ACCOMMODATION; in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).

ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

STE. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

ST. FRANCOIS, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).

ST. FULGENCE, WHARF; in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

ST. GÉDÉON ISLANDS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

ST. GODEFROI DE NOUVELLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL; in Com. of Sup.. 13067 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JAMES (MONTREAL) ELECTORAL DIVISION, JUDGMENT OF SUP. COURT: Notification, (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13376 (vi).
——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 13303 (vi).
——— NOTIFICATION OF VACANCY: (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).
——— VACANCY: Remarks, (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i). *See* 'Brunet.'
ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. JERÔME WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
ST. JOHNS, QUE., CUSTOMS BUILDING; in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com of Sup., 13069 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE, CABLE AND TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii).
———EQUIPMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).
———GULF FISHING, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).
———LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
———OBSTRUCTION TO NAVIGATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
———PILOTS, RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
———REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE AND FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).
———AND LLOYDS, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
———REP. *re* NAVIGATION OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4133 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).
ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3218, 3304 (ii).
———TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5917 (iii).
———TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
———TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: *See* 'Transportation'.
——— WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS: *See* 'Marconi', &c.
ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLE OF ORLEANS: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).
See "Island of Orleans."
ST. LOUIS DE MILE END, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. in Sup., 13080 (vi).
ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
ST. LOUIS RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. MARY'S CURRENT WHARF, CONTRACT WITH POUPORE & MALONE: M. for Copy of Contract * (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
ST. MAURICE, RIVER DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

ST. MAURICE, DREDGING EASTERN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
——— SLIDES, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
ST. MICHEL DE BELLECHASSE, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. NICHOLAS PIER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
ST. OURS CANAL, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
——— STOP LOGS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
ST. PIERRE POINTE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
ST. SIMEON WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
——— ACTING WARDEN, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*), 10831 (v).
——— HOSPITAL, MANAGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. (*Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
——— WARDEN'S RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
SABREVOIS WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).
SACRÉ-COEUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
SAGUENAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
SAVARD, MR. R. V., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
SEVEN ISLANDS PULP & LUMBER CO., WHARF *re*: Remarks in Com. of. Sup., 13480 (vi).
——— QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHERBROOKE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
SHOEMAKERS FEDERATED UNION, RES. *re* SLATER SHOE CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 14666 (vi).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEO. GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— O'LEARY CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— REPAIRING BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
SOUTHEASTERN VALLEY AND UNITED COUNTIES RY., SAFETY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 451 (i).
SOUTH SHORE RY., COMPLAINT *re* SAFETY: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 205 (i).
——— WORKING, &C.: M for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 448 (i).
SUBMARINE CABLE TO ISLAND OF ORLEANS: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 11186 (v).
——— M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.* 11301 (v)
See 'Island of Orleans'.
TELEGRAPH LINES, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
TERREBONNE, INDIAN RESERVE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
THETFORD MINES POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*
THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
——— RETAINING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
TOBIN CO.'s PULP MILL: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14462 (vi).
TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).
TRACHOMA HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC: in Com. of Supt., 14245 (vi).
See 'Agriculture'.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, *re* SOREL WHARF: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, *re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
See 'St. Lawrence, &c'.
TRAP NETS, GULF ST. LAWRENCE, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).
TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Quest. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).
TURNPIKE TRUST, MONTEEAL, INDEBTEDNESS, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 672 (i).
TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7567 (iv).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
———POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
———POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 98 (i).
———TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
See 'Loy, &c.'
———STRIKE, PAY OF MILITIA: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753, (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
———STRIKE, 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).
VERTE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. *(Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
See 'Bonaventure'.
VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 11188 (v).
WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS: *See* 'Marconi, &c.'
YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

Queen's College, Kingston B. No. 190 (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4404 (ii).

QUEENS, WEST, P.E.I., REPRESENTATION *re*: Remarks: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).

QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

QUESNEL DAM, B.C., OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*), 11557 (v).

QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 7203 (iii).

QUES. OF ORDER, ON APPNMT. OF JUDGES: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker, Dcp.*), 209 (i).
See 'Order,' &c.

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS, ANSWERS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 544 (i).

QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5587 (iii).

RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3231 (ii).

RACINE BROS. CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O., B.C., in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
———AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7162 (iii).
———LETTERS READ FROM DEP. MINISTER OF LABOUR, &C., 7164 (iii).
See 'Nelson P. O.'

"RAGGING" IN THE BRITISH ARMY: Remarks (Mr *Charlton*) on M. for Sup., 3130, 3134 (ii).

RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: in Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS, DUTIES OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 1032 (i).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS IN CAN., APPNMT. OF OFFICIAL INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 9217 (iv).
———INVESTIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
———INVESTIGATION INTO: Remarks on M. for Sup., (Mr. *Clarke*), 1329 (i).
——— LOSS OF LIFE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 873 (i).
See 'Belmont,' 'West Lorne,' 'Windsor Jn.' &c.

Railway Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*), 1° m., 93; 2° m., 552; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., agreed to (Y. 99; N., 53) 565 (i), wthdn., 7203 (iii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. No. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), 1° m., 244 (i); 2°*, 2585; M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591, 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5513, 5560, 5679, 5765, 6071, 6170, 6172, 6202, 6271, 7299 (iii), 7609, 8125; 3° m., 8334 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13834, 14519, 14663, 14690, 14734, 14740, 14760, 14762, 14844 (vi); Salaries of Ry. Commissioners, &c., Res. prop., 8085; in Com., on Res., 8119 (iv). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 58).
ACCIDENTS, INVESTIGATION, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5550 (iii).
———NOTICE, &C., penalties, 5549, (iii), ret. *re*, 15772 (iii).
ACTS REPEALED, 5772 (iii).
APPEALS FROM AWARDS, PRACTICE, &C., 4574, 4575, 4693; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*), 4578 (ii).
———FROM DECISION OF BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5773 (iii).
APPEALS TO HIGH COURTS, 3975 (ii).
APPLICATION OF ACT, 2608, 3536 (ii).
ARBITRATION, DISQUALIFICATIONS, &C., 4574 (ii).
ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS, &C., 4566 (ii).
ARBITRATORS' AWARDS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4691 (ii).
ASSETS, &C., RETURNS *re* TO BOARD, 5772 (iii).
AUTHORITY TO SELL OR CONVEY LANDS, 4131 (ii).
AWARDS, APPEALS, &C., 4574; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4574, 4693 (ii).
See 'Appeals.'
BALLAST PITS, &C., 4131 (ii).
BEACH LANDS, &C., 4125 (ii).
BELL AND WHISTLES, 5259, 5342 (iii).
BELL TELEPHONE AND C.P.R. AGREEMENT, 5514 (iii).
BOARD OF RY. COMMISSIONERS FOR CAN., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3854 (ii).
BOARD'S DUTIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3859 (ii).
BOARD'S SESSIONS, &C., 3859, 3862 (ii).
See 'Staff,' 'Vacancies,' &c.
BONDS, MORTGAGES, ISSUE OF, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3993 (ii).
BRANCH LINE CONSTRUCTION, 4694 (ii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6080 (iii).
BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, PERMISSION, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5251 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*
By-laws, Printed, 5563 (iii).
Canal Crossings, &c., 4125 (ii).
Cattle Guards *re* Crossings, 5774 (iii).
Cattle Guards, Fences, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 6220, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6222, Amt. (Mr. *Wade*) 6253 (iii).
Charges, 2602 (ii).
Charters, Application for, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) 6322 (iii).
Classification of Freight, &c., 5577, 6284 (iii).
Commercial Rates, Privileges, 5680 (iii).
Commissioners' Disqualification, &c., Amt, (Mr. *Blair*) 3857 (ii).
Commissioners, Number, 3857, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3887 (ii).
Commissioners' Residence, 3859, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3887 (ii).
Compensation for Lands and Damages, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 4568 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4568 (ii).
Compensation *re* Damage by Fire, Amt. (Mr. *L. P. Demers*) 6299 (iii).
Construction, &c., Buildings, &c., 3999 (ii).
Construction, Time limited, 3997 (ii)
County Divisions, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3882 (ii).
Crossings, Application of Provisions *re*, 3843 (ii).
Crossings or running on public highways, &c., 4697 (ii).
Crossings, Provisions *re*, 3843, 4697 (ii).
See 'Bells,' 'Highways,' 'Level Crossing', &c.
Crown Lands, &c., 4125 (ii).
Decisions of Board, Rules of Court, 3975 (ii).
Deviations of Line, Amt., (Mr. *Blair*), 4121 (ii).
Directors' Qualifications, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5774 (iii).
Discriminating Freight Rates, 6284 (iii).
Discrimination *re* Tolls, 5564-8 (iii).
Dividends and Interest, 3984 (ii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6074 (iii).
Dividends *re* Capital, 3985 (ii).
Documents as Evidence, Procedure, &c., 3974 (ii).
Dom. and Provincial Rys., Crossing, 3846 (ii).
Drainage across or under Rys., Compensation &c , 4728 (ii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6177 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 4735 (ii), 6186; Amt. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 6197 (iii).
Electric Rys, Tramways, Right of Municipalities, &c., 6080 (iii).
Equipment of Cars *re* Safety of Employees, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Ingram*) 6259 (iii).
Express Companies, Rates, &c., 2596, 2608, 3538; Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) 3725 (ii).
Expropriation, &c., Notice, Service, &c., 4566; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4691 (ii).
Expropriation of Land, &c., 2591, 4564 (ii).
See 'Land,' &c.
Extension of Time specified in Order, 3976 (ii).
Farm Crossings, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 5774; Amt. (Mr. *Holmes*) 6202 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6204 (iii).
Fire Guard along the Right of Way, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6071, 6318; Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) 5783, 6321 (iii).
Fire Guards along Line, Penalties *re* Damage, Amt. (Mr. *Demers*) 6299 (iii).
Fire Screens, 3894 (ii).
Forfeiture of Shares, 3988 (ii).
——— Sale of, 3989 (ii).
Free Transportation, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5776 (iii).
Freight Classification, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5577 (iii).
Freight Rates, &c., 3538 (ii), 5568 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*
Freight Rate Discrimination, Penalties, 6284 (iii).
See 'Discrimination.'
Freight Rate Standard, 5578 (iii).
Gates, &c., *re* unimproved Property, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6255 (iii).
Govt. Rys., Jurisdiction, 3563 (ii).
Headway of Bridges, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5251 (iii).
Highway Crossings, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5243, 6080, 6173 (iii).
See 'Municipalities,' &c. 'Bells,' &c., 'Ry.,' 'Watchmen,' &c.
Highways, Farm Crossings, &c., 3883 (ii).
Inspecting Engineers, 5251 (iii).
I.C.R. : *See* 'Govt. Rys.,' &c.
Interest Calls, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6075 (iii).
Judges Jurisdiction, 2591 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3885 (ii)
Judicial Decisions, Citations, &c., 3886 (ii)
Jurisdiction of Board to make Orders, 3976 (ii)
Land Expropriation, 4000, 4120 (ii).
Lands of other Companies, 4130 (ii).
See 'Expropriation.'
Level Crossings, Protection, &c., 6256 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 6257 (iii)
See 'Highway,' 'Rails,' &c.
Location of Line, 4120 (ii).
Meetings, Notice of, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3981 (ii).
Mines under Ry., &c., 4124 (ii).
Minutes, Certified Copies, 3981 (ii).
Mortgage Bonds, Penalties, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6077 (iii).
Municipal Rights *re* Crossing, &c., 4697 (ii).
Municipal Rights *re* Highway Crossing, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5243, 6080 (iii).
See 'Highway'.
Orders, Notice of, Duties of Co., Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*), 3974 (ii).
Overhead Bridges, Width, &c., 4712 (ii).
Paid-up Stock issued for certain Purposes, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6072 (iii).
Passenger Traffic on Rys, 2 Cent Rate, 6271, Amt., (Mr. *Macleau*) 6274 (iii).
Passes : *See* 'Free Transportation.'
Penalties recovered under this Act, 5767 (iii).
Penalties *re* Violation of Act, 5765 (iii).
Penalties *re* Violation of Act as to Tolls, 5692 (iii).
Plans and Maps, 2593, 4120 (ii).
Promissory Notes and Bills, 3995 (ii).
Protection Generally, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3895 (ii).
Rails *re* Level Crossings, 4709 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5250 (iii).
Rys. constructed, General Advantage of Can., 3840 (ii).
Ry. crossing another Line, 4697 (ii).
Railway Express Companies, &c., 2596 (ii).
Ry. Facilities for Industries, &c., 4695 (ii).
Ry. or Highway Crossing, &c., 4697 ; Amts. (Mr. *Blair*) 4697 (ii).
Ry. Inspection, 5252; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5253 (iii).
Rates *re* Freight, &c., 5568 (iii).
See 'Freight,' 'Tolls, &c.' 'Two cent,' &c. Tariff.
Regulations *re* Board, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3888 (ii).
Returns, Annual, 5770 (iii).
Rolling Stock, 2598 (ii).
See 'Train, &c.'
Safety Appliances, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5254 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*

SAFETY EQUIPMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES, Amt. (Mr. *Ingram*) 6259 ; Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 6325 (iii).
SHAREHOLDERS' LIABILITY, &c., 3992 (ii).
SHAREHOLDERS' MEETINGS, 3980 (ii).
SHAREHOLDERS' RECORD, 3993 (ii).
SHARES FORFEITED, SALE, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6075 (iii).
See 'Forfeited,' 'Paid-up Stock,' &c.
SIGNBOARDS AT LEVEL CROSSINGS, PENALTY, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4715 (ii).
SITTINGS OF BOARD, 3862 (ii).
SPECIAL ACT, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3885 (ii).
SPECIAL ACT, EXCEPTIONS, 3830 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3835 (ii).
SPEED OF TRAINS THROUGH TOWNS, &c., 3888 (ii), 5322 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3888 (ii), 5323 (iii).
STAFF OF BOARD, SALARIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3887 (ii), 14155 (vi).
STATIONS ON LINES NOT SUBJECT TO AUTHORITY OF PARLT., 5780 (iii).
STOCK PURCHASED IN OTHER COMPANIES, 5767 (iii).
STREET RYS. AND TRAMWAY CROSSINGS, 3850 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3887 (ii).
TARIFFS, JOINT, FILING AND PUBLICATION OF, 5681 (iii).
See 'Rates,' &c.
TELEGRAPH, &c., PROCEDURE, &c., 4721 (ii).
TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONSTRUCTION, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6173 (iii).
TELEGRAPH OR TELEPHONE WIRES, &c., Amt. Mr. *Lancaster*) 4717 (ii).
TELEGRAPHS, &c., 5513, 5561, 5680 (iii).
TELEPHONES AND TELEGRAPH, GOVT. USE, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*), 5346, 5513 (iii).
See 'Bell,' 'Telegraph.'
TIME-TABLES, RULES, &c., 5561 (iii).
TOLLS, APPORTIONMENT BY LAND AND WATER, 5575 (iii).
TOLLS, CLASSIFICATION, &c., 3538, 3713 (ii).
TOLLS, DISCRIMINATION, &c., 5568 (iii).
TOLLS LEVIED, BY-LAW FIXING, 5564 (iii).
TOLL, TRAFFIC, 2602 (ii).
See 'Penalties,' &c.
TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, 5700 (iii).
TRAFFIC PROVISIONS, 5680 (iii).
TRAIN EQUIPMENT, POWER OF BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5258 (iii).
TRAINS STANDING ON LEVEL CROSSINGS, PENALTY, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5340 (iii).
TRANSPORT PASSENGERS, &c., 4000 (ii).
TREES, REMOVAL, &c., 4000 (ii).
TWO-CENT RATE *re* PASSENGER TRAFFIC, Amt. (Mr *Maclean*) 6271 (iii).
See 'Passenger' &c.
VACANCIES BY DEATH, &c., 3981 (ii).
VIOLATION OF BY-LAWS, PENALTIES, &c., 5765 (iii).
WATCHMEN AT CROSSINGS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5260 (iii).
WEEDS, REMOVAL BY CO., 5552, 6299 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5554, 5560, 6311 (iii).
WITNESS FEES, 3978 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3979 (ii).
WORKING EXPENDITURES, 2604 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21, Res. from Senate *re* Appnmt. of Managers : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14519 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Fielding*) appointing Managers, 14663, 14690, 14734 (vi).
———FORMALITIES, &c.: 'Bourinot' quoted, 14760 (vi).
——— MESS. FROM SENATE, Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14760 (vi).
——— PROGRESS REPORTED, (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 14740, 14844 (vi).

Ry. Commission : *See* 'Ry. Act B. 21'.
Ry. Debts : *See* 'Exchequer Court', &c.
Ry. Drainage : *See* 'Drainage.'
Railway Act (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 74, (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1° m., 814 (i) ; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3247 (ii).
Railway Act (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1° m., 872 2°, and ref. to. Sel. Com., 2387 (i) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Railway Act (fire damages) Amt. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m. 283 ; (i) ; 2° m., 2780 (ii) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Railway Act (fire guards) Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) 1° *, 114 ; 2°, 871 (i) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Railway Act (fire guards) Amt. B. No. 181 (Mr. *German*) 1° m., 3391 (ii).
Railway Act (telephones) Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 92 ; 2° m., 701 (i).
See 'Telephone B. 4'.
Railway Labour Disputes Settlement B. No. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1° *, 114 (i) ; 2° m., 2535 ; in Com., 2923 ; 3° *, 3298 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 5653 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 55).
Railway Subsidies B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*), 1° m., 92 ; 2° m., 545 ; in Com., 550 ; ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., 700 ; in Com., 1059 ; 3° m., 1199 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 56).
——— **Subsidies B. No. 270** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 13549 ; in Com. on Res., 14313, 14428 ; 1°*, 14519 ; 2° and in Com., 14735, 14740 ; 3°*, 14741 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 57).
——— RES. 4, PAYMENT TO COS., SAFEGUARDS, &c.: in Com. on Ry. Res., 14511 (vi).
———RES. 5, NOTICE TO MUNICIPALITIES *re* LOCATION : in Com., on Res., 14513 (vi).
———RES. 6, RUNNING POWERS, TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, &c. : in Com., on Res , 14515 (vi).
———RES. 8, PRODUCTION OF BOOKS OF COS., &c.: in Com., on Res., 14516 (vi).
Railway Act (supplies to govt. rys.) Amt. B. No. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 8332 (iv) ; Res. wthdn., 10715 ; Res. prop., 11189 ; in Com. on Res., 12574 ; 1°*, of B., 12584 (v) ; 2°*, and in Com., 12944 ; 3°*, 12983 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 59).
RAILWAY SUBSIDIES, STATEMENT *re* GRANTS TO PROVINCES : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 14687 (vi).
———STATEMENT : laid on Table (Mr. *Fielding*) 14852 (vi).
See 'Subsidies to Rys.'
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RY. LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T., AREAS EARNED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2102 (i).
———AREA UNPATENTED : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
———VOTED &c., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
RAILWAY POLICY OF GOVT., DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7109 (iii). *See* 'G.T.P. Ry.'

RAILWAY POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, PETS. RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).

RY. RATES, GOVT. CONTROL OF: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14502 (vi).

RAILWAYS:

ACCIDENTS IN CAN., APPNMT. OF OFFICIAL INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

ACCIDENTS, DUTIES OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1032 (i).

——INVESTIGATION INTO: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1329 (i).

——INVESTIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup. 14154 (vi).

——LOSS OF LIFE, &C.,: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 873 (i).
See 'Belmont,' 'West Lorne,' &c.

AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).

ALBANY STATION AND LAND PURCHASE, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

ALBERTON, P.E.I. Ry. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

AMQUI STATION, I.C.R., ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3229 (ii).

BELL TELEPHONE AND C.P.R. AGREEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

BELMONT ACCIDENT, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14155 (vi).
See 'Windsor Junction.'

BLAIR, HON. A. G., RESIGNATION: Announcement (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 6540 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6522 (iii).

—— Explanation (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

BLUESHANK, P.E.I., STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
See 'G.T.R.,' 'Victoria Bridge.'

BORDEN, MR., RY. POLICY:
See 'G. T. Pacific.'

BROOKFIELD STATION, I.C.R., ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY., REGULATIONS *re* MORTGAGE DEEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
See 'Qu'Appelle.'

C. A. RY., STRIKE OF SECTIONMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 2303 (i).

CAN. CENTRAL, AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133(vi).

CAN. FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION, APPROVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3537 (ii).
See 'Freight.'

CAN. NORTHERN RY., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MACKENZIE & MANN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 916 (i).

CANADIAN NORTHERN RY. CO.: Ret. *re* cost, laid on Table, 5052 (ii).

C.P.R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH JAMES BAY RY. CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

—— BELL TELEPHONE AGREEMENT: *See* 'Telephone,' &c.

—— CAR SHORTAGE, &C., in N.W.T.:
See 'Ry. Traffic,' &c.

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

C.P.R., EXPENDITURE FOR ROLLING STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 2311 (i).

——AND GREAT NORTHWEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

—— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXES IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 916 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 667 (i)

—— PRIVATE CAR NO. 001, IMPROVEMENTS, PAYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, St. John*) 14282 (vi).

—— TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS, WATER SUPPLY: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).

CAR SHOPS, I.C.R., NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup.. 14106 (vi).

CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION, APPOINTMENT OF MR. GEO. ROBERTSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 668 (i).

—— APPOINTMENT OF MR. HOLT AND RETIREMENT OF MR. ROBERTSON, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1059 (i).

—— NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

—— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1199 (i).

—— REP. LAID ON TABLE, PRINTING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 14758 (vi).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Lennox*) 669 (i), 3396 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Pringle*) 14686 (vi).

—— WITHDRAWAL OF MR. ROBERTSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1034 (i).

'CHAPMAN' BALL-BEARING APPARATUS, REP. *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 7524 (iii), 8283 (iv).

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I., STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup. 14131 (vi)

—— REBUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).

CHAUDIÈRE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).

CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).

CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT FOR RAILS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 13668 (vi).

——Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

——Remarks *re* Subsidies to, in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14397 (vi).

'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER PATENT *re* I.C.R.: Remarks, (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).

COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, PRIVILEGES, FARES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Clarke*) 5680 (iii).

DEMURRAGE REGULATIONS, I.C.R: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).

DISCRIMINATING RATES, G. T. RY. CO., BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

DIXON, F. A., PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726-2753 (ii).

——PROMOTION AS CHIEF CLERK, COR. &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1058 (i).

——CHIEF COR. CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).

DOUBLE TRACKING PARTS OF I.C.R. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).

DRAW-BARS EXCHANGE ON FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8288 (iv).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

DRUMMONDVILLE, RY. SIDING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.B., BALANCE OF INTEREST *re* AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

EASTERN EXTENSION RY. AWARD, FEES OF STENOGRAPHER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).
EEL RIVER, STATION, I.C.R., AGENT'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12600 (v).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE, P.E.I. RY., : in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FIRE REGULATIONS, N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 21'.
FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R., ON CONNECTING LINES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION (CANADIAN), O.Cs. &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).
See 'Can. Freight.'
FREIGHT RATES ON OCEAN STEAMERS, DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CAN. AND U. S. FREIGHTS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 13674 (vi).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
GATES OVER RY. CROSSINGS: Remarks in Com. on Bill (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5775 (iii).
See 'Ry B. 21.'
GOVT. OFFICIAL, &c., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR HAULAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
See 'Private.'
GOVT. RY. POLICY, DELAY, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7298 (iii).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.'
GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).
G.T.P. RY., ALTERNATIVE POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).
——BILL, DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 8918 (iv).
——BILL, FRENCH TRANSLATION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Leonard*) 8118 (iv).
——COMPARISON WITH DIFFERENT RY. SYSTEMS: Remarks (Mr. *Cargill*) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——CONTRACTS *re* EASTERN PORTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 13027 (vi).
——GOVT. POLICY, DELAY, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399 (iii).
——GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7399 (iii).
——Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7487 (iii).
——Remarks (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 8086 (iv).
——M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 447 (i).
——MEMBER READING SPEECH: Ques. of Order (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 10249; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 10250 (v).
——MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——PARISHES CROSSED FROM LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——PETS. FROM BAGOT AND DORCHESTER: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bagot*) 12941 (vi).
——PETITIONS SIGNATURES, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*) 12715; Ruling (Mr *Speaker*) 12715 (vi).
——M. (Mr *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).
——Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 13266; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 13266 (vi).
——MEETINGS OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13559, 13671 (vi).
—— AFFIDAVITS, &c., PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR': Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*) 14845; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14846 (vi).
—— SUBSIDY FROM GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 671, 1031 (i).
—— PAR. IN OTTAWA 'JOURNAL' *re* SUBSIDY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*), 5733 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re* SUBSIDY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 5892 (iii).
—— SURVEYS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— Mr. Hays' Statement *re*, Par. in *Star*, 14648 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 14765 (vi).
——SURVEYS, BUSINESS SYSTEM, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14355 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, &c. : in Com. on Ways and Means, 14765 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, PLANS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 8230 (iv).
—— AND TRANS CANADA, SALE, &c. PAR. IN TORONTO 'NEWS': Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7566 (iv).
—— TWO-CENT RATE, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*), 10462 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*), 11556 (v).
G.T.RY. AND C.P.R. FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).
—— DISCRIMINATING RATES BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), 10745 (v).
——LOANS BY DOM. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 2920 (ii).
—— RENTALS FROM I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
—— STE. ROSALIE TO MONTREAL, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).
—— TERMINALS AT ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
——TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*), 2759 (ii).
See 'Bonaventure'.
GREAT NORTH WEST CENTRAL RY. AND C.P.R. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*), 2306 (i).
HALIFAX COTTON, LOAN OF RAILS TO, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
HALIFAX, ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825, 12874 (vi).
——IMMIGRATION BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080, (vi).
——Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY., CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
HAULAGE OF GOVT. &c. CARS., AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
—— AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).
—— CONTRACTORS NAME, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
——PREPARATION OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).
I. C. R., PASSES: *See* 'Passes.'
See 'I.C.R.'
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).
KELLEY'S CROSS P. O., P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iii).
KENSINGTON STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R. : Remarks (Mr *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N. W. TERS. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN., N. W. T., AREAS, NAMES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i).
——MILEAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).
——AREA RESERVED, PATENTED, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2307 (i).
—— UNEARNED, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3797 (ii).
—— UNPATENTED : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* RYS. AND CANAL DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
LEVIS ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. STATION : in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &C., I. C. R., PURCHASE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
LORNE SIDING, I. C. R, TRAFFIC, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR CAR SHOPS, I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
MANAGERS *re* RY. CONFERENCE : *See* 'Railway Act B. 21.'
METAPEDIA STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).
METIS STATION, DIVERTING ROAD, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE : in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION FOR I. C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).
MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RYS., I. C. R., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*), 1197 (i).
MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
MONTREAL LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MONTREAL SUBWAY CO., O. CS. COR., &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*), 705 (i).
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES : Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*), 12074 (v).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*), in Com. in Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'Chapman.'
MUNICIPALITIES, COMPENSATION FOR AMALGAMATION OF CAN. CENTRAL, AND BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RYS. &C. : in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* TRAMWAY COS., &C. : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6081 (iii).
See 'Ry. Bill 21.'
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 7530, 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
See 'Hillsborough.'
NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY., CHARTER, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 8084 (iv).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS, P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
O'LEARY'S STATION, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

O'LEARY'S STATION, P. E. I. RY., BRANCH LINE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6168 (iii).
—— Remarks, (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
OUELLE RIVER BRANCH, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
—— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10490 (v).
PASSENGER RATES ON G.T.R. :
See 'Discriminating'.
PASSES, I.C.R. : M. (Mr. *Bell*), for Ret., 2337 (i).
PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT for I.C.R. CARS : in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
POINT TUPPER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12608 (v), 12828 (vi).
—— GENERAL VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
—— MISREPRESENTATION *re* TOTAL COST : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *P.E.I.*), 1679 (i).
—— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH AND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14115 (vi).
—— SALE OF TICKETS : (Mr. *Hackett*), 2503 (ii).
—— SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, DISCONTINUANCE OF, &C. : Ques., (Mr. *Hackett*), 4443 (ii).
—— STATION AGENTS, SALARIES, &C. : Ques., (Mr. *Hackett*), 4361 (ii).
—— STEEL RAILS : in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
—— SUBSIDIES BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
—— WATER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
—— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
PRIVATE CARS PURCHASE BY GOVT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2309 (i).
See 'Govt. &c.'
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. BONDS, ATTACK ON MR. E. B. OSLER : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*), *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates', 14583 (vi).
—— MEMORANDUM FROM MR. KINGSMILL : Read (Mr. *Osler*), 14588 (vi).
—— LAND GRANT : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*), 2338 (i).
—— MORTGAGE DEEDS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 13024 (vi).
See 'Regina', &c.
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters, 10497 (v).
—— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
RY. ACT AMT. BILL : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 7201 (iii).
See general heading.
RY. CARRIAGE OF MAILS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
RAILWAY COMMISSION OF CAN., SALARIES AND EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
RY. CONFERENCE WITH SENATE, &C., FORMALITIES, &C. : 'Bourinot' quoted, 14760 (vi).
—— Mess. from Senate : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14760 (vi).
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RAIL CONTRACT WITH GOVT. : *See* 'Clergue.'

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

RY. DEPT., CHIEF CLERK, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i), 14055 (vi).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 92 (i).
——— ESTIMATES, INSUFFICIENCY OF DETAIL, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) in Com. of Sup., 14055. 14081 (vi).
——— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8269 (iv), 12593 (v), 12823, 14646 (vi).
RY. LANDS VOTED, &c., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
See 'Lands,' &c.
RY. MAIL CLERKS: in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5926, 6136 (iii).
——— INCREASED SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup. 5934 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE INSPECTORS, SUPT. OF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
RY. MAIL TRANSFER AGENTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6136, (iii).
RY. POLICY, ANNOUNCEMENT BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iii).
——— DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7109-(iii).
See 'G.T.P. Ry.'
RAILWAY POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, PETS. RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).
RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: In Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).
RY. RATES, GOVT. CONTROL OF: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14502 (vi).
See 'Ry. B. 21'.
RY. SUPPLIES VOTED FOR ONE ESTIMATE, TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081, (vi).
RY. TRAFFIC IN N.W.T., BLOCKADE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Sup., 2424 (i).
RATHBUN CO.'S RY., CHARTER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. SURVEYS OF RESERVED LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES:
See 'Can. Central'.
RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, I.C.R., FIRE PROTECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).
RHODES, CURRY & CO., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100, (vi).
RICHMOND AND NORTHAM, P.E.I. RY. STATION: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
RIVIERE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (vi), 12593, (v)
——— FREIGHT YARD: in Com. of Sup., 8309, (iv).
——— I.C.R. SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*), 12497, (v).
ROBERTSON, GEO. *re* CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i)
See "Cattle Guards Commission".
ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8292, (iv).
ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

STE. FLAVIE STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
ST. JOHN, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
ST. LOUIS, ELMSDALE, COLEMAN AND CONWAY STATION AGENTS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
SCOTCH HILL STATION, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 872 (i).
SIDINGS ALONG LINE OF I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi).
SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR RY., TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey* 2584 (ii).
SOUTH SHORE RY. WORKING, &c.: M. for Cor (Mr. *Tarte*), 448 (i).
——— COMPLAINT *re* SAFETY: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*), 205 (i).
STEEL RAIL CONTRACT WITH GOVT.:
See 'Clergue'.
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8295 (iv).
SUBSIDIES FOR PUBLIC HIGHWAYS, PETS., &c.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 591 (i).
SUBSIDIES, TO RYS., GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), 14352 (vi).
——— Remarks, (Mr. *Richardson*), in Com. of Sup., 14345 (vi).
——— Inquiry for, (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 12805 13005 (vi).
——— INTEREST PAYABLE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 3970 (ii).
——— FOR MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).
——— FOR N. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*) in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
——— (MONEY) PAID BY GOVT. SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1198 (i).
See 'Money.'
——— PER MILES OF RYS. IN N.W.T., AND MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1677 (i).
——— RES., AGGREGATE VOTE FOR EACH PROV., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).
——— STATEMENT *re* GRANTS TO PROVINCES: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*), 14687 (vi).
——— STATEMENT LAID ON TABLE: (Mr. *Fielding*), 14852 (vi).
——— TOTAL AMOUNT FOR TEN YEARS: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*), 13934 (vi).
——— VOTED BY PARLT. 1901-1903: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 2306 (i), 12842, 13259, 13934 (vi).
——— VOTED BY PARLT. for 1900, 1901, 1902. AMOUNT PAID FOR 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 13027 (vi).
RY. TRANSPORTATION IN N.W.T.:
See 'Ry. Traffic'.
SUMMERSIDE COAL SHEDS: In Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
SUSSEX, N. B., ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &c: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4672 (ii).
——— STATION GROUNDS: Remarks, (Mr. *Fowler*), in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
SYDNEY ACCOMMODATION, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
See 'I.C.R. and general heading.
SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).
TELEPHONE AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Maclean*), 5513 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
TIES IMPORTED FOR GOVT. RYS., COST, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*), 1679 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

TRANS-CANADA RY. CO., APPLICATION TO GOVT. FOR SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1026 (i).
——— CONTRACT WITH GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 2759 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 2794 (ii).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 672 (i).
TRANS-CANADA RY. AND G. T. PACIFIC: Par. in Toronto '*News*' (Mr. *Monk*), 7566 (iv).
TRANSCONTINENTAL RY. DECLARATIONS BY MINISTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
——— GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5765 (iii).
TRANSCONTINENTAL RY. AND SIR WM. MULOCK'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 367 (i).
——— PROPOSALS TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 874 (i).
——— REPRESENTATIONS *re* MILITARY PURPOSES: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 541 (i).
See 'G. T. Pacific.'
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1199 (i), 3129 (ii).
——— APPNMT. OF CHAIRMAN: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF SIR WM. VANHORNE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 7297 (iii).
——— SIR WM. VANHORNE'S VIEWS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 8330 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).
——— EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13362 (vi).
——— FORMATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 9819 (iv).
——— FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS, &c.: Remarks Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9458 (iv).
——— INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4120 (ii).
——— MEETINGS, BUSINESS TRANSACTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13027 (vi).
——— O.C., *re* APPNMTS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1324 (i).
———AND TARIFF INQUIRY, PAR IN MONTREAL "HERALD": Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 853 (i).
———PERSONNEL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 7206 (iii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, GOVT. POLICY *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 3432 (ii).
———*re* ST. LAWRENCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION POLICY, *re* SPEECH FROM THRONE: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 6404 (iii).
TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).
TWO CENT FARE CLAUSE, G. T. RY., REPEAL OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*), 11828 (v).
———Amt. in Com. on G. T. P. Ry. Bill, 12221 (v).
———RATE, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. Bill, 6271 (iii).
TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT, RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*), 7567 (iv).
VESTIBULES ON PASSENGER CARS: I.C.R. in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i.)
See 'Bonaventure,' &c.
WATER SUPPLY ON C.P.R. TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*), 9455 (iv).
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, REP. OF COMMISSON: Remarks, (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088, 5242 (iii).
——— COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on Adjnmt., 4726 (ii).
———COMMISSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 6168 (iii).
———JURY'S VERDICT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 3231, (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

WHARF CONNECTIONS AND RY. SUBSIDIES BY GOVT: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Res., 14463 (vi).
WHEAT, EXPORT FREIGHT RATE TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*), 11188, 11425 (v).
———RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*), 12074 (v).
WHITE, ALBERT S., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4673 (ii).
WINDSOR JUNCTION RY. ACCIDENT, I. C. R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Clarke*), 3496, 3712 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S., NEW STATION, RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
See 'I. C. R.,' &c.

RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6889 (iii).

RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
See 'Indians,' &c.

RAMY'S POINT, WELLAND CANAL, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).

RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).

RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 1857 (i).
See 'Ry. B. 21', 'Freight Rates', &c

Rathbun Co.'s B. No. 122 (Mr. *Harty*), 1° *, 1675; 2° *, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3° *, 5100 (ii), (3 Edward VII, c. 180).

RATHBUN CO.'S RY., CHARTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).

REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*), on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).

RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
——— ADDITIONAL VAULT: in Com. of Sup. 5842 (iii).

RECIPROCITY WITH U.S. AND JOINT HIGH COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14053 (vi).
See "Joint High", &c.

RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup.. 960 (i).

Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1° *, 1295; 2° m., 1812; 2° *, 1853 (i); in Com., 5892; 3° *, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 181).

REDISTRIBUTION BILL, COR. WITH N.B. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1110 (i).

REDISTRIBUTION IN ONT., REDUCTION, &C., COR. &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Sproule*), 2337 (i).
——— *re* P.E.I. AND N.B., COR., RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 876 (i).

REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 204, 208 (i).

Redistribution Bill: *See* 'Representation'.

Reformatory Prisons Act Amt. B. No. 221 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 6427 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8087; 3° *, 8087 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 51).

REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup. 5135 (ii).

Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Scott*) 1° m, 591; 2°*, 852 (i); in Com., and 3° *, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 182).

REGISTRAR, EXCHEQUER COURT, EDITING REP.: in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

Registrar of Supreme Court B. No. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop. 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14300, 14403; 3°*, 14405 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 69).

RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES, &C.: *See* 'Can. Central.'

REPATRIATION Agents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iii).

REPENTIGNY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

REPORTS, DEPTL. TRANSLATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 479 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:

AUDITOR GENERAL'S: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).
INDIAN AFFAIRS: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
INLAND REVENUE: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 89 (i).
INTERIOR: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
JUSTICE: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLT.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
MARINE: Presented (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 244 (i).
MILITIA: Presented (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 283 (i).
NORTH WEST MOUNTED POLICE: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 92 (i).
PENITENTIARIES: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
POSTMASTER GENERAL'S: Presented (Sir *Willtam Mulock*) 89 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1102 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*) 6 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 92 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 125 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE: Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*), 92 (1).

Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1° m., 708; 2° m., 1207; ref. to Sel. Com., 1294 (i); rep. of Sel. Com. (presented), 7293 (iii); M. for Com., 10832, 10903; in Com., 10911, 10958, 11087, 11427, 11567, 11692, 12293; 3° m., 12372, 12492, (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 60).

Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 2° m., 1207, 1265; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1284; Neg. (Y. 37, N. 72) 1292 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1207, 1265, 1290; (Mr. *Northrup*) 1219; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick* 1230; (Mr. *Barker*) 1241: (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1250; (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1257; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1259; (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1269; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1282, (amt). 1284 (i). 3° m., 12372; Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) 12404; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 65, 12431; Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12432; (ruling) Mr. *Speaker*, 12432, 12435; Amt. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 12454; Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 12459; Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12476; Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12481; Amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12486; Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) 12488; Amt. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 12492 (v).

In Com.,
BRANDON, 11032 (v).
BRANT, 11087 (v).
B. C., 11034 (v).
CAPE BRETON AND VICTORIA, 11028 (v).
CHAMPLAIN, 11035 (v).
DAUPHIN, 11748 (v).
ELGIN, 11517 (v).
FRONTENAC, 11114 (v).
GREY, 11525. 12293 (v).
HASTINGS, 11542, 12294 (v).
HURON, 11003 (v).
KENT, 11004 (v).
KING'S, P.E.I., 11030 (v).
LAMBTON, 11009, 11584 (v).
LEEDS, 11479 (v).
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON, 11114 (v).
LISGAR, 11033 (v).
MACDONALD, 11033, 11781 (v).
MANITOBA, 11032 (v).
MIDDLESEX, 11585 (v).
MUSKOKA, 11114 (v).
NEW-BRUNSWICK, 11809 (v).
NIPISSING, 11156 (v).
NORFOLK, 11114, 11117, 11427; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 11427 (v).
NORTHUMBERLAND, 11010, 11584 (v).
NOVA SCOTIA, 11793, (v).
PETERBOROUGH, 11013, 11624 (v).
PERTH, 11013, 11623 (v).
PICTOU, N.S., 11028 (v).
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE, 11781 (v).
QUEBEC, 11034, 11792 (v).
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE, 11034 (v).
SOURIS, 11034 (v).
TORONTO, 11693 (v).
VICTORIA AND HALIBURTON, 11497 (v).
WATERLOO, 11641, 12294 (v).
WELLINGTON, 11027 (v).
WINNIPEG, 11784 (v).
YORK, 11665 (v).

REPRESENTATION BILL, RESOLUTIONS, (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) moved in Sel. Com., 11441 (v).

——EVIDENCE *re* COMMITTEE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11423 (v).

——REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Hyman*) 7293 (iii).

——STMNT. OF HON. MR. PUGSLEY *re* N. B.: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 941 (i).

REPRESENTATION OF P.E.I. AND N.B. IN H. OF C., LAW OFFICERS OPINION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).

See 'Redistribution.'

RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, I.C.R., FIRE PROTECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).

RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).

Restigouche Boom and Log Co.'s B. No. 116 (Mr. *Logan*) 1° *, 1575; 2° *, 1816 (i).

Retiring Allowances of Judges Bill: *See* 'Judges.'

RETS. INQUIRIES FOR: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5413 (iii) *See* general headings.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903, AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12715, 1337 (vi).

Revised Statutes of Canada B. No. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 13667 ; 2° *, and in Com., 14297 ; 3° *, 14299 (vi), (*3 Edward VII c. 61*).

REVISION OF DOM. STATUTES, PAYMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14643 (vi).

RHODES, CURRY & Co., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100 (vi).

RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &c., PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).

RICHIBUCTO HARBOUR, N.B., PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).

——NORTH PIER EXTENSION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

——POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Tobin*), 1°*, 1575 ; 2°*, 1816 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 183).

RICHMOND AND NORTHAM STATION, P.E.I. : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

RICHMOND BAY, P.E. I., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

RICHMOND, QUE., RIVER ST. FRANCIS ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).

——CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

—— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*), 13302 (vi).

—— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK : in Com. of Sup.,, 12904 (vi).

RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5006 (ii), 13087 (vi).

—— DRAINAGE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 647 (i).

—— LIGHTING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i)

—— MAINTENANCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, GRANTS TO : in Com. of Sup., 3767 (ii).

RIMOUSKI, EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RITCHIE, MR., U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENT : in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).

RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).

RIVER VERTE, IMPROVEMENTS, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12593 (v).

—— FREIGHT YARD : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).

—— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).

—— I.C.R. SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 12497 (v).

—— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD, CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

—— FISH LADDERS, &c. : M. for copies of Reps.* (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

RIVIERE OUELLE, BRANCH LINE, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).

See 'Ouelle River.'

RIVIÈRE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).

RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).

ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

—— CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).

—— RECONSTRUCTION, &c., in Com. of Sup. 2690 (ii).

—— YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

See ' Pub. Works,' &c.

ROBIN, COLLAS CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

ROBERTSON, GEO., and CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

See ' Cattle Guards Commission '.

ROBERT VS. KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

ROBERVAL TO JAMES BAY RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

ROBINSON INDIAN TREATY, PAYMENTS TO INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

Rocky Mountains Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 197 (Mr. *Costigan*), 1°*, 4262 ; 2°* 4404 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 184).

ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8292 (iv), 14100 (vi).

RONAN, MR., AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).

ROOMS FOR MEMBERS, FURNITURE, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).

See ' H. of C.'

ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5319 (iii).

ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

ROSSLAND, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY, ESTABLISHMENT AT QUEBEC ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

—— IMPERFECT RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i).

ROSS RIFLE, EXAMINATION BY EXPERTS : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2758 (ii).

—— MANUFACTURE OF : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

ROUNDHOUSE, I.C.R., GATES, &c. AT SUSSEX, N.B. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672 (ii).
See 'I.C.R,' 'Sussex,' &c.
ROYAL ASSENT : *See* 'Bills.'
ROYAL CANADIAN FIELD ARTILLERY, KINGSTON : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 13128 (vi).
See 'Kingston.'
ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT, NUMERICAL STRENGTH, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3801 (ii).
ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
See 'Labour.'
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
See 'Kingston.'
ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 344 (i).
See 'Mint.'
Royal Trust Company's B. No. 103 (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1°*, 1295 ; 2°*, 1512 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 185).
RULES OF HSE., REVISION, &c. *re* PETS. FOR PRIVATE BILLS : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Demers*) 4441 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) to amend, 12216 (v).
See 'Private Bills.'
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, FREE ESTABLISHMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 285 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*). 13259 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, P.E.I., PAR. IN CHARLOTTETOWN "PATRIOT" : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), 13806 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 6137 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*), 511 (i).
RUSSELL ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*), 1023 (i).
RUTHERFORD, DR., DUTIES IN ENGLAND : in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
ST. AGNES TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST ALEXIS BAIE DES HA HA, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE HA HA BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÈ DE KAMOURASKA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS, MAN., CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &c. ; Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, RED RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 10490 (v).
——— REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 14284 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS, N.B., WHARF, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE, PIER RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'
ST. ANN'S, N.S., NORTH GUT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
———NORTH RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR, TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING : Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 5321 (iii).
———POSTAL FACILITIES : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
St. Chrysostome Railway Co.'s B. No. 158, (Mr. *Brown*) 1°*, 2582 ; 2°*, 2956 (ii) ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 7369 (iii) ; in Com., 7771 ; 3*, 7772 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 186).
ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY, FERRY SERVICE Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
ST. EUSTACHE TO ST. PLACIDE RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
STE. FAMILLE, PIER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. FIDÈLE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
STE. FLAVIE, STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER (YAMASKA) RY. BRIDGE SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
ST. FRANCOIS PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GÉDÉON ISLANDS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODEFROI DE NOUVELLE, BREAKWATER : in Com. 13489 (vi).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
———POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION, ISSUE OF WRIT, &c. Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13376 (vi).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION, JUDGMENT OF SUP. COURT : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).

——VACANCY : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i), 6995 (iii).

ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).

ST. JEROME, LAKE ST. JOHN WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).

ST. JOHN, N.B., AND BELFAST SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7731 (iv).

——AND DIGBY SS SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).

—— AND GLASGOW SS SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).

——AND HALIFAX SS SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).

——AND LONDON SS SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

See ' Allan,' &c., ' Atlantic Fast SS Service,' &c.

——AND W. INDIES SS SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).

See ' Trade and Commerce.'

ST. JOHN, N.B., DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).

——HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).

See ' I.C.R.' &c.

——IMMIGRATION BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).

——INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).

——QUARANTINE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

——WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).

See ' N.B.', &c.

ST. JOHN RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).

ST. JOHN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 5895 (iii).

ST. JOHN RIVER TRIBUTARIES : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

ST. JOHN RIVER WHARFS, TIDAL WATERS : in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).

ST. JOHN'S, QUE., CUSTOMS BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

——DRILL HALL, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*), 12496 (v).

—— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVER DU LOUP RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

ST. JOHN VALLEY RY. CO. AND C.P.R. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

St. Joseph Transportation Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°* 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii).

ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON : in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).

ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLE OF ORLEANS : in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).

See ' Island of Orleans,' &c.

ST. LAWRENCE, CABLE AND TEL. LINES : in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii).

—— EQUIPMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).

—— AND FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).

——GULF FISHING, PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2917 (ii).

——ISLANDS IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

——LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

—— AND LLOYDS, COR. *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).

—— LOWER REMOVAL OF ROCKS : in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).

——OBSTRUCTION TO NAVIGATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——PILOTS, RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2915 (ii).

See ' Pilots ', &c. ' Shipping Casulties B.'

——REP. *re* NAVIGATION, OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Clarke*), 4133 (ii).

—— ROUTE : in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

—— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5758 (iii).

—— SHIP CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).

—— SHIP CHANNEL, DREDGING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).

—— TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 13332 (vi).

—— WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY *re* : *See* ' Marconi '.

ST. LOUIS, ELMSDALE, COLEMAN AND CONWAY STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).

ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3001 (ii).

—— LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT : in Com. of Sup. 4602 (ii).

—— LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 4837 (ii).

ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

ST. LOUIS DE MILE END, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

ST. MARY'S CURRENT WHARF, CONTRACT WITH POUPORE & MALONE : M. for copy of Contract* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

See ' Montreal ', &c.

ST. MARY'S, ONT., PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).

St. Mary's River Railway Co.'s B. No. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4591 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 187).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).
St. Maurice River, Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).
——— Dredging Eastern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
———Slides, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
St. Nicholas Pier, Rebuilding, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
St. Ours Canal, Landing Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
———Stop Logs: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1858 (i).
St. Peters to Louisbourg Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).
St. Philippe d'Argenteuil to Brownsburg, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14457 (vi).
St. Pierre Pointe, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
St. Regis Lockup: in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
See 'Indians'.
St. Simeon, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
St. Stephen and Back Bay Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
———Acting Warden, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 10831 (v).
———Hospital Management, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
———Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
———Warden's Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
Sabrevois, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).
Sacré-Cœur, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
Saddles and Bridles for last S.A. Contingent, Contract, &c.: (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).
Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. No. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1° m., 3298 (ii); 2° *, and in Com., 6918; 3° *, 6921 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 63).
Saguenay Pilots: *See* 'Pilotage' and 'Shipping Casualties Bills'.
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
Sale of Tickets, P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.' &c.
Salmon Canning Industry in B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v)
——— Commissioners, B.C.: (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii)
——— Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).
Salmon Industry, Fraser River, B.C., Tels. from Canners Association, &c.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).
See 'B.C.' &c.
———Salmon shipped to France from B.C., Tariff *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
Sand, Indian Boy adopted by Mr. Johnston: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii)
Sandy Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
San José Scale: Remarks in Com. of Sup, 4434 (ii)
Sarnia, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi)
Saskatchewan Election, Proclamation in Prince Albert 'Advocate': in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
Saskatchewan Land Co., Sections acquired, &c.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor., 2338 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*). 4863 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
——— Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (ii).
——— Sections, &c.: (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2306 (i).
——— Surveys of reserved Lands: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 3225; 3°*, 3225 (ii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 88.)
Sault Ste. Marie, Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 13252 (vi).
——— Labour Disturbances, Par. in Newspaper (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 12610 (vi).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Militia: (Sir *F. W. Borden, Kings*) 12939 (vi).
———Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
Saunders, Dr. C. E., Appnmt. at Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 1676 (i).
Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 6895 (iii).
Schedules *re* Census of 1891: in Com. of Sup., 705. (iii).
See 'Census.'
Schell, J. T., M. P., Goods supplied Govt.: Ques. (Mr *Fowler*), 4959 (ii).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Schell*), 5416 (iii).
——— 1st Rep. of Sel. Com.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*), 5511 (iii).
See 'Privileges', &c.
Schooley, William Francis, Relief B. No. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*), 1°*, 2100; 2°m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 189).

SCHOOLEY, WM. FRANCIS, RELIEF B. No. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*), in Com., 3223; M. to ret. Evidence to Senate, 3224 (ii).

SCHOOLS, B. C., INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii) 13786 (vi).

——— MAN. AND N.W.T., SALES, AMT. PAID, &c.: M for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*), 706 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 6893 (iii).

——— PAYMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 6169 (iii).

——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
See 'Indians'.

SCHOOLS OF NAVIGATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com. of Sup., 13535, 13545 (vi).
See 'Naval Reserve'.

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS AND HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

SCOTCH HILL STATION, I.C.R., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 872 (i).

SCOTCH IRON MOULDERS AND TORONTO CAN. FOUNDRY CO.'S STRIKE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
See 'Can. Foundry'.

SCOTTISH DEMONSTRATION AT GLENGARRY, TEL. TO LORD DUNDONALD: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*), 10536 (v). *See* 'Dundonald'.

'SCOTIA' STR., SALVAGE SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).

——— Remarks on M. for Sup., (Mr. *Osler*), 7150 (iii).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 7266 (iii).

SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).

SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
See 'Indians.'

SECRETARY OF STATE.

'ADVOCATE' PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTIONS PROCLAMATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14268, 14652 (vi).

ALIEN LABOUR ACT, PROSECUTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3971 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 479 (i).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 222 (i), 14254 (vi).

ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENT TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
See 'Advocate,'

ELECTORAL LISTS, N.S., PRINTING, &c., CHANGES MADE: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 8331 (iv).

ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 288 (i).

ELECTION PROCLAMATIONS PRINTING:
See 'Saskatchewan Election.'

NATURALIZATION ACT, EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii)

——— REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Larivière* 2015 (i).

——— RETURNS, N. W. T.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3804 (ii).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Con.*

PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com., of Sup., 14268 (vi).
See 'Advocate.'

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1102 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU, COMPOSITORS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4182, 4444 (ii).

——— INDEBTEDNESS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Ques (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 4180 (ii).

——— PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12587 (v).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU AND UNION LABELS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 4179 (ii).

SEED GRAIN, RELIEF TO INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).

SEED INSPECTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5845 (iii).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. No. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 4442; in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); 2° and in Com., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn; 12493 (v).

SELKIRK WHARF MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i.)

SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, P.E.I. RY., DISCONTINUANCE OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4443 (ii).

Senate Representation of N.W.T.:
See 'N.W.T.'

SENATE REPRESENTATION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*), 1297 (i).

SENATE, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup. 5264 (iii).

SESSIONAL CLERKS, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup. 14242 (vi).

——— INCREASES TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 14113 (vi).

SESSIONAL MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE, DATE OF MEETING: M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).

SETTLERS' CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).

SETTLERS EFFECTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).

SEVEN ISLANDS PULP & LUMBER CO., WHARF *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13480 (vi).

SEVEN ISLANDS, QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

SEVEN ISLANDS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).

SHEDIAC AND COAST RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14325 (vi).

SHEGAWAKE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).

SHEPHERD, B., FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'

SHERBROOKE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).

SHERIFFS, CLERKS, &c., YUKON, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3410 (ii).

———FEES, YUKON, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

———LIVING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3414 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'

SHIELDS, MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF: Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
See 'Glace Bay,' &c.

SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH CLAIMS, AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 13373 (vi).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Shipping Casualties Act 1901, Amt. B. No. 263 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com. on Res., 12801; 1°* of B., 12805; 2°, and in Com., 12994; 3° m., 13560 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 64.)

Shipping Federation of Canada Incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Bickerdike*), 1°*, 1193; 2° m., 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 190.)

Ships Safety:
See 'Safety of Ships.'

SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).

SHOEMAKERS FEDERATED UNION, RES. *re* SLATER SHOE CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 14666 (vi).

SHORT BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

SHUTT'S REPORT *re* SOFT PORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).

SIDINGS ALONG LINE OF I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

——AND INCREASED FACILITIES FOR I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14081, 14107 (vi).
See I.C.R.

SIGNAL MARINE SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
See 'Marine.'

SILLS, E. H., PAYMENT *re* STORAGE OF FISH NETS: in Com. of Sup., 5128 (ii).

SIMCOE COUNTY CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).

SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &C.: M. (Mr. *Grant*), for Reps., 2762 (ii).

SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).

'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson Grey*), 5587 (iii).

SISAL USED IN BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 8085 (iv).
See 'Binder Twine,' &c.

SITTINGS OF HSE.:
See 'Sessions.'

SKINNER'S COVE N. S., PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SKINNER'S POND, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

SLATER SHOE CO. AND ALIEN LABOUR, RES. OF SHOEMAKERS UNION: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 14666 (vi).

SLIDES AND BOOMS, GENERAL REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

——— IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).

SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

———N.W.TER. RESERVES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6350 (iii).

——— PATIENTS, EXPENSES INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14688 (vi).

——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007, (ii), 5491 (iii).

SMITH, F. H., P. O. DEPT., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).

SMITH, WM., LATE M.P., AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 894 (i).

SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. Sup., 2672 (ii).

SNOWSTORMS IN N. W. TER., REPORTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 11822 (v).

SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).

SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).

——— COR. *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEO. GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).

——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

——— O'LEARYS' CLAIMS, PAYMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

——— REPAIRING BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).

SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).

S. AFRICA AND CAN. SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).
See 'Can. and S. Africa,' &c.

S. A. COLONIES, AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).

S. A. CONTINGENTS AND GOVT. EMPLOYEES, REINSTATED, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1026 (i).

———M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2337 (i).

——— PENSIONS TO BY DOM. GOVT: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).

——— SADDLES AND BRIDGES, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).

S. A. CONSTABULARY, &C., INFORMATION *re* GRIEVANCES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1027 (i).

———PURCHASE OF DISCHARGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 14287 (vi).

———MEDALS PBESENTED BY KING, PET. *re* FROM NON-COM. OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).

———REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv).

———Remarks (*Sir Frederick Borden*) 8319 (iv).

———MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iii).

———PENSIONS FROM IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).

———SUPPLIES PURCHASED BY IMP. GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) for Copies of O.Cs. &c., 2760 (ii).

SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).

SOUTHEASTERN VALLEY AND UNITED COUNTIES RY., SAFETY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 451 (i).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 152 (Mr. *Riley*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (*3 Edward VII.*, c. 191).

SOUTH INGONISH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR RY., TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).

SOUTH SHORE RY., WORKING, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 448 (i).

——COMPLAINT *re* SAFETY: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 205 (i).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: M. (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).

——Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

SPEECH OF GOV. GEN.: *See* Gov. Gen.'s Speech.

SPEECH FROM THRONE: Prorogation, 14861 (vi).

SPRINGHILL, N. S., ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).

——BOILER EXPLOSION IN DOM. BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).

——PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

SPRY BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).

STAFFORD & CO.'S RENTAL OF DOCK BUILDINGS, MIDLAND: in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
See 'Midland', &c.

STAMPING LETTERS BY MINISTERS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Standard Car Truck Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 105 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 192.)

STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., LONGFORD: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).

—— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).

—— PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL; in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
See 'Inland Revenue', &c.

"STANLEY", STR., AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

—— MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).
See 'Govt. Steamers'.

STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.', &c.

STATUTES, B.C., DISALLOWANCE: M. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) to print, 2675 (ii).
See 'B.C.', &c.

Statutes Publication, Act Amt. B. No. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 94; 2°*, 634; in Com., 634; 3°*, 635 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 65).

STATUTES, REVISION COMMISSION, NAMES, PROGRESS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1029 (i).

Statutes Revision: *See* 'Revised Statutes'.

Steamboat Inspection Act (Marine Engineers) Amt. B. No. 136 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 2100 (i); 2° m., 3288 (ii).

—— **(Regulation of Naptha Yachts, &c., Fees, &c.) Amt. B. No. 225** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; 1°* of B., 6543; 2°, and in Com., 6915; 3°*, 6917 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 66.)

—— **(Coal Oil as Fuel) Amt. B. No. 237** (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1° m., 12494 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12777; 3°*, 12779 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 67.)

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

—— TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. Sup., 13648 (vi).

STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT, B.C.: in Com. o Sup., 13787 (vi).

Steel and Iron Bounties Act Amt. B. No. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 6629 (iii); in Com. on prop. Res., 7923; 1°*, of B., 7988 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10799; 3°*, 10802 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 68).

Steel, James Reid, Relief B. No. 195 (Mr. *McCreary*), 1°*, 4178; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 193).

STEEL RAILS AND FASTENINGS, CONTRACT WITH CLERGUE SYNDICATE: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*), 13668 (vi).
See 'Clergue'.

STEEL RAILS, CONTRACT, PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 285 (i).

—— FASTENINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).

—— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).

—— P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).

STEEL SHELVING, &C., OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).

STEEL SHIPBUILDING, BOUNTY TO AID: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 8296 (iv).

Sterling Bank of Canada Incorp, B. No. 100 (Mr. *Calvert*), 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 194).

STEWART, Mr., APPNMT. as SUPT. OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

—— INSPECTOR OF MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*), in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).

—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*), 14599 (vi).

STEWART VS. KING, LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

STEWART, E., FOREST INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6416, 6774 (iii).

Stewart River Development Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 160 (Mr. *Davis*), 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 195).

STOCK EXCHANGE SPECULATIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Osler*) 7024; (Mr. *Fielding*) 7025; (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 7027; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7029; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 7032, 7045; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7034, 7047; (Mr. *Monet*) 7035, 7043; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 7035; (Mr. *Monk*) 7036; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7038; (Mr. *Holmes*) 7038; (Mr. *Henderson*) 7040; (Mr. *Maclean*) 7042; (Mr. *Sproule*) 7046; (Mr. *Speaker*) members remarks checked, 7044; (Mr. *Tarte*) 7051; (Mr. *Ingram*) 7052 (iii).

Stratford Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).

Strathcona Horse Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 14314 (vi).

Stuart, Capt. D.C., Halifax, Dismissal, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4353 (ii).

Sturgeon Falls, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).

Submarine Cable, Isle of Orleans: M. (Mr. *Talbot*), for Ret., 11301 (v).

——Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 11186 (v).

See 'Island of Orleans.'

Subsidies for Public Highways, Pets., &c.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 591 (i).

Subsidies, Rys., Aggregate Vote for each Prov., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).

——Bonuses voted by Parlt., 1900, 1901, 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 13934 (vi).

——Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), 14352 (vi).

——Remarks (Mr *Richardson*), in Com. of Sup., 14345 (vi).

——Interest Payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 3970 (ii).

——Inquiry for (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 12805, 13005 (vi).

——Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*), 10955 (v).

——Inquiry for (Mr. *Sproule*), 11422 (v).

Subsidies for Man.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*), in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).

Subsidy for N.W.T. Govt., Increase: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

——for N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*), in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Subsidy for P.E.I. Ry.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).

Subsidies (Money) paid by Govt. since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1198 (i).

Subsidies Per Miles of Rys. in N.W.T. and Man.: (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).

Subsidies, Total amount for Ten Years; Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13934 (vi).

Subsidies voted by parliament, 1901-1903: Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*) 2306 (i), 12842, 13027, 13259, 13370 (vi).

Subsidies, &c.: *See* 'Provincial.'

Subsidies to Railways: *See.*

Atlantic, Quebec & Western Ry. Co.
Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.
Beersville Coal & Ry. Co.
Bruce Mines & Algoma Ry. Co.
Canada Steel Co.
C. P. Ry., Elkhorn Branch,
C. P. Ry., Extension to Winnipeg Beach.
Cape Tormentine Ry.
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.
Chateauguay Ry. Co.
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.
Dawson City to Stewart River Ry.
Debert Coal Mines Ry.
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.
Elkhorn and Moosomin Ry.
Halifax and South-western Ry. Co.
Harvey and Salisbury Branch Ry.
Hawkesbury, Ont., to South Indian Ry.
'Hot Air' Line Ry.
Indian River Ry. and Lake Megantic.
Ingersoll to Stratford Ry.
International Ry. Co. of N.B.
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.
James Bay Ry. Co.
Joggins Ry.
Joliette and Lake Manuan Ry.
Jonquieres to Ha Ha Bay Ry.
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.
Lac Bouchette and Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.
Lake St. John Ry. and La Tuque Ry. Co.
Lake Superior, Long Lake and Albany Ry. Co. to Peninsula Harbour.
Lake Temiskaming and James Bay Ry. Co.
Lime Ridge and Megantic Ry.
Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.
Mackenzie and Renouf Falls Ry.
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.
Matane and Gaspe Ry.
Medicine Hat Ry.
Middleton and Victoria Beach Ry. Co.
Midland Ry. Co., Truro Branch.
Montfort and Gatineau Colonisation Ry. Co.
Montreal and Atlantic Ry. Co.
Nepigon Ry. Co.
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.
Nicolet River Bridge.
Nova Scotia Eastern Ry. Co.
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.
Parrsboro and Springhill Ry.
Paspebiac to Gaspe Ry.
Quebec Central Ry. Co.
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.
Roberval to James Bay Ry.
St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry.
St. Francis River (Yamaska) Ry. Bridge.
St. John Valley and River du Loup Ry. Co.
St. John Valley Ry. Co. and C.P. Ry. Co.
St. Mary's River Ry. Co.
St. Peters to Louisburg Ry.
St. Philippe d'Argenteuil to Brownsburg Ry.
Seven Islands, Quebec and Murray Bay Ry.
Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.
Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Co.
Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co.
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.
Tilsonburg to Woodstock Ry.
Timigami Ry. Co. to Sturgeon Falls.
Tobin Co.'s Pulp Mill.
Toronto and James Bay Ry.
Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Ry.

Subsidies to Railways—*Con.*
TROIS PISTOLES BRIDGE TO MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY.
WALKERVILLE BRIDGE CO. RY.
WALTHAM STATION TO FERGUSON POINT RY.
WELLINGTON TO UNION BAY RY.
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY.
WOODSTOCK, N.B. AND FREDERICTON RY.
WOODSTOCK RY.
YAMASKA RIVER AND ST. GUILLAUME RY.
YAMASKA TO LOTBINIERE RY.
YORK AND CARLETON RY CO.
YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.

SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL AMOUNT 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 14285 (vi).

SUGAR IMPORTED INTO CANADA 1902: M. (Mr. *Madore*) for Stmnt. *, 3236 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE, BREAKWATER, P.E.I., COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3234 (ii).

—— BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

—— COAL SHEDS: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).

—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).

—— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).

SUMMERVILLE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SUNBURY, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).

Superior Court, Quebec: *See* 'Judges of Sup. Court'.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).
See 'Estimates.'

SUPPLIES FOR RYS. VOTED FOR ONE ESTIMATE, TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081 (vi).

Supply B. No. 206 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5243 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 1).

—— **No. 218** (Mr. *Fielding*) Remarks, 6170; 1°*, 2°*, 6170; in Com., 6171; 3°*, 6172 (iii). (*3 Edward VII., c.* 2).

—— **No. 241** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8404 (iv). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 3).

—— **No. 271** (Mr. *Fielding*) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 14765; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14768 (vi). (*3 Edward VII., c.* 4).

SUPPLY BILL, VOTE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 5995 (iii).

—— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6003 (iii).

—— Remarks *re* one-fifth Vote (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

SUPPLY: Conc., 5238 (iii).

SUPPLY:

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice: *See* 'Justice.'

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Aid to Agricultural Societies, 4432 (ii)
Archives, 4429 (ii), 13503 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Con.
Census, 4594, 4635, 4800 (ii), 7053 (iii).
Cold Storage, &c., 4671 (ii), 7610 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, 4429 (ii).
Exhibitions, 4599 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 4548 (ii).
Fumigating Stations, 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).
General Statistics, 4429 (ii).
Historical Data of Acadians, 13505 (vi).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
Osaka Exhibition, 4626 (ii).
Patents, Classifying Canadian, 4433 (ii).
Toronto Exhibition, Grant, 13501 (vi).
Year Book, 4429 (ii).

Charges of Management, 12584 (v).
Additional Amount for Dom. Notes, 5135 (ii).
Public Debt, Conversion of, Expenses *re*, 14253 (vi).

Civil Government:
Agriculture, 4349 (ii), 14255 (vi).
Auditor General's Office, 224 (i).
Contingencies:
Agriculture, 4349 (ii).
Finance, 226 (i).
Indian Affairs, 13760 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries, 341 (i), 5033 (ii),
Public Works, 5824 (iii).
Trade and Commerce, 7573 (iv).
Customs, 319 (i).
Finance, 224 (i).
Geological Survey, 12592 (v), 13769, 13966 (vi).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 207 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 12585 (v), 13772 (vi).
Indian Affairs, 272 (i).
Inland Revenue, 227 (i).
Interior, 267 (i), 13761 (vi).
Mines Branch, 13762 (vi).
Justice, 207 (i), 14255 (vi).
Labour Gazette, 7151 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, 341 (i), 13663 (vi).
Clement, Jules, &c., 13664 (vi).
Militia and Defence, 221 (i).
North-west Mounted Police, 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
Post Office:
Allowance to J. W. T. Dixon, Winnipeg, 13995 (vi).
Higman, O., Report *re* Pneumatic Tube used in U. S. &c, 13998 (vi).
Junior second-class Clerkships, Salaries, 13995 (vi).
Smith, F. H., Salary Increase, 14000 (vi).
Transfer of Temporaries to Permanent Staff, 13994 (vi).
Privy Council Office, 207 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 223 (i).
Public Works, 333, (i).
J. B. Hunter, Salary, 13499 (vi).
Chief Architect's Salary, 13498 (vi).
Railways and Canals, 333 (i), 14055 (vi).
Additional second-class clerkship, 14055, (vi).
Secretary of State, 222 (i).
Additional junior second-class clerkships, 14254 (vi).
Trade and Commerce, 7573 (iv).

Culling Timber:
General Vote, 7798 (iv).

Customs:
Amount required for Yukon, 3968 (ii).
Kilroy, T., Amount *re* Services, 13993 (vi).
Miscellaneous, 3962 (ii).
Preventive Services, 3949 (ii).
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 3782, 3897, 3949 (ii), 13980 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Dominion Lands—Capital:
Surveys, &c., 6758, 6939 (iii), 13776 (vi)
Dominion Lands—Income:
Commissioners' Salary, 6765 (iii).
Protection of Timber Lands, 6773 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 13772, 13966 (vi).
Travelling Expenses, Contingencies, &c., 6766 (iii).
Tree and Timber Planting, 13775, 14272 (vi).
Dominion Police:
General Vote, 3511 (ii).
Excise:
Adulteration of Food, 5389 (iii).
Further Amount for Electric Light Inspectors, 5407 (iii).
Inspectors of Distilleries, Salaries, &c., 13974 (vi.)
Methylated Spirits, 5373 (iii).
Minor Revenues, 5404 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 5363 (iii), 13967 (vi).
Stamps for Tobacco, 5373 (iii).
To reimburse E. Forrest, 5405 (iii).
To pay J. M. Ferguson, 5412 (iii).
To pay Assistant Inspector Kelly, 5405 (iii).
To compensate A. Guay for Horses, 5406 (iii).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 5373 (iii); Additional amounts, 5404 (iii).
Weights and Measures:
Salaries, 5381 (iii).
Fisheries:
Behring Sea Arbitration, 13568 (vi).
B. C., New Steamer, 5278 (iii).
Building Fishways, &c., 4174 (ii).
Canadian Fishery Exhibit, 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 4174 (ii) 13660 (vi).
Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, 5277 (iii).
Investigation *re* Sardine, Oyster Fisheries, Dog-fish, &c., 13649 (vi).
Licenses to U. S. Fishermen, 5309 (iii).
Protection Services, B.C., 4174 (ii).
Salaries, &c., of Fishery Officers, 5050, 5122 (ii).
Steamers to replace *Acadia* and *Petrel*, 13658 (vi).
Geological Survey:
Compiling of field-notes, &c., 6826 (iii).
General Vote, 6815 (iii).
Geologist to International Boundary Survey, Salary, 6825 (iii).
Metallurgical, Petrographical Assistance, 13778 (vi).
Printing, Engraving, &c., of Maps, 13778 (vi).
Government of North-west Territories:
Further Amount for Assistance in Registry Offices, 6888 (iii).
General Vote, 6946 (iii), 13787 (vi).
Lethbridge, Bridge over Belly River, 13367 (vi).
McLeod, Bridge over Old Man's River, 13367 (vi).
Government of Yukon Territory:
Checking flow of Eldorado Gusher, 6949, 7274 (iii).
General Vote, 6802 (iii), 13367 (vi).
Roads and Bridges, 7283 (iii).
St. Mary's Hospital, Dawson, 7291 (iii).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 6615 (iii).
Further Amount required, 2299 (i), 6847 (iii).
General Expenses in Can. and G. B., &c., 6658 (iii).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Additional Amount for Salaries, 13785 (vi).
General Vote, 6425 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
British Columbia—*Con.*
Hazelton Hospital, 13787 (vi).
Industrial Schools, 7254 (iii).
Medical Attendance, 13785 (vi).
Schools, &c., 13786 (vi).
Steam Launch for Agent, 13787 (vi).
Generally:
Indians, Generally, 6425 (iii).
Manitoba and N.W.T.:
Amount for Triennial Clothing, 13783 (vi).
General Expenses, Dr. C. H. West, &c., 13784 (vi).
General Vote, 6350, 6422 (iii).
Implements, Purchase of, 13782 (vi).
Schools, Additional Amount, 13784 (vi).
Surveys, Additional Amount, 13784 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Schools, 6409 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Additional Amount for Salaries, 13782 (vi).
To pay Fire Damage at Edmundston, 13782 (vi).
Nova Scotia:
Medical Attendance, &c., 6421 (iii).
Purchase of Lands for Reserves, 13781 (vi).
Relief and Seed Grain, 6417 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec:
Blankets and Clothing, 6409 (iii).
Doncaster Reserve, Squatters' Improvements, 13779 (vi).
General Legal Expenses, 6416 (iii).
Land Management Fund, 6415 (iii).
Lock-up at St. Regis, 6415 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Ontario and Quebec, 6408 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Ontario, 6326, 6409 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Quebec, 6326, 6408 (iii).
Rama Indians, Repairs to Roads, 13781 (vi).
Repairs of Roads, &c., 13779 (vi).
Robinson Treaty Annuities, 6410 (iii).
Salaries of Chiefs, Cape Croker & Gibson, St. Regis, 6410 (iii).
Schools, Ont. and Que., 6409 (iii).
Surveys of Reserves, 6410 (iii).
Yukon:
Education of Indians, 7270(iii).
Relief for Destitute Indians, 7270 (iii).
Inspection of Staples:
Chief Inspectors, &c., 7762 (iv), 13698 (vi).
Inspection of Binder Twine, 7763, 7772 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act, Expenditure, 7798 (iv).
Insurance:
General Vote, 12586 (v).
Justice, Administration of:
Allowance to ad hoc Judges, 3402 (ii).
Divorce Court, N.B., 3400 (ii).
Exchequer Court, Additional to Registrar, 3407 (ii).
Admiralty, Quebec, Registrar, 3408 (ii).
Accommodation for Court, 3408 (ii).
Contingencies, &c., 3407 (ii).
Junior 2nd class Clerks, 3406 (ii).
Legal Decisions, Report of, 3407 (ii).
Expenditure under R.S.C., c. 181, 3401 (ii).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 3398 (ii), 14257 (vi).
Additional Judge of Superior Court, N.W.T., 14257 (vi).
Prince Albert Court House, &c., 3401 (ii).
Retiring Allowance, Judge Henry, 14662 (vi).
Salary of County Court Judge, District No. 7, N.S., 14259 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

Miscellaneous—*Con.*
Salary of Junior Judge, Nipissing, 14258 (vi)
Travelling Allowances, Judges, B.C., 3399 (ii).
Manitoba, 3399 (ii).

Supreme Court:
Contingencies, &c., 3404 (ii).
Law Books, &c., 3402, 3405 (ii).
Printing and Binding, 3405 (ii).
Reporter's Salary, 3402 (ii).
Salary of E. R. A. Taschereau, 14257 (vi).
To assist L. W. Coutlee, 'Digest of Judgments,' 14256 (vi).

Yukon:
Clerk's Salary, 3410 (ii).
Judges' Travelling Allowances, 3409 (ii).
Law Books, &c., 3506 (ii), 14267 (vi).
Living Allowances, 3411 (ii).
Living Allowances, Generally, 3414 (ii).
Miscellaneous Expenses, 3507 (ii).
Salary of Deputy Sheriff, &c., 3411 (ii).
Stenographers, 3411 (ii).

Legislation:

General:
Printing Paper and Binding, 5267 (iii).
Voters' Lists, 5274 (iii).

House of Commons:
Debates, Amanuenses, 14243 (vi).
Increases to Clerks, 14112 (vi).
Sessional Clerks, 14242 (vi).
Sessional Messengers, 14243 (vi).
Tradesmen and others, 14115 (vi).

Library:
Salaries, 5267 (iii).

Senate:
General Vote, 5264 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Aids to Navigation, 4173 (ii), 5735 (iii), 13633 (vi).
Halifax Harbour, Land Purchase for Buoy Service, 13638 (vi).
Lurcher's Shoal Lightship, 4173 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 13632 (vi).
Montreal Agency, &c., 13632 (vi).
Montreal Pilot Commissioners' Court, 4173 (ii).
Repairs to Wharfs, &c., 4174 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4132 (ii).
Telephonic Communication, Atkinson Lighthouse and Vancouver, 13638 (vi).
Wireless Telegraph Stations, Equipment, 13639 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Canada and Australia, 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).
Canada and G. B., 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672 (vi).
Canada and South Africa, 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 7756 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac, 13694 (vi).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 7742 (iv).
Halifax and Canso, 6002 (iii).
Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool, 7730 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
Manchester and Canada, 7745 (iv).
Petit de Grat and I. C. R. Terminus at Mulgrave, 14249 (vi).
P. E. I. and G. B., 7744 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 7741 (iv).
P. E. I. and Nfld., 13676 (vi).
St. John and Digby, 7739 (iv).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 7731 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow, 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).
St. John, Halifax and London, 7734 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Conventions—Con.
St. John, Halifax, W. I. and South America, 7740 (iv).
St. John and Halifax *via* Yarmouth, 7742 (iv).
St. Stephen, Campobello and Back Bay, &c., 7759 (iv), 13695 (vi).
Services of Str. *Lord Strathcona*, 6002 (iii), 13697 (vi).
Sydney to Bay St. Lawrence, &c., 13677 (vi).
Tadousac and St. Catharine's Bay, 13695 (vi).
Victoria and San Francisco, 7741 (iv).
Victoria and West Coast Vancouver Island, 13694 (vi).

Militia:
Annual Drill, 3603, 5005 (ii).
Contingencies, 3778 (ii).
Coronation Contingent, Further Amount, 6950 (iii).
Dominion Arsenal, 7089 (iii).
Esquimalt Defences, 3778 (ii).
General Statement, 13379 (vi).
Grants to Associations, 3767 (ii).
Hamilton, Drill Hall, Additional Land, 6949 (iii).
Military Asylum, Pensions, 6788 (iii).
Military Properties, 3611 (ii).
Pay and Allowances, 3584 (ii), 13379 (vi).
Royal Military College, 3778 (ii).
Salaries and Wages, 3608 (ii).
To pay Lieut. Col. Cole, 6950 (iii).
Transport and Freight, 3752 (ii).
Winnipeg Barracks, Paving Streets, 6949 (iii).

Miscellaneous:
Alaska Boundary Commission, 6931 (iii), 13957 (vi).
Arbitration, Can., Ont. and Que., 12590 (v).
Art Academy, 12589 (v).
Astronomical Observatory, 6791 (iii).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 6790 (iii).
Can. Mining Institute, Publication of Documents, 12591 (v), 13965 (vi).
C.P.R., Transportation of Sir Edmund Barton, 6952 (iii).
Classification of Records, Privy Council Office, 12592 (v).
Engraving, &c., of Maps of Can. and N.W.T., 6800 (iii).
Keewatin Govt. Expenses, 6798 (iii).
Maintenance of Lunatics, 6798 (iii).
Labour Dept., &c., 7197 (iii).
Labour Troubles, B.C., Royal Commission, 6984 (iii).
Litigation, Costs, 6794 (iii).
Maintenance of Assay Office, Vancouver, 6799 (iii), 13965 (vi).
Maintenance of Roads, &c., Banff Park, 6788 (iii).
Bath House, &c., 13955 (vi).
Museum Building, 6927 (iii).
Martineau Defalcations, Expenses of Commission *re*, 6991 (iii).
Middleton, late T. W., *re* Shortage, 6931 (iii).
Naturalization Act, Expenses *re*, 6952 (iii).
N.W.T. Govt., Protection of Bow River Bridge, Canmore, 6925 (iii).
Paris Agency, 12589 (v).
Petersen, Tate & Co., Return of Deposit, 6953 (iii).
P. O. Savings Bank, Defalcation, Compensation *re*, 14274 14655 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate*, Payments, 14268, 14652 (vi).
Printing Bureau Plant, 12587 (v).
Rand's Micmac Dictionary, 12592 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—Con.

St. Lawrence River, Improvements *re* Thousand Islands, 14661 (vi).
South African Memorial Association, Can. Grant, 6992 (iii).
Statutes, Revision, 14643 (vi).
Teulon Road, Man., Construction, 6927 (iii).
To compensate Canadian Bank of Commerce, Yukon, 14274 (vi).
To meet Expenses *re* the King *v.* Bank Note Co., 14279 (vi).
To pay Amos Barnes *re* River Lots, Man., 6922 (iii).
To pay Wm. Perkins for Evidence *re* Lisgar Election, 14251 (vi).
To pay Casca Trading and Transportation Co., 6926 (iii).
Trade Combination *re* Lumber, Expenses *re* Commission, 14654 (vi).
Tuberculosis, Prevention, Grant *re*, 13517 (vi).
Turtle Mountain, Land Slides, Expenses *re*, 13965 (vi).
Unforeseen Expenses, Additional, 6951 (iii), 12588 (v).
Victoria Memorial, London, England, 14655 (vi).
Yoho Park Reserve, Construction of Roads, &c., 6790 (iii).

Mounted Police:

Compensation for Injuries, 5264 (iii).
Pay of Force, 5262 (iii).
Services in Yukon, 5003 (ii), 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service:

Cattle Inspection, 4116 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c., 4041, 5033 (ii).
Surveys, &c., of Coasts of Northern Canada, 13760 (vi).
Tidal Service, 4114 (ii).
Unforeseen Expenses, 4116 (ii).

Penitentiaries:

General, 3511 (ii).
Kingston, 3511 (ii).
Manitoba, 3534 (ii).
Regina Jail, Additional Land, 5135 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 3534 (ii).

Pensions:

To Lady Lafontaine, 14252 (vi).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 6065 (iii).
Outside Service, Salaries, &c., 5924, 6004 (iii), 14010 (vi).
Salaries, &c., 6136 (iii).
Salaries of fourth-class Clerks, &c., Increase, 14002 (vi).
Salaries of P. O. Inspectors, &c., Increase, 14001 (vi).
Temporaries in various cities, Appointment as fourth-class Clerks, 14001 (vi).
To pay Arrears Postmasters' Salaries, 5921 (iii).
To provide for Appointment of Additional Mail Clerks, 14041 (vi).
To provide for Promotions in City Offices, 14009 (vi).
Transfer of Temporaries to Permanent Staff, 13994 (vi).
Vancouver Division, Asst. P. O. Inspector 14000 (vi).
Winnipeg, Additional senior second-class clerkship, 14001 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:
Ottawa:
Astronomical Observatory, 342 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Addition, &c., 13006 (vi).
Royal Mint, 344 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 353 (i), 14243 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers:
Kingston Graving Dock, 13023 (vi).
Port Arthur, Dredging, 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 3368 (ii), 13024 (vi).
Quebec, Harbour Improvements, 3336 (ii).
River Kaministiquia, 5825 (iii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 3354 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 3218, 3304 (ii).
St. Mary's Current, Montreal Harbour, &c., 3365 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Quesnel-Atlin, &c., 5826 (iii).
Trails, Roads and Bridges:
Yukon:
To pay Trading and Exploring Co., Ltd., 5826 (iii).

Public Works—Collection of Revenue:

Esquimalt Graving Dock, Special Constables, 5919 (iii).
Slides and Booms, 2974 (ii).
Gatineau River, 2977 (ii).
Repairs and Working Expenses, 2978 (ii).
Upper Ottawa Improvement Co., 2974 (ii).
Telegraph Lines:
B. C., 2992 (ii).
Working Expenses, 13368 (vi).
Lower St. Lawrence, 2989 (ii).
N.W.T., 2991 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, 2988 (ii).
SS. *Tyrian*, &c., 5007 (ii).
Yukon Territory:
Ashcroft-Dawson, &c., 2992 (ii).
Working Expenses, 14041 (vi).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:
British Columbia:
Nelson Public Building, 13131 (vi).
Rossland Armoury, 13133 (vi).
Public Building, 13131 (vi).
Vancouver, Public Building, 13132 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 965 (i).
Experimental Farms, New Buildings, 972 (i).
General Vote, 961 (i).
Immigrant Buildings, 14247 (vi).
Salaries to Resident Clerks of Works, &c., 963 (i).
Manitoba:
Winnipeg, Immigration Buildings, &c., 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
Military Buildings, N.C.O.'s Quarters, 13127 (vi).
Military Building, Magazine, 13127 (vi).
Military Stores Buildings, 13126 (vi).
Public Building, Addition, 13127 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Dominion Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 421 (i).
New Brunswick:
Buildings, Generally, 421 (i).
Campbellton, Public Buildings, 13037 (vi).
Fredericton Military Building, New Officers' Stables, 13041 (vi).
Sergeant Major's Quarters, 13041 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income :—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick—*Con.*
Marysville, Public Building, 5841 (iii).
Moncton, Public Building, 13038 (vi).
Newcastle, Public Building, 13038 (vi).
Richibucto, Public Building, 412 (i).
St. John, Drill Hall, 13042 (vi).
Immigration Building, 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
Quarantine Station, Water Service, 414, 486 (i), 13041 (vi).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Improvements, &c., 13038 (vi).
Woodstock, Armoury and Gun Shed, 13039 (vi).
Public Building, 13041 (vi).
North West Territories :
Court Houses, Police Accommodation, &c., 958 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 13129 (vi).
General Repairs, 958 (i).
Macleod Court House, 959 (i).
Moosejaw, Public Building, 13130 (vi).
Prince Albert Court House, &c., 13129 (vi).
Red Deer, Court House, &c., 960 (i).
Strathcona Horse Barracks, 13130 (vi).
Yorkton, Court House, &c., 961 (i).
Nova Scotia :
Antigonish, P. O. Fittings, 13034 (vi).
Arichat, Public Building, 5827 (iii).
Digby, Public Building, 13034 (vi).
Guysborough, Public Building, 5839 (iii).
Halifax, Immigration Building, Addition, 13033 (vi).
Public Building, 411 (i), 13031 (vi).
Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island, 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
Middleton, Armoury, 5841 (iii).
North Sydney, Public Building, &c., 13035 (vi).
Springhill, Public Building, 14247 (vi).
Sydney, Public Building, Addition, 13035 (vi).
Sydney Mines, Public Building, 13028 (vi).
Ontario :
Alexandria, Public Building, 487 (i).
Belleville, Armoury, 13082 (vi).
Bowmanville, Public Building, 567 (i).
Brantford, Drill Hall, 13108 (vi).
Bridgeburg, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
Clinton, Public Building, 518 (i).
Cobourg, Armoury, 540 (i).
Improvements, 13118 (vi),
Deseronto, Public Building, 5842 (iii), 13112 (vi).
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 636 (i).
Fort William, Public Building, 636 (i).
Guelph, Armoury, 13083 (vi.)
Public Building, 637 (i).
Hamilton, Public Building, Alterations, 13113 (vi).
Hawkesbury, Public Building, 13119 (vi).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 638 (i), 5842 (iii).
R. C. F. A. Barracks, 13118 (vi).
Royal Military College, Drill Hall, 13094 (vi.)
R. M. C. Stable, 13117 (vi).
London, Drill Hall, &c , 641 (i).
Military Buildings, Magazine, 13115 (vi).
Oshawa, Public Buildings, 13110 (vi).
Ottawa, Bacteriological Laboratory, 5842 (iii).
Electric Lighting, &c., 5842 (iii).
New Coal Sheds, 13115 (vi).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income :—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa—*Con.*
New Elevator for West Block, 13115 (vi),
Paving in front of Parliament Buildings, 13119 (vi).
P. O. and Customs House, 5844 (iii), 13117 (vi).
Rideau Hall, Drains, 647 (i).
Rideau Hall and Grounds, Repairs, &c., 13087 (vi).
Steel Drawers, &c., 13087 (vi).
Western Block, Heating Apparatus, &c., 13087 (vi).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13083 (vi).
Picton, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
St. Catherines, Drill Hall, 13106 (vi).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 13109 (vi).
Sarnia, Public Building, 13117 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Public Building, 13107 (vi.)
Stratford Armoury, 13125 (vi).
Toronto, Asst. Receiver-General's Office, Vault, 5842 (iii).
Custom House, 547 (i).
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 650, 956 (i).
Drill Hall, Addition for new Corps, 13086 (vi).
Drill Hall, Paving Armoury Street, &c., 13115 (vi).
Examining Warehouse, Addition, 13118 (vi).
Military Buildings, Magazine, 13115 (vi).
Engineer Company's Building, 13086 (vi).
Post Office, 956, (i), 5842 (iii).
P. O., Additional, 13112 (vi).
P. O., Additional Story, &c., 13096 (vi).
P. O., Station "C", 5920 (iii).
Toronto Junction, Public Building, 650 (i).
Windsor, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
Wingham, Public Building, 13120 (vi).
Woodstock, Armoury, 13125 (vi).
Public Building, 13108 (vi).
Prince Edward Island :
Charlottetown, Armoury, &c., 13035 (vi).
Dom. Building, Improvements, &c., 13036 (vi).
Quebec :
Actonvale, Public Building, 13059 (vi).
Dom. Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 422 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 425 (i).
L'Assomption, Public Building, 427 (i).
Levis, Public Building, 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
Longueuil, Public Building, 13069 (vi).
Magog, Public Building, 13081 (vi).
Montmagny, Public Building, 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
Montreal, Barracks for Permanent Corps, 13076 (vi).
Examining Warehouse, Repairs, &c., 438 (i), 13058 (vi).
New Postal Station, 13080 (vi).
Post-office Improvements, 13067 (vi).
Public Building, 436 (i).
Quebec, Citadel, Drill Shed, &c., 13053 (vi)
Drill Hall, 13077 (vi).
Hospital for Trachoma, 14245 (vi).
Iron Foundry, 14247 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Public Stores, 13053 (vi).
Military Buildings, Dom. Arsenal, &c., 13054 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works:—*Income*—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall, 13067 (vi).
Public Building, 439 (i).
St. John's, Examining Warehouse, 13069 (vi).
Public Building, 13059 (vi).
St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building, 13080 (vi).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, 13079 (vi).
Terrebonne, Public Building, 13059 (vi).
Thetford Mines, Public Buildings, 441 (i).
Three Rivers, Custom House, New Heating Apparatus, 13069 (vi).
Retaining Wall, 13080 (vi).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 443 (i).
Rents, repairs, &c.:
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c., Salaries, 1016 (i).
Electric Power, 1067 (i).
Heating, &c., 1065 (i).
Lighting, 1067 (i).
Rents, 989 (i), 13133 (vi).
Water, 1067 (i).
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings, Rents, &c., 973, 989 (i).
Elevators, Attendance, 1011 (i).
Fuel, Light, &c., 1005 (i).
Furniture, 1006 (i), 5007 (ii).
Grounds, 1015 (i).
Heating, Engineers' Salaries, &c., 1008 (i).
Lighting, &c., 1012 (i), 5845 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, 1015 (i).
Rideau Hall, Maintenance, &c., 993 (i), 5006 (ii).
Telephones, &c., 1013 (i).
Yukon:
White Horse, Public Building, &c., 13133 (vi).
Dredging:
British Columbia:
To replace Snag Boats, *Samson* and *Mudlark*, 13311 (vi).
Tug and Hopper Scows, 13318 (vi).
Manitoba:
New Tug, 13311 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Additional Amount for Dredging, 13309 (vi)
Hydraulic Dredge, 13312 (vi).
New Plant:
Generally, 2673 (ii).
Manitoba, 2672 (ii).
Mar. Provinces, 2665 (ii).
Ont. and Quebec, 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).
Ont. and Quebec, 2674 (ii).
P.E.I., New Dredge, 13313 (vi).
Repairs, Generally, 2612 (ii).
Manitoba, 2665 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Anderson and Kennedy's Lake, Clearing Outlets, 1451 (i).
Columbia River above Golden, Pile Driver, 13304 (vi).
Above Golden, Opening Channel, 13304 (vi).
Above Revelstoke, 1451 (i).
Arrow Lakes, Dredging Machinery, 13305 (vi).
Arrow Lakes Improvements, 13304 (vi).
Fraser River Improvements, 13305 (vi).
Hardy Bay Wharf, 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
Quatsino City Wharf, 13305 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
British Columbia—*Con.*
Victoria Harbour, Removal of Rock, 13306 (vi).
William's Head Quarantine Station, Wharf, 13306 (vi).
Generally:
General Vote, 13308 (vi).
Manitoba:
General Repairs, 1448 (i).
Gull Harbour, 1448 (i).
Hnausa, Wharf Extension, 1448 (i).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering, &c., 1448 (i).
Lake Francis, Outlet, 1449 (i).
Lake Manitoba, Outlet *via* Fairford River, 1449 (i).
Selkirk, Wharf Extension, 1450 (i).
White Mud River, Dredging, 1450 (i).
Winnipeg Lake, Gimli Wharf, 1450 (i).
Mar. Provinces:
General Repairs, &c., 1185 (i).
New Brunswick:
Anderson's Hollow, 1163 (i).
Bay du Vin, Wharf, 1164 (i).
Black Brook, Additional Wharf, 13227 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, &c., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).
Campobello, Breakwater, 13228 (vi).
Cape Tormentine, Improvements, 13228 (vi).
Caraquet, Wharf, 1173 (i).
Chatham, Slip, &c., 13231 (vi).
Cocagne Wharf, Compensation *re* Schr. *Morning Star*, 13231 (vi).
Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, 13233 (vi).
Dipper Harbour, Breakwater, 13233 (vi).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 1177 (i).
Hopewell Cape Wharf, Repairs, &c., 13233 (vi).
Lord's Cove Wharf, 1177 (i).
Miscou Harbour, Wharf, 13234 (vi).
North Head, Grand Manan, Breakwater, 13234 (vi).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, 13234 (vi).
Point du Chene, Breakwater, Repairs, 13235 (vi).
Richibucto, North Piers, &c., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
River St. John, 1177 (i).
Oromocto Wharf, 1181 (i).
Wharfs on Tidal Waters, &c., 1178 (i), 5895 (iii).
St. Andrews, Wharf Repairs, 5894 (iii).
St. John Harbour, Negro Point Breakwater, 1181 (i).
Protection of Fort Dufferin, 1183 (i).
Shippegan Harbour, Protection Works, 1183 (i).
Upper Salmon River, Alma Pier, 1184 (i).
North-west Territories:
General Repairs, 1450 (i).
Nova Scotia:
Abbott's Harbour, Addition to Beach Protection, 13141 (vi).
Abram's River, Wharf, 13141 (vi).
Amagandus, Wharf, 1068 (i).
Bailey's Brook, 1072 (i).
Baxter's Harbour, Reconstruction of Breakwater, 13143 (vi).
Bayfield Harbour Works, Repairs and Improvements, 13141 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Benoit Cove, Improvement to Boat Landing, 13143 (vi).
Big Harbour (Port Bevis), Wharf, 13143 (vi).
Big Pond, Wharf, 1071 (i).
Breton Cove, Boat Landing, 13151 (vi).
Bridgewater Dredging, 1074 (i).
Caribou Island, Causeway, 13179 (vi).
Chegoggin Pier, Training Dam, 13179 (vi).
Cheticamp Point, Wharf, 13179 (vi).
Cheverie, Breakwater Extension, 1078 (i).
Church Point, Breakwater, Repairs, 1078 (i).
Cow Bay Breakwater, 1078 (i), 13178 (vi).
Digby, Pier Renewals, 1083 (i).
Donald's Head, Breakwater Repairs, 13179 (vi).
Drumhead, Breakwater, 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
Duncan's Cove, Wharf, 13179 (vi).
East Bay, Wharf, 13180 (vi).
East Berlin, Breakwater, 13180 (vi).
East End, Cape Sable Island, Boat Harbour, 13180 (vi).
East Jeddore, 13179 (vi).
Economy, Wharf Extension, 1087 (i).
Finlay Point, Wharf, 13181 (vi).
Five Islands Wharf, Repairs, 13180 (vi).
Fort Lawrence, Landing Pier, 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
Freeport, Landing Pier, 13182 (vi).
Friar's Head, Boat Harbour, 1087 (i).
Frude's Point, Wharf, 13180 (vi).
Gabarus, Breakwater Extension, &c., 13182 (vi).
Georgeville Wharf, 13198 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 1087 (i).
Wharf, 13184 (vi).
Grand Etang, Bridge Works, 1095 (i).
Grand Narrows, Wharf Repairs, 1094 (i), 13198 (vi).
Grand River, Entrance, 1094 (i).
Granite Village, Mooring Pier, 13182 (vi).
Green Cove, Boat Harbour, 1100 (i).
Hall's Harbour Improvement, 13198 (vi).
Hawke Point Inlet, Boat Channel, 1102 (i).
Herring Cove, Breakwater, 1102 (i).
Indian Harbour Wharf, 13199 (vi).
Inverness, Harbour Works, 13199 (vi).
Iona, Wharf, 13200 (vi).
Janvrin's Island, Wharf, 1102 (i).
Judique, Breakwater Repairs, 1103 (i).
Ketch Harbour, Entrance, 13202 (vi).
Kingsport, Pier Reconstruction, 1103 (i), 13202 (vi).
L'Ardoise, Breakwater, 13201 (vi).
Larry's River, Breakwater, 1104 (i).
Lingan, Beach Protection, 1105 (i).
Livingston's Cove, Breakwater, 13200 (vi).
Lunenburg, Dredging, 1106 (i).
McKay's Point, Wharf, 13201 (vi).
McNutt's Island, Beach Protection, 13201 (vi).
Main-a-Dieu, Breakwater, 13201 (vi).
Malagawatch, Boat Channel, 13203 (vi).
Malignant Cove, Harbour, 13201 (vi).
Margaree, Improvements, 1133 (i).
Margaretville, Breakwater, 13202 (vi).
Melbourne, Wharf, 13203 (vi).
Meteghan Cove, Breakwater, 1133 (i).
Middle River, Pier Dam, 13202 (vi).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Musquodoboit Harbour, Wharf, 13203 (vi).
Necum Teuch, Wharf, 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
Neil's Harbour, Breakwater, 1139 (i).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf, 1142 (i).
New Harbour, Breakwater Repairs, 1143 (i).
Noel, Wharf, 13204 (vi).
North Gut, St. Ann's Wharf, 13203 (vi).
North River, St. Ann's, 13203 (vi).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection, 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
Oyster Pond, Beach Protection, 13204 (vi).
Parrsboro, Landing Pier, 13205 (vi).
Pembroke, Breakwater, 13205 (vi).
Petit de Grat, Protection Work, &c., 1146 (i).
Pickett's Pier, 13205 (vi).
Pictou Light Beach, Protection Works, 13205 (vi).
Pleasant Bay, 13205 (vi).
Poirierville, Wharf, 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
Porter's Lake Channel, 13205 (vi).
Port George Breakwater, 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
Port Greville, Breakwater, 13210 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 1146 (i).
Port Hawkesbury, Wharf, 1146 (i).
Port Hood, Harbour, 13206 (vi).
Pier Repairs, 13206 (vi).
Port Howe, Wharf, 13210 (vi).
Port Latour, Breakwater, 13210 (vi).
Port Maitland, Breakwater, &c., 13211 (vi).
Port au Pique, Wharf, 13210 (vi).
Sandy Cove, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Scott's Bay, Breakwater, 13211 (vi).
Short Beach, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Skinner's Cove, Channel, &c., 13213 (vi).
South Ingonish, Wharf, 1149 (i).
Spry Bay, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Summerville, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Sydney, Quarantine Station, 13213 (vi).
Tenecape, Breakwater, 13213 (vi).
Three Fathom Harbour, Beach Protection Works, 1149 (i).
Tiverton, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Victoria Beach, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Wallace Harbour, 13216 (vi).
Washabuck Centre, Wharf, 1150 (i).
Wedge Point, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
Wentworth, Wharf, 13216 (vi).
West Arichat, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
West Baccaro, Harbour Improvements, 1150 (i).
West Bay, Wharf, 13217 (vi).
West Chezzetcook, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
White's Cove, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
Windsor Harbour, Sheer Dam, &c., 14248 (vi).
Wolfville, Wharf, 13217 (vi).
Yarmouth Bar, Repairs, &c., 13218 (vi).
Ontario:
Amherstburg, Dredging, 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
Barrie, Wharf Construction, 1186 (i).
Barry's Bay, Wharf, 13236 (vi).
Bayfield, Extension of South Pier, 1188 (i).
Belle Rivière, Sheet Piling, 1191 (i).
Bowmanville, Breakwater Repairs, 1352 (i).
Bracebridge, Wharf, 13236 (vi).
Bronte Harbour, Improvements, 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
Bruce Mines, Dredging, 5911 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Burke's Falls, Magnetawan River, 1358 (i).
Burlington Channel, Repairs to Piers, &c., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
Cobourg, Completion of Repairs, 5909 (iii).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 13239 (vi).
Cumberland, Wharf, 13238 (vi).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
Georgian Bay, Point au Baril Route, 1365 (i).
Goderich, Harbour, 1365 (i), 13240 (vi).
Gore's Landing, Wharf, 13244 (vi).
Grand Bend, Pier, &c., 13239 (vi).
Hawkesbury, Dredging, 5909 (iii).
Improvements, Repairs, &c., 1369 (i).
Kingsville, Breakwater, 13244 (vi).
Lake Temiscamingue, Wharfs, 1376 (i).
Leamington, Wharf, 13246 (vi).
Little Bear Creek, Dredging, 13245 (vi).
Little Current, Channel, 13245 (vi).
Midland Harbour, Dredging, 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
Oakville Pier, Repairs, 1376 (i).
Orillia, New Wharf, 1377 (i).
Owen Sound Harbour, Dredging, &c., 1377 (i).
Parry Sound, Wharf, 13248 (vi).
Pembroke, 13248 (vi).
Petawawa Narrows, Ottawa River, 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
Pickering Harbour, Dredging and Repairs, 1377 (i).
Point Edward, Dredging, 13249 (vi).
Port Arthur, Breakwater, 13249 (vi).
Port Burwell, Harbour, 13249 (vi).
Port Elgin, Dredging, &c., 1424 (i).
Port Hope, Pier Repairs, &c., 1425 (i).
Port Perry, Harbour, 13249 (vi).
Port Stanley, Dredging, 13249 (vi).
Prescott, Dredging, 5915 (iii).
Rivière de Puces, Pile Work, 1425 (i).
River St. Lawrence, Wolfe Island Channel, 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
Rondeau, Harbour, 1427 (i).
Rosedale, Wharf, 13249 (vi).
St. Joseph, Wharf, 3382 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour, &c., 13252 (vi.)
Southampton, Harbour Improvements, 1428 (i).
Sturgeon Falls, Wharf, 1431 (i).
Sydenham River, Improvements, &c., 13250 (vi).
Thessalon, Breakwater, 13254 (vi).
Thornbury Harbour Works, 1432 (i).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
Magann & Phin's Claims, 13255 (vi).
Trenton, Dredging, 1434 (i).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging, 13255 (vi).
Washago Works, Repairs, 13252 (vi).
Wendover, Wharf, 1434 (i).
Wiarton Wharf, 13256 (vi).
Prince Edward Island:
Beach Point, Widening boat Channel, 13218 (vi)
Belfast Pier, Dredging, 1153 (i)
Canoe Cove Breakwater, Repairs, &c., 13218 (vi).
Cape Traverse, Carleton Head, Survey, 13218 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Prince Edward Island—*Con.*
Cascumpec Harbour, Closing Breach, 1153 (i).
Cove Head Harbour, Entrance Channel, 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).
Creosoted Timber for Piers, &c., 1155 (i).
Gaspereaux, Fisherman's Harbour, 155 (i).
Higgin's Shore Pier, Reconstruction, 1159 (i), 13222 (vi)
Lewis Point Pier, Repairs, 13223 (vi).
Lower Montague, 1159 (i).
New London, Breakwater, Repairs, 1160
Improvement to Clifton and French Rivers, 13223 (vi).
North Cardigan Pier, Extension, 13223 (vi).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 13223 (vi).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 1160 (i).
Richmond Bay, Reconstruction of Wharf near Grand River, 13223 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point. Breakwater, 1162 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13223 (vi).
Tignish Harbour, Breakwater, 1162 (i).
Quebec:
Anse aux Gascons, Wharf Extension, 13345 (vi).
Anse aux Gris Fonds River, Improvements 13445 (vi).
Anse St. Jean, Wharf Extension, 13445 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Breakwater, 13445 (vi).
Bois Brulé Training Pier, &c., 13448 (vi).
Bonaventure East, Breakwater, 13446 (vi).
Cacouna, Wharf Extension, 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
Caplan, Breakwater, 13448 (vi).
Chambord, Wharf, 13454 (vi).
Chateau Richer, Harbour Improvements, 13454 (vi).
Crane Island, Repairs to Wharf, 1513 (i).
Cross Point, Isolated Landing Pier, 1512 (i).
Deschambault, Wharf, 13457 (vi).
Desjardins, Allumette Wharf, 13457 (vi).
Doucet's Landing, Dredging, 5907 (iii).
Douglastown, Isolated Block 13457 (vi).
Father Point, Landing Pier, 1513 (i).
Gatineau River, C.P.R. Bridge Protection 13457 (vi).
General Repairs, 5907 (iii), 2241 (i).
Grande Rivière Wharf, New Covering, 13457 (vi).
Grand Valley Pier, 1514 (i).
Hull, Wharf, 5900 (iii).
Isle aux Coudres, Wharf, 2242 (i).
Isle Grosbois, Dredging Channel, 5902 (iii).
Kamouraska, Pier Extension, 13457 (vi).
Lake Nomininge, Wharf, 13460 (vi).
Lake St. John, Wharf, Dredging, 2243 (i), 13459 (vi).
Lake Temiscamingue, Improvements, 2246 (i), 14248 (vi).
Laprairie Ice Piers, &c., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
Le Tableau, Wharf, 2249 (i).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Rocks, 2257 (i).
Lotbinière, Wharf Improvements, 13460 (vi).
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 2257 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 2264 (i).
Maguasha, Landing Pier, 13461 (vi).
Maria, Pier, 2265 (i).
Mistook (Delisle), Wharf, 13461 (vi).
Mont Louis, Wharf, 13461 (vi).
Murray Bay, Wharf, 2266 (i).
Newport Breakwater Extension, 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
New Richmond, Breakwater, 13463 (vi).
Nicolet River, Dredging, 2278 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 13463 (vi).
Paspebiac, Landing Pier, 13464 (vi).
Perce, Extension Pier, North Cove, 13467 (vi).
Pierreville, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Pointe aux Esquimaux, Wharf, 2278 (i).
Pointe aux Trembles, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Pointe Fortune, Wharf Improvements, 13468 (vi).
Point St. Pierre, Breakwater, 2278 (i).
Port Daniel, Extension Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Repentigny, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Rimouski, Pier Extension, Tidal Basin, 13468 (vi).
River Batiscan, Channel, 2280 (i).
River Chateauguay, Dredging, 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
River Fox, Breakwater, 2279 (i).
Rivière Jesus, Dredging, 13470 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Wharf, 2281 (i).
Harbour Improvements, 13476 (vi).
Rivière Ouelle, Pier Repairs, 13470 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, 2282 (i).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 13473 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dredging Eastern Entrance, 2286 (i), 5904 (iii), 13469 (vi).
Grand Piles and La Tuque, 2285 (i), 13491 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, 13472 (vi).
River Touladie, Improvements, 2286 (i).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay, Pier, 2289 (i).
St. Alphonse, Baie de Ha Ha, Wharf, 13489 (vi).
St. André Kamouraska, Pier Extension, 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
St. Andrew's Landing, Dredging, 5907 (iii)
Ste. Anne de la Perade, Bank Protection, 13488 (vi).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier Reconstruction, 13489 (vi).
Ste. Anne du Saguenay, Wharf Improvements, 13488 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel, Ice Piers, 13489 (vi).
Sainte Famille, Pier Extension, 13488 (vi).
St. Fidèle, Wharf, 13493 (vi).
St. Francis Pier, Orleans Island, 2290 (i).
St. Fulgence, Wharf, 13491 (vi).
St. Gédéon Islands, Wharf, 13491 (vi).
St. Godefroi de Nouvelle, Breakwater, 13489 (vi).
St. Irene, Wharf, &c., 2291 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 13494 (vi).
St. Jerome, Wharf, 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
St. Laurent, Wharf, 5906 (iii).
St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier Repairs, 13494 (vi).
St. Nicholas, Strengthening Pier, 5905 (iii).
St. Simon, Wharf Extension, 13493 (vi).
Sabrevois, Wharf Improvements, 13485 (vi).
Sacré Cœur, Wharf, 13476 (vi).
Seven Islands, Wharf, 13479 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Shegawake, Harbour Improvements, 13479 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845, 12869 (vi).
Three Rivers, Harbour, Wharfs, 2296 (i).
Valleyfield, Dredging Channel in Bay, 2298 (i), 5905 (iii).
Ville Marie, Wharf, 14248 (vi).
Yamaska Lock Dredging, 13498 (vi).
Yukon :
Lewes and Yukon Rivers, Improvements, 13306 (vi).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments *re*, 13339 (vi).
Chief Architect's Office, Salaries, 2747 (ii).
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c., 2726 (ii), 13340 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 2925 (ii).
National Art Gallery, 2725 (ii).
Surveys and Inspections, 2715, 2720 (ii).
Surveys, Ottawa River Headwaters, 13340 (vi).
Temporary and Clerical Assistance, 2753 (ii).
Transportation Commission, 13362 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Port Colborne, 13024 (vi).
Roads and Bridges :
Bryson Bridge, 13 21 (vi).
Edmonton Bridge, 13323 (vi).
Generally, 2701 (ii).
Hull Slides and Union Bridge, 13321 (vi).
North Shore, Telegraph Line, 13322 (vi).
Ottawa City, Dufferin and Sappers Bridges, 13321 (vi).
Ottawa City and Vicinity, 2700 (ii).
Peace River to Pelly River, Pack Trail, 13323 (vi).
Portage du Fort, Bridge, 2690 (ii).
Slides and Booms :
Generally, 2690 (ii).
St. Maurice River, 2677 (ii).
Telegraph Lines :
B.C., Alberni—Clayoquot, 5918 (iii).
Kamloops—Nicola, Poles, &c., 13337 (vi).
Vancouver Island—Salt Springs Extension, 13337 (vi).
Mar. Provs. :
Cable Lines, 2701 (ii).
Chatham to Tracadie, 13325 (vi).
Deer Island—Eastport, Me., 13325 (vi).
N.W.T. :
Alexander Indian Agency, TelephoneLine, 5918 (iii).
Edmonton — Athabasca Landing, 13335 (vi).
Edmonton to Edmonton Indian Agency, 13334 (vi).
Victoria to Andrews, 13335 (vi).
Wood Mountain Post—Willow Bunch, 13335 (vi).
Quebec, Anticosti, Fox Bay—Bescie River, 13325 (vi).
Belle Isle and Mainland, 2712 (ii).
Bersimis to Godbout, 13332 (vi).
Bryon Island and Anticosti, 5917 (iii).
Chateau Bay—Belle Isle, Marconi, 13325 (vi).
Chicoutimi, Ste. Anne to Lac Clair, 13333 (vi).
Godbout, 2711 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Telegraph Lines—*Con.*

N.W.T—*Con.*

Island of Orleans, &c., Ste. Famille, 13330 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Land Lines, 2714 (ii).
Murray Bay to St. Catharines Bay, Second Wire, 13326 (vi).
Petite Rivière, St. Agnes, 13334 (vi).
Ste. Anne du Saguenay—Descente des Femmes, 13331 (vi).

Quarantine :

Cattle Quarantine and Veterinary Division, 5502 (iii).
Public Health, &c., 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii).
Public Works Health Act, 4440 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 4439 (ii).

Railways and Canals :

Canals :

Chambly, Electric Station By-wash, 12906 (vi).
Land Damages, 12908 (vi).
Macadamizing Tow Path, 12906, 14151 (vi).
Cornwall, Electric Plant for Lock Gates, 14134 (vi).
Compensation for Geo. Heath, 14155 (vi).
Enlargement, 12895 (vi).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Plant, 14155 (vi).
Enlargement, 7565 (iii), 12898, 14150 (vi).
Galops, Enlargement, 7803, 8268 (iv), 12899, 14141, 14644 (vi)
Generally, Operating Expenses, &c., 12920, 14157 (vi).
Salaries, Contingencies, Collectors' Offices, 12933 (vi).
Sunday Service, 12929 (vi).
Grenville, 12909 (vi).
To pay Henry Tucker *re* Investigation, 14156 (vi).
Lachine, Electrical Appliances, 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).
Enlargement, &c., 12903 (vi).
Gratuity to Family of late F. Guilbault, 14157 (vi).
Lock Gate Protection, 14142 (vi).
Paving Mill St., 14153 (vi).
Renewing Masonry of Lock No. 2, 12906 (vi).
Lake St. Francis, Protection to South Side, 14152 (vi).
Lake St. Louis, 12904 (vi).
Murray, To purchase W. H. Johnson's House, 14143 (vi).
Wire Fencing, 14150 (vi).
North Channel, Dam, &c., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14142 (vi).
St. Ours Lock, 12908 (vi).
Landing Wharfs, 12908, 14154 (vi).
Rapide Plat, 12898 (vi).
Rideau, Brasses' Point Bridge, 7808 (iv).
Concession St., Ottawa, Bridge, 14150 (vi).
Hog's Back, Swing Bridge, 12904 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction, &c., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, Surveys, Lifting Boulders, &c., 12900 (vi).
Soulanges, Construction, &c., 7549 (iii).
To pay Geo. Goodwin *re* Contract, 14142 (vi).
To pay J. and M. O'Leary *re* Claim, 14651 (vi).
To repair Breach in Bank, 14153 (vi).
Trent, Construction, 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Railways and Canals—Con.

Canals—*Con.*

Trent—*Con.*

Peterborough, &c., Entrance Piers, 14645 (vi).
Repairs and Dredging, 14645 (vi).
To pay Corry and Laverdure *re* Claim, 14651 (vi).
Welland, Deepening Long Level, 14148 (vi).
Dunnville Dam, &c., 7809 (iv).
Electric Light Plant, 12900, 14148 (vi).
Foundations for Elevator, Port Colborne, 14149 (vi).
Improvements at Port Colborne Entrance, 12902 (vi).
Improving Drainage along Feeder, 12905 (vi).
Land Damages, Grand River, 7805 (iv).
Lock Valves, &c., 12905 (vi).
Lowering Mitre Sills, &c., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
Removing Obstructions, 7804 (iv), 12902 (vi).
Rock Cut, Port Colborne to Humberstone, 14148 (vi).
Stone Protection to Banks of old Canal, 12904 (vi).
Summit Level Deepening, Port Colborne to Thorold, 12903 (vi).
Surveying Lands, &c., 12905 (vi).
Williamsburg, Gate Lifter, 14149 (vi).
Overseer's House, 14150 (vi).
Working Scow, 14154 (vi).

Miscellaneous :

Investigations into Ry. Accidents, 14154 (vi).
Litigation, 12911 (vi).
Ry. Commission, Salaries, &c., 14155 (vi.)
Salaries of Engineers, Draftsmen, &c., 12910 (vi).
Works not provided for, 12910 (vi).

Railways :

C.P.R., Canada Central and Brockville & Ottawa Rys., Amalgamation, 14133 (vi).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Surveys, &c., 14646 (vi).
Grand Trunk Ry., Rental, 12887 (vi).
Intercolonial Ry. :
Additional Sidings, Facilities, &c., 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi).
Air Brakes on Freight Cars, 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).
Passenger Cars, &c., 8311 (iv).
Amqui, Increased Accommodation, 12601 (v).
Anchor S.S. Line, Salvage *re* "Scotia," 14107 (vi).
Chaudière Jn., Engine House, 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).
Double Tracking, 14062 (vi).
Drawbars of Freight Cars, 7520 (iii), 8288 (iv).
Eastern Extension Ry. of N.B., Award, 7528 (iii).
Arbitrators' Fees, &c., 7529 (iii).
Eel River Station, Agent's Dwelling, 12600 (v).
Ferry Service, Strait of Canso, 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).
General Vote, 12873 (vi).
Grand Narrows Bridge, Protection, 14094 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. W. P. Brown, 14155 (vi).
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, 12597 (v), 12824, 14080 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—Con.
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*
Halifax, Dredging at Deep Water Terminus, 14646 (vi).
Lévis, Accommodation, 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
Little Metis Station, Improvements, &c., 12604 (v), 12827 (vi).
Metapedia, New Station, Improvements, &c., 14096 (vi).
Miramichi Bridge, South-west, 8307 (iv).
Moncton, Extension of Freight Car Shop, 8312 (iv).
Increased Accommodation, 12599 (v), 14090 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Freight Shed, &c., 14095 (vi).
New Machinery for Shops, 8290 (iv), 14106 (vi).
North Sydney, Improvements, 14089 (vi).
Operating Expenses, 7811 (iv).
Original Construction, 3698 (ii).
Passenger Cars, Vestibules, 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
Pintch Gas Apparatus, 8291 (iv).
Point Tupper, Improvements, 8309 (iv).
Power Saw, for Sawing Rails, 12607 (v).
Restigouche Bridge, New Superstructure, 8303 (iv).
River du Loup, Shops, &c., 8314 (iv), 12593 (v).
Yard, 8309 (iv).
River Ouelle Branch, 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
Rolling Stock, 8292 (iv), 14109 (vi).
Ste. Flavie, Increased Accommodation, 12602 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
Steel Rails, 5005 (ii), 14097 (vi).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation, 8296 (iv).
Strengthening Bridges, 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).
Sydney, Accommodation, 3696 (ii), 12597 (v).
To pay M. Connolly Interest *re* Dredging, 14103 (vi).
Truro, Increased Accommodation, 12603 (v), 12823 (vi).
Windsor, New Station, &c., 14097 (vi).
Prince Edward Island Ry. :
Albany, Station and Land, 14133 (vi).
Alberton, New Station, 14132 (vi).
Blue Shank, To straighten Line, 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, 14131 (vi).
General Vote, 12608 (v), 12891 (vi).
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, 12840 (vi).
Kinkora, Increased Accomodation, 12841 (vi).
Montague Bridge, Survey, &c., 14132 (vi).
Mount Stewart, Freight House, 7530 (iii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
Northam and Richmond, New Stations, 12841 (vi).
Steel Rails, &c., 7802 (iii).
Summerside, Wharf and Coal Sheds, 12828 (vi).
Water Service, 12841 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Scientific Institutions :
General Vote, 4118 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection :
General Vote, 4119 (ii), 13648 (vi).
Gratuity to Capt. R. M. MacGregor, 6993 (iii).
Time Ball at Halifax, 6993 (iii).
Superannuation :
To ex-lockmaster W. J. Casselman, 14272 (vi).
Trade and Commerce :
Chinese Immigration Act, 7759 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, 7760 (iv).
International Customs Tariffs Bureau, 7760 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, 7762 (iv).
Law Costs, 7795 (iv).
Unprovided Items :
Generally, 6992 (iii).
CONCURRENCE :
Fisheries, Salaries, &c., 6069 (iii).
Galops Rapid, 8374 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Quebec, 6070 (iii).
Grand Vallee, Pier, 6070 (iii).
Post Office, Additional Amount for Outside Service, 14764 (vi).

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act (jurisdiction) Amt. B. No. 22 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*), 1° m., 283 ; 2° m., 2351 (i).

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act : *See* 'Judges Retiring', &c.

SUPREME COURT CONTINGENCIES, DISBURSEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
—— LIBRARY, PURCHASE OF BOOKS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3402, 3405 (ii).
—— N. W. TERS., ADDITIONAL JUDGE : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
—— REGISTRAR : *See* 'Registrar'.
—— REPORTER'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).
—— REPORTS, BINDING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3405 (ii).
—— SALARY OF MR. E. R. A. TASCHEREAU : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).

Surtax, German, &c. : *See* 'Curtoms Tariff Act'.
—— *See* 'Customs Act', 'Customs Tariff', &c.

SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720 (ii), 13784 (vi).
SURVEYS FOR G.T.P.RY. in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi). *See* 'G.T.P.Ry',
SURVEYS, INSTRUMENTS, PURCHASE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
—— CONSTRUCTION, &C., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 8331 (iv).
—— BRIGADE CAMP : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 3235 (ii).
—— ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4672 (ii).
——STATION GROUNDS, I. C. R. : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*), in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
SWIM'S POINT, N. S. : WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 2312 (i).

Swing Bridges Control: *See* 'Navigable'.

SYDENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).

SYDNEY ACCOMMODATION, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.'

SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).

Sydney (North) Harbour Act Amt. B. No. 262 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304; wthdn., 12492 (v); in Com. on Res., 12800; 1°*, of B., 12801; 2°, and in Com., 12993; 3°*, 12994 (vi). (*3 Edward VII c.* 39).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. Bill (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res. 12304; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12306 (v).

SYDNEY, POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

——QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SYDNEY MINES, N.S., POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).

SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).

TADOUSAC AND ST. CATHERINE'S BAY SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup, 13695 (vi).

TARGET PRACTICES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).

TARIFF BILL: *See* 'Customs Bills, 174 and 273' (i).

TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1406; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1489 (i).

TARIFF, CHANGES, FREE LIST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

——MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 265 (i).

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4957 (ii).

TARIFF POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Brock*) 4880; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 4884; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 4889; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 4901; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4908; (Mr. *Bell*) 4912; (Mr. *Gourley*) 4919; (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 4921; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 4926; (Mr. *Osler*) 4929; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4931; (Mr. *Fielding*) 4920, 4937; (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 4943; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4945; (Mr. *Northrup*) 4951 (ii).

——Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 4263 (ii).

TARIFF PROTECTION, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6707 (iii).

——PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. on Binder Twine B 233: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*), 7304-7392 (iii).

TARIFF REVISION, COR. *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*), 3003 (ii).

TARIFF TAXATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., on Immigration, 6861 (iii).

TAYLOR, GEO. L., POLICE MAGISTRATE, YUKON, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONES, in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B., 5513 (iii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

—— B.C., in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).

—— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).

—— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

—— P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).

—— P.E.I., RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE: in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).

—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

—— ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).

——WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).

TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418, 3509 (ii).

Telephone Companies B. No. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1°*, 92; 2° m., 700 (i).

——*See* 'Railway Act'.

Telephones, &c.: *See* 'Canadian Telephone,' &c.

TELEPHONE AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

TELEPHONE COS. IN MAR. PROVS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2585 (ii).

TELEPHONES IN OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

TELEPHONE LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 291, 409 (i).

—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

—— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

——SERVICE LONG DISTANCE IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 5088 (ii).

TELESCOPE FOR OTTAWA OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, REPAIRS TO WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
See 'Lake Temiscamingue.'

TEMPORARIES IN P.O. DEPT., TRANSFER TO PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

TENDERS *re* GOVT. CONTRACTS, INJUSTICE TO ENGLISH FIRMS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

TENECAPE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup. 13213 (vi).

TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).

TENTS FOR N.W. MOUNTED POLICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

TERREBONNE, INDIAN RESERVE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).

—— POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

TEULON NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

Textile Fabrics Regulation and Inspection B. No. 137 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°m., 2101 (i); 2°m., 3294 (ii).

THANKSGIVING DAY ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13790 (vi).

THESSALON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).

THETFORD MINES, POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).

THOMPSON, MR. P., 'LABOUR GAZETTE', COR., TORONTO, REMUNERATION : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).

THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).

THREE FATHOM HARBOUR BEACH WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

——— RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARVES : in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).

TICKET OF LEAVE ACT, RELEASE, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 566 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).

See 'Marine' &c.

TIES, ISSUED, PURCHASED, USED on I.C.R., &c. : M. for Ret,* (Mr. *Haggart*), 3805 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*), 1679 (i).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, RUBUILDING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).

TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14314, 14345 (vi).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*), 14737, 14739 (vi).

TILSONBURG TO WOODSTOCK RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).

TIMBER AND TREE PLANTING, PROTECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 13775, 14272 (vi).

See 'Tree Planting'.

TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 2757 (ii).

TIMIGAMI RY. TO STURGEON FALLS, SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

TIVERTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

TOBACCO AGENT, MR. DUGAS, AMTS. PAID TO : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1034 (i).

TOBACCO COMBINE, CHAIRMAN'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1297 (i).

——— EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 8267 (iv).

TOBACCO DUTIES COLLECTED IN 1902, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*), 2103 (i).

——— COLLECTED IN 1903 : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*), 12217 (v).

——— DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*), 446 (i).

——— EXCISE DUTIES, PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re* INCREASE : Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*), 5701 (iii).

——— STAMPS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14462 (vi).

TORONTO, ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION : in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

TORONTO, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 972 (i), 13086 (vi).

——— PAVING, &c. ; in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

TORONTO ARMOURY, LETTERS *re* ENLARGEMENT : Read (Mr. *Clarke*), in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).

TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), 11177 (v).

TORONTO CUSTOM HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 647, 957 (i).

——— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

TORONTO ELECTRIC ST. RY. CO. : Remarks *re* running rights (Mr. *Clarke*) 6083 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Railway Co.'s B. No. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 2396 (i) ; 2°*, 2756 ; in Com., 4672 ; Order for Com., 4868 (ii), 5555, (remarks) 5882, 6198 (iii), ref. back to Sel. Com., 7812 ; in Com., 9419 ; 3°*, 9431 (iv). (*3 Edward VII*, c. 196).

TORONTO AND HAMILTON RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to resume adjnd. Deb., 5882, 6198 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* running rights, 6091 (iii).

Toronto Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Co.'s B. No. 203 (Mr. *Calvert*) M. to receive Pet., 4261 ; 1°*, 4727 (ii) ; 2°*, 5139 ; in Com. and 3°*, 6399 (iii) (*3 Edward VII*, c. 197).

TORONTO HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).

——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).

——— TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT. ON HARBOUR, &c. : M. for Stmnt* (Mr. *Grant*). 534, 1203 (i).

TORONTO INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO : in Com. of Sup., 13501 (vi).

TORONTO ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).

TORONTO AND JAMES BAY RY. SUBSIDY : Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) 14358, 14443 (vi).

TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).

See 'Can. Foundry Co.' &c.

TORONTO, LINDSAY AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

TORONTO, MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

——— STOREHOUSES : in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

——— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

——— ADDITIONAL STORY : in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

——— BRANCH OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).

——— ENLARGEMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c. : in Com. of Sup , 956 (i).

——— PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).

TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).

TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).

"TOWNSEND" VALVE, *re* LOCK GATES, WELLAND CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
TRACADIE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
——— LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii), 13038 (vi).
TRACHOMA, EPIDEMIC *re* IMMIGRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 5493 (iii).
——— HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 14245
——— IMMIGRANTS, MEDICAL INSPECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6662, 6695, 6843 (iii).
TRACKMEN'S INCREASE OF WAGES, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 1297 (i).
——— INCREASE OF SALARIES : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).
See 'North Atlantic.'
——— INCREASE OF WAGES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12874, 14083 (vi).
TRADE COMBINATIONS, INVESTIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14654 (vi).
See 'Lumber.'
TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON, ENG. : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3497 (ii).
TRADESMEN'S ACCOUNTS FOR H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE :

ALLAN'S CONTRACT *re* ATLANTIC SERVICE, DISCRIMINATING RATES *re* CAN. FREIGHT : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13674 (vi).
See 'Atlantic Fast SS.'
ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, ALLAN'S CONTRACT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 13672 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Hfx.*) 7091 (iii).
ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, WITHDRAWAL OF ALLAN STEAMERS FROM ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).
See 'C.P.R.'
ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4007 (ii).
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) for Stmnt., 4445 (ii).
——— PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT : in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) to Com. of Sup., 14158 (vi).
——— Remarks *re* Amt. to Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 13948 (vi).
——— TENDERS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3882, 4120 (ii).
AUSTRALIA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).
BINDER TWINE, BOUNTIES, &c. : Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7305 (iii).
BINDER TWINE, CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* SALES : Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 4180 (ii).
BINDER TWINE INSPECTION, ADMINISTRATION OF, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF INSPECTOR, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).
——— METHODS OF COLLECTING PENALTIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 14684 (vi).
——— QUANTITY IMPORTED FROM U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7565 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc. in Rep. on Agriculture, &c. 13788 (vi).
See general heading.
CAN. AND AUSTRALIA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*

CAN. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
See 'G. B. and Can.'
CAN. AND S. AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
C.P.R. STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
See 'Allan'
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS, COR., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).
——— DUTIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 4360 (ii).
DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 92 (i).
DEPTL. VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 7573, 7759 (iv).
FAST MAIL LINE :
See 'Atlantic.'
FRANCE AND CANADA SS. SERVICE : Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4957 (ii).
See 'Ocean Steamship Subsidies Bill.'
FREIGHTS ON OCEAN VESSELS : *See* 'Freight Rates.'
FREIGHT RATES BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).
———Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).
———PROVISION IN CONTRACT *re* DISCRIMINATION : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).
FURNESS-WITHY CO.'S SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GASPÉ AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).
GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).
GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND AND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
G B. AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7573, 7728 (iv).
G.B. AND CANADA SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).
See 'Atlantic Fast SS. Service,' &c.
HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL *via* NFLD, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
HAYCOCK, JOS., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : Ques. (Messrs *Wilson* and *Taylor*) 4959 (ii).
———APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup. 7763, 7772 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
HIDES INSPECTIONS, TEL. FROM W. F. MACLEAN, M. P. : Read (Mr. *Sproule*), 3969 (ii).
HIDES INSPECTOR AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3627 (ii).
HIDES, TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 7748 (iv), 13678 (vi).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS SS. SUBVENTION : i n Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 5878, 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672, 14249 (vi).
MANCHESTER AND MONTREAL SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup.. 7745 (iv).
PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE :
See 'Chamber of Commerce.'
PASPEBIAC AND GASPÉ BASIN SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT CHEQUE : in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Con. of Sup., 14249 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
P.E.I. AND G.B. MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv).
P.E.I. AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
P.E.I. AND NEWFOUNDLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13676 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
ST. JOHN AND BELFAST SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7731 (iv).
——AND DIGBY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).
——AND GLASGOW SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).
——AND HALIFAX SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
——AND LONDON SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
ST. JOHN AND W. INDIES SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE AND FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv). *See* 'Marine,' etc.
ST. STEPHEN AND BACK BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
S. AFRICA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).
TADOUSAC AND ST. CATHERINE'S BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON, ENG. : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3497 (ii).
'TUNISIAN' AND 'BAVARIAN,' RATE OF SPEED, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).
VICTORIA, B. C., AND VANCOUVER ISLAND, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
TRADING AND EXPLORING COMPANY'S EXPENSES *re* YUKON TRAIL : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
TRAFFIC IN N. W. T., BLOCKADE, &c. : Remarks (Mr *Scott*) on M. for Sup., 2424 (i).
TRAFFIC RATES, I. C. R. : Inquiry for Papers (Mr *Bell*) 3712 (ii). *See* 'I. C. R.'
TRANS-CANADA RY. CO., APPLICATION TO GOVT. FOR SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1026 (i).
TRANS-CANADA RY. AND G. T. PACIFIC, PAR. IN TORONTO 'NEWS' *re* SALE : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7566 (iv).
—— CONTRACT WITH GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2759 (ii) ; Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 2794 (ii).
—— M. for Cor (Mr. *Tarte*) 672 (i). *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.', &c.
Transcontinental Ry. B. No. 235, 1°m, 7658 (iv).
——Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7726 (iv).
——AND SIR WILLIAM MULOCK'S SPEECH : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 367 (i).
—— DECLARATIONS BY MINISTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
——GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5765 (iii).
——PROPOSALS TO GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 874 (i).
—— REPRESENTATIONS *re* MILITARY PURPOSES : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 541 (i). *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'
R
TRANSLATION OF PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*), 545 (i).
TRANSLATORS OF DEBATES, RENTAL OF OFFICES : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 3799 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 2311 (i).
TRANSPORT AND FREIGHT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES : in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND TARIFF INQUIRY, PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD" : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 853 (i).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF CHAIRMAN : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 9582 (iv).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, &c., APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS : Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 5137 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 1199 (i), 3129, 4840 (ii), 9819 (iv).
—— APPNMT. OF SIR WM. VANHORNE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 7297 (iii).
—— DISCUSSION OF *re* SOREL WHARF : Remarks (Mr *Brock*), in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
—— EXPENDITURE *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13362 (vi).
——FORMATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 9819 (iv).
——FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 9458 (iv).
——INSTRUCTIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 4120 (ii).
——MEETINGS, BUSINESS TRANSACTED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 13027 (vi).
——O. C. *re* APPNMTS. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Tarte*), 1324 (i).
——PERSONNEL, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 4727 (ii), 7206 (iii).
——SIR WM. VANHORNE'S VIEWS *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*), 8330 (iv).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, GOVT. POLICY *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 3432 (ii).
Debate : (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 3438 ; (Mr. *Sproule*), 3442 ; (Mr. *Haggart*), 3444 ; (Mr. *Tarte*), 3451 ; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 3456 ; (Mr. *Charlton*), 3459 ; (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*), Irregularity of debate, 3470, 3499 ; (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3471 ; (Mr. *Oliver*), 3479 ; (Mr. *Bickerdike*), 3483 ; (Mr. *Kemp*), 3486 ; (Mr. *Osler*), 3490 ; (Mr. *Pringle*), 3493 ; (Mr. *Bell*), 3497 ; (Mr. *Clare*), 3505 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE : in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
—— *re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION FROM THE N.W.T. : *See* 'Ry. Traffic', &c.
TRANSPORTATION POLICY *re* SPEECH FROM THRONE : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 6404 (iii).
TRAP NETS IN GULF ST. LAWRENCE, PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2917 (ii).
TREADGOLD AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, INQUIRY, *re* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4840 (ii).
—— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4960 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*), to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95), 2914; (Amt.) 2826 (ii).

Debate: (Sir *William Mulock*), 2826; (Mr. *Pringle*) 2842; (Mr. *Blair*) 2863; (Mr. *Porter*) 2873; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2880; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 2887; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2898; (Mr. *Barker*) 2906; (Mr. *Osler*) 2912 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2424 (i).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4486; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).

Debate: (Sir *William Mulock*) 4499; (Mr. *Monk*) 4505; (Mr *Borden, Hfx.*) 4509; (Mr. *Blair*) 4513; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4522; (Mr. *Northrup*) 4525; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4533; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4536; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4541; (Mr. *Davis*) 4544 (ii).

TREADGOLD COMMISSION, APPNMT., &C.: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).

———AND DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1224 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 3298, 3303, 3713 (ii).

——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3864 (ii).

——— CORRECTED ANSWER (Mr. *Sifton*), 6803 (iii).

——— ENGINEER'S REP. TO MIN. OF JUS., 2798 (ii).

——— FREE REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 5990 (iii).

——— FREE REPRESENTATIONS: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6427 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 3397 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioner (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 13134, 13258 (vi).

——— INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 4120, 4564 (ii), 5242 (iii).

——— LETTER FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, 2818 (ii).

——— LETTER FROM HON. J. H. ROSS *re* LIB. CONVENTION, 2817 (ii).

——— LETTER TO SENATOR WOOD FROM HOLME, MILLER & CO., 2807 (ii).

——— LIBERAL ASSO'CN, PET., 2821 (ii).

——— LIB. PLATFORM, CONVENTION, 2842 (ii).

——— PLEDGES OF HON. J. H. ROSS, 2843 (ii).

——— 'MORNING SUN', QUOTATIONS, &C., 2804 (ii).

——— 'MORNING SUN', REPS. OF DAWSON CITY MEETING, 2808 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4727 (ii).

——— PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS *re* EVIDENCE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11064 (v).

——— PERSONNEL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638, (iii).

——— PET. BY YUKON CITIZENS TO GOV. GEN., 2798 (ii).

——— PRINGLE, MR., Speech at Bonanza, 2822 (ii).

——— REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638 (iii), 7927 (iv).

——— RESOLUTIONS OF DAWSON CITIZENS' MEETING 1902, 2810 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, RESOLUTIONS *re* LIBERAL CONVENTION, 2815 (ii).

——— SEC. 14, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4593 (ii).

——— TAPPAN ABNEY'S REMARKS IN "HARPERS WEEKLY", 2849 (ii).

——— TEL. FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE *re* PETS &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1195 (i).

——— TEL. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, DAWSON: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 8085 (iv).

——— TEL. FROM W. A. BEDDOE *re* COMMISSIONER'S REFUSAL TO PRODUCE FILES: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9818 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9979 (iv).

TREADGOLD EXHIBITS, GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).

TREADGOLD, HYDRAULIC LEASES, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*), 288 (i).

TREASURY BOARD: *See* 'Auditor General.'

TREE CULTURE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii).

TREE PLANTING: in Com. of Sup., 13775 (vi).

See 'Timber.'

TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).

———EMPLOYMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 8117 (iv).

———HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*), 129 (i).

———MESSRS. CORRY & LAVERDURE, INTEREST *re* ARBRITATION: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

———PAYMENT TO THOS. DODDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 8118 (iv).

———PETERBOROUGH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).

———REP. OF W. MCLEOD, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 12716 (vi).

———ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

———SPECIFICATIONS, REPS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ward*), for Copies, 2313 (i).

TRENTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).

TROIS PISTOLES BRIDGE TO MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*), 8488 (iv).

TRURO TO PARRSBOROUGH, RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14491 (vi).

TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).

Trust Co.: *See* 'Royal Trust.'

Trust Corporation: *See* 'Consolidated.'

Trust Funds, Moosonee Diocese B. No. 148 (Mr. *Osler*), 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 157).

TUBERCULOSIS, AID TO CAN. ASSOCIATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

TUCKER, HENRY, PAYMENT *re* INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).

'TUNISIAN' AND 'BAVARIAN,' STRS., RATE OF SPEED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).

TURNPIKE TRUST, MONTREAL, INDEBTEDNESS, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 672 (i).

TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
See 'Frank.'

TWO-CENT FARE CLAUSE, G. T. RY., REPEAL OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 11828 (v).
——— Amt. in Com. on B. 235, 12221 (v).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'

TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT, RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7567 (iv).

TYERMAN, P. D., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 286 (i).

UNFORESEEN EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iii), 12588 (v).

United Empire Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3796, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 198).

U. S. COASTING LAWS, BONDING PRIVILEGES, &c., REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

U. S. IMMIGRATION OFFICERS, NEWPORT VT., TREATMENT OF ENGLISH DELEGATES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).

U. S. INDEMNITY TO FISHERMEN, COR. &c.: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor.*, 3236 (ii).

U. S. INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS *re* CUSTOMS MANIFEST AND POSTAGE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).

UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).

VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

VALIQUETTE, Mr. J. A., APPNMT. AS STENOGRAPHER IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 4005 (ii).

VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
——— ELECTION: *See* 'Beauharnois.'
——— LABOUR STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.,: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 98 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
——— STRIKE, PAY OF MEN, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).

Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) 1°*, 1111; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., 4587; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 199).

Vancouver Harbour, Lands B. No. 76 (Mr. *Macpherson* 1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).

VANCOUVER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— P.O., INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).

VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) on conc., 14764 (vi).

VEGETABLES IMPORTED FROM U.S., DUTY COLLECTED AT TORONTO AND MONTREAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1058 (i).
See 'Market'.

VENIOT, P.I., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT BATHURST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

VENTILATION IN H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 488, 975 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).
——— FANS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).

VESTIBULE EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).

VETERANS, CANADIAN, PET. *re* MILITARY SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 11188 (v).

VETERINARY, CHIEF INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1591 (i).

VETERINARY DIVISION, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO S.S. SUBVENTION: in Com of Sup., 7741 (iv).

VICTORIA, B.C. AND VANCOUVER ISLAND, SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).

VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i), 14243 (vi).
See 'Public Works, &c.'

VICTORIA MEMORIAL, LONDON, CONTRIBUTION OF CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

VICTORIA, N.W.T. TO ANDREWS, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).

VICTORIA, N.S., BEACH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

VISITORS IN H. OF C. CORRIDORS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lennox*) 11427, 11557 (v).

VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N.W.T., LAND SCRIP, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).

VOTERS' LISTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (iii).
See 'Electoral Lists.'

VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

WABY, INDIAN PRISONER, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iii).

WADSWORTH, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).

WAGNER, D. J., SALARY INCREASE: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 14256 (vi).

WALKERVILLE BRIDGE CO., SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

WALLACEBURG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).

WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE, MEMBER FOR ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUSSELL: Introduced, 1642 (i).

WALLACE HARBOUR, N.S., FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).

WALPOLE CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).

WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

WALTHAM STATION TO FERGUSON POINT, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

WASHABUCK CENTRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).

WASHINGTON, MR. HECTOR, REP. *re* LAND VALUES: Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).

WATER SUPPLY FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).

WATER SUPPLY ON C. P. R. TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).

WATSON, JOHN, PRES. OF LIB. ASSOCIATION, NESBITT, MAN: Ques. (Mr. *Roché, Marquette*) 1195 (i).

WAYS AND MEANS: German Surtax in Com. on B. 273, 14755 (vi).

——— Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 89, 1378 (i).

——— Financial Statement, 1378 (i).

——— DEBATE: *See* 'Budget'

WEDGE POINT, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WEEKLY PUBLICATIONS, 'JESSE JAMES' SERIES, CUSTOMS DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

Weigh Masters Bill: *See* 'General Inspection.'

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°m, 203; 2°m., 2338 (i), 3245 (ii).

——— **(scales) Amt. B. No. 188** (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4009; in Com., 4009, 4187; 3°*, 4203 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, c. 72).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTORS: Salaries in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).

WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).

——— DRAINAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).

——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).

——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).

——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).

——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).

——— ROCK CUT: *See* 'Colborne.'

——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).

——— WATER POWER, O. CS. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).

——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE OF ST. CATHARINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).

WELLINGTON TO UNION BAY, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).

WENTWORTH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).

WEST BACCARO, BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).

WEST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).

Western Alberta Railway Co.'s B. No. 205 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 5238; 2°*, 5362; in Com., and 3°*, 6657 (iii) (3 *Edward VII*, c. 200).

Western Assurance Co.'s B. No. 244 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 8406; 2°*, 8559 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 10903 (v), (3 *Edward VII*, c. 201).

Western Canada Mortgage, &c. Bill: See 'Canada Permanent.'

WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6168 (iii).

——— JURY'S VERDICT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3231 (ii).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on Adjmnt., 4726 (ii).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 249 (Mr. *Morrison*) M. to receive Pet., 10489 1°, 10744; 2°*, 10903 (v).

WEST POINT, U.S.: Remarks (Col. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 13095 (vi).

WHARFS, &c., BUILDING BY GOVT.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 13143, 13449 (vi).

WHARF CONNECTIONS AND RY. SUBSIDIES BY GOVT Remarks in Com. on Ry. Res., 14463 (vi).

WHARFS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

——— PRIVATE, GOVT. EXPENDITURE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1352-1377 (i).
See 'Public Works.'

WHEAT, BLOCKADE IN N.W.T.; *See* 'Ry. Traffic,' 11425 (v).

——— EXPORT FREIGHT RATES PER HUNDRED POUNDS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).

——— FREIGHT RATES, RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).

——— SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 284 (i).

———Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).
See 'Grain,' &c.

WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).

WHITE, ALBERT S., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4673 (ii).

WHITE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WHITE, MR., EXPENSES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6732, 6853 (iii).

WHITE HORSE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).

WHITE MUD RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).

WHITNEY PIER, N.S., SALARY OF POSTMASTER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 130, 668 (i).

WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 11188 (v).

WILLIAMSBURG CANALS, APPNMT. of SUPT., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

——— COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).

——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).

——— OVERSEER'S HOUSE; in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
See 'Galop'.

WILLIAM'S HEAD, B. C., QUARANTINE STATION WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. No. 228 (Mr. *Wade*), 1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9149; in Com., and 3°*, 9152 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 202).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*), 1°*, 367; 2° m., 630, 664 (i).

WINDSOR HARBOUR, N.S., SHEER DAM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT, I. C. R, EVIDENCE *re*: Remark (Mr. *Clarke*), 3301, 3398, 3496, 3712 (ii).

WINDSOR, N.S, NEW STATION, RENTAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

WINDSOR, ONT., CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &c.; Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 3907 (ii).

WINDSOR, ONT., POST OFFICE, LETTER BOXES: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).

WINGHAM, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).

Winnipeg Bank: *See* 'Bank of Winnipeg'. &c.

WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).

WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Winnipeg City Water Power Bill: *See* "Assiniboine River'.

WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS AND POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13126, (vi).

——— LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).

——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).

——— MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 438 (1), 13127 (vi).

——— P.O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).

——— P.O., REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).

Winnipeg Western Land Corporation Co.'s Limited B. No. 61 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°* 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 204).

WINNIPEGOSIS, CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).

WINTER COMMUNICATION BY STR 'STANLEY', P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

———M. for Copies of Pets., &c., (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

———CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett* 6895 (iii).

———COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1036 (i).

———M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.,' &c.

WIRE FENCING, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup. 14150 (vi).
See 'Canals,' &c.

WIRELESS STATIONS ON MARINE COASTS: in Com. of Sup., 13639 (vi).
See 'Marconi,' &c.

WOLFE ISLAND, DREDGING SHOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).

WOLFVILLE, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WOOD ALCOHOL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

——— MANUFACTURE IN CANADA, OUTPUT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 98 (i).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
See 'Standard,' &c.

WOODS, J. W., RENTAL OF BUILDINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).

——— TENDER FOR TENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii).

———Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).

Woodmen of the World, Can. Order B. No. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., 1854; 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 206).

WOOD MOUNTAIN POST, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).

WOODSTOCK, N. B. AND FREDERICTON RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

WOODSTOCK, N. B., ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).

———DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 4563 (ii), 5735 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Ret. (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 4593 (ii).

——— REPAIRS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).

WOODSTOCK, N. B. TO U.S. BOUNDARY, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

WOODSTOCK, ONT., ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).

———PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041, 13108 (vi).

Woolf Valve Gear Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 161 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 205).

WORKING EXPENSES, I. C. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).

———P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

WRECKING PLANT, STR. 'LORD STRATHCONA,' MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13524, 13514 (vi).

See 'Marine.'

WRIGHT, MR. A. W., AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 8116 (iv).

YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

YAMASKA TO LOTBINIÈRE, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14318 (vi).

YAMASKA RIVER AND ST. GUILLAUME, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

YARMOUTH, N.S., BAR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

'YEAR BOOK' : in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

YOHO PARK, ROAD CONSTRUCTION, &C : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

YORK AND CARLETON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

YORKTON COURT HOUSE, in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).

YUKON, COMPENSATION TO CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE : in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Yukon Territory Act (Jurors) Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 94 ; 2°*, 313 ; in Com., 313 ; 3°*, 314 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 73).

Yukon Ter. Act (Court of Appeal) Amt. B. No. 254 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 11692 ; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12301 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 74).

YUKON :

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE : In Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

ADMINISTRATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

BRITTON, JUDGE, CHARGES *re* INVESTIGATION OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION, PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 11065 (v).

BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

CLERKS, &C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

COMPENSATION TO CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE : in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

COURTS, PURCHASE OF LAW BOOKS : in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).

CUSTOMS EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 3968 (ii).

DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re* TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS : Remarks (Mr *Borden, Halifax*), 1024 (i).

DAWSON TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

DISTRICT NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : M. for stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).

DOM. LAND REGULATIONS : in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

DUGAS, JUDGE, REFUND TO DEPT. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

EILBECK, SHERIFF, FEES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

——— SALARY, LIVING ALLOWANCE, FEES, &C. : in Com., of Sup., 3414 (ii).

ELDORADO GUSHER, EXPENDITURE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6949, 7275 (iii).

GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

GOVTL. EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6802, 6949 (iii), 13367 (vi).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

YUKON—*Con.*

HOSPITAL GRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iii).

HYDRAULIC LEASES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*), 1323 (i).

INDIANS, GENERAL EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iii).

——— RELIEF, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7270 (iii).

JUDGES' LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

———TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

———LAW LIBRARY : in Com. of Sup., 14267 (vi).

LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

LITHGOW, MR., CONTROLLER : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).

MIDDLETON, T. W., GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DEFALCATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

MOUNTED POLICE, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5262 (iii).

NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).

N. W. MOUNTED POLICE, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).

OFFICIALS, LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).

POLICE MAGISTRATES, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

POST OFFICE DEFICIT : Remarks (Sir *William Mulock*), in Com. of Sup., 14014 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13133, 13306 (vi).

REGULATIONS *re* DOM. LANDS, APPROVAL, &C. : in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 5826, 7283 (iii).

SHERIFFS, CLERKS, &C. SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 3410 (ii).

SHERIFFS FEES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

———LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3414 (ii).

STENOGRAPHERS, APPNMT. OF J. A. VALIQUETTE : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 4005 (ii).

———SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

SUPPLIES, PURCHASE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6930 (iii).

TAYLOR, GEO. L., POLICE MAGISTRATE, YUKON, SALARY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

TEL. LINES : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

——— MANAGEMENT, &C., PAR. IN 'POST INTELLIGENCER' *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 7003 (iii).

——— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).

TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418, 3509 (ii).

TRADING AND EXPLORING COMPANY'S EXPENSES *re* YUKON TRAIL : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

TREADGOLD AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, INQUIRY *re* : (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4840 (ii).

———Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4960 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2796 ; Neg. (Y. 52 ; N. 95) 2912 ; (Amt.) 2826 (ii).

———Letter from Dawson Board of Trade, 2818 (ii).

———Letter from Hon. J. H. Ross *re* Liberal Convention, 2817 (ii).

———Letter to Senator Wood from Holme, Miller & Co., 2807 (ii).

——— Liberal Association, Pet., 2821 (ii).

——— Liberal Platform, Convention, 2842 (ii).

———Pledges of Hon. J. H. Ross, 2843 (ii).

——— '*Morning Sun*' Quotations, &c., 2804 (ii).

——— '*Morning Sun*' Reps., Dawson City Meeting, 2808 (ii).

YUKON—*Con.*

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4486 (ii).
———APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3298, 3303, 3713 (ii).
———APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3864 (ii).
———APPNMT. &c.: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).
———AND DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1024 (i).
———CORRECTED ANSWER (Mr. *Sifton*) 6803 (iii).
———ENGINEER'S REP. TO MIN. of JUS., 2798 (ii).
———EXHIBITS, GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
———FREE REPRESENTATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 5990 (iii).
——— FREE REPRESENTATIONS: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6427 (iii).
———HYDRAULIC LEASES, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).
———O. Cs. &c.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*).
———Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3397 (ii).
———Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioners (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13134, 13258 (vi).
———INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120, 4564 (ii), 5242 (iii).
———Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 5243 (iii).
———NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 4727 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2424 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, &c., O. C. 12th June 1901, 2800 (ii).
———O. C. 7th Dec. 1901, 2801 (ii).
———O. C. 21st April, 1902, 2803 (ii).
———PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS *re* EVIDENCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11064 (v).
———PERSONNEL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638, 7297 (iii).
———REPRESENTATIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638 (iii).
———SEC. 14, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.* 4593 (ii).
——— TEL. FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE *re* PETS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1195 (i).
——— TEL. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, DAWSON: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 8085 (iv).
——— TEL. FROM W. A. BEDDOE *re* COMMISSIONER'S REFUSAL TO PRODUCE FILES: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9618, 9979 (iv).
———TAPPAN ABNEY'S REMARKS "IN HARPERS' WEEKLY," 2849 (ii).
VALIQUETTE, MR. J. A., APPNMT. AS STENOGRAPHER IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5005 (ii).
WHITE HORSE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
YUKON ITEMS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13500 (vi).

Yukon Ry.: *See* 'Canadian Yukon'.
Yukon Ry.: *See* 'Coast'.

ERRATA.

Bazinet, Mr.
Joliette and Lake Manuan Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com. and 3°*, 2050 (i).

Blain, Mr.
Blankets, &c., read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Blair, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5144 for 5139 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5139 for 5138 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5149 for 5145 (iii).

Clarke, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5141 for 5139 (iii).

Davis, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5148 for 5145 (iii).

Fielding, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5151 for 5147 (iii).

Fitzpatrick, Mr.
Dorchester Penitentiary, read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Fowler, Mr.
Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ottawa (census building) read 992 for 982 (i).

Haggart, Mr.
Bonding Privileges with U.S., read 12757 for 12751 (vi).

Heyd, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5152 (iii).

Ingram, Mr.
Dorchester Penitentiary, read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Kemp, Mr.
Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Wendover wharf) read 1439 (i), and delete 1439 for Que. Harbour Improvements.

LaRivière, Mr.
Private Bills, read 5138 for 5137 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid.
Blankets, &c., read 10102 for 10101 (v).
Private Bills, read 5139 for 5137 (iii).

McCarthy, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5139 for 5138 (iii).

Murray, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 235, read 10111 for 1011.

SUBJECTS.

Page clxii first line for "Census Buildings" read "Census, Cost," &c.